

EUROPEAN INTERVENTION INITIATIVE VS COMMON EUROPEAN ARMY

Neno Hristov

Assoc. Prof. D.Sc. (National Security), Ph.D., Military Academy „G. S. Rakovski“, Sofia, Bulgaria,
neno.hristov@gmail.com

Abstract

European Intervention Initiative is different from the EU initiative on Permanent Structured Cooperation in the Field of Defense (PESCO) and the idea of creating a common European army. Undertaking additional commitments jeopardizes the implementation of strategic priorities for the countries and further exacerbates the fragile and insufficient military budgets.

Keywords: European Intervention Initiative, NATO, armed forces.

THE MAIN TEXT

Europe behaves as if it has not yet realized that US behavior towards it is related not only to new American views in commercial policy but also to security philosophy. The growing alienation between the US and Europe is a reason to seek in particular the materialization of the European security policy and focus on the Eastern and Southeastern European countries. A concentration of arms and armed forces and a massive American influence on the so-called from Victoria Nyland "frontier states" from the Baltic countries to Bulgaria can divide Europe into Western and Eastern Europe.

The US would never abandon NATO because it would lose a decisive means of pressure against European countries. The fears that have arisen in the European elites that Trump could bring the American armed forces out of Europe or even leave NATO were, besides unfounded, very damaging. And overestimating the threat from Russia, ignoring the serious changes in the Southeast of us. Conservative American politician Pat Buchanan says about the situation in Europe: "Today's Europe is not afraid that Vladimir Putin could reach the Rhine. Europe is afraid that Africa and the Middle East can reach the Danube. "

The causes of Trump's attacks against European countries at the NATO summit have political and economic roots and are not just about his chin and behavioral features, as some politicians are trying to explain. In principle, the leaders of the major European countries are related to the neoliberal forces (represented by Hillary Clinton) and Trump's logical dislike towards them, which is particularly evident in his attitude to Angela Merkel. And criticism of NATO is somewhat justified, because it does not show flexibility and innovation, as

well as a perspective view of the geopolitical and geo-economic interests in which the United States is the main and more important economic opponent of China, not the political enemy Russia, which should be temporarily only isolated and blocked.

More importantly, thinking as a businessman, Trump wants to stop Nord Stream-2 in order to take control of the European energy market and ensure the supply of liquefied gas. He also worries about the huge losses that have emerged from the denial of US arms procurement. The Italian government, for example, questioned the deal for 90 F-35 fighters, initially even 131 planes for \$ 14 billion. It is also understandable that the EU countries, focusing on their own projects and reducing the purchase of US arms, are also concerned by the EU's ongoing Permanent Structured Co-operation and Defense Industry Fund

All this has led to the vote of the Declaration of the Summit, in which a significant place is devoted to Russia, to which many accusations have been made and a definite critique of the Crimea has been expressed. However, NATO remains "open for an open, regular and meaningful dialogue at the NATO-Russia Council," and the terms used as "partnership" and "strategic importance" of the same are indicative and promising.

Strengthening the military presence in the Eastern Sea and the Black Sea does not promise a step towards a dilapidated relationship with Russia.

However, it is extremely worrying that, without any discussion, the text on hybrid threats, which triggered Article 5 of the Treaty, a military response to help the affected state because it sharply drops the threshold of a hot war. Neither the hybrid actions of rebels nor the non-directional cyber attacks would be credible evidence to be held responsible for a reprehensible military response.

In the light of what has been said so far, an initiative by France and its President Emmanuel Macron, with which nine European countries announced the creation of a European Intervention Initiative (EII) on 25 June, sounds quite reasonable. These are Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Estonia, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the initiator France. This military co-operation structure was presented as allowing collective action in response to a crisis situation such as engaging in a warring country or providing support in the event of a natural disaster. Italy also agreed to participate in the group of nine countries, but the new government has asked for time to explore the options.

The project was first announced in a speech by the French president in the Sorbonne in September last year, designed to boost European integration and develop its concept of European sovereignty as an alternative to national sovereignty. The aim of the new military alliance is to respond to crises near the borders of Europe without NATO or the United States. Macroe's idea is also to keep Britain engaged in European defense and after Breckit. In the words of the French Minister of Defense, cooperation is "between countries with political will and military intervention capacity if necessary".

The idea is backed by German Chancellor Angela Merkel, which is why Germany is one of the participating countries. The coalition is said to be ready to respond to crises without the help of NATO or the United States.

At first glance, it seems that the initiative is a likely step towards the creation of a common European army that EC President Jean-Claude Juncker proposed in March 2015, but a careful analysis shows that this initiative is rather against the general interests of The EU.

The project comes as a result of the need for a new approach due to the fact that the EU can not meet its defense ambitions and its commitments to increase military capabilities. Being ashamed of their collective inability to prevent Serbian ethnic cleansing in Kosovo without US aid, the European leaders in 1999 at the Helsinki European Council set a goal to build a fully capable army of 60,000 by 2003. Fifteen years later, this "rapid reaction force" is still hypothetical, and in recent years European "battle groups" have not been used to resolve any conflict.

It is right to ask what the real purpose of this new group is, what are the criteria for inviting it to join. On what principle are invitations to selected countries? "

The initiative argues that this new intervention group outside the European Union, at crisis points outside the Union, is a new coalition of the willing. Looking from the perspective of a country such as the Republic, Bulgaria, which is a member of the EU and of NATO and a small country with relatively limited military capabilities, it is a new succession of division. And with a careful reading of the non-pepper of this new initiative, it is clear that it develops entirely outside the framework of the European Union's common security and defense policy. This is about much bigger changes within the EU, the formation of a new European strategic culture, the exchange of intelligence in this new framework, the strategic analyzes and plans

planned in this new framework, the exchange of directives and doctrines in this new framework framework and for joint preparation within it.

The question arises as to how this will affect NATO, PESKO and, above all, the countries that remain outside this group.

This is a new regional format, respectively for new dividing lines. I.e. the unity of the Union as such, including the implementation of the European security and defense policy, and of course the latest initiative under the structured cooperation that was announced in December at the EU Summit.

This initiative gives a clear signal that the European defense system faces a new turning point. A number of European leaders have allowed themselves to make unacceptable statements until yesterday that "Europe can not rely more on others and have to take security in their own hands."

What are the pros and cons of this initiative?

Pros of the initiative (Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018, pp.473-476; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018a, pp. 477-481; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018b, pp.487-491; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018c, pp.492-496; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018d, pp.501-504; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018e, pp.497-500; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018f, pp.505-510; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018g, pp.482-486; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018h, pp.511-516; Terziev, Petkov, Krastev, 2018i, pp.517-521)

First of all, there is an expectation that the readiness of the forces of the countries involved in this initiative will be strengthened and the modernization of the armed forces of the participating countries will be facilitated. They will be forced to allocate more funds and consequently to realize new defense capabilities through the realization of the project for modernization of the armed forces. This is particularly about the modernization of Germany, which has come out really scary, not just the German public, details about the state of the armed forces.

Secondly, this initiative is perceived as a real step towards more security for Europe, no matter how it sounds to other EU member states at this time.

Thirdly, there will be opportunities for a rapid reaction if necessary, as in this case the unanimous decision of all EU Member States will not be sought. This will be a peculiar instrument of military intervention for a group of countries where the decision is taken by a majority. One of Germany's concerns about cases of blocking decisions taken by a single country on military or civilian intervention in cases of evacuation or, say, a natural disaster, is eliminated.

Last but not least, this is an initiative that is seen as an opportunity for UK participation after its departure from the EU, but which, despite its departure, wants to keep its access to the Union database, intelligence exchange and agreements to jointly develop different weapons.

These are part of the pros and cons of the initiating countries and the participants in this initiative.

What are the minuses?

First of all, there is a duplication of initiatives in the field of European defense and security. It is about PESCO - the constantly structured cooperation, including with regard to the PESCO projects. Since the beginning of the year, 17 multinational projects have been implemented within the framework of PESKO, with Bulgaria participating in three of them.

Second is the focus of attention by launching different initiatives. And through the involvement of different groups of countries in different formats, including, of course, within the EU.

Third is the creation of new regional formats and new dividing lines, respectively.

Next is the scattering of forces and resources. Ultimately, the effectiveness of the efforts being made within the EU is low.

And, of course, not least, the initiative shows that there are differences in approaches, in the strategic culture of member states in relation to different crisis situations. For example, whether and when EU military intervention is needed in which part of the world and under what circumstances?

The careful review shows that the importance of these minuses prevails over the positive expression of the initiative.

Another important and unresolved issue, both in NATO and in the EU, which leads to the desire of individual countries to create their own military alliances, is the lack of clear requirements on spending defense money.

In general, for Bulgaria we can reduce these fundamental requirements to three: to spend enough on defense (measured as a percentage of GDP); to seriously consider its modernization with a view to creating usable armed forces (measured by means of invested military means); to be ready to use these armed forces (percentage of deployed military personnel during an operation).

Criteria for assessing the effectiveness of these requirements are:

1. "Political Adequacy" - the degree of alignment of military strategy with political goals and ambitions. Political ambitions define the political framework and in it the balance of the objectively required relative share of the military factor in the common defense efforts and the cost of its maintenance.
2. "Military Necessity" - to what extent established (planned) defense capabilities contribute (may contribute) to achieving the desired military-strategic results.
3. "Reachability" - compares assessments, mechanisms and approaches to developing the Armed Forces with available resources to meet defense needs.
4. Simultaneously with the evaluation of the achievement of the desired final result, evaluate the resources invested and the extent to which each additional lev in the defense has defensive capabilities.
5. It is imperative to assess progress with regard to:
 - Implementation of the current programming documents and plans for the development of the Armed Forces;
 - Level of achievement of the NATO Capabilities Capabilities Package 2017, including quantitative and qualitative indicators, and capabilities under the Common Security and Defense Policy of the EU, incl. and Permanent, Structured Cooperation;
 - Achieving NATO-wide targets on the usability of the armed forces in operations;
 - Implementation of the country's commitments under the Permanent, Structured Cooperation to the CPSD, in line with the commitments made under the EU CPSD in the field of defense.
 - The unequal status of the various EU Member States, both economically and politically, leads to different understandings regarding the Common European Security and Defense Policy and to different spending demands and the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of these requirements. The result of these differences is the attempts of individual member states to make different unions of interest (Terziev, Georgiev, 2018j, pp. 452-461; Banabakova, Georgiev, 2018k, pp. 468-483; Terziev, Nichev, Stoyanov, Georgiev, 2017, pp. 690-694; Terziev, Banabakova, Latyshev, Georgiev, 2017a, pp. 773-791; Terziev, Georgiev, 2017b, pp. 602-606; Kanev, Terziev, 2017c; Terziev, 2017d; Terziev, Madanski, Kanev, 2017e; Terziev, Banabakova, Georgiev, 2017f, pp 256-258; Terziev, Banabakova, Georgiev, 2017g, pp. 259-260; Terziev, Banabakova, Georgiev, 2017h, pp. 261-262).

REFERENCE LIST

- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018). Operative mode for police cooperation between the member states of the European Union. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.473-476, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018a). European arrest warrant: appearance and preferences for fulfillment. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp. 477-481, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018b). Eurojust casework on mafia-type criminal organisations. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.487-491, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.

- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018c). Concept of joint investigation teams. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.492-496, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018d). European arrest warrant and human rights of the accused. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.501-504, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018e). Pumps for the action on the European Union in the scope of the European agenda on security. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.497- 500, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018f). The process of forming a criminal policy of the European Union. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.505-510, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018g). Organization on the European Union in the sphere of penal preparation. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.482-486, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018h). Sources of European Union law. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.511- 516, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Petkov, M., Krastev, D. (2018i). The „Source of law“ category. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2018- 5th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2-4 July 2018- Dubai, U.A.E, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, pp.517- 521, ISBN: 978-605-82433-3-0.
- Terziev, V., Georgiev, M. (2018j). Efficient management as optimization of the organization. // *Proceedings of INTCESS2018- 5th International Conference on Education and Social Sciences* 5-7 February 2018- Istanbul, Turkey, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, Istanbul, Turkey, 2018, pp. 452-461, ISBN 978-605-82433-2-3.
- Banabakova, V., Georgiev, M. (2018k). The role of the Balanced Scorecard as a tool of strategic management and control. // *Proceedings of INTCESS2018- 5th International Conference on Education and Social Sciences* 5-7 February 2018- Istanbul, Turkey, International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerints.org, Istanbul, Turkey, 2018, pp. 468-483, ISBN: 978-605-82433-2-3.
- Terziev, V., Nichev, N., Stoyanov, E., Georgiev, M. (2017). A general principle of the development process of balanced scorecards as an instrument of control. // *Proceedings of ADVED 2017- 3rd International Conference on Advances in Education and Social Sciences* 9-11 October 2017- Istanbul, Turkey. International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerint.org, 2017, pp. 690-694, ISBN: 978-605-82433-0-9.
- Terziev, V., Banabakova, V., Latyshev, O., Georgiev, M. (2017a). Opportunities of application of the balanced scorecard in management and control. // *3rd International Conference on Advances in Education and Social Sciences*. International Organization Center of Academic Research, www.ocerint.org, 2017, pp. 773-791, ISBN: 978-605-82433-0-9.
- Terziev, V., Georgiev, M. (2017b). Highlights of the evolution of the 'Balanced Scorecard' idea as a model for managing strategy development and control. // *IJASOS- International E-journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, OCERINT International Organization Center of Academic Research, 3, 2017, N 8, pp. 602-606, e-ISSN: 2411-183X.
- Kanev, D., Terziev, V. (2017c). Behavioral economics: development, condition and perspectives. // *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2017- 4th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities* 10-12 July 2017- Dubai, UAE, ISBN: 978-605-82433-1-6.

- Terziev, Venelin. (2017d). Entry Opportunities in the Bulgarian Military – Educational System and Ensuring of Civil Rights. // 3rd Central and Eastern European LUMEN International Scientific Conference New Approaches in Social and Humanistic Sciences 8-10 June 2017 | Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, ISBN: 978-973-166-461-3.
- Terziev, V, Madanski, V., Kanev, D. (2017e). Entry opportunities in the bulgarian military-educational system and ensuring of civil rights. // Proceedings of SOCIOINT 2017- 4th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities 10-12 July 2017- Dubai, UAE, ISBN: 978-605-82433-1-6.
- Terziev, V., Banabakova, V., Georgiev, M. (2017f). Comparative analysis of the formation of military professional skills in the cadets to be trained in logistics specializations in Bulgaria. // 4th Central & Eastern European LUMEN International Scientific Conference on Education, Sport and Health 29-30 september 2017, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, LUMEN, 2017, pp 256-258, ISBN: 978-973-166-479-8.
- Terziev, V., Banabakova, V., Georgiev, M. (2017g). Analysis and perspectives for the development of the higher education system in Bulgaria. // 4th Central & Eastern European LUMEN International Scientific Conference on Education, Sport and Health 29-30 september 2017, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, LUMEN, 2017, pp. 259-260, ISBN: 978-973-166-479-8.
- Terziev, V., Banabakova, V., Georgiev, M. (2017h). The Development of academic membership and the development of higher education system in Bulgaria. // 4th Central & Eastern European LUMEN International Scientific Conference on Education, Sport and Health, 29-30 september 2017, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, LUMEN, 2017, pp. 261-262, ISBN: 978-973-166-479-8.