

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT STRUCTURED COOPERATION TO INCREASE INTEGRATION AND INDEPENDENCE EUROPEAN REGIONAL MILITARY COOPERATION

Hardi Alunaza

Department of International Relations
Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak, Indonesia
hardi.asd@fisip.untan.ac.id

Bastian Andhony Toy

Department of International Relations
Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak, Indonesia
bas.andhony@gmail.com

INFO ARTIKEL

Article History

Received

23 February 2021

Revised

4 July 2021

Accepted

7 July 2021

Kata kunci:

*integrasi; keamanan;
pertahanan; PESCO; Uni
Eropa.*

Keywords:

*integration; security;
defence; PESCO;
European Union.*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini berupaya menjelaskan bagaimana pembentukan PESCO dapat meningkatkan integrasi dan independensi kerja sama militer antara negara-negara anggota UE. Padahal sebelumnya telah ada North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) sebagai pilar keamanan yang telah lama diakui di kawasan Eropa. Untuk itu metode kualitatif digunakan dan berlandaskan pada teori kompleksitas keamanan regional dan konsep keamanan kolektif dalam menganalisa fenomena terkait. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pembentukan PESCO sebagai bentuk implementasi dari Pasal 42 ayat 6 Perjanjian Lisbon tahun 2009, dan didasari keraguan oleh Uni Eropa terhadap peran AS dalam NATO. Meskipun demikian PESCO tidak langsung menggantikan NATO, melainkan sebagai pelengkap dalam penyelesaian krisis yang otonom dan efektif.

Abstract

This study seeks to explain how the establishment of PESCO can increase the integration and independence of military cooperation between EU member states. Whereas previously there had been the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a security pillar that had long been recognized in the European region. For this reason, a qualitative method is used and is based on the theory of regional security complexity and the concept of collective security in analysing related phenomena. The results showed that the establishment of PESCO as a form of implementation of Article 42 paragraph 6 of the Lisbon Agreement in 2009, and was based on doubts by the European Union about the US role in NATO. However, PESCO does not directly replace NATO, but as a complement in an autonomous and effective crisis resolution.

INTRODUCTION

Security is basically what is needed by all human beings in maintaining a sense of security and creating order and forming collective peace. Kelsen in (Somek, 2007) said that security can be considered as a protection measure for a person or party against the use of force carried out by another party. In the context of state sovereignty, security efforts allow actions and policies to create internal or territorial protection from external parties that are perceived as threats or attacks (Amaritasari, 2015). Therefore, sovereign states certainly have defence and security mechanisms that can be used to counteract the efforts of foreign parties which are considered disturbing the stability and peace of the country.

Policies related to security and defences not only involve one country, it can also be in the form of several countries that form regional alliances or defence pacts such as NATO between the US, Canada and European countries. Then the Warsaw Pact which was previously developed by the Soviet

Union in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, there are also security cooperation in the ASEAN region, the African Union and other regions. There is even global security cooperation such as the existence of peacekeeping forces by the United Nations.

Regarding the NATO defence pact in the European region, it has had an existence since the Cold War era, this cooperation aims to inhibit the influence of the Soviet Union, increase European political integration, protect the sovereignty of member states, and promote democratic values and peace. This pact can also involve military capabilities in maintaining collective defence and crisis management (conflicts) both by fellow member states and in collaboration with other international organizations (Yakti, 2016).

The relationship between NATO and the European Union in the field of defence-security is indeed quite intense as seen from the signing of the EU-NATO Declaration on European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) on

December 16, 2002 and the Berlin Agreement in 2003 in increasing support and cooperation in crisis management so the agreement makes the European Union quite bound or dependent on NATO which incidentally there are members outside Europe such as the United States and Canada. Even though the European Union economically and politically should have had a chance to compete with the capabilities of the United States, but with the influence and strong legitimacy by the US in NATO, made the European Union does not have sufficient independence in the field of security and defence.

However, on 11 December 2017, the Council of the European Union agreed to establish Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) which was approved by 25 EU member states including: Austria, Bulgaria, Belgium, Estonia, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Croatia, France, Finland, Hungary, Germany, Greece, Italy, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Poland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovenia, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden and Spain. The establishment of PESCO aims to

develop military capabilities, increase joint investment, and more effective participation in national, regional or multinational operation missions. PESCO is also an implementation of Article 42 paragraph 6 of the Lisbon Treaty on the European Union in 2009, concerning the determination of EU member states with the capability of military capabilities that are capable and committed and willing to be bound in the field of security and defence, to form a structured and permanent cooperation within the framework of European Union (European Defence Agency, 2018)

Based on the above explanation, the writer focuses on the efforts of the European Union in forming a more autonomous and integrated military cooperation through PESCO. Considering previously there was the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a security pillar that was first recognized in the European region. Therefore, the authors determine the formulation of a research problem namely how the formation of PESCO can increase the integration and independence of military cooperation

between EU member states. The purpose of this paper is to find out the integration of European Union military cooperation through the establishment of PESCO.

Previously there had been a research on "The Need of the European Union for Security Institutions: The Role of NATO in the Contemporary Era" by Probo Darono Yakti. The research discusses the continuing role of NATO in the European region because the European Union still needs NATO after the Cold War. The study differs in focus from the author's research, but the similarity is related to the security cooperation in the European region. Then there is a study entitled "The EU's Permanent Structured Cooperation in Defence: Keeping Sleeping Beauty from Snoozing" by Niklas Nováky regarding the participation of EU member states in PESCO, and the progress of the implementation of PESCO. The focus of the research is the similarity of the research with the author's research, but the writer aims more to emphasize the role and function of PESCO as a form of EU military integration, and to show the

establishment of PESCO as an effort of independence from the EU in policy making, investment and autonomous military cooperation. The position of this paper is a continuation of Niklas's research writing, but this article focuses more on explaining PESCO as a form of military integration in the European Union with a different research approach.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study tries to explain the phenomena associated with using the theory of regional security complexity and the concept of collective security. Basically, the regional security complex theory (RSCT) theory, developed by Buzan and Weaver, emphasizes the significance of the region to understand the constellation of international security. According to Buzan, the complexity of regional security can be said to be the formation of a group of countries that have closeness, and then make the security of priority (primary

security) in member countries become united and inseparable.

Based on this theory, security interdependencies are formed at the regional level, which are formed by several factors, such as geography, economics, politics and history. So that it will form a pattern of cooperation (amity) or competition (enmity) between countries in a region. Buzan and Weaver also do not deny the existence of potential competition, balance of power, the formation of alliances, or the possibility of external parties or forces entering into the formation of regional security complexes. Therefore, the establishment of regional security complexes is certainly influenced by the existence of defence-security cooperation and interdependence between countries in creating regional stability.

The RSCT theory is simply defined as the state's efforts to maintain order and regional security through the establishment of cooperation with other countries in the region. Buzan and Weaver then formulated two constituent variables from the theory of regional

security complexity, namely internal variables which have several indicators such as geographical location, interactions or relations between countries, and similarity of both systems economically, socially, politically and culturally. Furthermore, external variables are measured through two indicators such as the condition of the international system which is considered to support or not the formation of security cooperation and whether there are political and security influences dominated by superpowers or countries in other regions; the second indicator is contemporary issues that are developing and require arrangements for security cooperation in dealing with issues such as the problem of terrorism (Nurdiana, 2019).

In other words, the RSCT theory states that there are efforts formed by countries in the region in terms of political, geographical, economical, and historical equality in creating a more complex security cooperation framework to enhance unity and integration between countries. The RSCT theory is used by the author in analysing the basis for

establishing Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) by countries in the European region as an effort to form defence-security policies and cooperation within the framework of the European Union.

While in the concept of collective security, Waltz explained that, "... in simple terms, collective security is related to efforts by a group of states to act together in order to better preserve their own security (Ulusoy, 2003). "Collective security in general can take the form of regional and global security agreement in nature, which have been agreed upon and recognized jointly that the security of one party is in the interest of all parties involved in the agreement. All countries that have signed treaties must provide a collective response in the face of attacks and threats to peace.

According to Organski, there are five assumptions that underlie the formation of a collective security, among others: first, countries will agree on which party is considered a common enemy (aggressor), all member countries also try to prevent and shape the coming

aggression, each member state has the right to act and join in the face of the enemy, a combination of member states qualified enough to conquer the enemy, and enemy countries tend to be daunted and change policies when looking at the capabilities of forming the security alliance (Irwan, 2017).

While Morgenthau assesses three conditions for the formation of joint security in preventing war, among others: first, the military capability of the collective security system must be qualified and greater than the enemy. Second, member states have the same commitment and belief in maintaining the security of the existing system or order. Third, all countries joined in the alliance must prioritize the interests of collective defence rather than conflicts of interest or existing disputes.

Collective security is an initiation from countries that have previously agreed and signed agreements to promote mutual security both regionally and internationally. All member states agreed on protecting and committing to each other and are incorporated as an alliance

in the framework of cooperation or defence-security agreements.

RESEARCH METHODS

The author uses a qualitative method with descriptive approach, in which the writer gives a description (description) related to the situation of social phenomena, sorting out information related to the problem both from a theoretical and practical point of view. Then do the interpretation (interpretation) of the data in explaining and analysing the problem, as well as providing answers to how the formation of PESCO can increase the integration and independence of military cooperation between EU member states (Raco, 2010, pp. 60–62). The author uses the technical analysis of Miles and Huberman's data model which consists of data reduction, the presentation of the data and then the conclusions are drawn (Sugiyono, 2010, p. 91). Data collection techniques in this study were obtained through literature study from books, journals, theses, websites, and other literature related to this research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Role and Function of PESCO as an Integration Effort for Military Cooperation

The Establishment of PESCO could make the integrity of the European region more capable because the EU member states will jointly maximize the capability of defence and military operations that was carried out. As an international security actor, the European Union needs to increase the effectiveness of defence spending and contribute more to the protection of EU citizens who are expected to be met through PESCO. Commitments from countries that are members of PESCO are legally binding, but the decision of member countries to participate in PESCO can be done voluntarily so as not to rule out the special character of a security and defence policy of certain EU Member States, which may differ from the other members (European Union External Action (EEAS), 2018).

PESCO members have been committed to increasing national defence budgets and also defence investment

expenditure in defence research and technology. Additionally, they need pledged step to more develop and make a good supply strategically relevant defence capabilities by using the financial and practical support that was provided by the European Defence Fund. Finally, they have been committed to contribute to the projects that boost the European defence industry and therefore the European defence technological and industrial base (Lazarou, 2020).

PESCO itself has two layers of structure, among others: the board level, namely the Council of Ministers as the person in charge of relation to all decision making and policy direction and provides an assessment of the commitment of member states participating in PESCO. Decision making is also only carried out by PESCO members. While at the project level, the effectiveness of PESCO is measured based on projects developed and managed by the Member States involved, but still under the supervision of the board. Then there is the PESCO Secretariat consisting of EDA (European

Defence Agency) and EEAS (European Union External Action), assisted by the EU Military Staff.

Participating Member States can submit projects to the PESCO Secretariat, then the EDA will function in preventing duplication of projects that have the same initiatives as other institutions such as NATO. The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR) will also make recommendations to the High Council (Council of Ministers) in forming projects that can contribute in accordance with EU ambitions and increase the strategic autonomy of the European region (Parliament.uk, 2018). In certain PESCO projects can involve or invite other parties (countries) that considered to be able to help substantially, but the country does not have the authority in making decisions. Thus, it shows that PESCO Member States have the integration, capability, and autonomy of decision-making regarding projects that are relevant to the development of EU capabilities, while the participation of other parties can be

considered as partners only without having qualified authority.

Related to the increasing commitment and implementation in actively contributing and optimally integrated, participating Member States are required to coordinate annually through the preparation of a National Implementation Plan (NIP) which is submitted annually in January and assessed for its contribution by the PESCO Secretariat. Then the EU High Representative also presents an annual PESCO report to the High Council which will assess the commitment of participating Member States. On March 6, 2018, the Board inaugurated 17 PESCO projects covering a number of security issues, a number of these projects were divided into three core parts, including: First, the Common Training and Exercise consisted of 2 projects namely the European Training Mission Competence Center (EU-TMCC) and the European Training Certification Center for European Armies.

Second, Operational Domains (Land, Air, Maritime, Cyber) consist of 9

projects namely Armoured Infantry Fighting Vehicle, Indirect Fire Support, Deployable Military Disaster Relief Capability Package, European Crisis Response Operation Core (European Force), Maritime Surveillance, Maritime Mine Counter Measures, Harbor Protection, European Cyber Information Sharing Platform, and European Cyber Rapid Response Teams.

Third, Joint and Enabling Capabilities (Bridging Operational Gaps) which consists of 6 projects namely European Medical Command, Network of Logistics Hubs in Europe and support for Operations, Military Mobility, Strategic Command and Control (C2) System for CSDP Missions and Operations, Energy Operational Function (EOF), and European Secure Software-defined Radio (ESSOR). The above projects show the efforts of the European Union through PESCO in creating complex cooperation on security and defence both in terms of training and military operations in various fields including sea, air, land and even cyber, as well as cooperation related to logistical, medical, mobility needs communication

and energy equipment (fuel), which can support military operations.

PESCO as an effort to integrate European security is also supported by its role which is also connected with the Coordinated Annual Review on Defence (CARD) and the European Defence Fund (EDF). The existence of EDF, CARD, and PESCO can be said to be a comprehensive defence package for Europe. EDF provides financial incentives to Member States in creating defence cooperation from research to prototype development through joint financing from the EU budget. While CARD as a party that monitors national defence spending plans and helps identify opportunities for the initiation and collaboration of defence cooperation.

EDF itself finances 90 million Euros of military research (2017-2019) and defence capacity development of 500 million Euros (2019-2020). Even for proposals in the period of 2021-2027, a proposed military research fee of 4.1 billion Euros and the development of defence capabilities of 8.9 billion Euros.

Even the European Commission has decided that there is a joint financing by EDF of 20% of project acquisition and development costs outside PESCO while for projects inside PESCO of 30%. Of course, having a large amount of funding will make Member States interested in developing joint projects in PESCO. The existence of EDF and CARD which can support the existence of PESCO certainly becomes a strong enough potential for the European Union to harmonize military requirements and encourage cooperative programs and form integration among Member States in developing defence and security cooperation (Aydın-Düzgıt & Marrone, 2018).

The Establishment of PESCO as an Independent EU Effort in the Field of Security

The formation of PESCO can be considered as a response of the European Union to the comments of US President Donald Trump in a NATO meeting in May 2017. Trump stated that the US has too much financial burden on NATO and

considers the weak commitment of EU Member States in 2006 to contribute 2% from the GDP of each country to NATO financing in 2024. Trump has indeed criticized NATO since he was the US presidential candidate because he assessed the losses suffered by the US in European trade, even though the US is a major party in the security of the European Union through the US (VOA Indonesia, 2017).

French Foreign Minister Jean-Yves Le Drian assess Trump's critical attitude towards EU military spending also spurred the acceleration of a more inclusive and independent EU defence cooperation initiative. NATO Secretary General, Jens Stoltenberg is of the view that PESCO is a follow-up to the concerns of Trump's commitment to the NATO defence alliance. However, the formation of PESCO is not a competitor to NATO, this is because it is in accordance with the Annual Report on the implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union in September 2018. In points 30 to 33 discussing the relationship between the EU and NATO

must respect each other for the specific role of each party. The EU and NATO must also support each other, work together and work towards the effectiveness of the security and defence of all EU and NATO partners (DW (Deutsche Welle), 2017).

Before the formation of PESCO, EU regional security was quite dependent on NATO for the US, as seen from a 2013 Wall Street Journal report that US military assets were the highest, followed by the United Kingdom (UK). This makes the EU dependent on the US, while Trump is quite critical of NATO. Other conditions when Britain decided to leave the European Union despite the exit of Britain also facilitated the formation of PESCO because Britain previously opposed it. Russia's military aggression into Crimea, Ukraine in 2014 also contributed to a strong enough trigger for the need of the formation that was more capable and effective integration in maintaining regional security from Europe (European Parliament, 2018).

In 2016, the EU Global Strategy as a guide to the external policy of the

European Union has added strategic autonomy security objectives which mean the EU is increasing its capacity to carry out certain military activities and is always alert at all times and has independent initiatives. This has also been decided by the EU Council of Ministers based on the Implementation Plan on Security and Defence since November 14, 2016 regarding global strategic operations that contain joint ambitions and management in resolving crises and security issues. The operation also includes joint stability both in land and maritime land security as well as cyber and border security in the European Union. This decree later became the background for a number of PESCO projects in 2018, which implemented an autonomous and independent EU regional security cooperation plan, which was followed by EU Member States (Biscop, 2018).

PESCO is an ambitious and binding also an inclusive European legal framework for investments within the security and defence of the EU's territory and its citizens. PESCO also provides an

important political framework for all Member States to enhance their respective military assets and defence capabilities through well-coordinated initiatives and concrete projects supported more binding commitments. Enhanced defence capabilities of EU Member States also will benefit NATO (European Council, n.d.). They're going to strengthen the EU pillar within the Alliance and answer repeated demands for stronger transatlantic burden sharing. PESCO may be a crucial step towards strengthening the common defence program. It might be a component of a possible development towards a standard defence should the Council by unanimous vote decide so (as provided for in article 42.2 TEU). An extended term vision of PESCO might be to reach a coherent full spectrum force package - in complementarily with NATO, which can still be the cornerstone of collective defence for its members. NATO considers PESCO as an inclusive because the most vital instrument to foster common security and defence in a neighbourhood where more coherence,

continuity, coordination, and collaboration are needed. European efforts to the present end must be united, coordinated, and meaningful and must be supported commonly agreed political guidelines.

With the existence of PESCO, it also strengthened the position of Germany and France which incidentally also took leadership initiation in the formation of the PESCO. French Defence Minister Florence Parly considers that PESCO is a form of European autonomy in responding to a security threat, when the US and NATO chose not to involve themselves (Damarjati, 2018). This was also justified by Ursula von der Leyen as the Minister of Defence of Germany, that European military autonomy was also not merely a rival to NATO, but also had the opportunity to improve European internal security and in principle also be able to complement NATO. The attitudes of France and Germany indicate that basically NATO remains a pillar of security in Europe, but PESCO is also still needed in reducing dependence on the US and NATO to deal with common

security threats, especially in the European region.

Analysis of the Establishment of PESCO by the European Union in Increasing the Integration and Independence of European Regional Military Cooperation

The formation of PESCO is a new reform in the defence cooperation of the European Union. Before the advent of PESCO, the European defence-security problem was naturally dominated by NATO led by the United States which in fact was a country outside the European region. However, criticism from the US President, Donald Trump and the case of Russian aggression in the Crimea region, led to the need for a more effective and synergic implementation of policies or cooperation in crisis management and handling European regional security issues. This was also the background for the formation of PESCO on December 11, 2017, even though the formation of this collaboration had been planned since 2009 through the Lisbon Agreement.

The formation of PESCO is in accordance with the theory of regional security complexity, which holds that the formation of a group of countries that have closeness, then create security priorities in member countries to become united and inseparable. It also shows the efforts of integration and independence in prioritizing collective security of the EU Member States and implemented through the inauguration of 17 PESCO projects in March 2018 regarding joint military training cooperation, operational and logistical needs that support military operations by the European Union.

Regional security complexity theory focuses on two main variables, namely internal variables and external variables that form regional defence-security cooperation. Internal variables related to the similarity of both system political, economic, social, cultural, and geographical proximity. This is clearly seen from the European Union itself, which has a highly integrated regional cooperation arrangement and is demonstrated by the existence of political unity through the European

Council and economic unity through the main currency, the Euro. The external variables itself are associated with international conditions that affect. A quite risky condition is where EU protection depends on the US and NATO. Although NATO has long been a pillar of security, the criticism of Trump and the Crimea case shows that the capability of the EU in maintaining regional security is still questionable.

Efforts to bring and make sure coherence of output and synergies between planning instruments and processes within the EU and NATO continue. The general complementarity between PESCO and NATO increasingly were accepted, especially at the upper political level. This follows the continued emphasis by the EU upon the single set of forces principle whereby all capabilities developed through PESCO belong to those Member States that have invested in them and can be made available for deployment in NATO also as other multinational frameworks (Lazarou & Lađici, 2020).

Whereas politically and economically, the EU is actually capable of creating comprehensive defence cooperation in Europe. Politically, there is a binding commitment between EU Member States in carrying out obligations and contributing to the development of the PESCO project. Then the annual report of the High Representatives and EU Member States which are assessed by the PESCO Council and Secretariat, makes the integration of cooperation more concrete and synergistic. EU independence in cooperation projects can be seen in the PESCO framework when partners or external parties who join the project do not have the right as decision makers. Economically, PESCO has good prospects considering the financing of research and development of military capabilities is projected to reach billions of Euros. What's more, the existences of EDF and CARD help strengthen PESCO projects both in terms of financial and military planning which has more potential and effective.

CONCLUSION

The establishment of PESCO is basically a follow-up and implementation of the Lisbon Agreement in 2009 concerning the efforts to form comprehensive defence and security cooperation between European Union Member States in having more effective strategic autonomy and crisis management. The international political conditions also influenced the European Union in seeing the need to build strength in the face of threats. Moreover, US criticism of the EU regarding NATO involvement and the Crimea case shows that the EU should form an inclusive military defence pact so that decision making, and crisis management can be carried out more effectively.

This paper is expected to be able to add insight related to regionalism security studies in the science of International Relations and show that the EU as one of the international organizations chose a more independent attitude through the establishment of a new defence pact as a more comprehensive security cooperation in the European region. However, the

formation of PESCO is not to rival NATO nor is it an effort to break away from the Atlantic transnational cooperation, but PESCO itself can be a complement to NATO related to strengthening existing military forces. This was also shown in the Annual report on the implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy by the European Parliament that EU-NATO relations remained interrelated and without any duplication of policies between PESCO and NATO so that the policies that was made did not overlap with each other.

Critic argues that the top goal of PESCO projects still to be contextualised within the broader debate on an EU strategic culture, also a concrete vision about the ambition of EU security and defence program. They also trying to emphasise the necessity to align PESCO priorities with those identified by parallel EU defence initiatives, also like the potential needs of the EU. In doing so, PESCO is still cooperating with a view to achieving higher levels of investment expenditure on defence equipment

within the light, as an example of the international responsibilities (especially within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); and aligning the defence apparatus by identifying military needs, pooling and specialising capabilities, and inspiring cooperation in training and logistics.

REFERENCES

- Amaritasari, I. (2015). Keamanan Nasional dalam Konsep dan Standar Internasional. *Jurnal Keamanan Nasional*, 1(2), 153–174.
<https://doi.org/10.31599/jkn.v1i2.21>
- Aydın-Düzgit, S., & Marrone, A. (2018). *PESCO and Security Cooperation Between the EU and Turkey*.
- Biscop, S. (2018). European defence: Give PESCO a chance. *Survival*, 60(3), 161–180.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00396338.2018.1470771>
- Damarjati, D. (2018). *Mulai Berani ke AS, Paris-Berlin Kukuh di Pakta Pertahanan Uni Eropa*.
- DW (Deutsche Welle). (2017). *PESCO: EU army one step closer after defense pact agreement*.
- European Council. (n.d.). *Notification*

- on Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) To the Council and To the High Representative of the Union for*
- European Defence Agency. (2018). *Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO)*.
- European Parliament. (2018). *DRAFT REPORT on annual report on the implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy*.
- European Union External Action (EEAS). (2018). *Permanent Structured Cooperation*.
- Irwan, M. N. S. B. (2017). *Transformasi Kebijakan NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) Dalam Penanganan Ancaman Non-tradisional (Studi Kasus: The 2010 New Strategic Concept)*. Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Lazarou, E., & Lađici, T. (2020). *PESCO: Ahead of the strategic review*. September, 12. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/R egData/etudes/BRIE/2018/625127 /EPRS_BRI\(2018\)625127_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/R egData/etudes/BRIE/2018/625127 /EPRS_BRI(2018)625127_EN.pdf)
- Nurdiana, N. A. (2019). Peran Politik Keamanan Rusia di Kawasan Asia. *EJournal Ilmu Hubungan Internasional*, 7(1), 153–166.
- Parliament.uk. (2018). *EU Defence: the realisation of Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO)*.
- Raco, J. R. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif - Jenis, Karakteristik, dan Keunggulannya*. PT. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Somek, A. (2007). *Kelsen Lives*. *European Journal of International Law*, 18(3), 409–451. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chm028>
- Sugiyono. (2010). *Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif*. Alfabeta.
- Ulusoy, H. (2003). *Possible Transformation of Collective Security Arrangements in the Post-September 11 Era*.
- VOA Indonesia. (2017). *Trump Terus Kecam Anggota NATO karena Sumbangan yang Tak Memadai*.
- Yakti, P. D. (2016). *Kebutuhan Uni Eropa Terhadap Institusi Keamanan: Peranan NATO di Era Kontemporer*. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 1, 81–98.