

## Address given by Hans-Dietrich Genscher to the WEU Assembly (Paris, 20 June 1984)

**Caption:** On 20 June 1984, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, German Foreign Minister and President-in-Office of the Council of Western European Union (WEU), submits the Council's Annual Report for 1983 to the WEU Assembly. During his address, he outlines the arguments in favour of the reactivation of WEU, the only European organisation which is authorised, under its treaty, to deal with defence and security matters.

**Source:** Assembly of the WEU. Official Report of Debates - Fourth Sitting June 1984. Paris: Assembly of the WEU, [s.d.], p. 145-148.

**Copyright:** (c) WEU Secretariat General - Secrétariat Général UEO

**URL:** [http://www.cvce.eu/obj/address\\_given\\_by\\_hans\\_dietrich\\_genscher\\_to\\_the\\_weu\\_assembly\\_paris\\_20\\_june\\_1984-en-b605938a-86dc-4de7-9a22-e9e0b95ccdca.html](http://www.cvce.eu/obj/address_given_by_hans_dietrich_genscher_to_the_weu_assembly_paris_20_june_1984-en-b605938a-86dc-4de7-9a22-e9e0b95ccdca.html)

**Last updated:** 22/06/2015

## Address given by Hans-Dietrich Genscher to the WEU Assembly (Paris, 20 June 1984)

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for your kind words of welcome. I deem it a special honour to address the Assembly of Western European Union today. I am pleased that in this way I can express my esteem and respect for this parliamentary body of WEU.

Before turning to the actual subjects of my address, I should like to congratulate you cordially on your election, Mr. President. I am convinced that you will perform the even more important task which we all hope WEU will have with prudence, expertise and personal commitment.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I speak to you today in a dual function: firstly, as Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and then in my capacity as Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany. As Chairman of the Council of Ministers I have the honourable task of presenting the twenty-ninth annual report, which has to be submitted to the Assembly every year under Article IX of the modified Brussels Treaty. The report covers the period from 1st January to 31st December 1983 – my remarks will therefore concentrate on this period; in addition, I shall report on the meeting of the Council of Ministers held on 12th June 1984.

In accordance with the structure of the annual report, I shall speak on relations between the Council and the Assembly, then on the activities of the Council, and finally – an indispensable subject – on budgetary matters.

The WEU Assembly is the only parliamentary body at the European level which is expressly authorised under an international treaty to deal with security matters. This underscores its particular significance and the importance of its function. Security issues are of vital interest to the peoples of Europe. This is where one of the central tasks of this parliamentary body lies: it is a forum where the democratically elected representatives of European countries can discuss European security policy and thus inform the public in our countries, enabling it to participate in the discussion.

The Council welcomes the expertise and determination with which the Assembly has devoted itself to this task. This year's agenda underscores this anew and illustrates the Assembly's endeavour to cover the entire breadth of its functions. In particular, the Council pays tribute to the fact that the Assembly is again dealing in detail with numerous aspects of European security.

For the Assembly to discharge its responsibility, a dialogue with the Council is necessary. The Council attaches great importance to this and devotes a considerable part of its activities to the dialogue. In future we shall seek ways and means of making it even closer and more direct. Suggestions from you will be most welcome. Let me single out the following topics:

In 1983, the dialogue was conducted on questions connected with the implementation of the modified Brussels Treaty. The questions included ones which the governments of WEU member states deal with in other political forums, especially in European political cooperation and in the Atlantic Alliance.

In addition to its annual report, the Council has submitted substantive replies to the recommendations and written questions presented to it by the Assembly.

In response to specific requests, the Council authorised the secretariat of the Standing Armaments Committee to provide technical assistance to the Committee for Scientific, Technological and Aerospace Questions in the preparation of a report. The Council is willing to examine similar requests by other committees of the Assembly.

After the Council meetings in Brussels on 17th May 1983 and here in Paris on 12th June 1984, informal meetings took place between the Council and the Presidential Committee, the Committee for Defence Questions and Armaments, and the General Affairs Committee. The meeting of 12th June 1984 led to a thorough discussion between the Council and representatives of the committees. As Chairman of the Council, the Minister for External Relations, Mr. Cheysson, informed the deputies on the results of the

meeting and presented on behalf of the Council a working paper on the reactivation of WEU, which is in your possession. I shall come back later on to the results of this important meeting, which provided fresh impetus for the future activities of WEU.

In 1983, several ministers took the opportunity to address this Assembly. The Council welcomes such participation, especially by foreign and defence ministers.

In its annual report, the Council stresses once more the importance which the seven member states attach to WEU as the only European organisation which is authorised under the treaty to deal with defence matters. The Council reaffirms the determination of the member states to fulfil all their obligations under the modified Brussels Treaty. This applies particularly to the obligation of collective self-defence, as enshrined in Article V of the treaty.

In the context of its political consultations, the Council held meetings in Brussels on 17th May 1983 and in Paris on 12th June 1984. At the Brussels meeting, East-West relations were discussed particularly from the point of view of European security. In addition, other aspects of the international situation were deliberated, including in particular the situation in the Mediterranean. The Council meeting here in Paris on 12th June 1984 was attended by the foreign ministers of almost all member countries for the first time in years. An important item on their agenda was the discussion of ways and means of making greater use of WEU. The numerous recommendations and initiatives of the Assembly were taken into account. I should like to sum up the main results of this Council meeting as follows:

The ministers agreed to make greater use of WEU in future as a consultative and coordinating forum for their close co-operation in security matters. The Council of Ministers instructed the Permanent Council to prepare, on the basis of the working paper in your possession, concrete proposals on further aspects of WEU reactivation in time for the meeting in Rome in October. It is intended to adopt a political declaration in Rome.

Let me return to the period covered by the report. In military matters the Council, assisted by the Agency for the Control of Armaments, ensured that the provisions of the modified Brussels Treaty were observed with regard to the level of forces and armaments in the member states. The Assembly was informed that the Council had continued to examine the various aspects of a reduction of the list of types of armaments in Annex IV to Protocol No. III. Furthermore, the Council has started to investigate how the Agency for the Control of Armaments can, through a comprehensive renewal of its functions, take up activities in new fields. The Council will inform the Assembly of the results of this study once it has been completed.

Pursuant to a decision taken by the Council of Ministers in Brussels on 17th May 1983, the Standing Armaments Committee revised the confidential version of the first part of its economic study on the armaments industries of member states. A version of this up-dated study for publication will be forwarded to the Assembly. The international secretariat of the Standing Armaments Committee has completed its preliminary work on another study, dealing with Japan's entry into the armaments market.

A number of proposals concerning the future activities of the Standing Armaments Committee are currently being discussed by the Council. The Council is intent on avoiding any overlapping with the activities of other organisations in the arms sphere.

In its Recommendations 380 and 397 this Assembly advocated that the organisation of WEU be brought into line with the requirements of the 1980s, and in this connection you advocated cancellation of the final existing production bans and quotas for conventional weapons. I am able to inform you that the Council of Permanent Representatives will shortly deal with these matters.

Let me now turn to the final part of the annual report. As in preceding years, the financial situation of member states obliged the Council to pursue a careful budgetary policy in 1983. The Council will none the less seek to ensure that the organs of WEU can continue to work vigorously towards attaining the goals of the treaty. It is therefore resolved to make sure that the organs receive the resources they need for the

efficient performance of their functions and for any necessary changes in their activities. It goes without saying that, in view of the strained budgetary situation, we shall have to continue to economise.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, in my capacity as Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany I should like to present to you some considerations which, in my government's opinion, favour a greater use of WEU. The substance of what I have to say is, I know, supported by the other WEU governments.

It is worthwhile starting with the historical facts which Mr. De Decker presented in such a clear and well-organised fashion in his report on the thirtieth anniversary of the modified Brussels Treaty. The London conference and the accession of Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany to the modified Brussels Treaty date back thirty years. Only a few people still remember that these political decisions paved the way to eliminating certain consequences of world war two: they permitted the statute of occupation to be terminated, the Bonn Convention to be concluded, and the Federal Republic of Germany to acquire its sovereignty and join the Atlantic Alliance. This marked the beginning of the Federal Republic of Germany's return to and integration into the democratic western family of nations. Since then we have together travelled a long and successful path, and I feel that none of us has any reason to regret the decisions taken then. In this lengthy period, WEU has fulfilled important tasks in connection with the objectives defined in the treaty. Today it is essential to make use of WEU in a manner appropriate to present requirements.

Why do we need Western European Union?

The Council working paper provided the following answer: because WEU is the only European organisation authorised under a treaty to deal with defence and security matters. That lends legitimacy to our objective, namely to make use of the great potential of the modified Brussels Treaty, which has not been fully exploited.

In past years there has been no shortage of efforts to provide European economic and political co-operation with a third dimension, a joint security policy. In the solemn declaration on European union of 19th June 1983, the heads of state or government of the ten member states of the European Community stated that "the political and economic aspects of security" could be dealt with within the scope of European political co-operation. Defence policy issues are still excluded in this context. However, Europe must begin to speak with one voice on these questions too, so that it can become a strong and confident partner in the alliance. Europe and America are the two pillars of the Atlantic bridge; they complement and need each other. It is therefore crucial that both pillars should be strong and reliable.

On both sides of the Atlantic complaints have frequently been made about an imbalance within the alliance. A picture has been drawn of a Europe living cheaply under the American umbrella. On this point let me repeat what I said at the Ministerial Council on 12th June: it is not that the United States is too strong within the alliance, but that the Europeans are too weak.

The European pillar of NATO must be reinforced. Specifically, that means pooling European security efforts. If we succeed in that we shall gain more weight in the North Atlantic Alliance and enjoy greater recognition outside the alliance. I have good reason to emphasise the alliance aspect; those who see in the reactivation of WEU the establishment of a counter-position to NATO, or who view it as a way of separating Europe from America, are deluding themselves. The opposite is the case – reactivation of WEU serves to strengthen the alliance. Our goal, the strengthening of the European pillar of the alliance, will determine the future work of WEU. In short: WEU should become the forum for European co-ordination on all matters for which a common European position in the alliance is desirable. That is an ambitious objective.

The paper submitted to you by the working group of the Permanent Council highlighted four subjects with which joint work could be launched, subjects which cover important areas. They can help to "examine and redefine the problems of European security", as a draft recommendation of this Assembly puts it.

Let us take a look at these subjects: analysing the threat to Europe, or, in other words, analysing the military, political and psychological aspects of the imbalance of power in Europe as a basis for outlining Europe's security interests; as to the effects of international developments on the security of Europe, we shall have to pay particular attention to the causes of crises and conflicts in the third world. We should assert more firmly the idea that genuine non-alignment is essential to international stability, that East-West antagonism must not be carried over into the third world. Similarly, we must be aware that economic and social instability are of particular importance and that measures to help overcome such instability in the third world are a constituent part of security policy for us in Europe, too.

In this context the question often arises as to whether WEU's involvement with these questions could be a way of circumventing the geographical limitation of NATO. I wish to make quite clear that this is not intended. The Federal Government will not tamper with the established principles of the alliance; intensification of the transatlantic dialogue in all its aspects is an important contribution to strengthening the alliance itself. It strengthens political co-operation and thus the cohesion of the alliance; your Assembly has again and again made suggestions on how co-operation in the field of armaments can be co-ordinated.

Such co-operation is an important concern of all European states. WEU and its bodies can provide a framework for efforts aimed at co-ordinating existing European resources for the conventional component of defence and using them more efficiently. Such action could take account of the need for a more effective Euro-American two-way street in arms cooperation and technology transfer. However, WEU and NATO must also complement each other in this area; the work of the existing institutions of the European NATO allies must not be impeded.

Increased use of WEU will certainly make greater demands on its organisation than hitherto. For that reason, on 12th June 1984 the Council of Ministers charged the Permanent Council to submit specific proposals in time for the anniversary meeting in Rome in October 1984 for decision by the ministers.

I cannot anticipate the decisions of the Permanent Council and therefore do not wish at this point to go into details of any possible organisational reform. I should like to restrict my remarks to one point, namely the reform of the Agency for the Control of Armaments. The Assembly has always carried out the duties laid down in the treaty and – together with the Council – has supervised observance of the armaments control provisions of the treaty. You therefore have a particular interest in this institution, and you have underlined this interest with a series of recommendations. The integrated defence structure of NATO and the close bilateral and multilateral links between the allies afford an open insight into the military capabilities and intentions of all members. Europe should build on openness and transparency, which we have realised to an extent probably unique in the world. In multilateral negotiations we are seeking verifiable arms control measures which transcend the block system. In almost thirty years of activity the Agency for the Control of Armaments has gained a high degree of experience and knowledge, which must not be wasted. One of the important functions fulfilled by the Council – not least as a result of your recommendation – is an examination of the way and the framework in which the potential of the Agency for the Control of Armaments can be exploited in future.

When we speak of Europe, we must not forget that Europe is more than the Seven, more than the European Community and the Council of Europe. Warsaw, Prague and Budapest are as European as Paris, London or Rome. In the interests of peace and stability in our continent and in the world, we must not relax our efforts to seek dialogue and co-operation with the states of the Warsaw Pact. The Assembly has expressed itself along these lines in several reports.

The Washington declaration of 31st May 1984 by the alliance unreservedly supports dialogue and co-operation as a constructive means of shaping relations with the East. In particular, it endorsed and elucidated the dual aspect of the long-term alliance strategy laid down in the Harmel report: what is necessary for defence will be done without seeking superiority or confrontation but in the expectation that the Soviet Union will respect our legitimate security interests just as we respect theirs; further to the Brussels appeal of December 1983, the West confirms its offer of co-operation at all levels and in all spheres without preconditions or limitations. It is of particular importance that the dialogue between the United States and

the Soviet Union should be restarted. In his recent Dublin speech, President Reagan again called upon the Soviet Union to return to the negotiating tables. The United States is prepared to listen to and negotiate on every new specific proposal made by the Soviet side.

We must utilise the opportunities offered by the Stockholm conference on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe. There we are seeking a network of specific measures which complement each other. We are also prepared to talk with the Soviet Union in Stockholm about reaffirming the pledge to refrain from the use or threat of force. However, the discussion on refraining from force must not be a substitute for the agreement on specific measures required by the Madrid mandate.

All these efforts must remain geared to the major goal of creating a peaceful order in Europe, in which states with different political and historical systems can live in peaceful competition. This order must be based on confidence, on co-operation and on respect for mutual interests.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, cooperation between the member states of WEU serves to strengthen Europe and the alliance. Co-operation in this union is thus a contribution to stability and peace in the world.