North Atlantic Council

Research Report

The Question of:

The future of European military organization

Introduction

The European Union is well-known for its cooperation between member states in matters of trade, fighting terrorism and financial support for one other. However, one thing the EU is not so famous for, is its military cooperation. Military cooperation within the EU is something that has existed for quite some time. In 1970 the European Political Cooperation (EPC) brought forth the initial idea of collaboration between European nations on fields such as defence and security.

This sparkled debate about the topic and in 1992 the EPC was replaced with the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). NATO then agreed to allow the EU to develop the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) this made sure that the EU could set up connections and work together with NATO in defence and security measures. Then, in addition to that, the EU changed the ESDI into the Common Security and Defence Policy in 1999. This allowed the EU itself to carry out missions itself, without the help of NATO. And in 2002 they started carrying out peacekeeping missions, and so since 2002, the EU has carried out 30 deployments. However, there is no such thing yet as a European army. The question of such is something that is highly debated in the EU itself. In 2017 the PESCO was introduced. This is a voluntary agreement that enhances the cooperation and the responsibility of member states on matters of security (European Union, 2018).

The Committee

The North Atlantic Council (NAC) is a political decision-making body and has "effective political authority and powers of decision". (North Atlantic Council, NATO) It was founded in 1949 by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, The United Kingdom and The United States of America due to clause 9 in the North Atlantic Treaty. This treaty was signed by all nations mentioned previously, with the main purpose to work together in order to defend themselves from pro-communist nations, namely the Russian Federation. Another important task from this committee is to issue declarations and communiques about NATO's policies.

Rules of Procedure

The most important difference between normal Rules of Procedure and the RoP of the NAC is the fact that every nation has veto powers. As the NATO needs a unanimous consensus as they are setting up a Draft Communiqué, a document concerning the opinion of the council on a certain matter.

The goal of the NAC isn't setting up a resolution on a topic, but the production of accords: statements. While writing statements, you do not have to stay put to the rules when writing a resolution; you can write anything you like, as long as:

1. It stays a point-wise statement.
2. It contains a committee-wide vision and consensus.

Rules of Procedure

The course of debate will be almost identical to normal MUN-debate with resolutions, but there will be a few adjustments.

1. All delegations will have a very short policy statement on each issue, so every delegate knows the view of each delegation on the topic.
2. After that, there will be a lot of lobbying time, in order for all delegates to form a consensus between all member states.
3. After lobbying, debate starts according to ad-hoc rules. Delegates can hand in amendments for the statement, the chair will set debate time and after time has elapsed, delegates will vote on the amendment.
4. After time on the issues has elapsed, the committee will vote on the statement, which has to be passed unanimously.

N.B. These rules of procedure are formed to simulate the North Atlantic Council as well as possible. However, when the Student Officers believe the Rules of Procedure hinder the course of debate, they can, in consultation with the Executive Staff, decide to set aside these rules of procedure and proceed with normal Rules of Procedure, with debating a resolution and holding on to specific rules on phrasing.

The treaty formed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, commonly referred to as NATO. Clause 9 states that members of NATO will form a council where each nation will be represented in order to discuss matters concerning the nations of NATO.

The council is also responsible for having a subsidiary body to be used when necessary and the creation of a defence committee. This defence committee will be used when one or more nations are attacked and all of NATO believes the attack was toward NATO and not just the nation itself. The committee was also established to help aid each other and help all nations develop. (NATO, Its Purpose, History and Members, The Balance)

Key Terms

EU: The **E**uropean **U**nion, a political and economic union between 28 member-states in Europe. With a standardized system of laws and a single internal market.

EPC: The **E**uropean **P**olitical **C**ooperation, a body within the EU that makes member-states align their foreign policies more.

CFSP: Common **F**oreign and **S**ecurity **P**olicy, an extension upon the EPC, allowing member-states to align not only their foreign policies, but their security policies also.

ESDI: European **S**ecurity and **D**efense **I**dentity: Upgrade of the CFSP linked to NATO allowing the EU to work together with NATO on matters as security measures and military cooperation.

CSDP: Common **S**ecurity **and D**efense **P**olicy The latest version of the body within the EU that is behind the deployments of member-state troops to areas of conflict and responsible for the defence policy.

General Overview

The question of a European military is something that has been around almost as long as the EU itself. In the last few years things have changed so radically that the subject had to be debated in the EU again. First of all, major terrorist attacks happened in Germany, France, Belgium and Spain. Especially in the countries stuck the most by the attacks, political figures started asking questions about security within the EU. It did not take long before the question of a combined European force was mentioned. It was heavily debated and still unresolved, yet some European countries have taken the first steps.

Military cooperation within the EU is not new, in fact some countries have taken the initiative and became a prime example of this. Germany and The Netherlands for example, were some of the first nations to combine some of their Brigades. The "11de Luchtmobiele brigade" or 11th airmobile brigade has been integrated into the "Division Schnelle Krafte", a Rapid Response Force within the German army (Braw, 2017). This means that a complete Dutch brigade is under command of a German general. Yet politically this brought forth a considerable amount of difficulties.
The German army stands under the command of the German government. However, there is now a Dutch brigade within the German army. This means that the sovereignty of The Netherlands somewhat reduced because its government cannot completely decide on what their own army does. If the Dutch government wants to deploy the 11th Airmobile Brigade to a certain area and the Germans do not agree, there is nothing that the Dutch can then do about it. This goes both ways since the Germans have agreed to put a part of their marines under Dutch control. When the time comes to decide, both governments need to discuss the better option.

This is one of the reasons that the UK is definitely against a common European army. They fear that the troops of certain countries will fight for something they themselves do not believe in (Cridland, 2016). For example, it would mean that, in case of attack, Spanish troops will have to defend the Falkland Islands, whilst the Spanish government supported the Argentinian claim in the first war. It is something that is an ethical dilemma for both governments and soldiers themselves. This makes it a very complex and highly inefficient system. Another issue that the British have a problem with is the fact that NATO would be undermined (Cridland, 2016). If there were to be a common European army, NATO would fall apart since its job is taken away by the new European army. A large part of NATO's responsibilities is the protection of Europe. This undertaking does cost a lot. And from those costs about 75% is paid by the US. Therefore, if the member states of the European Union decided to make an army of their own, their expenditures will rise immensely (Cridland, 2016). So, if a common European army is established, a Major part of NATO member states might leave the alliance due to the unnecessary costs it brings.

Russia, who is seen as a major threat in Europe, watches the events play off in the distance. The Russians have not made an official statement of what they think of the idea of a common European army. However, it might come as a surprise that they look to this idea with great interest. The common European Army will take over NATO's role of defending Europe. And because American forces are then not present in Europe anymore, Russia will find it easier to oppose the European Union (Hasink, 2017). This can be seen in numbers. If we compare the EU to Russia in terms of troops and weaponry, you can get a glimpse of what the situation is. The EU has a total population of 508 million people of whom 1.4 million are in active military service, and 1.7 million are in reserve. In total: 3.1 million people in manpower (Infographics, 2017). Russia however, has a population of 143

million people of whom 766.000 thousand are in active military service and 2,5 million in reserve. A total of 3.2 million (Infographics, 2017). In terms of personnel, the EU and Russia are on the same level. But when we start to compare them in terms of weaponry or nuclear weapons, you can clearly see who is the dominant force. Within the EU only France and Great Britain (who at this point is still in the EU) have nuclear warheads capable of being launched. Combined it makes 525 nuclear warheads in the EU's arsenal (Infographics, 2017). But compared to Russia's 7300 warheads, it is a mere breadcrumb (Infographics, 2017). But since a nuclear war would lead to total destruction of the world, and is therefore not a realistic situation, we will have to look at more conventional weaponry. Europe has 6,700 tanks, 48,971 armoured fighting vehicles, 2,312 self-propelled Guns, 3,492 towed artillery and 1,069 Multiple-Launch Rocket Systems (Infographics, 2017)This is largely overshadowed by Russia's 15,400 tanks, 31,300 armoured fighting vehicles, 5,972 self-propelled Guns, 4,625 towed artillery and 3,793 MLRS (Infographics, 2017)

One could say that the EU is under gunned, so if it wants to be a considerable force it needs to produce more weaponry. Undoubtedly this would cost a gigantic amount of money. This is also one of the reasons that the UK (among others) is against a common European army. Who would produce the weapons, and who pays them, and who gets control over them. Such questions are still unanswered. Only if all of the issues posed by the opponents can be solved, a Common European army can be established.

To conclude, the coming of a common European army is an unresolved matter. There are a certain amount of issues that need to be solved first, who gets command, who pays, what to do with certain ethical dilemmas, who produce the weapons and How to then deal with NATO and Russia. The EU still has a lot of work to do in order for them to not only call themselves a legal and trade alliance, but also a military alliance. If this can be realised, then the EU would rise to be a superpower.

Major Parties Involved

Major opponents:

The UK: The United Kingdom has long been a sturdy opponent to the idea of a common European army. This is partly because the UK feels that this army will bypass NATO, which they think is a better solution to the problem of protection of Europe. They are also concerned with the sovereignty of their own country, and with the political difficulties that such an army will bring.

Denmark: Denmark has no interest in putting resources and personnel into a military controlled by people other than Danes themselves. Furthermore, they are against the EU becoming a Continental superstate with this army.

Malta: Malta has the intention of staying neutral. They fear that if they join this European army, the country will become one giant military base.

The United States: It might come as a surprise but the US would not actively be in favour of an EU army. This is because the US then loses its position of power in Europe itself. Within NATO the US is responsible for 75 till 80% of the payments for the protection of Europe. In exchange for that, the Americans have a considerable influence on Europe. If they lose that position they also lose that power.

Major Supporters:

Germany: The Germans have from the start pushed for a united European army. They want this because they are convinced that the unity of the countries will create strength and a better bond between all member states.

France: The French think similar to what the Germans think yet the French have a broader view and are convinced that by unifying the armies in Europe, Europe itself can get more political might in the rest of the world.

The Netherlands and the rest of the EU: The Dutch, among others, are also interested in the points that Germany and France have. Yet the main interest of these countries is the financial interest. Combining the armies would mean that the expenditures would go through the EU, meaning that the upkeep is now divided over several countries instead only themselves. This gives an advantage for the countries so they can focus their own finances more on other matters.

Neutral:

Russia: Russia tends to keep themselves uninvolved, but that does not mean they are not watching the process. It is not clear whether it is an advantage for them or a disadvantage.

Timeline of Events

1970: The EPC is created, laying the foundations for the idea of European military cooperation.

1992: The EPC is replaced with the CFSP, this is one of first stones that make the outer walls of and a European army. Creating a foreign and defensive policy that all member states align with. This makes sure that military cooperation between the armies is initiated and improved.

1996: During the next push towards a common force, the EU establishes the ESDI, this allows them to work together with NATO and thus even further improve the military cooperation between member states. This is also an improvement since it allowed the EU of then to work together with countries who would later become members of the EU.

1999: The CFSP and the ESDI are replaced with the CSDP, this creates the opportunity for the EU to send out military missions themselves. They have until now only send out peacekeeping missions and support missions.

2017: PESCO is signed. This is a voluntary agreement to which not all member states have to comply, that enhances the responsibility of member states on matters as security. This means that for example ships from different countries will patrol and protect other countries shorelines.

Previous attempts to solve the issue

After the creation of the EPC in 1970, the EU has put every bit of effort in creating a united military. In the beginning there was quite some resistance from a lot of member states. This was because the second world war was not that far away yet and countries first wanted to rebuild more. After some more time, when the economies of member states where stabilized more, the discussion of a European army become more popular and got more support from within the EU.

But since a common army was still far-fetched, the EU kept to improving and aligning foreign and security policies, to make a stable base for a common European force. Especially since 1990, when Germany became one whole state again, the Germans have pushed for military cooperation. But since the UK used its VETO on every attempt to create an army, It has stayed with strong military cooperation between armies of the EU states, rather than an actual EU army. The last attempt was PESCO, which makes sure that member states are now also busy defending each other's territory together, without having special training events.

The Future

The future is looking very bright for the idea of a common European army. Since the UK will leave the EU in 2019, it will have no more power over the EU, and therefore cannot stop them from creating a common force. Also, since there is a high terrorist threat in the EU member states are forced to cooperate more with each other. And since there are a lot of miscommunications, there are more and more calls for a joined defence force within Europe. The chances for a common European force grow by the day.

Important Decisions a Resolution Must Tak

A good resolution tackles all the problems that arise with the issue. With this issue it is important that questions such as the ones below are answered :

- What will the structure of the European army look like? (who is in command, is it a voluntary army)
- Who will pay for what?
- How to Deal with NATO?
- Who will produce the necessary weaponry?

Note that the questions you can answer are **not** limited to those posed above. Feel free to solve more problems that come with this issue. Remember that the more information a resolution has, the higher the chances are it cannot be disputed. Think of how ethical dilemmas can

Further Reading

If you wish to read up more information about this topic feel free to go to these websites, but you can use others too.

https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/983102/EU-news-latest-army-Europe-defence-European-Union-countries-Ukip-Brexit

https://www.businessinsider.com/eu-countries-agree-mega-army-2017-11?international=true&r=US&IR=T

https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/05/22/germany-is-quietly-building-a-european-army-under-its-command/

https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp_en

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common_Security_and_Defence_Policy

Bibliography

Braw, E. (2017, May 22). *Germany is quietly building a European army*. Opgehaald van FP: https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/05/22/germany-is-quietly-building-a-european-army-under-its-command/

Cridland, D. (2016, November 1). *Why is the UK against an EU army?* Opgehaald van Quora: https://www.quora.com/Why-is-the-UK-against-an-EU-army

European Union. (2018, September 17). *The Common Defense and Security Policy*. Opgehaald van EEAS.europa.eu: https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp_en

Hasink, J. (2017, October 3). *Russia's worst nightmare, a European army?* Opgehaald van National interest: https://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/russias-worst-nightmare-european-union-army-22581?page=0%2C1

Infographics. (2017, may 12). *EU vs Russia 2017, who would win, military comparison*. Opgehaald van The Infographics show: https://www.theinfographicsshow.com/home-1/european-union-eu-vs-russia-2017-win-army-military-comparison