

Letter from Sir E. John W. Barnes to Lord Hood on NATOWEU relations (London, 13 March 1968)


Caption: On 13 March 1968, Sir E. John W. Barnes, head of the Western Organisations and Coordination Department in the British Foreign Office, sends a working paper prepared by the British delegation for the study on relations between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and Western European Union (WEU) to Lord Hood, Deputy Under-Secretary of State at the Foreign Office and Permanent Representative to WEU. The text focuses on the outstanding issues caused by France’s withdrawal from the NATO integrated command and highlights the particular situation of France with regard to the WEU armaments control system, given that the procedures differ depending on whether forces and armaments are under national command or under NATO command.

Source: The National Archives of the UK (TNA). Foreign Office, Western Organisations and Co-ordination Department and Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Western Organisations Department: Registered Files (W and WD Series). WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION (WEU). Relations with NATO. 01/01/1967-31/12/1968, FCO 41/267 (Former Reference Dep: WU 4/3/1 PART B).

Copyright: (c) The National Archives of the United Kingdom

URL:
http://www.cvce.eu/obj/letter_from_sir_e_john_w_barnes_to_lord_hood_on_nato_weu_relations_london_13_march_1968-en-f415f20d-8d8e-4c58-9dd9-e66533014657.html

Last updated: 13/10/2016



CONFIDENTIAL

ENTER

(31)

Lord Hood

Has seen
JG
21/3.



NATO/WEU RELATIONS

At the W.E.U. Council on 6 March you offered to circulate a working paper on the main points outstanding on the Study on NATO/WEU Relations.

2. I attach a draft which has been agreed with the Department's Legal Adviser.
3. If you agree, we will circulate it to the W.E.U. Working Group in time for a meeting on 15 March.

(E.J.W. Barnes)
13 March, 1968

Lord Hood thought that something shorter was required and prepared a draft, which I submitted to the Working Group. It was circulated informally (see /30). On the basis of this draft the Working Group prepared a short report to the Council on Outstanding Issues on the NATO/WEU relations Study (see /29). This will be considered at the next meeting of the Council on 3 April.

JG
P.A. 22/3

CONFIDENTIAL

Council's resolution of 22 October, 1954
to implement the Final Act of the London
Conference,

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN

WBL 51-7433

Registry No.	DRAFT	WORKING PAPER	Type 1 +
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	To:—	From	
Top Secret. Secret. <u>Confidential.</u> Restricted. Unclassified.		Telephone No. & Ext.	
PRIVACY MARKING		Department	
In Confidence			

NATO/WEU Relations

Outstanding Issues

Working Paper by the U.K. Delegation

the
In/view of the United Kingdom Delegation

the Council still have to reach an agreed view
on the following ~~matters~~ ^{issues} arising from the Study
on NATO/WEU relations.

- (a) The obligations assumed by member countries under the revised Brussels Treaty of 1954 and the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 are interdependent. Any step taken by a member of W.E.U., which affects the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, will also affect the Brussels Treaty system.

The Council therefore need to identify the effects of the French decision to withdraw their forces from the NATO integrated command arrangements on the mutual ~~negotiations~~ ^{obligation} under the Revised Brussels Treaty.

- (b) The French withdrawal from the NATO integrated command arrangements has placed France in an exceptional position vis-à-vis the W.E.U. control system. The WEU control system was drawn up on the basis that member countries would act in accordance with paragraph 4 of the North Atlantic Council's resolution of 22 October, 1954 to implement the Final Act of the London /Conference,

main points
Eloy A

Mr. F. ^{first}
first.

Conference, in which it is stated that
"all forces of member nations stationed
in the area of the Allied Command, Europe,
shall be placed under the authority of the
Supreme Allied Commander, Europe....".

Now that all French forces are under
national command, these forces are subject
to less exacting control procedures than
those of the other members of WEU who
continue to act in conformity with the
Resolution of 22 October, 1954. For
example:

(i) In accordance with Article IV of
Protocol No. II SACEUR carries out
inspections to ensure that as stated in C(68)2, FLAG B
the limits set out in Articles I and II of
Protocol No. II have been observed. There
are no such inspections to ensure that
the limits for French forces for the common
defence under national command have
in fact been observed as stated
in C(68)13.

FLAG C

(ii) As pointed out by the Netherlands
Ambassador in the Council on 1
February, 1967, the information
provided by member countries
relating to forces under NATO
command is more detailed than that
about forces under national command.
Other member Governments are thus
in no position to arrive at a meaningful
assessment of the military strength
of French forces.

FLAG D

(iii) According to the resolution of 15
September, 1956, increases in the
levels of forces of member states
under NATO Command above the
limits set out in Articles I and II of
Protocol

FLAG E

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN

Protocol No. II are subject to the requirement of a unanimous decision by the Council of WEU. Having withdrawn her forces from the integrated command arrangements, France is under no corresponding restriction as regards the level of her forces.

✎ The Council therefore need to consider whether any action should be taken to correct these imbalances.