

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نېاشد تن من مېباد بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مېباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

Seth Ferris

31.03.2025

European Army NOT REAL:

Changing Political Landscape and Tight Budgets. Part 1

As geopolitical tensions escalate, Europe is once again considering the prospect of a common army—a move that could reshape the continent's security landscape but also further complicate the ongoing, SMO, conflict in Ukraine.



The idea of a common European Army is nothing new. The push for a European military force comes at a critical moment, with some arguing it could signal the decline, even demise, of NATO. Most European nations lack the financial, political, and logistical capacity or resolve to sustain two separate military structures.

Yet, despite this, Old Europe remains deeply tied to the U.S. and seeks to balance security concerns with potential economic gains from a post-war Ukraine.

The Democrats that got everyone in this situation with their organization of the 2014 Maidan coup and insistence on Ukraine joining NATO

A shift toward an independent European defense would force governments to rethink their stance on the Ukraine conflict. Europe's leaders, despite their rhetoric, do not have the resources, either individually or collectively, to continue funding Kyiv at anything like the levels previously sustained by Washington. Despite this, with Ukraine facing mounting battlefield setbacks, even total defeat in some areas, it is clear that the appetite for prolonged support is not waning among most European politicians.

The idea of a common European army was first proposed during the Cold War when the Eisenhower administration encouraged European leaders to form a joint military force—only for the effort to be blocked, (ironically) by the French parliament. Had it succeeded, Europe might have evolved as a military bloc rather than an economic union. The concept resurfaced in the 1990s alongside EU expansion but was overshadowed by NATO and U.S. influence.

While a unified European army remains a strategic goal for some, history suggests it faces major obstacles. Whether Europe can finally turn the idea into reality—or if the project will once again fade under political and financial constraints—remains to be seen.

The Timing is Wrong!

The collapse of Democratic values in Europe is only too apparent. Ukraine has suspended elections, and in Romania, elections have been canceled, and the leading candidate barred from running. In major European democracies such as Germany, France, Austria, and the UK, political parties with significant voter support have been blocked from gaining power. Meanwhile, in the Baltic States, concerns over freedom of speech are growing, with individuals reportedly feeling intimidated and oppressed for expressing views on the war in Ukraine, immigration policies, and economic hardships.

The trajectory of the war in Ukraine, combined with domestic instability, may drive European leaders to reassess their priorities, potentially leading to a realignment of power on the continent and in its relations with the US as the keystone in NATO.

They may have to run for cover!

Europe Going It Alone!

The main question, aside from politics, is the practicality of Europe “going it alone” as both the French and Germans now seem to be calling for.

The recent “winner” of the German elections, Merz, head of the CDU, has called for massive rearmament of Germany saying:

“In view of the threats to our freedom and peace on our continent, the rule for our defence now has to be ‘whatever it takes’,”

While French President Macron, effectively a dictator himself after refusing to recognize the results of the French parliamentary elections, has accused Putin of Imperialism, proposed extending the French nuclear umbrella to cover all EU countries, and he has effectively declared war on Russia in recent speeches.

Macron also expounded on his belief that France is the strongest military in Europe (something not as impressive as it sounds, given the competition, and only if you don't count Russia and Ukraine as European....), and, along with British Prime Minister Starmer, has proposed sending troops from a European "Coalition of the Willing" (sound familiar?) to Ukraine as "peacekeepers", which Russia has called completely unacceptable, as stated by Russian foreign minister Lavrov:

"We see no room for compromise. This discussion is being conducted with an openly hostile purpose. They are not hiding what they need it for," Lavrov said.

Russia sees any European or US troops in Ukraine as reinforcing the Ukrainian military, not for peace keeping.

Laying the Rhetoric on "Thick and Heavy"

Even if that wasn't the case, what can Europe actually do? Polish PM Tusk, in a sudden rush of blood to the head, asked why Europe, with 500 million people, is asking the USA with 350 million people, to defend it from Russia which has 140 million people.

This rhetoric overlooks a number of factors:

Firstly, the economic crisis in Europe, mostly as a result of sanctions against the EU's most profitable export market. Russia, and the divestment from the cheap energy that Russia provided. This is particularly noticeable in Germany, where deindustrialization is accelerating, according to Gitta Connemann, German politician and chairman of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany's (CDU's) Committee on Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises, who said about German businesses:

"They used to go in the overtaking lane, but today they got stuck on the side of the road. They are hampered by huge energy prices, too-high taxes and contributions, paralysing bureaucracy and hostility to innovation."

It is the same story across Europe, and even if cheap energy was available, any new factories for weapons would need to jump through the insane bureaucracy of not only local governments, but the EU, running the gauntlet of environmental laws that have so far stopped any increase in EU weapons production in the three years of the conflict in Ukraine.

In this dire economic environment, there is unlikely to be any increase in weapons production, and even if there was, the western approach is to focus on extremely expensive

(and therefore extremely profitable) “wunderwaffen” rather than the cost-effective solutions favored by Russia.

Higher Defense Spending, budget deficits!

A European Army would demand higher defense spending across the board, but at what cost? Countries like Germany would need to abandon strict debt policies, while others would need to slash social programs to fund military expansion. Europe’s identity has long been tied to social welfare and citizen-focused policies—would ramping up for a war that, so far, is confined to Ukraine, mean sacrificing those values?

Almost certainly!

The debate over a European Army raises more questions than answers, exposing deep political, economic, and strategic divides among EU member states.

I am hearing the echoes of Iraq’s WMD justification loom large: is Russia becoming the new justification for austerity and militarization?

Defining “Europe” in military terms is no easy task. The continent is far from unified—does the Balkans operate as a cohesive bloc? Would smaller nations like Ireland even invest in such a force?

While the narrative of a universal Russian threat persists, the reality is that not all European nations perceive Moscow as an existential danger

Tossing a Bone to Gnaw On!

The biggest problem for NATO right now isn’t Russia—it’s Donald Trump, at least according to Europe (One suspects the US administration has a similar feeling about the Europeans...) Wouldn’t it be cheaper to negotiate with the U.S. rather than build an entirely new military structure? Trump isn’t pro-Russia; he’s pro-Trump. If European leaders made him a deal he couldn’t refuse—say, a Greenland-style concession—would he reaffirm U.S. commitments?

With his unpredictable presidency, some argue Europe might be better off waiting him out, banking on a return to normalcy after he leaves office. But that, too, is a gamble. After all, it was the Democrats that got everyone in this situation with their organization of the 2014 Maidan coup and insistence on Ukraine joining NATO.

A European Army would undoubtedly provoke responses from Russia, the U.S., and China. If Moscow actually invaded Ukraine to prevent NATO expansion, as the Western media so likes to claim, would not then an EU military force be received as proof of a further act of aggression by Russia and its allies? Such a force could actually trigger the very conflict Europe claims to be preparing against, making it a self-fulfilling prophecy of war!

A Pipe Dream in a Fractured Europe

The idea of a European Army remains more rhetoric than reality. While leaders like Macron and Merz push for rearmament, the continent faces insurmountable economic, political, and logistical hurdles. European nations remain divided on security priorities, public support is uncertain at best, and financial realities suggest that any large-scale military build-up would come at the expense of social programs and economic stability.

More importantly, Europe's dependence on the U.S. is not easily severed. The talk of "going it alone" may be a temporary reaction to Trump's unpredictability, but waiting out his presidency—or cutting a deal—seems a far more pragmatic path than a costly and divisive military experiment.

Ultimately, the biggest risk of a European Army isn't its failure—it's the possibility that its creation would escalate tensions with Russia, fulfilling the very prophecy of war that European leaders claim to want to prevent.

To be continued...

Seth Ferris, March 26, 2025

Seth Ferris, investigative journalist and political scientist, expert on Middle Eastern affairs