

# Should we use the terms of Airbus, Marshall plan and why not Ariane, ESA, OCCAR and PSA in Europe ?

Even if some will say that it is a detail and that the bottom of the problem is not here, the communication has all its importance in the European construction, in particular on the choice of the words, acronyms, names fallen sometimes in the common language, or metaphors that aim to mark our minds, united in diversity, in order to save time in explanation. Be careful, however, to master its meaning, especially in mastering certain realities.

---

Par François CHARLES

Economist, strategy and management consultant, former responsible for European and international affairs at the DGA, Président of I.R.C.E.

---

As we see in Franco-German, confidence, which is so fragile often requires understanding words and especially the possible misunderstanding. Without remembering that the cock crowing, seeming so distant from politics, is perceived differently across Europe, some former French elected officials were still surprised by the difficulty experienced in having been able to get the European Defense Fund through, not seeking to wear other glasses and therefore not seeing either, or not wanting to see certain realities, certainly evolving, of European defense apart from certain driving forces. Its initiator had just voluntarily or not

forgotten the words "research" and "industry" to properly frame the action, certainly perhaps offset by the only German introductory word left to appreciation.

Since the establishment of the new geopolitical European Commission, a new wind has been blowing on the concept of competition, sovereignty and strategic autonomy and it should be carefully guided. Like the American anti-trust laws, taken up willingly by certain European countries, the Commission always ensures that this necessary and often saving competition is present in a closed universe to leave the choice to the buyers by regulating in particular the prices and feeding the technological competition. Communicating on many acceptances, it must nevertheless adjust its gaze on certain significant strategic files when the offers or potential external purchases exist and must therefore not necessarily prevent the formation of champions pushed by their guardianship in a logic of industrial strategy and able to fight effectively, even if they can certainly be created on occasion by cooperation or alliances, which seems very difficult to achieve in certain sectors.

The endless debate about who from Airbus or from Europe helped to create the other

reminds us that European solidarity is possible in the face of external competition attacking an area of sovereignty, notably shared, and above all thanks to convinced leaders and guided in particular by a logic of rationalization and lowering of unit production costs. It should not be forgotten that apart from the engines, Airbus is validated in Europe, with or without state aid, often put forward by American competitors, no longer internal competition on this particular range of manufacturing. As for the choice of the final consumer, it is undoubtedly respected in the fact that Air France uses both Airbus and Boeing and therefore does not prevent their purchases as well as certain other European aircraft of other ranges for regional flights. Why not even imagine a possible reasoned Buy European Act, under penalty of the risk of bearing a certain cost of autonomy even at objective cost, open book, bonus and penalty for an aeronautics which remains in the domain of sovereignty and where the 'We do not imagine that a national fleet with its flag is not composed of all or part of aircraft manufactured on its soil. Perhaps we should also ask the question about maintenance services beyond manufacturing.

Employing the term Airbus for trains, ships, batteries, energy should therefore be produced under the same conditions in civil sectors

deemed less strategic except energy, which remains the decision of the States. But if the Airbus company makes war every day in the civilian sector, it is possible for the employer also in the military land, naval and aeronautical fields with objectives often close but with different realities sometimes without real justification but that Airbus will think about it...

No doubt we should pay the same attention to the use of the term **Marshall plan** recently requested as an example by the French Commissioner T. Breton on tourism, without necessarily waiting for the end of the Covid War, to use the President's words. French. Should we also use it for a crisis and especially for a European action except to think that it would also be financed by the United States for this time mainly American tourists? Note however that the reconstruction was a model of reimbursement between countries, certainly without the participation of the countries of Central Europe by refusal of Stalin.

And why not use other names, terms, metaphors often little known or then insiders who are often recognized models for Europe in governance or the realization of products, except to think that this observation is not not shared by all. This is the case, for example, of **Ariane's** proven strategic industrial space

success, in competition with the programs of other countries, where negotiations were important in the division of tasks, in particular in propulsion. Why not also talk about **ESA**, the European space agency, which is not an agency of the European Commission but intergovernmental between some twenty European countries in a strategic area with a proven governance model.

Do you know **OCCAR**, a joint armaments cooperation organization, European of Franco-German origin with an international vocation, welcoming in particular the participation of Turkey without its being a member, often also taken for an agency of the Commission, working in the management of land, air and sea weapons programs with a strong and global model, sometimes attacked, to ensure the success of its objectives as soon as they have been entrusted to it.

Finally, the strategic industrial and especially defense world, confronted with sovereignty and if possible European considerations, would have everything to gain from being inspired by the **PSA**, Peugeot - Citroën model, in order to facilitate, in people's minds, the bringing together of entities with a strong protected identity, as we mentioned in the terrestrial for the **KNDS** joint venture with brands, stories, technologies, different customers, with a certain internal competition

even saving, knowing however to bring together their offices of studies to gain new national, European and international markets, then gradually lead to an osmosis between the teams. Other symbolic names can be put forward with sometimes a pride in the identity of a monopoly posture by technological budget shortages of competitors like the Concorde. Others still await a certain maturation like Galliléo to replace or complement the American GPS. Finally, and before using the term, let's also look at the realities of GAFAM (M) in real or false geopolitical independence breaking price competition, which have become stronger than certain states, with industrial substitution initiatives notably in sectors defense and why not tomorrow and controlled by whom?