

**PROPOSAL FOR A RESOLUTION [3.1.] OF THE UEF CONGRESS “TOWARDS A FEDERAL EU ARMY: A UNION THAT PROTECTS, EMPOWERS AND DEFENDS”**

Submitted by Bogdan Birnbaum

1 **The European Congress of the Union of European Federalists:**

2 In reference to the 60th Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome and the 70th Anniversary of the  
3 Marshall Plan;

4 In reference to the resolutions on Europe Defence adopted by the Federal Committee in 2013,  
5 2014, 2015, and 2016;

6 In reference to the resolution on foreign and defence policy adopted by the UEF XXV European  
7 Congress in June 2016;

8 In reference to the resolutions on TTIP adopted by the Federal Committee in 2015 and 2016;

9 Having regard to the Rome Declaration on the 60th Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome;

10 Having regard the Global Strategy for the European Union’s Foreign and Security Policy of June  
11 2016;

12 Having regard the EU-NATO Joint Declaration of July 2016;

13 Having regard the European Commission EU Defence Action Plan;

14 Having regard the Council decision establishing PESCO and its list of participants;

15 Having regard the launch of the European Defence Fund;

16 Whereas Europe’s security environment has changed dramatically in the past few years;

17 Whereas Russia’s aggressiveness, persistent instability in the Middle-East and North-Africa,  
18 increased terrorist threats as well as a shift in the foreign policy priorities of the United States  
19 changed the basis of EU’s security situation and call for Europe to take responsibility for its own  
20 security;

21 Whereas Only a handful of Member States have significant military capabilities and can be used  
22 only for specific missions, limited in duration and field of operation. European security still relies  
23 exclusively on NATO, which in turn depends on the United States and their capabilities;

24 Whereas at present, neither individual EU Member States nor the EU as a whole have the means  
25 to protect the integrity of the European border or to play the role of stabilizer and peacemaker  
26 in the tragically unstable regions bordering Europe;

27 Whereas the fragmentation of the current intergovernmental institutional framework hampers  
28 the EU’s effectiveness in the field of security, defence and foreign policy and the EU’s role on the  
29 global stage;

30 **EU defence**

31 *Policy Objectives*

- 32 ■ Stress that reforms to enable the EU to speak with one voice in international relations and in  
33 international institutions should be a fundamental component of the process of building a truly  
34 European foreign, security and defence policy;
- 35 ■ Calls for the establishment of a truly EU foreign and security policy that would enable the EU to  
36 promote its values in today's globalised world;
- 37 ■ Calls for a European Union permanent seat at the Security Council of the United Nations. In this  
38 way, the European Union would finally be a transformative power that contributes to a peaceful  
39 and cooperative multilateral global order through a broad range of policies and operational  
40 capabilities;
- 41 ■ Considers the immediate neighbourhood of the European Union a priority, calling for a greater EU  
42 role in filling the security vacuum in its wider neighbourhood;
- 43 ■ Stresses the importance of reinforcing the European pillar of NATO.

44 *From PESCO to EU Army, passing by EU integrated forces*

- 45 ■ Calls on the Member States and the EU institutions to make full use on the Common Security and  
46 Defence Policy (CSDP) and to exploit the recent established permanent structured cooperation –  
47 PESCO that should ultimately lead to a European Defence Union;
- 48 ■ Supports the establishment of permanent EU military headquarters, headed by a Military  
49 Operations Commander, with its own operational assets, that would enable the EU, when  
50 necessary, to respond to crises without relying exclusively on NATO, and to plan and run EU military  
51 and civilian missions. This military HQ would complement the Civilian Planning and Conduct  
52 Capability, which was already established in 2007 and runs all civilian CSDP missions. Synergies  
53 between the two HQs as well as with the European Commission and relevant JHA-Agencies, such  
54 as the newly established European Border and Coast Guard Agency, should be actively sought;
- 55 ■ Calls for the procedural, financial and political obstacles which so far prevented the deployment of  
56 the existing Battle groups to be removed as soon as possible, as suggested in the EU Global Strategy;
- 57 ■ Stress that within PESCO, participating Member States should establish a European Integrated  
58 Force, allowing for divisions of national armies to come together in a permanent and structured  
59 fashion and to carry out missions and operations un-der the orders of a common European chain  
60 of command;
- 61 ■ Stress that in the longer term this integrated force should evolve into a true European Army. This  
62 European Army should progressively integrate divisions of national forces, leading one day to  
63 European Defence becoming a European exclusive competence.

64 *Defence Budget and EU industry*

- 65 ■ Welcomes the creation of a European Defence Fund. For it to become a step-change in the way  
66 defence is financed, it should move away (at least partially) from a system of simply national  
67 contributions. It could be financed partly by a “defence tax” or the issuance of “defence bonds”;
- 68 ■ Calls for a substantial increase of this fund with both in the stage of research and development and  
69 in the stage of operations;
- 70 ■ Calls for a single market on defence. The application of EU's internal market rules (namely  
71 competition law) to national defence procurement, combined with an EU-level public procurement  
72 and EU funding for research and technology development, would greatly incentivise the creation  
73 of a truly European defence industry and a robust single market for defence;

- 74 ■ Calls for an Erasmus for soldiers. Today, training, evaluation and certification are, in the main,  
75 conducted according to national criteria, hindering the possibility of civilian and military staff from  
76 different EU countries to work together.

77 *Decision - making*

- 78 ■ Stress that Decision-making on CSDP issues should be democratic and transparent. Today, CSDP is  
79 largely determined by the EU Member States, deciding at unanimity, with little parliamentary  
80 involvement and democratic accountability;
- 81 ■ Stress that The European Parliament sub-committee on Security and Defence (SEDE) of the Foreign  
82 Affairs Committee should become a fully-fledged committee;
- 83 ■ Calls for the nomination of a Commissioner responsible for Defence and Security;
- 84 ■ In the long run, the European Parliament should be entitled to co-legislate on all aspects of security  
85 and defence policy (capabilities, procurement, priorities, missions' mandates, geopolitical  
86 strategies etc.) on an equal footing with a Council configuration of Defence ministers (chaired by  
87 the High Representative) on proposals made by the European Commission. This would ensure fully  
88 democratic CSDP decision-making processes.