

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung
Center for European Integration Studies
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität Bonn



Joseph M. Hughes

**“Sleeping Beauty”
Unleashed: Harmonizing
a Consolidated European
Security and Defence Union**

Discussion Paper

**C248
2018**

Joseph M. Hughes completed the "Master of European Studies – Governance and Regulation" at the Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI), Class of 2017. Prior to this, he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science/International Affairs from the University of California-Riverside in 2016. He also studied at the National Centre for Research on Europe on an exchange at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand in 2015.

Joseph M. Hughes

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

I. The Triangle of European Defense Integration

Notwithstanding Europe’s historic heritage, a fully harmonized and independent ‘European Security and Defense Union’ (ESDU) is a prerequisite for the European Union’s (EU) mainstay as a capable and influential international actor, its own security, and ultimately that of the United States (US). As the world’s single most cohesive military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has traditionally been the sole legitimate medium through which the EU and US ensure security throughout Europe. European defense and security have thus been deeply entrenched in a longstanding US-centric power structure through the security guarantor of NATO. In the ensuing assessment of blockages to forging such a ESDU, one can first envision a ‘triangle of European integration’ with a political apex at the top representing the commanding capacity of politics to shape and often override legal and economic aspects of integration, and with one legal and one economic base point at the bottom of the triangle. Predominantly, it is this political apex within the triangle of European defense integration to blame for the EU’s reticence and sluggishness in establishing a fully harmonized ESDU. Therefore, with politics as the greatest obstacle to European defense integration, a fully operational defense union will be stillborn until member states come to terms with one another politically while applying the permitted legal foundations and convincing economic rationale to the debate on defense.

Never has there been a more exciting and opportune time for European defense with the recent activation of PESCO (Permanent Structured Cooperation), so it is high time for this discussion.

II. Recalling Europe's Historic Legacy

The story of European defense integration really begins with the scourge of the Two World Wars. Though rather rudimentary in its inception, defense integration was already well underway in Europe before the EU was deemed a legitimate *de jure* entity in 1949 with the formation of NATO after the Vandenberg Resolution's passing by the US Senate in 1948¹. In its rise to pre-eminent global leadership, it was not long before the US propped Europe back onto its feet with economic stimulus via the Marshall Plan and militarily through NATO. These two major catalysts, which remedied Europe's perils, soon precipitated the US' materialization as 'the' global hegemon whereby a new global order had been born. Much to its dismay, the US soon found itself deeply entrenched in European woes as it began to wave a sizeable wand in international affairs. While the Marshall Plan had re-stimulated the ravaged economies of Western European nations, NATO had brought military security to Europe which eventually led to an unintentional² security dependence of Europe on the US. This cycle of security dependence remains intact to this day and has since curtailed the development of a fully harmonized European defense policy. As the Schuman Plan and European Coal and Steel Community fostered a cooperative spirit throughout Europe, it was not until the Korean War during which the North Koreans trespassed the 38th parallel division into the South was Europe obliged to rethink its entire security framework. One might ponder the relevance of this international infringement to the debate on European defense, but it was in fact the Korean War which brought security to the fore in Europe when the US and Western Europe recognized the pertinence of German rearmament and the forging of a cohesive

1 Wyatt-Walter, Holly, *The European Community and the Security Dilemma, 1979-92*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1997, p. 17.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 18.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

alliance³ as critical solutions to the patchy security vacuum left by the Second World War. North Korean hostility had ingrained the West vs. East mentality between the US and Soviet Union (USSR) following the War with Europe caught betwixt two clashing superpowers in a new bipolar global order.

Pressured by the US to keep Germany in check under this period of security re-structuring, France proposed the ‘Pleven Plan’ in October 1950 to oversee potential German rearmament and to ensure that any further German military resurgence would solely serve the purpose of European integration under close French purview. The Pleven Plan essentially called for the creation of a European army and initiated the European Defense Community (EDC), both of which proposals later proved to no avail and quickly fizzled into contentious political issues due to flaky commitments and differentiation amongst the US and member states regarding their constructs⁴. While Jean Monnet’s EDC proposal gained initial momentum and backing by the US, signing the EDC Treaty in 1952 backfired when all treaty signatories except for France agreed to ratify the treaty. This rejection of the EDC Treaty by France in 1954 out of concern for its national sovereignty constitutes one of the longest standing arguments against European defense integration with defense as the last “bastion of the nation-state”. While France ironically supported European integration though it refused to ratify the EDC Treaty, it was the self-preservation of its national interests and colonial roots in Indochina that demonstrated early on how the military identity of a European state⁵ would embody a significant political blockage to European defense integration under the existing US-NATO power structure already providing Europe with security.

Despite the EDC’s failure in 1954, the 1950s and 1960s were contrarily a period of rapid boom for defense gains in the transatlantic alliance. Perhaps out of resentment for Anglo-American leverage in the European security

3 Ibid., p. 20.

4 Ibid., p. 21-27.

5 Ibid., p. 27.

framework held by the US and UK, French President Charles de Gaulle introduced the Fouchet Plan in 1961 which added a predominantly French flavor to the dimension of European security cooperation by attempting to include defense and foreign policy within it. The Fouchet Plan strove to wean Europe off its dependency on the US and promote intergovernmentalism while steering Europe away from supranationalism. When De Gaulle realized that he could not uproot NATO, the Fouchet Plan eventually withered and was soon surpassed by the European Political Cooperation (EPC) in the 1970s, which sought to coordinate the foreign policies of member states⁶ without overriding state sovereignty. It was also succeeded by the Western European Union (WEU) in the 1980s, the salient entity for security and defense matters of its time. It was thus conceived early on that the preservation of state sovereignty would pose a great political obstacle to European defense integration under the existing US-NATO power structure.

Paradoxically, the Cold War appears to have thwarted European defense integration yet simultaneously invoke more fruitful defense initiatives as a result. While the 1950s and 1960s did not pan out according to plan with the unsuccessful EDC and Fouchet Plan, the 1990s brought a series of crises to Europe which nurtured defense integration and the eventual implementation of the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). As the USSR squirmed in steep economic decline during the 1970s despite the illusions it preferred to portray, the Berlin Wall finally crumbled in 1989. This momentous occasion enabled German reunification in 1990, and allowed the inevitable implosion of the USSR in 1991 and breakup of Yugoslavia. As Soviet communism evaporated in Europe's backyard, the collapse of the USSR had consequently removed a long-standing obstacle to European defense integration by allowing Europeans to rethink their global role⁷ with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, proposals in

6 Ibid., p. 33.

7 Larivé, Maxime H. A., *Debating European Security and Defense Policy Understanding the Complexity*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2014, p. 51.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

the mid-1990s⁸ for a European Security and Defense Identity and Combined Joint Task Forces in addition to a more cohesive Union. The milestone Maastricht Treaty introduced the ‘three-pillar structure’ which included the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) as its second pillar, and brought forth a dimension of external affairs to the Union. Shortly after this institutional breakthrough, a series of crises unfolded in Europe’s eastern neighborhood and beyond its territory during which the CSDP was furthered by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1980s, the Gulf War in 1991, the Bosnian War between 1992 and 1995, the Kosovo War between 1998 and 1999, and additional external wars taking place in Africa and the Middle East circa the same timeframe. Such conflict in Europe’s vicinity and across the Mediterranean compelled the European Community (EC) to internalize its geopolitical strategy and extend the applicable reach of the CFSP and European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). As London and Paris closely monitored Berlin under NATO and US scrutiny in the years following German reunification, European defense and security maturation henceforth continued. A salient climax in the long road to European defense integration was the Saint Malo Declaration in 1998 between Britain and France. Saint Malo was instrumental as it consisted of a joint effort by France and the UK to add a dimension of peacekeeping and crisis-management intervention to the European defense framework. Shortly thereafter, a series of European Councils took place between 1999 and 2000 in Helsinki, Cologne, and Nice as well as Santa Maria da Feira to enhance European defense policy. Notably, the idea of a European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF) was first introduced at the Helsinki Summit in 1999 which would permit the deployment of 60,000 troops within thirty days’ notice in response to outbreaking crises, and was thereupon labeled a ‘Battlegroup’ (BG) of 2,000 troops to be deployed within five days’ notice⁹. While Europe thought it had seen its worst

8 Howorth, Jolyon, and John Keeler (eds.), *Defending Europe: The EU, NATO, and the quest for European autonomy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, p. 8.

9 Allen, T.S., “The Fantasy of European Defense: An American Perspective”, Policy Exchange, December 11, 2016, online at: <https://policyexchange.org.uk/the-fantasy-of-european-defence-an-american-perspective/>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

Joseph M. Hughes

breaches of security imaginable during the Second World War, the Cold War, and on its own doorstep in the Balkans, it was later compelled to reconsider its security arrangement once again following the catastrophic scenes coming out of New York City on 9/11.

As 9/11 shattered global trust for both sides of the Atlantic, the US soon waged the “War on Terror” (WOT) in the Middle East, which naturally had profound implications for the EU as it did not concur with US foreign policy for the first time. The WOT prompted the EU to develop the Helsinki Headline Goal of 2003 which set a capabilities target for a fully deployable fleet of 60,000 troops to respond within 60 days for at least one year with adequate intelligence, logistics, combat support, command and control capabilities, and air and naval options.¹⁰ Following suit came the European Security Strategy (ESS) of 2003, which acknowledged a new emerging concept of defense within Europe and called for the increase of civilian and military-led operations. It also prefaced the establishment of the European Defense Agency (EDA) in 2004 to improve crisis management capabilities, and emphasized the EU’s collective strength in numbers as well as its need to manage defense resources amongst member states more effectively¹¹. The Union made further piecemeal progress in defense via the launch of its first two military crisis management missions, Operation Concordia (EUFOR Concordia) in Macedonia and Operation Artemis (ARTEMIS) in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in 2003.

After these advancements, the EU was later plagued by the Eurocrisis in 2008 and the ensuing American Great Recession which had wrought the gravest global financial crisis since the Great Depression in the 1930s. That same year, the Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy (RIESS) was released, which aimed to reinforce the ESS from 2003 and implement viable improvements to the existing security and defense framework. The RIESS calls to attention various security threats

10 European Union, European Council, “Background – Development of European Military Capabilities: The Force Catalogue 2006”, News release, 2006, online at: https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2007/1/9/015eb683-75fd-4586-a717-5920a4bc9b17/publishable_en.pdf. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

11 European Union, European Council, *A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy*, Brussels: European Council, 2003, p. 1-14.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

mounting in the mid to late 2000s which still loom to this day such as the proliferation of WMD in rogue states like Iran and North Korea, global terrorism, the remnants of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS), organized transnational crime, hybrid warfare, energy security in the EU and its eastern neighborhood, and global climate change¹². While the Eurocrisis set Europe off course of its defense integration, the establishment of the EDA and the RIESS, nevertheless, were integral stepping stones to greater defense integration.

Most recently, the Lisbon Treaty of 2009 gave the EU a greater legal persona and expanded the CFSP framework by establishing the European External Action Service (EEAS) in 2010 and widened the role of High Representative (HR) of the Union for the Foreign Affairs and Security Policy position, currently held by Federica Mogherini. Furthermore, the Lisbon Treaty outlined new extensive provisions on the CSDP in Articles 42 to 46 of the TEU, ranging from but not limited to granting the Union civilian and military capabilities for the possibility of member states to partake voluntarily in the PESCO doctrine.¹³ While the 2000s brought forth many significant developments such as the transformation of the ESDP into the CSDP via the Lisbon Treaty, the 2010s have introduced the most recent landmarks in European defense integration with forward gusto. The Ghent Initiative rolled out by Germany and Sweden in 2010 aims to preserve and improve national operational capabilities of member states via effectiveness, sustainability, interoperability and cost efficiency¹⁴. Recently, the European Union Global Strategy (EUGS) of 2016 composed by Mogherini lays down urgent and ambitious goals for growth in the

12 European Union, EEAS Strategic Planning, *Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy – Providing Security in a Changing World*, Brussels: European Union, 2008, p. 1-12, online at https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/104630.pdf. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

13 European Union, *Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union*, June 07, 2016/C, 202/38-41, online at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12016M/TXT>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

14 European Defense Agency, Fact Sheet, p. 1, online at: https://www.eda.europa.eu/docs/default-source/eda-factsheets/final-p-s_30012013_factsheet_cs5_gris. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

European defense sector via: increased investments in capabilities, stronger defense cooperation between member states, the creation of a solid defense industry, more responsiveness of the CSDP and strengthened defense capabilities among member states. It also urges autonomy for member states to act in accordance with their state sovereignty, a more credible defense industry with greater effectiveness, efficiency and trust between member states, the optimum use of natural resources between participants, mutual adaptation of national defense planning cycles and capability development practices to enhance strategic convergence between member states, full application of the EDA, improved civilian protection, deeper coordination with NATO in capabilities development, higher paid defense expenditures by member states, a firm European defense technological and industrial base (EDTIB) as developed in the 2007 Strategy for the European Defense Technological and Industrial Base¹⁵ based on a transparent internal market, and finally, the promotion of security of supply and dialogue within the defense industry¹⁶. Following the EUGS, the Implementing the EU Global Strategy Year 1 (EUGSY1) report has since also been drafted in 2017 by Mogherini, which touts that the EU has achieved more in security and defense in the last ten months than the past ten years¹⁷ by pushing for stronger EU cooperation between member states within the defense sector.

15 European Defense Agency, *A Strategy for the European Defense Technological and Industrial Base*, 2017, p. 1-7, online at: <https://www.eda.europa.eu/what-we-do/our-current-priorities/strategies/Technologicalandindustrialbase>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

16 Mogherini, Federica, *Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy*, Brussels: European Union, 2016, p. 1-52, online at: https://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

17 Mogherini, Federica, *From Shared Vision to Common Action: Implementing the EU Global Strategy Year 1, A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy*, Brussels: European Union, 2017, p. 1-33, online at: https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/sites/globalstrategy/files/full_brochure_year_1.pdf. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

III. Assessing the Blockages within the Political Apex

With a wide gap between the fields of academia and policy-making¹⁸ as another sizeable obstacle to European defense integration, there are yet four core political blockages to harmonizing a fully operational ESDU. They are lack of political will, traditional “NATO-first” reflexes, conservative defense industry policies, and military cooperation fragmentation¹⁹. Additionally, Special Advisor on European Defense and Security Policy Michel Barnier underscores the differing defense priorities between member states whereby the UK has been reticent towards defense integration since the start in contrast to Germany, France and the Benelux nations; whereas Italy, Spain and Poland express a more open attitude to it. While France emphasizes an executive and expeditionary approach, Germany exudes greater reluctance to deploy troops due to unsettling memories of its dark past. Furthermore, EU member states sharing borders with Russia (RU) are geared more towards traditional territorial defense initiatives whereas southern member states on the Mediterranean prioritize terrorist threats emanating from North Africa and the Middle East²⁰. Such divergences in security priorities between the member states result from geography and geopolitics, and therefore pose yet another blockage to a streamlined defense trajectory.

Diverging considerably in defense doctrines and security prioritization, one of the most drawn-out political blockages for the EU has been the “traditional NATO-first instinct”, according to the European Political Strategy Centre’s Strategic Notes, which is residual from the Cold War era and was hashed out by the US to keep Europe at arm’s length because of its

18 Wilkinson, Benedict, Maria Giulia Amadio Viceré, and Erin Montague, “Navigating the Unknown: Barriers to Evidence-Based Defense and Security Policy in the European Union”, *The International Spectator*, Vol. 52, No. 1, February 1, 2017, p. 88-99, online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03932729.2017.1256931>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

19 Barnier, Michel, “In Defense of Europe—Defense Integration as a Response to Europe’s Strategic Moment”, European Political Strategy Centre (EPSC), *EPSC Strategic Notes*, No. 4, 2015, online at: https://ec.europa.eu/epsc/sites/epsc/files/strategic_note_issue_4_en.pdf. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

20 Ibid., p. 4.

transgressions during both World Wars. Consequently, autonomous European ambitions to forge a community of mutual strategic and defense-industrial interests were initially suppressed but this has since changed due to the US' strategic foreign policy shift to 'the pivot' in Asia under the Obama Administration and Donald Trump's recent invocation of 'fair burden-sharing' which mandates that underperforming NATO stakeholders meet the organization's defense expenditure quota of 2% of gross domestic product (GDP). Not to mention, NATO's Smart Defense and the EU's Pooling and Sharing (P&S) program have both been met with fervent national conservatism and resistance despite a deepened NATO-EU strategic partnership and joint efforts within the Alliance thanks to the Berlin Plus Agreement of 2003, which enables the EU to access NATO's capabilities for handling crisis management operations in the EU. Thus with such national "reflexes" still blocking supranational defense cooperation, European defense market fragmentation has also resulted in much inefficient cooperation between member states²¹. Despite EU Directive 2009/81/EC on defense procurement and Directive 2009/43/EC on intra-EU transfers of defense products to liberalize defense markets and make them more efficient and competitive, member states can still bypass these legally non-binding thresholds by reinforcing national industry 'state champions'²², and thus deviate from converging European security concerns. In light of these formidable political obstacles to European defense integration, the impacts of Brexit, RU's geopolitical calculations and US foreign policy also have profound implications for the debate on defense. Above all, the greatest loss to common defense by Brexit will be the extraordinary military capabilities that Britain offers as it comprises approximately 20%²³ of the EU's total capabilities making it Europe's most

21 Ibid., p. 6.

22 Koenig, Christian, and Bernhard von Wendland, *The Art of Regulation: Competition in Europe: Wealth and Wariness*, Cheltenham/Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017.

23 Major, Claudia, and Alicia von Voss, "European defense in view of Brexit: Europe's military power might not suffer, but its political clout is at risk", Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2017/4, p. 2, online at: https://www.swp-berlin.org/-fileadmin/contents/products/comments/2017C10_mjr_vos.pdf. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

indispensable European partner in terms of security and military cooperation²⁴. On the one hand, the presently known and unknown consequences of Brexit on EU defense groundwork are bound to impair the EU’s political capacity to act collectively, decrease the already fragile trust Europeans had in defense policy to begin with, make the EU a more fragmented and inward-looking entity, and further differentiate tasks between NATO and the EU²⁵. On the other hand, authors Major and Voss project that Brexit will not prove deleterious to the CSDP as it will likely shore up its capacities, albeit, only in crisis management and security, not defense. If anything, Brexit has tested the EU’s credibility in defense as a considerable blockage and will have narrow implications on the existing US-NATO power structure.

The issue of defense is a rather timely issue in a post-Brexit Union. While Britain still has much to hash out with the EU in their messy “divorce”, and while the Franco-German relationship comes under pressure to spearhead European integration, the worst ways in which Brexit can mangle EU defense are further depressions in cooperation in trust. Lower cooperation and trust stall defense integration since Europeans must subsequently opt for either a staunch French nationalist military outlook or a strong German industrial base. External bilateral defense cooperation initiatives, however, such as those between Britain and France brought forth by the Lancaster House Treaties of 2010 should not wither away²⁶ as bilateralism between nations in general will not cease anytime in the foreseeable future. Although direct bilateral relations between Britain and France will not be strained solely by Brexit, one of the most profound obstacles is Brexit’s effect(s) on the European defense production industry given that the wings of Airbus aircraft are manufactured in Wales and that workers accustomed to circulating freely between the two countries might face hassles going

24 Ghez, Jeremy, Magdalena Kirchner, Michael Shurkin, Anna Knack, Alex Hall, and James Black, “A snapshot of international perspectives on the implications of the UK’s decision to leave the EU”, Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2017, p. 11, online at: https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PE200/PE225/RAND_PE225.pdf. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

25 Major/von Voss, op. cit., p. 1-4.

26 Ghez/Kirchner/Shurkin/Knack/Hall/Black, op. cit., p. 5-7.

forward. More importantly, the leadership gap by Britain in defense cooperation will be felt among member states since it has historically led the pack in defense. Moreover, if the failed merger between British Aerospace Electronic Systems (BAE Systems) and the multinational European corporation Airbus (EADS) in 2012²⁷ is any indicator of lack of British and continental European cooperation pre-Brexit, then the prospects of continued cooperation are grim. The full detrimental effect of Brexit on European defense galvanization, however, certainly remains to be seen. From behind the glass, Brexit by no means smoothens out the creases of European integration. While it surely adds a knotty twist, it might have paradoxically invoked greater Europeanization in the CFSP, CSDP and PESCO²⁸ in the meantime. This newfound cooperation could perhaps be more of a blessing in disguise and less of a political blockage to harmonizing an ESDU.

Although Britain has historically expressed a lukewarm attitude towards the European project especially in utmost important matters of foreign policy, security and defense, its actions speak volumes of the will of its people who turned out to vote in the 2016 referendum. British attempts to block permanent military structures, geopolitical tepidity by Britain's foreign policy leaders, institutional blockages within its own government, and high levels of Euroscepticism among its elder population²⁹ have determined the UK's destiny as a non-EU European partner. Perhaps at the core of these 'British blockages' to European defense integration lies the rift between 'Atlanticist' and 'Europeanist' philosophies with the former emphasizing NATO and healthy transatlantic ties, and the latter stressing a strong independent EU security actor³⁰. Moreover, Brexit reduces the UK's counter-terrorism and intelligence contributions to valuable European

27 Ghez/Kirchner/Shurkin/Knack/Hall/Black, op. cit., p. 7-8.

28 Kienzle, Benjamin, and Inez von Weitershausen, "Brexit has given an impetus to reshape Europe's foreign, security and defense policies", *LSE Brexit*, Defence Studies Department, King's College London, 2017, p. 1, online at: <https://defenceindepth.co/2017/05/15/brexit-has-given-an-impetus-to-reshape-europes-foreign-security-and-defence-policies/>. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

29 Ibid., p. 2-3.

30 Ibid., p. 3.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

databases including Europol, Schengen Information System II, the Eurodac system for distinguishing between asylum seekers and illegal migrants, and Eurojust for interstate matters of judicial cooperation³¹. On the other side, the EU has lost easier access to British assets, as if there had ever been much ‘easy access’ for the EU to the longstanding bilateral ‘Special Relationship’ between the UK and US, covert British intelligence, or the exclusive Five Eyes intelligence alliance between the world’s foremost ‘Anglo countries’: the UK, the US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. While Brexit will initially hamper the EU’s defense capacity, it will deter the UK from cooperating on a transatlantic global security framework with the rest of Europe and could estrange transatlantic ties³² between the EU and US with the UK having bridged the two.

Apart from divergences in strategic culture, defense market fragmentation and mere lack of political will by member states, the US has long played both an invisible and visible hand in European politics since it came to the rescue of Europe after years of destruction. The US has historically alongside the UK, been skeptical of the EU’s defense capacity and political will despite doubly urging the EU to bolster its defense spending and burden-sharing since at least the Eisenhower Administration during which former US President Dwight D. Eisenhower once retorted that the Europeans were “making a sucker out of Uncle Sam³³”. Interestingly, it is argued by Rees that the US encouraged the UK to view the EU as an illegitimate defense actor while it called for stronger military force deployability though suspicious of any efforts outside of NATO framework. The UK even endorsed the US by partaking in the European Capabilities Action Plan, but the US was in turn negatively impacting the UK’s views of the EU³⁴ in the suspenseful months prior to Brexit.

31 Rees, Wyn, “America, Brexit and the security of Europe”, *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 2017, p. 563-564, online at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1369148117711400>. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

32 Ibid., p. 567-569.

33 Leffler, Melvyn P., and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, Vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, 2010, p. 298.

34 Rees, op. cit., p. 562.

Paradoxically, this authenticates the US as a potent political blockage to advancing European defense integration yet a simultaneous encourager of EU defense autonomy.

Momentarily diverging from this train of thought, the differing structures of the American and European defense markets shall also be juxtaposed to help understand the stagnancy of European defense. The US has traditionally exhibited an autarkic defense market, meaning that the US seeks to maintain self-sufficiency and independence from the global market when it comes to any defense-related expenditure. Due to legal, military and economic constraints, the US defense market is barred from transitioning to an interconnected and global one. Legally, US export regulations require foreign companies to comply with strict US security regulations and fine them for non-compliance, while economically, US defense companies do not need to merge with foreign companies or create economies of scale due to their self-sufficiency. Needless to say, US national security is prioritized above profitability and efficiency. Europe, on the other hand, saw the emergence of transnational defense companies due to its economic integrational foundation. While Europe and the US would surely benefit from more American-European mergers, European firms collaborating with the US are constrained by rigid penalties for violating US security requirements, hence less cooperation³⁵. US sequestration as an autarkic, realist defense actor in contrast to the EU as an interdependent, multinational defense actor is thus another blockade to furthering European defense integration as Europe still treats defense as a matter of state sovereignty with member states essentially relying on the traditional US-NATO power structure for defense.

A turning point for Britain was when it decided to join bilateral efforts with the US during the 2003 WOT despite continental Europe's bitterness towards this US policy under the Bush Administration. Under direction of

35 Maye, Diane L., "Autarky or Interdependence: US vs. European Security and Defense Industries in a Globalized Market", *Journal of Strategic Security*, Vol. 10, No. 2, Art. 3, The Berkeley Electronic Press, 2017, online at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1597&context=jss>. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

Tony Blair’s ministry, Britain came to view itself as an unwavering American ally, and therefore resonated more closely with the US than the EU with mainstream EU policy pitted against the WOT³⁶. That said, the US single-handedly obstructed EU defense efforts by giving rise to a distinguished sentiment of ‘otherness’ across Britain, which eventually influenced its decision to leave the EU a decade later. It must thus be taken into account that the Special Relationship between Washington and London played a powerful role in shaping British perceptions of state sovereignty and self-identity in the 2016 British referendum. While the critical juncture of Brexit ultimately backfired on the Obama Administration’s desires, American Europeanists must too grapple with this setback as the US continues to maintain a ubiquitous presence in European defense matters.

Similarly though of a different nature, RU poses a stifling threat to European defense integration yet paradoxically kindles the drive towards a more consolidated defense policy and exertion of hard power by the EU. Arguably, the most ominous security threat knocking on Europe’s backdoor is the Russian Federation, sitting atop rickety relations from the Cold War. With the West deeply perturbed about the ambiguous signals and conflicting messages emanating from Moscow, it is felt that the Kremlin is stirring revanchism, neo-imperialism, expansionism and hostility³⁷ to divide and conquer as seen by the cases of Ukraine and Crimea and other strips of territory on Europe’s eastern flank. As RU infringes upon the EU’s Eastern neighborhood territorially and engages in hybrid warfare, nuclear weaponry and conventional combat capabilities are vaunted by the Kremlin. This is enough to keep any subscriber to international affairs wide awake at night given that EU member states are at odds with one another amidst 27 distinct national security strategies. Due to mutual feelings of distrust and residual misunderstandings from the Cold War between the US and RU, Europe is nonetheless subject to each’s

36 Rees, op. cit., p. 567.

37 Sokolsky, Richard, “The New NATO-Russia Military Balance: Implications for European Security”, *Task Force White Paper, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, Vol. 13, 2017, p. 1, online at: <http://carnegieendowment.org/2017/03/13/new-nato-russia-military-balance-implications-for-european-security-pub-68222>. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

power posturing. There is thus great cause for concern in Europe as RU engages in provocative behaviors whether out of genuineness or mere intimidation tactics to elicit recognition from the international community. Regardless of RU's intentions and its suspected capabilities, it ultimately jeopardizes European security while Russian President Vladimir Putin's thorny rhetoric must be taken seriously as it endangers the fragile European defense environment.

While RU would think twice before daring to test Article 5 of NATO, it is yet undermining the transatlantic security framework by: threatening a military response should Sweden or Finland join NATO, possessing nuclear weaponry, engaging in hybrid warfare, having annexed Crimea in 2014, invading Ukraine militarily, and enjoying expansive geography and manpower capacity. Compared to the Baltic States which have only 11 infantry battalions, Russia boasts 22 battalions in its Western Military District (WMDT), 13 of which are tank, motorized, or mechanized infantry. With 10 artillery battalions in the WMDT, RU is able to exert longer ranges and rates of firepower than can NATO, which is significantly outgunned by the Kremlin and is deprived of tubed artillery, rocket launchers and surface-to-surface missiles (SSMs). In the air, NATO would also be at a slight disadvantage possessing 19 squadrons in contrast to RU possessing 27 deployable combat air squadrons alongside 6 battalions of assault helicopters. As stated by Sokolsky, RU is therefore able to wreak havoc with an immense and forceful attack equipped by its advanced armor, weapons, sensors, sophisticated air defense system and long-range direct fire systems. While it is perceived that the qualitative versus quantitative gap between NATO and RU has narrowed, the possibility of a Russian attack on Europe can never be ruled out as RU's manpower could substantially inundate NATO. This leaves the EU extremely vulnerable in its defense capacity with Russian aggression as an ever-looming geopolitical obstacle³⁸.

Daunting as the prospect of a Russian attack on NATO may seem, it must also be entertained that RU's air defense capabilities have dramatically

38 Ibid., p. 5-6.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

improved. Since RU has upgraded its A2/AD capabilities, it has also deployed new S-400 anti-aircraft systems, land-based coastal defense missile launchers, and nuclear-capable ship-based cruise missiles³⁹. Meanwhile, RU has revised and improved its command structures, personnel, hardware, exercises, and the organization, training and equipment of troops alongside boosting combat readiness. In addition, RU has held consistent snap drills while the WMDT has assigned several mobile heavy ground force units under command of a corps-level headquarters. RU has also allegedly enhanced its rapid decision-making and its will to carry out large-scale offensive operations. More comforting, however, are the inspection reports which indicate that RU overstates its readiness levels and exaggerates its armaments equipment inventory⁴⁰. RU’s leverage in manpower, long-range artillery and direct fire weapons systems, however, cannot be underestimated as they are adversarial challenges to EU defense integration despite Moscow’s blatant shortcomings in backwards Soviet-generation technology and strategic airlift capabilities⁴¹.

While Putin knows his insurmountable boundaries with NATO and the US, hybrid warfare in recent years has become a new conduit for RU to seep through traditional defense mechanisms in Europe and beyond. This non-kinetic soft power tool of modern warfare is disconcertingly advantageous. Firstly, hybrid warfare has become a mode of choice for the Kremlin due to its elusive and veiled nature. RU can deny any allegations of tampering with networks of other governments as most recently seen by Moscow’s meddling in both the US Democratic National Convention and 2016 presidential election whereby a tripartite report⁴² between the US Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Justice and National Security Agency expressed high confidence that Putin indeed waged a hybrid warfare attack

39 Ibid., p. 7.

40 Ibid., p. 8.

41 Ibid., p. 9.

42 Intelligence Community Assessment (ICA), “*Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent US Elections*”, January 6, 2017, online at: https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/ICA_2017_01.pdf. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

to undermine public faith in the American democratic system, and to boost Trump's likelihood of winning the election by defaming the already contentious reputation of Secretary Hillary Clinton by way of covert intelligence operations coupled with more overt efforts through Russian agencies, state-funded media, third-party intermediaries, paid online "trolls" and digital online platforms. It can thus be affirmed that the conventional military capabilities and emerging hybrid warfare tactics possessed by RU must be effectively deterred by proportionate European defensive means. RU, with its leverage in such capabilities, comprises a lofty political obstacle to European defense integration by the conglomeration of security threats it poses to faith in liberal democracy.

IV. The Legal Foundations and Economic Rationale behind an ESDU

Although the political apex has stifled European defense integration the most, there are counterintuitively fewer gray areas in the legal and economic bases of the triangle, both of which edge the EU closer towards a common defense policy substantially more than the political apex. To begin with the legal base, Article 4 (2) of the TEU explicitly states that safeguarding national security "remains the sole responsibility of each Member State"⁴³. Flipping forward to Article 42 (3) of the TEU⁴⁴, however, states that, "Member States shall undertake progressively to improve their military capabilities. The Agency in the field of defense capabilities development, research, acquisition and armaments (hereinafter referred to as 'the European Defense Agency') shall identify operational requirements, shall promote measures to satisfy those requirements, shall contribute to identifying and, where appropriate, implementing any measure needed to strengthen the industrial and technological base of the defense sector, shall participate in defining a European capabilities and armaments policy, and

43 European Union, *Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union*, 7 June 2016, 2016/C, 202/18, online at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12016M/TXT>. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

44 *Ibid.*, 2016/C, 202/38.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

shall assist the Council in evaluating the improvement of military capabilities”. Likewise, Article 42 (2) of the TEU⁴⁵ stipulates that, “The common security and defense policy shall include the progressive framing of a common Union defense policy. This will lead to a common defense, when the European Council, acting unanimously, so decides”. It is thus legally evident that the Treaties themselves pave the legal way towards a common defense framework. It is assumed that these provisions were not only written with the ambition of forging an eventual ESDU, but that this would be the natural course of European defense integration to unfold. Achieving this required unanimity, though, takes the debate back to the political apex where any outcome ultimately rests on the political will of all member states for agreement.

Shifting gears to the economic base of the triangle, there are several sound economic arguments for the EU to bolster its capabilities and interstate cooperation in the defense sector. In terms of increased military enhancement and military cooperation, it has been argued under different topoi why both are economic necessities for the EU. Within the topos of finances on the European defense debate, the standard argument centers around the dire need for member states to share the burden of costs associated with defense undertakings. As asserted by Kühnhardt⁴⁶, institutional failures in defense integration were paradoxically advantageous in the long run for harmonizing defense as they led to stronger movements later on and furthered P&S of military equipment between member states. This demonstrates P&S as a viable economic vehicle for optimizing military capabilities and cooperation since national leaders can more easily defend defense cooperation based on economic savings rather than furthered political integration, a more heavily contested can of worms. The EU therefore exhibits liberal intergovernmentalism in this case, laid down by Andrew Moravcsik in 1998, in which member

45 Ibid., 2016/C, 202/38.

46 Kühnhardt, Ludger (ed.), *Crises in European Integration: Challenges and Responses, 1945-2005*, New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2009, p. 33-40.

states decide to integrate whenever it is economically logical to do so⁴⁷. The economic rationale of P&S to enhance military capabilities and cooperation is therefore key to igniting a ESDU despite the long-standing political brick wall of state sovereignty.

At the table of European defense integration is the centerpiece of military capabilities. As indicated above, P&S are means to the end of bolstering EU defense capacity with military capabilities. The P&S solution to “pool it or lose it”, once famously retorted by Lady Ashton, is seemingly the only means of enhancing these capabilities⁴⁸ lest the EU lose them to national pride and protectionism if it does not collectively engage in P&S within a wider protectionist defense procurement market. To clarify, national protectionism is regarded by Europeanists as the anathema to a healthy and viable European procurement market whereas European protectionism is sought for the welfare of the entire single internal market. P&S therefore aligns with the existing principles of the Single Market and the broader story of European economic integration as opposed to protectionist national economic policies for defense, which obstruct Union progress in defense integration.

It is argued by Mogherini in the EUGS 2016 that member states cannot afford to employ national defense policies since multilateral cooperation in defense boosts interoperability, effectiveness, and trust while it increases the output of defense spending. While recognizing the need to preserve national sovereignty, Mogherini acknowledges cooperation as a fruitful yield of the economic necessity for P&S of military capabilities⁴⁹. Similarly, EDA Chief Executive Jorge Domecq argues that the reduction in national defense spending and equipment budgets prompts the need for increased spending cohesion amongst member states if the EU is to retain its capabilities with the goal of “providing security”. Complexly enough,

47 Heinikoski, Saila, ““Pool it or lose it?” – a contrastive analysis of discourses concerning EU military integration and demilitarisation in the Baltic Sea”, *Journal on Baltic Security*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2017, p. 32-47, online at: <https://www.degruyter.com/downloadpdf/j/jobs.2017.3.issue-1/jobs-2017-0002/jobs-2017-0002.pdf>. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

48 Ibid., p. 38.

49 Ibid., p. 39.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

European defense cooperation relies on autarkic defense production despite the autarkic US sequestration of which the EU defense market should be weaned off. Subsequently, this leads to the discussion about EU strategic autonomy since there is no valid justification for the progressive improvement of military capabilities with P&S costs and resources as the only means of maintaining capabilities according to Heinikoski who analyzes the topos of usefulness, threat, responsibility, and law in an ambitious attempt to justify why increased European military capabilities are needed. By employing the topos of finances, Heinikoski asserts cooperation as the pith of the economic argument to maintaining military capabilities. It is to this end that the key to unlocking a fully harmonized and operational ESDU ultimately lies in the preservation of national state sovereignty as the greatest political blockage, and how much Ministers of Defense (MOD) are willing to cooperate on behalf of their countries for the greater good of the Union.

To draw upon German-American political scientist Ernst Haas’ theory of neo-functionalism, the EU’s progress in the Single Market could indeed carry over into the defense sector via what is known as ‘positive spillover’. Given the European Commission’s (COM) recent establishment of the European Defense Action Plan (EDAP) in November 2016, one can gauge progress in European defense integration and by what means a fully harmonized ESDU is most viable on grounds of economic cooperation between member states in defense acquisition and procurement. Recently, the COM has launched the European Defense Fund (EDF) in June 2017 via the EDAP which supports investment in joint research and development (R&D) of defense equipment and technologies with a “research window” and “capability window”. The EDF under the EDAP also aims to further the development of small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) in addition to other start-ups, mid-caps and suppliers in the defense industry, and to fortify the Single Market for defense⁵⁰ (SMD). Compelled by Brexit, France and Germany hosted a meeting in September 2016 for all MOD in

50 European Commission, Press Releases, European Defense Action Plan: Towards a European Defense Fund, November 30, 2016, online at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-4088_en.htm. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

Bratislava which foreshadowed the EDF. In doing so, the MOD schemed an EDF that would harbor cost sharing for EU Battle Groups (EUBGs) and EU military missions of willing participants since defense cooperation is voluntary for member states according to Article 46 paragraphs 3 and 5 of the TEU⁵¹. Improving such cost sharing, however, pales in comparison to the Union's ambition of creating an 'EU army'⁵², another formidable economic obstacle to defense integration. Not to mention, the EDF is projected not to interfere with the neutrality of non-NATO EU members.

As regards increasing defense expenditures, the EU has preferred the optimization of defense-related expenses due to its costly past. While the US has indeed browbeaten European countries to boost their remarkably low defense expenditures to meet the minimum threshold set by NATO at 2% of GDP, further feasibility of defense integration in the EU depends on other critical variables such as the fiscal latitude of member states, supranational European policy preferences versus centrifugal national policy preferences, and public opinion among EU citizens⁵³. Given these challenges to picking apart 'defense economics', the focus on deepening European defense integration rests more on the efficient use of resources and increased interoperability, and ensuring that military expenditures such as those of R&D, acquisition, and procurement are not duplicated since Europe still falls strikingly short of this objective with 80% of all its equipment procurement occurring at the national level and with duplication rates of 25-100 billion EUR⁵⁴ per year. Obviously, this is an appreciable waste of money and immense disregard for the savings a 'defense economy of scale' would bring, banking upon the relative success that has come with the Single Market. To illustrate the benefits that an SMD would bring the EU, savings of such a finalized mechanism would amount to approximately

51 European Union, *op. cit.*, 2016/C, 202/40-41.

52 Wall, Mark, Barbara Boettcher, and Kevin Koerner, "Defense spending, fiscal stimulus and European integration", *Economics Focus Europe*, London: Deutsche Bank AG, June 30, 2017, p. 2-12, online at: https://www.dbresearch.com/PROD/RPS_EN-PROD/PROD0000000000446201/Defence_spending%2C_fiscal_stimulus_and_European_int.PDF. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 4.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 7.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

600 million EUR for infantry vehicles and 500 million EUR for a collective system of ammunition certification. An SMD is thus a harbinger of a fully harmonized ESDU, assuming the EU can converge the billions of euros it squanders per annum in the duplication of resources and scattered spending pools.

A helpful comparison of the autarkic US defense market as the founding facilitator of Europe’s security framework via NATO can help explain the EU’s sticky defense expenditure agglomeration. The average cost for deploying a European soldier on overseas military operations is 310,000 thousand EUR higher than the same deployment of its US counterpart. That said, the EU could save upwards of 20.6 billion EUR per year were it to operate a fully interoperable European armed force. It is also staggering that the EU costs itself more than half of what the US costs itself, and is only able to exert a tenth of this capacity⁵⁵. From an international standpoint, the EU has a long way to go in catching up with the US and other global superpowers if it is to be esteemed a credible security partner. It is also wise to be realistic about the unequivocal differences between the EU and the US with the former being a supranational collective decision-making body, and the latter an actual nation-state abiding by the traditional Westphalian notion of state sovereignty. To demonstrate the chasm between the EU and US in defense savings, the EU invests 23,829 EUR per soldier for equipment procurement and R&D whereas the US invests 102,264 EUR; as regards duplication of systems in use, the EU possesses 154 types of weapon systems whereas the US possesses 27; the EU has 17,160 units of armored personnel carrier and 37 such types while the US 27,528 units but only 9 such types; the EU has 42 units and 12 types of air-to-air refueling tanker aircraft meanwhile the US bears 550 units with 4 types; and finally, the EU puts forth 1,703 units and 19 types of combat aircraft while the US boasts 2,779 units and only 11 types⁵⁶. It is easily inferred from these figures the greater integration of US systems with substantially more units and fewer types than the EU. This is the conundrum of duplication in the EU, a major economic blockage to defense

55 Barnier, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

56 Barnier, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

integration with political undertones which can be remedied by increased Union capabilities for autonomous action and elimination of such futile redundancies⁵⁷.

V. Public Opinion Matters Indeed

In light of this discussion on the predominant political obstacles to harmonizing a consolidated and joint ESDU, such an assessment would be incomplete without a survey of public opinion surrounding the debate. This is especially apropos given the overwhelming majority of European citizens who hold favorable views of deeper European defense integration. Although a single European army and common defense institutions have yet to materialize, the debate on defense should center equally around the expectations of European citizens, considering that approximately 7 in 10 EU citizens have consistently backed the idea of a CSDP for over two decades, and even more so than the CFSP framework or Economic Monetary Union. Security is in high demand by constituents yet low in supply⁵⁸ due primarily to the political blockages discussed in previous passages. By honing in on public opinion, it is found that the variable of national identity is a principal determinant in shaping one's support for the CSDP and an eventual single European army, and that the varying attitudes towards defense are shaped by pre-existing social representations of security⁵⁹. To test this hypothesis, the authors of a survey separate different national strategic cultures into four social representations of security in the EU, known as 'strategic postures': pacifism, humanitarianism, traditionalism, and globalism. This classification of social representations stems from the American foreign policy positions conducted by Wittkopf,

57 Van Ham, Peter, "Europe's Common Defense Policy: Implications for the Trans-Atlantic Relationship", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 31, Issue 2, 2000, p. 215-228, online at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0967010600031002007>. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

58 Barnier, op. cit., p. 5.

59 Irondelle, Bastien, Mérand, Frédéric, and Martial Foucault, "Public support for European defense: Does strategic culture matter?", *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 54, Issue 2, p. 363-383, online at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1475-6765.12090/full>. Last accessed: January 18, 2018.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

which include four distinct groups: ‘internationalists’, ‘isolationists’, ‘hardliners’, and ‘accommodationists’.

Under the determinant of national identity, a citizen’s identification with the nation is deemed a symbolic predisposition that is cultivated early on in one’s life and bears an emotional attachment to his or her nation, thus bearing the potential to affect attitudes towards common European defense⁶⁰ favorably or unfavorably. An intriguing takeaway from these findings is how increased heterogeneity among citizens’ attitudes towards European defense might be due to differing psychological dispositions⁶¹ at the individual level. Psychological surveys would make a fruitful addition to supplementing existing findings on national identity as a determinant to help explain these divergences in strategic culture, but the problem encountered in this field of research is that Eurobarometer surveys are conducted sporadically, and these phenomena are often measured via proxy indicators. Therefore, more psychological surveys and regularly updated Eurobarometer reports would enhance the ability to gauge citizens’ attitudes and provide greater insight on the psychological subtleties lying beneath the shrouded surface of other determinants such as national identity or historic legacies. Limited Eurobarometer data⁶² thus inhibits European defense integration as it is known that most EU citizens are in favor of a more comprehensive defense package, yet research in this area is still lacking. Authors Endres, Mader and Schoen further suggest that the systematic clash between humanitarian internationalism and militarism in strategic culture contributes to the complexity of public opinion as the former advocates deeper defense insofar as it does not substitute national defense and is used to further humanitarian goals; while the latter centers

60 Endres, Fabian, Matthias Mader, and Harald Schoen, “On the relationship between strategic cultures and support for European defense: A comment on Irondelle, Mérand and Foucault”, *European journal of political research*, Vol. 54, Issue 4, 2015, p. 855.

61 Ibid., p. 857.

62 Ibid., p. 857.

around preferences for global EU power projection in accordance with traditional territorial security and defense power relations⁶³.

As regards the four European strategic postures, the first of ‘pacifism’ encompasses individuals who believe that hard security and global influence must fade. Secondly, is the strategic posture of ‘humanitarianism’, which engulfs individuals who subscribe to ‘soft security’ but maintain that Europe should play an active role in the world. The third posture of ‘traditionalism’ refers to individuals who adopt a traditional notion of security and hold that Europeans must prioritize issues affecting the Union. Finally, comes the strategic posture of ‘globalism’, which pertains to individuals who firmly believe the EU should take a stronger lead in global affairs by asserting its political and diplomatic semblance⁶⁴. By surveying citizens’ views of European defense policy, the authors draw data from the Eurobarometer 54.1 (the ‘defense special’) of 2000, the latest and most up-to-date database on citizens’ attitudes regarding defense. Researchers find a considerable degree of heterogeneity among the results in this survey with the largest strategic posture of 44% adhering to globalism, the second largest to traditionalism at 31%, and smallest degree to humanitarianism and pacifism ranking upwards of 10%. While compiled at the turn of the century, this set of data is still relevant because it is the most comprehensive compilation of citizens’ attitudes towards the CSDP to date⁶⁵. These varying human perceptions of strategic culture via such ‘strategic postures’ thus also stall any forward defense acceleration.

63 Ibid., p. 853.

64 Irondelle/Mérand/Foucault, *op. cit.*, p. 369.

65 Irondelle/Mérand/Foucault, *op. cit.*, p. 370.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

VI. *The Way Forward*

Stagnant defense integration can be attributed to a complex interplay of insecurity, enthusiasm and uncertainty by the EU as it faces an immense credibility crisis with a wide gap between its defense ambitions and the actual structures, tools and capabilities it has at its disposal. While it might be that the recent election of French President Emmanuel Macron can rekindle the spirit for European cooperation and incite prospects of renewed Franco-German leadership⁶⁶ alongside German Chancellor Angela Merkel’s pro-European cooperative outlook, the recent surge of far-right party politics across Europe, Germany’s difficulty to forge a government coalition, and Trump’s unpredictable foreign policy are yet alarming reminders of the EU’s pending defense vacuum. More promising however, has been the EUGS, the EUGSY1, the EDAP, the EDF, the EU-NATO joint declaration of 2016 at the Warsaw Summit to bolster cooperation, the Coordinated Annual Review on Defense (CARD) to improve the coordination of national defense plans, and the Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC) to aid in the management of EU military operations. Even more auspicious has been the recent signing of a joint notification on PESCO by 23 member states in November 2017 and a milestone decision adopted by the Council in December 2017 to establish PESCO in which 25 member states have agreed to increase defense expenditures and undertake 17 joint projects of which some of the highlights include creating a pan-European military training center, improving capability development and fostering common standards for military radio communication⁶⁷. Having been only one prior attempt to

66 Frontini, Andrea, “The ‘Macron effect’ on European defense: En Marche, at last?”, Commentary, Brussels: European Policy Centre (EPC), June 2017, p. 2, online at: http://www.epc.eu/documents/uploads/pub_7723_macroneffectoneuropeandefence.pdf. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

67 Deutsche Welle, “Twenty-five EU states sign PESCO defense pact”, News DW, December 11, 2017, online at: <http://www.dw.com/en/twenty-five-eu-states-sign-pesco-defense-pact/a-41741828>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

invoke PESCO under Belgian Presidency⁶⁸ in 2010, it is this nascent awakening of “Sleeping Beauty” that is just the flick of the wand needed to transform the current hodgepodge of civilian missions and military operations into a streamlined ESDU. Integrated capabilities enhancements should therefore not stop at procurement but should extend to common program management, common logistics, common updates for common configuration, common doctrines, common deployment, and common training and exercise⁶⁹.

Prior to this unprecedented establishment of PESCO, a Council meeting in May 2017 took place in which MOD agreed upon a fund known as the Cooperative Financial Mechanism (CSM) under the umbrella of the EDA with around 19 participating member states sharing the objective of incentivizing defense cooperation to remedy the obstacle of budgetary disharmony⁷⁰. Further ongoing defense initiatives include a ‘European Security Compact’ proposed by French and German MOD, a call for a permanent joint multinational military force by Italian MOD who had also called for a ‘Schengen of defense’ beforehand, and beckoning for a European Defense Union by the European Union People’s Party. During his 2016 State of the Union address, European COM President Jean-Claude Juncker called for the present day EDF in addition to having adamantly yearned for the creation of a legitimate single EU army for decades⁷¹. Yet despite 6 ongoing military operations, 9 civilian missions⁷² and widespread

68 Coelmont, Jo, “With PESCO brought to life, will European defense live happily ever after?”, Egmont Security Policy Brief, No. 90, July 2017, p. 1, online at: <http://aei.pitt.edu/88540/1/SPB90.pdf>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

69 Ibid., p. 4.

70 Barigazzi, Jacopo, “EU pushes joint defense fund”, POLITICO, May 18, 2017, online at: <http://www.politico.eu/article/eu-pushes-joint-defense-fund-nato-security/>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

71 Duke, Simon, “Security and defense as the (unlikely) saviours of the integration project?”, EU-CIVCAP, October 6, 2016, online at: <https://eu-civcap.net/2016/10/06/security-and-defence-as-the-unlikely-saviours-of-the-integration-project/>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

72 “Military and civilian missions and operations”, European External Action Service (EEAS), May 2016, online at: https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

support among European citizens with 72%⁷³ in favor of a common European security and defense policy as per 2015 Eurobarometer data, the momentum these initiatives have generated for the cyclical defense debate is thwarted by sharp divergences in strategic culture and lack of political will. Invoking the legal provisions of PESCO found in Articles 42 (6), 46 of the TEU and Protocol 10, reaching a feasible level of budgetary harmony via the EDF, and increasing the extent to which member states engage in P&S are the most optimum solutions to establishing a ESDU.

Despite permissive legal stipulations in the Treaties and economic flight via ‘defense economics’, the conglomeration of blockages to harmonizing a fully consolidated operational ESDU include: Diverging interests; the preservation of state sovereignty; reticence by member states; varying perceptions of the concept of ‘security’; cultural-linguistic divergences of perception behind the concepts of ‘security’ and ‘defense’; the Cold War; the breakup of Yugoslavia; the Balkan crises; 9/11; the 2008 global financial crisis; Russia and its marginal warfare leverage; the US as Europe’s paradoxical enabler yet disabler of growth; a staunch cleavage between the fields of academia and policy-making; differing strategic cultures and postures resulting in regional clustering of EUBGs; limited Eurobarometer data; the role of geography and geopolitics; divergences in security priorities between member states; structural defense market fragmentation; the implications of Brexit; US defense market sequestration; the long-standing Special Relationship between the US and UK; lack of cooperation among MOD; national protectionist economic policies; the duplication of EU defense resources; unreached consensus by member states; the ECB’s prohibition on monetary financing; the fiscal sustainability of the EDF and EDAP; and mutualization of cost sharing between member states. The most paramount political blockages of these include: Lack of political will, traditional “NATO-first” reflexes, conservative defense industry policies, and military cooperation

73 Bunde, Tobias, and Wolfgang Ischinger, “European Security Policy at the End of the Post-Cold War Era”, *Global Policy*, Vol. 8, Issue S4, 2017, p. 28, online at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1758-5899.12431/full>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

fragmentation. The EU's quest towards a ESDU is therefore stalled by a slew of political obstacles as opposed to legal or economic ones.

In grappling with all of these blockages, there are a myriad of actions the EU can take to ensure that the recent activation of PESCO is not rescinded. Member states can muster the political resolve needed under a balanced Franco-German axis of leadership by increasing quality-based defense research, by remaining open about the recent additions of the EDF and EDAP, by establishing a central European Operational Headquarters that oversees all its civilian missions, and by engaging in military operations and intelligence gathering activities. It can also do so by promoting the development of a SMD, by converging spending pools via P&S, by advancing 'defense economics', bolstering the EDTIB, and filling the gap between its ambitions and structures, tools and capabilities. European defense integration can also be continued by enhancing integrated military capabilities, by pursuing common program management, logistics, updates for configuration, doctrines, deployment, training and exercise, and by continuing to entertain the CSM, CARD, and MPCC.

Above all, the political apex of the European defense integration triangle has substantially overpowered its economic and legal bases, which contain the necessary impetus for the EU to evolve its defense capabilities. An unwavering commitment to the recent activation of PESCO, increasing the extent of P&S, and facilitating a protectionist SMD are the most conducive solutions for rendering a fully harmonized ESDU that does not undermine the long-standing US-centric power structure via NATO as Europe begins to measure up to its obligations in securing its territories and defending its citizens under a consensual and united defense shield that does not impinge upon each member state's own national security measures as stipulated in Article 4 of the TEU⁷⁴. While citizens demand more security and defense concessions from the EU, it is chiefly politics and a tender history to blame for blockading European defense gains over the last century that have overridden the legal and economic conduits for a ESDU contained within the Treaties and defense economics. In agreement with former HR of the

74 European Union, *op. cit.*, 202/18.

“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defense Union

CFSP Javier Solana, a united European defense union to provide a collective European response⁷⁵ to outbreaking crises and security threats would only complement the existing US-NATO power structure, and may the recent establishment of PESCO be the verge of a new constitutional treaty for a ‘United States of Europe’ as called for by Martin Schulz in December 2017, who clasps Jean Monnet and the Founding Fathers’ dream of a federal Europe in his fingertips. This birth of a European Security and Defense Union will ultimately foster a redefined transatlantic relationship of cooperation between the European Union and United States of America as two of the world’s premier collaborators of global security, seekers of justice, and exemplars of democratic rule of law and moral authority in all their faults. A stronger Europe can indeed rise to the occasion without undermining the traditional US-NATO power structure, which is indispensable in a dawning 2020s decade of zealous great power competition, uncharted political waters and unfinished globality⁷⁶. So long as the EU is able to walk the talk in its latest defense breakthroughs to more effectively diffuse peace, stability, and security throughout its own territories and beyond, the once far-fetched dream of a European Security and Defense Union from skittishness to reality has only begun.

75 Solana, Javier, “Why Europe needs deeper defense integration”, World Economic Forum, September 26, 2016, online at: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/09/javier-solana-why-europe-needs-deeper-defense-integration>. Last accessed: January 23, 2018.

76 Kühnhardt, Ludger, *The Global Society and Its Enemies: Liberal Order Beyond the Third World War*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, p. 1-3.

Das **Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung (ZEI)** ist ein interdisziplinäres Forschungs- und Weiterbildungsinstitut der Universität Bonn. *ZEI – DISCUSSION PAPER* richten sich mit ihren von Wissenschaftlern und politischen Akteuren verfassten Beiträgen an Wissenschaft, Politik und Publizistik. Sie geben die persönliche Meinung der Autoren wieder. Die Beiträge fassen häufig Ergebnisse aus laufenden Forschungsprojekten des ZEI zusammen.

The **Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI)** is an interdisciplinary research and further education institute at the University of Bonn. *ZEI – DISCUSSION PAPER* are intended to stimulate discussion among researchers, practitioners and policy makers on current and emerging issues of European integration and Europe's global role. They express the personal opinion of the authors. The papers often reflect on-going research projects at ZEI.

Die neuesten ZEI Discussion Paper / Most recent ZEI Discussion Paper:

- C 234 (2016) Rike Sohn
EU environmental policy and diplomacy from Copenhagen to Paris and beyond
- C 235 (2016) Ludger Kühnhardt
Maturing beyond Cotonou: An EU-ACP Association Treaty for Development. A proposal for reinventing EU relations with the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States
- C 236 (2016) James D. Bindenagel
America and Europe in the Twenty-first Century
- C 237 (2016) Matthias Vogl/Rike Sohn
Nachhaltige regionale Integration in Westafrika und Europa. ZEI
Forschungskooperation mit dem West Africa Institut (WAI) von 2007 bis 2016
- C 238 (2016) Matteo Scotto
Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). An Insight into Transatlantic Relations and Global Context
- C 239 (2017) Michael Gehler
Revolutionäre Ereignisse und geoökonomisch-strategische Ergebnisse: Die EU- und NATO-„Osterweiterungen“ 1989-2015 im Vergleich
- C 240 (2017) Tapio Raunio/Matti Wiberg
The Impact of the European Union on National Legislation
- C 241 (2017) Robert Stüwe
EU External Energy Policy in Natural Gas: A Case of Neofunctionalist Integration?
- C 242 (2017) Ludger Kühnhardt
Weltfähig werden. Die Europäische Union nach dem Biedermeier
- C 243 (2017) César Castilla
Perspectives on EU-Latin American Cooperation: Enhancing Governance, Human Mobility and Security Policies
- C 244 (2017) Joe Borg
The Maltese Presidency of the European Union 2017
- C 245 (2018) Ludger Kühnhardt
The New Silk Road: The European Union, China and Lessons Learned
- C 246 (2018) Teodora Lađić
The Impact of European Integration on the Westphalian Concept of National Sovereignty
- C 247 (2018) Wolfgang Reinhard
Die Expansivität Europas und ihre Folgen
- C 248 (2018) Joseph M. Hughes
“Sleeping Beauty” Unleashed: Harmonizing a Consolidated European Security and Defence Union

Die vollständige Liste seit 1998 und alle Discussion Paper zum Download finden Sie auf unserer Homepage: <http://www.zei.de>. For a complete list since 1998 and all Discussion Paper for download, see the center's homepage: <http://www.zei.de>.



Rheinische
Friedrich-Wilhelms-
Universität Bonn

Center for European
Integration Studies

Genscherallee 3
D-53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49-228-73-1810
Fax: +49-228-73-1818
<http://www.zei.de>

ISSN 1435-3288

ISBN 978-3-941928-89-3