

In collaboration with Eurocorps

Instructor: Colonel Cédric Denier



# European Defence

## Is there a real political will?

Europe de la Défense : quelle réelle volonté politique ?

Marion Blatgé  
Ronan Boëbion  
Clara Fumex  
Yashar Jafarli  
Alexander Kasimov  
Tomek Kubiak  
Amila Planincic  
Jonathan Nougarede  
Julia Scarpinato Medway



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to express our gratitude to Colonel Cédric Denier for his valuable and constructive suggestions during the planning and developments of this research work. His willingness to give his time has been very much appreciated.

We also would like to thank our Professor, Mr. Alexis Vahlas, as well as Ms. Cristina Alexeev, Sir Van Orden and Mr. Vincent Peillon for their support and advice throughout our study.

We are specially grateful for General Jean-Paul Thonier's help and for his professional guidance and constructive recommendations on this project.

## INTRODUCTION

The ongoing debate on the European Defence structure has intensified in the recent years. It is discussed on a political, diplomatic and military level of the European Union (EU) states. The current state of affairs is showing that a common framework is challenging. This diversity of views is creating an incoherent and a dispersed political will that is not effective on a pan-EU level. There is a consistent disconnect between what is hoped on a higher political level, and what is executed at the bottom. This is most seen in debates regarding EU defence and security.

European Defence is a common structure aimed at defending the internal and external space of the European Union. It is an institutional framework inscribed in the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) section of the Treaty of European Union, aimed at creating cohesion and collaboration between EU Member States in order to create a mutual defence system.

The current political context is showing that the world is becoming less and less secure with each coming day. The European Union itself is shaken up by various external and internal threats. There is a common agreement on some mutual threats, such as the protection of borders, terrorism, and cyber security. There is also agreement that certain questions affect the entire Union, notably Brexit, a more imposing Russia, and partnerships with Eastern European and North African states. However, on a deeper level, every EU state prioritizes its security differently towards these questions. On many levels, it is simply a question of geographical placement and historical experience.

On a military level, there is a limited will due to national allegiances, different military doctrines, and different levels of technological advancement. There is also a disagreement whether the threat is incoming from the east or the south. All of these debates lead to confusion and a lack of agreement as to what exactly this European Defence structure shall be. The national allegiances create distrust between which countries sends which soldiers under which commander. There are debates as to who is to contribute how many military personnel.

On another level, there is a debate whether a European Defence structure is even needed. Many states consider the existence of NATO as being sufficient for the security of the European continent. Others feel that the European Union must take steps into its own hands and not rely on its Transatlantic partners for assistance in the event of a crisis. NATO remains largely funded by the United States, and a debate remains on their trustworthiness. For other EU Members, NATO has always been the backbone of Europe's strength, and therefore a second defence framework is unnecessary.

On still another level, the very structure of the EU creates obstacles for the construction of a common framework. The principle of unanimity guides the vast majority of EU international and

security decisions, as an exception to the ordinary 'qualified majority' system for the other UE policies. However, because of numerous cleavages between European Union Member States, agreements favouring one region or another can be blocked.

On the highest political level, attempts are being made to supersede these problems. Leaders such as Jean-Claude Juncker see the EU as an entity that must have its own armed forces, structures and a common foreign policy. They see the European Defence Framework incorporate all of these elements, in addition to the CSDP. The attempts to erase national borders for the mutual protection of all have its roadblocks along the way.

It is clear that some kind of agreement and consensus is needed to resolve these problems. The EU needs some change to function. This paper will analyse the recent trends in this debate. In order to assess the possibility of an efficient political will, we will examine in a first part, the renewal of the debate and in a second part, the persisting lack of political will behind European Defence.

## **I) European Defence: the remake?**

### **A) European declared political will**

The political ambitions of the institutions governing the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the European Union, and more precisely of the Common Security and Defence Policy, has been emphasized in formal documents, reports and declarations of qualified EU organs and individuals. Many treaties, declarations and reports played an important role in the foundation of the European Union's defence structure. Those declarations and treaties were influenced by the political, historical and geopolitical context of their time. Aside from these factors, the level of European integration process enabled some crucial institutional changes and enhancements in the creation of the EU's defence concepts. Even though the level of political willingness to create a European defence is faced with many constraints (where one of the most important ones is the political and ideological readiness of the EU member-states to develop this domain of the EU's external action), there is a perceptible institutional and political will declared in several formal documents and reports made by EU organs and officials.

After the signature and ratification of the Lisbon Treaty, that had laid down to some important changes in the domain of the future European defence, it was for the first time in 2013 that the European Council had an important thematic debate on the European defence. In its Declaration entitled "Defence matters", the European Council concluded that the EU and its Member States should exercise greater responsibilities in response to security challenges if they want to contribute to

maintaining peace and security through CSDP, together with key partners such as the United Nations and NATO. The EU should equally work on the effectiveness, visibility and increased impact of the CSDP. The European Council has also called on Member States to deepen defence cooperation by improving the capacity to conduct missions and operations and by making full use of synergies in order to improve the development and availability of the required civilian and military capabilities. Furthermore, the EC emphasized that Europe needs a more integrated, sustainable, innovative and competitive defence technological and industrial base (EDTIB) to develop and sustain defence capabilities. In 2015, the Council of the European Union reiterated the same conclusions appealing once again for the enhancement of the EU's CSDP capabilities and impacts.

Most recently, after several large crises (Economic crisis, refugee crisis, terrorist attacks, Brexit, etc.), the question of the European Defence has been raised once more as one of the most important issues on the European level. For many voices, the political and security context of the European Union requires taking decisive moves for reconciling diverse attitudes of Member States by strengthening the European Defence. In his 2016 State of the Union speech, the President of the European Commission declared that “the soft power is not enough in an increasingly dangerous neighbourhood.”<sup>1</sup> He pledged the need for the formation of permanent structures that would enhance EU's military capacity. Above all, he emphasized the importance for all EU states to take ownership in building European Defence. During the dedicated EU Summit held in July 2016, the High Representative Federica Mogherini presented an EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy<sup>2</sup>. This document pointed out that cooperation between Member States should be deepened, and would lead to a more structured form of cooperation, making full use of the Lisbon Treaty's potential. In this sense, the EU should be a more responsible global stakeholder, with responsibility must be shared within all EU members. The importance of complementary and transparent cooperation with NATO was stressed, as well as the necessity for the EU to be able to act autonomously. This strategic document especially underlined the significance of mutual assistance and solidarity in addressing challenges from both inside and outside the EU, such as terrorism, hybrid threats, cyber and energy security, organized crime and external border control. The cooperation between the EU and NATO was not questioned. On the contrary, an improved and strengthened cooperation within the two partners was re-confirmed during the NATO Summit in Warsaw in July 2016.

In two reports adopted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the European Parliament in 2016, the importance of reinforcing European Defence was once more highlighted. Endorsed by the European Parliament on 23 November 2016, the Pascu Report on “The implementation of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jean Claude Juncker, Speech on State of Union, [http://ec.europa.eu/news/2016/09/20160914\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/news/2016/09/20160914_en.htm), 25.10.2016

<sup>2</sup> EU Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy, [https://eeas.europa.eu/top\\_stories/pdf/eugs\\_review\\_web.pdf](https://eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf), 25.10.2016

Common Security and Defence Policy”<sup>3</sup> noted that the CSDP has been focused mainly on crisis management operations until now and should become more robust in facing current security challenges on its own. It was also suggested to take on crisis prevention and crisis resolution objectives, especially after the conflicts in the Balkans. It underlined that all Council decisions on future missions and operations should prioritize engagements in conflicts directly affecting EU security, as well as considered that the decision to engage should be based on a common analysis and understanding of the strategic environment and on shared strategic interests of the member-states. Finally, the Petersberg tasks should be revised and the Battlegroups should become an employable military instrument through increased modularity and a more functional financing. In another report on the European Defence<sup>4</sup>, the Committee expressed concerns that administrative procedures unnecessarily slow down the cross-border movement of rapid response forces inside the EU and called on Member States to establish an EU-wide system for coordination of rapid movement of defence forces personnel, equipment and supplies.

Although there is evidence for political determination to go further in creating and strengthening European Defence, it is also obvious that the decisions concerning this particular domain depend on the political will of the individual Member States. A consensus-based intergovernmental decision-making system allows members to veto every decision they consider in contradiction to their national prerogatives, and this can slow down or even make unable progression in the field of the European Defence. In order to explore these concepts, it is necessary to explore the new inter-states proposals.

## B) New inter-state proposals: a boosting effect for the European Defence system?

The British referendum in favour of leaving the European Union has led to an upsurge of inter-state proposals for a European Defence system. Moreover, in the background of internal and external threats that the European Union is facing, their leaders consider essential to move to a deeper integration.<sup>5</sup>

By 2015, the German Minister of Defence, Ursula von der Leyen, as well as Jean-Claude Juncker supported a stronger european integration in the field of defence, knowing all too well that at the current stage of European integration, it would be inefficient and difficult to achieve. These new

---

<sup>3</sup> Pascu Report of European Parliament on The implementation of the Common Security and Defence, November, 2016

<sup>4</sup> Committee on Foreign Affairs, [http://www.emeeting.europarl.europa.eu/committees/agenda/201610/SEDE/SEDE\(2016\)1012\\_1/sitt-3263846](http://www.emeeting.europarl.europa.eu/committees/agenda/201610/SEDE/SEDE(2016)1012_1/sitt-3263846), 26.10.2016

<sup>5</sup> See below.

challenges changed the situation and led to a more realistic option: the fostering of a European Defence system.

The shift came on 13 July 2016 with the publication of German Ministry of Defence's "White Paper"<sup>6</sup> which foresees, among other developments, the enhancing of Bundeswehr's competence in the coming years. Furthermore, it forecasts an increase in its security and defence budget from €32 billion to €40 billion, thanks to the Horizon 2020 program. These adjustments show that Germany is now ready to take on its military responsibilities, its leadership within the European Union, to reassure France, and to mutually face new challenges with its partners in the European Union. Thus, the increase in Germany's military budget is a response to future security stakes and a fulfilment of France's and Poland's wishes.

As Minister Ursula von der Leyen pointed out: "Great Britain has always blocked what Europe wanted to do". It is not clear if the situation would be very different for the European Defence, now that the United Kingdom will leave the EU. It does appear as though France and Germany wish to take advantage of Brexit to push their European Defence agenda.

On 11 September 2016, French and German Ministers of Defence, Mr. Jean-Yves Le Drian and Mrs. von der Leyen handed over a six-page draft proposal to the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Federica Mogherini, in order to modernize and to make the European Defence system more performing, relevant and comprehensive<sup>7</sup>. They called for rapid implementation due to a degraded security context in the European Union. This is exemplified by terrorist attacks in Paris, Brussels and Nice.

Both Ministers argue in favour of reinforcing EU's prerogatives in Defence and Security and called for a credible, efficient and reactive common defence. They recommended, therefore, the implementation of the permanent structured cooperation (PSC), created by the Lisbon Treaty, but never used before. According to them, it would be the most efficient tool to create a strong European Defence. Furthermore, they urged to enhance solidarity among EU Member states and for the "European capacity in defence". We can presume that if France and Germany are both flirting with this idea, Spain and Italy may join the leading group in the future.

One of the most relevant shifts that France and Germany have put forward is the concrete reinforcement of European Union's activities which combine military and civilian instruments. They proposed, as a mid-term objective, that a "permanent EU military planning and conduct capability and a permanent EU civilian planning and conduct capability" as well as an establishment of permanent

---

<sup>6</sup> German Ministry, White Paper on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr, 19.09.2016

<sup>7</sup> France-Allemagne.fr, *Revitalisation de la PSDC: Vers une défense au sein de l'UE globale, réaliste et crédible*, <http://www.france-allemande.fr/article9346.html>, 11.09.2016

civilian-military headquarters. Furthermore, they called for strengthening Eurocorps in order to “support the EU with the required expertise of training, mentoring, advisory and assistance missions, in implementing and managing a mechanism to pre-identify trainers and advisors as well as to foster capability development for armed forces”. This proposal is significant for Eurocorps, its role and future within the European Union. It means that Eurocorps’ position in the European Defence and security strategy would be upgraded, all while retaining the possibility of providing assistance to NATO when required. Eventually, they recommended putting at EU’s disposal “adequate capabilities at the tactical/ operational level for the planning and conduct of military CSDP missions and operations”.

The Franco-German partnership is not the only one to imply a deeper collaboration in the field of security and defence. Indeed, on 16 September 2016, during the Informal Summit of Heads of States in Bratislava, under the chairmanship of Frederica Mogherini, the Italian Ministers of Defence and Foreign Affairs, Roberta Pinotti and Paolo Gentiloni, presented their idea of a “Schengen of Defence”. They first presented this concept in a joint letter that these Ministers published in the French Newspaper *Le Monde*, on 10 August 2016. The Schengen of Defence is based on the model of the existing Schengen area and on the “spill-over” effect. Indeed, according to the proposal, a small group of countries would sign an agreement whereby they would agree to share military capabilities and resources. As they claimed, the aim would be to not create a European army, but rather to build a European multinational force (EMF) with features and mandates established collectively, reinforced with a command structure, decisional mechanisms, as well as a common budget. They are looking for “available member states willing to share forces, command and control, manoeuvre and enabling capabilities” in order to establish this “joint permanent EMF”<sup>8</sup>.

The European Multinational Force would be at the European Union Headquarters’ disposal, as well as for NATO’s and UN’s, depending on the context of the military missions. Then, like the original Schengen Agreement, other countries could apply to join in. However, one should note that the latest proposal seems to have minimal impact across the European Union member states.

After interviewing members of the European Parliament from the Security and Defence subcommittee and members of military forces, we underlined that the most recurrent proposition is to activate the permanent structured cooperation foreseen by article 42.6 of the Treaty. Establishing the PSC would open the path to a European Defence based on the model of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU). As a French socialist MEP explained to us, “States’ engagements play the role of the convergence criteria; an organism is in charge to check out the application. For example, the European Agency of Defence will play for Defence the role of the European Central Bank plays for the EMU.

---

<sup>8</sup> Paolo Gentiloni and Roberta Pinotti, *L’Italie appelle à un « Schengen de la Défense »*, [http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2016/08/10/l-italie-appelle-a-un-schengen-de-la-defense\\_4980759\\_3232.html](http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2016/08/10/l-italie-appelle-a-un-schengen-de-la-defense_4980759_3232.html), 10.08.2016

Finally, the collective defence clause, which supposes an efficient defence, is for the European Union's Defence what the euro is to the EMU". According to him, we therefore do not need an institutional upheaval.

The conclusion we can draw is that a small number of countries within the European Union see each other eye to eye in an informal context. The exit of the United Kingdom from the European Union can be a real opportunity to enhance European integration and to discover which EU Members States were using UK's veto as an excuse to not commit to European Defence. Moreover, they all agreed, during the meeting in Bratislava that they will have to counter current threats together. But, beyond these discourses, as the political newspaper Politico explained, "a pragmatic strategy and, above all, political will is necessary"<sup>9</sup>. These questions came back after Brexit and the invocation of article 42.7 after November terrorist attacks in France.

### C) An unprecedented momentum in a questionable context

On 23 June 2016, a referendum was held in the UK on whether the country should leave the European Union or not. The Leave camp won with 51,89 %. This result begged several questions to be raised: what is next for European Defence? Can the EU still be a strategic player without the UK? Will the EU lose its credibility? What could replace the Franco-British engine at the core of EU security and defence integration? Indeed, with the United Kingdom leaving the EU, the organization is facing a historic decision and the future could be challenging.

Firstly, it is important to stress the numerous political declarations that were raised right after the results. For the first time, government officials began to speak on European defence without the UK<sup>10</sup>. French minister of defence Jean Yves Le Drian<sup>11</sup> said that Brexit will neither have an impact on this subject, nor on the bilateral agreements between France and the UK. Moreover, both François Hollande and Angela Merkel expressed the idea that Brexit could be seen as an opportunity to rethink European defence and build a stronger relationship between Germany and France.

Nevertheless, the situation also has its worrying sides. Indeed, with the United Kingdom leaving, France remains the only EU country with a permanent seat in the UN Security Council. The United Kingdom is also, with France, the only EU country to be a nuclear power and to have a significant force projection capacity. Finally, both countries share around 40% of the total EU defence spending and two thirds of its investments. Looking at these numbers, the United Kingdom's exit

---

<sup>9</sup> Jacopo Barigazzi, *The almost-an-EU-army*, <http://www.politico.eu/article/italy-proposes-joint-european-military-force-schengen-of-defense/>, 27.09.2016

<sup>10</sup> GRIP, *La Défense Européenne après le Brexit: mieux vaut tard que jamais*, <http://www.grip.org/fr/node/2099>, 27.09.2016

<sup>11</sup> Anne Bauer, *Et si l'on réparait d'une Europe de la Défense ?*, <http://www.lesechos.fr/idees-debats/editos-analyses/0211099035814-et-si-lon-reparait-dune-europe-de-la-defense-2012815.php>, 07.07.2016

could indeed be seen as a step backwards for a common EU defence policy. That being said, we should also note that the United Kingdom has often done its best to limit the development of European Defence<sup>12</sup>. Prioritizing NATO and their relationship with the US, The UK always used its veto to block any project that would go against NATO's interests. For instance, it has constantly said "no" to the creation of a permanent EU military headquarters. Every step forward has always been blocked or challenged by the United Kingdom. In fact, it has rarely been a useful contributor to the EU strategic independence towards NATO and the United States. Although they did help France right after the Paris attacks in November 2015, this initiative came more from their bilateral agreement with France (that is, the Lancaster agreements of 2010) than their implication within the EU.

Therefore, there are two things that we need to keep in mind when asking ourselves what is next for European defence: firstly, that the EU is indeed losing a strong economic and military partner but also that their implication in European Defence's policy has never been significant anyway. For this reason, the negative consequences of Brexit are obvious; nevertheless, it might now be time for EU Member States to seize the opportunities this momentum offers. Too often the United Kingdom's position has been used as a convenient excuse from some Member States for the lack of progress of European institutions in the defence area<sup>13</sup>. The UK's opposition has provided an alibi, allowing Europeans not to go further and strengthen their common defence policy. Now that the United Kingdom is on its way to leaving, it is time to make decisions. We already saw that France and Germany have shown a will to play a decisive role. It is nevertheless probable that their enthusiastic political declarations would only rally the EU's "big three" France, Germany and Italy, and would be seen as an opportunity to hide the inability of "old" Europe to agree on fundamental subjects such as the Euro currency or how to revive the continent's stagnant economy. The EU members have shown unity against Euroscepticism and a reticence to talk about controversial subjects<sup>14</sup>. But the United Kingdom's departure from the EU won't change the fact that not all Member States share the same views about European Defence or integration in general. One such example is Poland, which gives stronger support for NATO than for European Defence. For this reason, progress might have to go through tedious negotiation, one step at a time. And in this light as seen previously, it is perhaps now an opportune time to make more frequent use of the Permanent Structured Cooperation. According to Article 46 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), it allows for more committed EU states to establish their own permanent structured cooperation within the Union. It enhances cooperation, but does not go so far as to create European armed forces. Unwilling Member States can choose not to

---

<sup>12</sup> Nicolas Gros-Verheyde, Le Britannique est-il nécessaire à l'Europe de la Défense ?, <http://www.bruxelles2.eu/2015/10/15/brexit-le-britannique-est-il-necessaire-a-leurope-de-la-defense/>, 15.10.2016

<sup>13</sup> Jean-Marie Guéhenno, How Brexit affects EU Defence Policy, <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/jean-marie-guehenno-on-european-defence-after-brexit-a-1110352.html>, 01.09.2016

<sup>14</sup> Peter Foster, EU Summit: Europe must work closer on Defence after Brexit, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/08/22/eu-summit-europe-will-not-come-to-an-end-after-brexit/>, 22.08.2016

take part. There is no veto power against its creation, and participation is voluntary. Member States can also join once it is set up – and leave at any time, with no conditions attached.

Finally, analysts are raising concerns over military-industrial aspects<sup>15</sup>. They are worried that as a result of Brexit, the United Kingdom will invest less into defence. There are also concerns pertaining to international trade. The context of Brexit has created two hypothetical scenarios: a stronger relationship between the core EU countries, or a further regression into Euroscepticism<sup>16</sup>. Due to this vulnerable position, any new European Defence initiatives should always leave room for the United Kingdom to participate. Even the most anti-European defence policy such as MEP Sir Van Orden that we interviewed, stated that “I would suggest and I fear to some extent that in order to make it easy to come to an arrangement with the EU on things like market issues, we will say that “well ok we’ll continue to be supportive of your EU military missions”

Brexit is one example of an external event that created a rapprochement between EU States. Another such example is terrorism, where Member States agree on the measures to be taken. In the wake of the November Paris terrorist attacks, France was the first Member State to call for mutual assistance under Article 42.7 of the Lisbon treaty, France invoked this article for a very pragmatic reason, namely, that it was struggling to cope with ISIS on its own and needed support and assistance from the rest of Europe. The Lisbon Treaty also includes a “solidarity clause” under article 222 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, this article makes direct reference to European Union Institutions, whereas article 42.7 mentions Member States. Therefore, by choosing to invoke Article 42.7, France has chosen an intergovernmental approach to deal with this problem<sup>17</sup>. The use of this article was a good way of reminding EU States that implementing other provisions of the Lisbon Treaty can be useful in the future in the context of a permanent structured cooperation with the goal of deepening defence cooperation.

Federica Mogherini stated that the invocation of this article “is a political act, a political message” and that each Member State would contribute in helping France “in line with their capabilities and foreign policies”. Moreover, on 17 November 2016, even the French Defence Minister Jean Yves le Drian insisted on the fact that the invocation of this article was politically motivated, and the activation of the clause was used to develop EU defence initiatives and establish

---

<sup>15</sup> Claire Digiacomi, Les conséquences du Brexit sur la sécurité européenne, <http://www.huffingtonpost.fr/2016/06/25/les-consequences-du-brexit-sur-la-securite-europeenne/>, 25.06.2016

<sup>16</sup> CEIS, Les enjeux de la Défense en Europe et le Brexit, [http://www.universite-defense.org/fr/system/files/mars\\_xiv\\_pp\\_ceis\\_pl\\_l1\\_2.pdf](http://www.universite-defense.org/fr/system/files/mars_xiv_pp_ceis_pl_l1_2.pdf), Mars 2016

<sup>17</sup> Jorge Valero, France ‘at war’ inaugurates EU’s mutual defence clause, <http://www.euractiv.com/section/justice-home-affairs/news/france-at-war-inaugurates-eu-s-mutual-defence-clause/>, 17.10.2015

the foundation for a strong European Defence. It confronted EU Member States with their military responsibilities and it provides for direct dialogue and support between countries<sup>18</sup>.

Furthermore, France decided not to use article 5 of the NATO Treaty, legal basis of the Alliance's collective self-defence, that was used after the 9/11 attacks in the United States. We can believe that France decided not to call on NATO (and, by extension, the USA) only for political reasons and instead to call on European solidarity by default. The coalition against ISIS is a group of Member States outside the framework of NATO and calling for individual Member State action may be more consistent. Indeed, the US is already involved in Syria, and so France can count on its support without having to go through NATO. Moreover, the priority to back the EU ahead of NATO echoes France's longstanding support for an autonomous European Defence<sup>19</sup>.

The invocation of article 42.7 was unanimously approved by EU Member States and on 2 December 2015, the European Commission adopted a package of measures to step up the fight against terrorism and the illegal trafficking of firearms and explosives. Germany and the United Kingdom were the first two countries that decided to take part in operations against ISIS in Syria. The United Kingdom decided to increase its troop contribution to UN peacekeeping operations instead of the CSDP. This was another example of the United Kingdom's lack of will in becoming more engaged with European Defence. Nevertheless, most European Union countries have decided to provide support to the French operations in Africa. They contributed by sending logistical and military support, notably in Sub-Saharan Africa, where France has military commitments in countries like Mali. Thus, the invocation of this article can be seen as an opportunity to develop European Defence initiatives, through the unanimous approval by European Union states and their contribution to French operations is a perfect example of how EU countries can work together in establishing a strong European Defence.

However, the lack of unanimous actions between countries shows that the EU has neither the capabilities, nor the political will to start an independent military mission against ISIS. Indeed, without any correlation between countries, a strong European Defence will be difficult to achieve and the EU will continue to depend on NATO. The actions led by European Union Member States have already been foreseen. It thus renders this article very weak in its application. In the end, this translates into weak political will.

---

<sup>18</sup> ECFR, Article 42.7 : an explainer, [http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary\\_article\\_427\\_an\\_explainer5019](http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_article_427_an_explainer5019), 19.10.2015

<sup>19</sup> ECFR, Article 42.7 : an explainer, [http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary\\_article\\_427\\_an\\_explainer5019](http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_article_427_an_explainer5019), 19.10.2015

## II) The « clipped wings » of European ambitions

### A) EU Members States: Divided opinions

The CSDP is a unique structure where decisions have to be adopted unanimously by all the Member States. In the context of the EU, Member states have their own ingrained interests which are not likely to change in the future. For this reason, finding a solution that suits all 28 States is very challenging. Compromise and concessions are difficult to find in the areas of sometimes contradicting interests. An inquiry into the official points of view shows that despite the above-mentioned official positions, EU Member States approach security from a different angle. They can be broken down into four separate groups.

The first group of Member States stands for an independent framework, a Pan-European defence system, the formation of more unified European armed forces and taking concrete steps in achieving those goals. The principal pivots for these ideas are France and Germany. This Franco-German approach, beginning after the Second World War, has had success. The creation of Eurocorps shows what mutual cooperation can enact. Other countries following this path are Spain, Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy, Romania and Greece.

A second group of countries does not reject the idea of creating an EU defence system but give preference to NATO in assuring a collective defence. These countries do not demonstrate particular interest in creating a European Defence framework. A good example of this group of countries is Bulgaria. They attempt to collaborate with the EU and NATO in order to accomplish its own goals and objectives, but it is playing both sides for its advantage.

Third option, London is well-known for its hard line position of opposing any idea of strengthening European Defence. In their opinion it would be a duplication of NATO structures, which is perceived as a waste of funds. In July 2011, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, William Hague, expressed British decisive point of view about establishment of the EUHQ by stating: "We don't accept now, and we won't accept in the future."<sup>20</sup>

The attitude of the last group of countries on the idea of a European Defence express particular interest. This group includes Sweden, Austria, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland and Malta which are EU states but not NATO nations. Furthermore, these countries are not expressing a strong desire to join any military alliances for the time being. They believed that neutrality is a guarantee of their safety.

---

<sup>20</sup> Laurent Lagneau, Défense : Le président de la commission européenne veut un quartier général permanent pour l'UE, <http://www.opex360.com/2016/09/14/defense-le-president-de-la-commission-europeenne-veut-quartier-general-permanent-pour-lue/>, 14.09.2016

In recent years, Sweden and Finland strengthened their cooperation with NATO and showed interest in becoming members of the Alliance. According to these two countries, the EU should clearly define the purpose of European Defence, while at the same time favoring humanitarian missions. Sweden and Finland believe that in such case, all members of the EU, including the six countries of this third group of neutral States, may have an equal right to make decisions and participate in these operations. NATO will remain guarantor in case of a major threat to security. These countries give different arguments in order to protect their positions. Sweden's Defence minister has said that Sweden is not in NATO partly because the EU treaty contains its own security guarantee. Speaking to the EU observer at the Globsec conference in Bratislava on 20 April 2013, she said: "If you really read it, the Lisbon Treaty says you must support your EU neighbours with all the necessary means."<sup>21</sup> Regarding article 42.7, she noted: "Since the EU is not a military alliance, it's not like article five [Nato's collective security clause], but there is this line which says all EU member states must support any other member state if it's attacked or if it's affected by a natural disaster."<sup>22</sup> Then she summarizes its concern for all and says: "It's really difficult to think that if one [EU] country [...] was affected by a catastrophe or an attack, it would not affect all the other EU countries. It would be an act of self-interest to try to stabilize the situation."<sup>23</sup> In short, the position of neutral countries with respect the idea of a common defence policy for Europe is unique.

The opinions of officials of the countries are influenced by their geographical location, geopolitical and particularly foreign policy goals. Even though all European Union Member States, with the exception of the United Kingdom, officially and in different measure, express their support to the development of CSDP, to strengthening of the military role and presence of the EU on the international stage, their concrete actions in raising the European Defence's role on a higher level are usually far from what they state in official documents. The changing political and security context in Europe, with a recent withdrawal of the Great Britain from the EU could be an impetus of rethinking and putting the political will of the remaining 27 EU member-states to a test.

## B) The « Rubik's cube » of EU/NATO relation

One cannot fully understand the situation of the European Defence without considering the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and its relation with European Union Member States. NATO can be considered as one of the first European Defence organisations and is still the main guarantor of European security as a whole. Fierce arguments still occur to promote the necessity

---

<sup>21</sup> Andrew Rettman, Sweden: Who needs NATO, when you have the Lisbon Treaty?, <https://euobserver.com/news/119894>, 22.04.2013

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

for the European Union to develop a separate political defence framework. Some deputies, however, see it as unnecessary, such as the British MEP Sir Van Orden quoted supra, stated that “the European Defence in is the hands of NATO. I never had a satisfactory explanation as to why there is any merit to establish a separate organisation”<sup>24</sup>. Some, on the contrary would favour a European Defence independent from NATO and more specifically its main sponsor, the United States. In between these two extremes lies the EU-NATO cooperation embodied by the 2003 Berlin Plus agreements, which represents a cornerstone in the cooperative history between the two institutions.

The Berlin Plus agreement gives the EU access to NATO assets for its missions. It includes the use of the NATO headquarters “SHAPE” in Mons, Belgium. The relevant NATO regional command serves as an EU operative structure, as implemented with the Joint Forces Command Naples for the EU military operations in the Balkans. This collaboration also helps with information sharing, through consultation arrangement in order to create a “coherent and mutually reinforcing capability requirement<sup>25</sup>”. As such, the Berlin Plus agreement creates a more enhanced cooperation and an interoperability between the two institutions in order to facilitate the successes of future operations. It gives the militarily-limited EU a much needed access to extended NATO resources. This kind of trust and capability-sharing between two organisations of such amplitude is unprecedented. Indeed, NATO has to agree this supportive action in favour of a military operation of the EU, which means – in a consensus-based organisation like NATO – that any Member of the Alliance can veto the implementation of the Berlin Plus framework for an EU-led operation. In the end, the Berlin Plus agreement gives an opportunity for the EU to benefit from the huge potential of NATO means and capabilities but with the logical counterpart of NATO conditions on its support as well as a NATO presence in the EU chain of command. Furthermore, if Berlin Plus becomes the main option for EU-led military operations, it may be seen as a loaded gun pointed at EU's strategic vision regarding its CSDP.

During the NATO summit of July 2016 in Warsaw, the Alliance and the European Union issued a new Joint Declaration. They emphasised the need for closer collaboration on fighting common issues, notably hybrid threats, migration, and expand coordination on cyber security and defence<sup>26</sup>. This statement shows a will to initiate a cooperation tackling new threats. But this broad declaration provides rather general objectives instead of clear guidelines. This Joint Declaration is rather to be seen as a call for Member States of both organisations to take initiatives, make new propositions and engage more in the debate of reforming the EU-NATO relationship. Significantly, it does not mention the Berlin Plus agreement and therefore does not offer any perspectives to reform it.

---

<sup>24</sup> Extract of the interview with MEP Sir Van Orden, EP Strasbourg 26.10.2016

<sup>25</sup> Text of the 2003 Berlin Plus Agreement

<sup>26</sup> EU-NATO Joint Declaration, Warsaw Summit, 08.07.2016

Another reason for this first Joint Declaration is the British referendum to leave the EU. The UK is a major actor both in NATO and in the EU. It is also a controversial player which was often accused of slowing the development of CSDP and of being a “US puppet”. But times of uncertainty after the Brexit are good incentives to take a step forward in sensitive matters like the European Defence. Even though the Joint Declaration does not seem yet to have had any major consequences on how the EU and NATO work with each other, it is clear that events like the Brexit may be triggers for increased collaboration.

One uncertainty following another, the US Presidential election of 8 November 2016 saw Donald J Trump becoming the 45th President of the United States. During his election campaign, the candidate Trump made strong comments on defence issues, especially NATO, often causing interrogations and concerns amongst EU and NATO members. Donald Trump publicly insisted said that his country will only “help the countries that pay fair share” and “[i]f they fulfill their obligations to us”<sup>27</sup>. These comments target the controversial 2 % of GDP issue that all NATO members are supposed to dedicate to defence expenditures. In 2015, this threshold has been reached only by 4 European members (Estonia, Greece, Poland, United Kingdom). It is not a new problem and past US administrations have already pointed out the lack of financial involvement from NATO allies. However, statements from Donald Trump are much tougher, with a lack of diplomatic courtesy, and may weaken the confidence and trust between the United States and its European allies. Indeed, this new approach may help EU Member States to upgrade their defence budgets and to reach NATO requirement as soon as possible. But it may also trigger a mistrust towards NATO. It is doubtful that the Atlantic Alliance will be dissolved. However, building a more European-centred cooperation may reassure its most exposed members.

So far, military operations led by the EU have been mostly short and limited. If the European Union wishes to become a more significant military actor based on a capability of European Defence, it is urgent to ask the key questions. Can it still afford to rely on a non-European life insurance, taking into consideration that after Brexit, 80% of the NATO spendings will come from non-EU members. Can the EU and NATO work out their overlapping problem in order to clarify the principle of "avoiding unnecessary duplication" proclaimed by NATO?

It is likely that the EU Member States will have to spend more on defence. It seems to be the only way to ease the relationship with their American ally. There may be a need for reforms in the future. There is still useless duplications in terms of operations and inaccuracies. Even the European Union Battlegroup (EUBG), today's EU's most advanced military tool, more agile than its heavier NATO Response Force (NRF) have to be articulated.

---

<sup>27</sup> Interview with the *New York Times*, "Donald Trump Sets Conditions for Defending NATO Allies Against Attack", 20 July 2016.

In the end, the relationship between the European Union and NATO is imperfect but on a good path. To carry on that way, it is crucial to develop the partnership in due consideration of the clear military superiority of NATO, much stronger because of US and Turkish capabilities, which is a matter of fact impossible to change in the foreseeable future. That being said, it should not be used to excuse the EU's poor development of capabilities.

### C) The EU - a Paper Tiger? Deficit of operational and industrial means

Despite a degrading global security context, it is important to point out the discrepancy between official political announcements and the actions taken by those who are directly involved in this sector. We will tackle the military and industrial aspects of this European Defence.

Military staff are the primary drivers of this European Defence, because they have to transform the political will into reality on the ground. Thus, a French general points out that "European Defence is not the Defence of Europe"<sup>28</sup>, and there is a glaring void in CSDP goals. The European Union could see an awakening of its military-industrial complex, or lead it to stagnate – and collapse? – in the face of resurgence in Russian military spending. Nevertheless, the military competence of various member states seems to adapt to this illusion of a perpetual peace deprived of any forthcoming threats. Conscript armies transformed into professional ones, with reduced operational capacities, tighter budgetary constraints, and limited assets for projection. The European Union is in shortage of projection capabilities and strategic equipment to be able to be deployed in distant theatres and on a large scale. Although, as stated previously, the Berlin Plus agreement reminds us of the EU's apparent dependence on NATO for some operations. In other domains, the dependence on American systems is even more obvious, which is clearly incompatible with the ambitious objectives demonstrated by the political leaders. It is noteworthy to point out, nevertheless, that the European Union is making attempts to reduce this dependence and develop a strategic autonomy, notably in the example of constructing programs like Galileo, which seek to obtain an independent GPS system from the United States. Progress remain much to be seen in this area.

European countries have neglected their defence needs for some time. The result is cruel. In 2016, a flagrant gap was shown between the political ambitions of the European Union and its actual defence abilities. This gap is most problematic due to the fact that the European Union is hoping to become a major player in preserving international stability.

In post-Brexit EU, France will be the only Member state that possesses an operational army with significant projection capabilities. Other Member States have armed forces composed of a bare

---

<sup>28</sup> Extract of the interview with a French general (2e section).

minimum, and insufficient to respond to stated goals. Jean-Claude Juncker observed in 2015 that "without the French army, the EU would be defenceless"<sup>29</sup>. Germany, on its part, seems at a crossroads. As of 1945, they are restricting themselves from an active international military presence. They can nevertheless join France and restart a dynamic military motor to revive 'the spirit of Defence' in Europe, in the event that the country decides to rid itself of its self-limiting bureaucratic and legislative conundrum. If the current Officer Staff of the Bundeswehr adopt a pro-NATO stance, an ideological change is foreseeable among the younger generation<sup>30</sup>. As of now, the military set up of various States remain insufficient to respond to the stated objectives.

In addition to this inadequacy in what is stated by politicians and the funds that are disbursed for the military, there is a notable deficit in the European military-industrial complex. First of all, not all Member states possess an independent defence industry, and those who do, have outsourced some of its production. Whereas the most important strategic hardware remains produced inside the Member States themselves, in the current context of rising defence costs, European capacities are weakening.

In the 'Defence Package' for 2007<sup>31</sup>, the European Commission announced its will to develop several conglomerates that would become the 'champions' of the European Defence industry. This has the purpose of removing duplications that could exist between the defence industries of several Member states. This strategy also aims at motivating collaboration in armament and defence manufacturing projects between Member states. There is also the economic advantage of saving the costs of development and production. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy to point out that previous projects of such nature have given mixed results. The examples of the Eurofighter Typhoon and the European helicopter Tigre show that Member states struggle to agree on a common material. As a result, France withdrew from the Eurofighter program to develop the Rafale independently, which shows again that States remain attached to their national needs. Nevertheless, mutual projects could help develop strategic autonomy on a European-level, especially in the face of the aggressive selling tactics of the United States, who seek to manipulate EU Member States into purchasing their equipment. Poland, for example, recently chose to purchase American Black Hawk helicopters instead of the Airbus Caracal<sup>32</sup>. As a consequence of US successes, defence armaments from the United States tend to be cheaper than European ones, and they are used by numerous European Union Member States. The EU's defence industry is behind in many points, and through a domino effect, brings on even further weakening of the political will to launch the European Defence. With the exception of Airbus and the

---

<sup>29</sup> Europe 1, Interview de Jean Claude Juncker, <http://www.europe1.fr/mediacenter/emissions/l-interview-de-jean-pierre-elkabbach/videos/juncker-l-armee-francaise-sauve-souvent-l-honneur-de-l-europe-2403837>, 19.03.2015

<sup>30</sup> Financial Times, Germany to push for progress towards European army, <https://www.ft.com/content/e90a080e-107b-11e6-91da-096d89bd2173>, 02.05.2016

<sup>31</sup> European Commission Press Release, [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-07-1860\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-07-1860_en.htm)

<sup>32</sup> Vincent Lamigeon, Contract Caracal : le coup de poignard polonais à Airbus, [http://www.challenges.fr/challenges-soir/contrat-caracal-le-coup-de-poignard-polonais-a-airbus\\_431424](http://www.challenges.fr/challenges-soir/contrat-caracal-le-coup-de-poignard-polonais-a-airbus_431424), 05.10.2016

several projects currently developed within the European Defence Agency, the European defence industry only exists on paper. Recently, the European Commission proposed to develop a European Defence Fund to support Member States spending in joint defence capabilities, and foster a competitive and innovative industrial base<sup>33</sup>. However, one can doubt that the Commission's objective is shared by all Member States.

Indeed, interoperability between them has already reached an advanced stage thanks to standardization packages from NATO. As such, obtaining common material does not seem to be as urgent as before. In the context of different military doctrines and operational approaches, it is more challenging to gather all the Member states to agree on a common set of strategies. This has been observed in the development of the A400M. It is thus apparent that the European defence industry favours integration rather than taking into account the real needs for Member States armed forces. Once the fundamentals are put in place through interoperability and by NATO, it appears difficult to struggle against the weakness and the fragile state of the EU defence industry.

## CONCLUSION

European Defence has resurged as a long neglected issue in the EU's recent discourses. But the Union is facing internal divisions that make less feasible a mutual agreement. If we look at the EU as the Greek God Janus, what is said by the first face can be contradicted by the second one. In practice, this is reflected in the geopolitical objectives pursued by each State. Countries like France, Italy and Spain are more concerned with the Southern African flank, whereas countries like Poland and the Baltic States fear a resurgent Russia in the East.

The context of tight defence budgets dictates that strategic choices need to be made, sometimes to the detriment of other Member states. Some external events have recently deepened the debate. The context of Brexit and the election of Donald Trump have been cited as blessings and curses at the same time. Besides France, the United Kingdom is the only current EU member that can project its military into distance theatres. It is also one of the biggest military spenders within the Union. However, the United Kingdom is also a State that has consistently blocked any resolution to create a European Defence framework independent from NATO. And other countries, such as Poland, often used the British position as an excuse not to invest into their military spending. This problem, in

---

<sup>33</sup> European Commission Press Release, [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-16-4088\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-4088_en.htm), 30.11.2016

itself, poses an even greater question about who will secure Europe – NATO, the EU or individual nuclear European States? Indeed, France and Germany favour a more independent, European Defence, autonomous from NATO and with its own projection capabilities. Donald Trump’s pre-election discourses questioned NATO and contemplated a possible extinction. It is indeed very unlikely in the short term but the uncertainty is leaving Europe’s security vulnerable.

It is noteworthy to observe that 22 out of 28 EU Member States also NATO nations, both organizations are broadly committed in securing the European continent. The Berlin Plus agreement is an example of a cooperation framework between both structures. But it doesn’t hide the fact that 75% of NATO’s budget is paid by the United States, which give a leading role to Washington within the Alliance. It also leaves the EU dependent on the United States, despite the fact that the credibility of the latter has been questioned since the Iraq War, the NSA scandals, and a few inappropriate statements on EU enlargement. Whereas the European Union could take opportunity of new threats, such as the fight against violent Islamism, to build up the necessary means of a strategic, it still depends on support and solidarity from the United States, especially for any large scale defensive operation.

European Defence has been discussed since the end of the Second World War. The debate continues to this day. Recent statements have shown renewed interest from many EU Member states. But if the cause does not progress in the near the future, it may need to be re-energized outside of the EU, by certain “core” states like France, Germany and the United Kingdom. Areas such as cybersecurity, air-control and naval operations may be the future drivers behind European Defence, built on a twofold voluntary and no-string attached basis. With little risk of losing lives for the sake of others, it is always easier to support from a political point of view. Hence the persisting dilemma between a comprehensive European Defence based on deep solidarity as well as shared values, and a fallback solution relying on ad-hoc activities led by occasional common interests.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Andrew Rettman, Sweden: Who needs NATO, when you have the Lisbon Treaty?, <https://euobserver.com/news/119894>, 22.04.2013
2. Anne Bauer, Et si l'on reparlait d'une Europe de la Défense ?, <http://www.lesechos.fr/idees-debats/editos-analyses/0211099035814-et-si-lon-reparlait-dune-europe-de-la-defense-2012815.php>, 07.07.2016
3. Ben Jacobs, The Guardian, Donald Trump reiterates he will only help NATO countries that pay 'fair share', 28.07.2016
4. Berlin Plus Agreement, [http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/berlin/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/berlin/index_en.htm)
5. Cassandra Vinograd, NBC, Donald Trump Remarks on NATO Trigger Alarm Bells in Europe, 21.07.2016
6. CEIS, Les enjeux de la Défense en Europe et le Brexit, [http://www.universite-defense.org/fr/system/files/mars\\_xiv\\_pp\\_ceis\\_pl\\_11\\_2.pdf](http://www.universite-defense.org/fr/system/files/mars_xiv_pp_ceis_pl_11_2.pdf), Mars 2016
7. Claire Digiacomì, Les conséquences du Brexit sur la sécurité européenne, <http://www.huffingtonpost.fr/2016/06/25/les-consequences-du-brexit-sur-la-securite-europeenne/>, 25.06.2016
8. ECFR, Article 42.7: An explainer, [http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary\\_article\\_427\\_an\\_explainer5019](http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_article_427_an_explainer5019), 19.10.2015
9. Eric Maurice, Weak start for EU mutual defence clause, <https://euobserver.com/foreign/131918>, 20.01.2016
10. EU Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy, [https://eeas.europa.eu/top\\_stories/pdf/eugs\\_review\\_web.pdf](https://eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf), 25.10.2016
11. EU-NATO Joint Declaration, Warsaw Summit, 08.07.2016
12. Europe 1, Interview de Jean Claude Juncker par Jean Pierre Elkabbach, <http://www.europe1.fr/mediacenter/emissions/l-interview-de-jean-pierre->

elkabbach/videos/juncker-l-armee-francaise-sauve-souvent-l-honneur-de-l-europe-2403837, 19.03.2015

13. European Commission Press Release, [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-16-4088\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-4088_en.htm), 30.11.2016
14. European Parliament Press Release, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?language=fr&type=IM-PRESS&reference=20090115STO46438>, 20.01.2009
15. Financial Times, Germany to push for progress towards European army, <https://www.ft.com/content/e90a080e-107b-11e6-91da-096d89bd2173>, 02.05.2016
16. France-Allemagne.fr, Revitalisation de la PSDC : Vers une défense au sein de l'UE globale, réaliste et crédible, <http://www.france-allemande.fr/article9346.html>, 11.09.2016
17. German Ministry, White Paper on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr, 19.09.2016
18. GRIP, La Défense Européenne après le Brexit : mieux vaut tard que jamais, <http://www.grip.org/fr/node/2099>, 27.09.2016
19. Jacopo Barigazzi, The almost-an-EU-army, <http://www.politico.eu/article/italy-proposes-joint-european-military-force-schengen-of-defense/>, 27.09.2016
20. Jean Claude Juncker, Speech on State of Union, [http://ec.europa.eu/news/2016/09/20160914\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/news/2016/09/20160914_en.htm), 25.10.2016
21. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, How Brexit affects EU Defence Policy, <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/jean-marie-guehenno-on-european-defense-after-brexit-a-1110352.html>, 01.09.2016
22. Jorge Valero, France 'at war' inaugurates EU's mutual defence clause, <http://www.euractiv.com/section/justice-home-affairs/news/france-at-war-inaugurates-eu-s-mutual-defence-clause/>, 17.10.2015
23. Laurent Lagneau, Défense : Le président de la commission européenne veut un quartier général permanent pour l'UE, <http://www.opex360.com/2016/09/14/defense->

le-president-de-la-commission-europeenne-veut-quartier-general-permanent-pour-lue/,  
14.09.2016

24. Nicolas Gros-Verheyde, Le Britannique est-il nécessaire à l'Europe de la Défense ?,  
<http://www.bruxelles2.eu/2015/10/15/brexit-le-britannique-est-il-necessaire-a-leurope-de-la-defense/>, 15.10.2016
25. Nolan D. McCaskill, Obama urges NATO members to pull their weight,  
<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/11/obama-nato-pay-fair-share-231405>,  
15.11.2016
26. Paolo Gentiloni and Roberta Pinotti, L'Italie appelle à un « Schengen de la Défense »,  
[http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2016/08/10/l-italie-appelle-a-un-schengen-de-la-defense\\_4980759\\_3232.html](http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2016/08/10/l-italie-appelle-a-un-schengen-de-la-defense_4980759_3232.html), 10.08.2016
27. Pascu Report of European Parliament on The implementation of the Common Security and Defence, November, 2016
28. Peter Foster, EU Summit: Europe must work closer on Defence after Brexit,  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/08/22/eu-summit-europe-will-not-come-to-an-end-after-brexit/>, 22.08.2016
29. Report of the Foreign Affairs Council,  
<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/fac/2015/05/18/>, May 2015
30. S. Gänzle and A. Sens, The changing politics of European Security: Europe Alone?,  
2007
31. Vincent Lamigeon, Contrat Caracal : le coup de poignard polonais à Airbus,  
[http://www.challenges.fr/challenges-soir/contrat-caracal-le-coup-de-poignard-polonais-a-airbus\\_431424](http://www.challenges.fr/challenges-soir/contrat-caracal-le-coup-de-poignard-polonais-a-airbus_431424), 05.10.2016