



# **Assembly of Western European Union**

**DOCUMENT 1430**

**31st October 1994**

**FORTIETH ORDINARY SESSION**

**(Second Part)**

**The WEU Institute for Security Studies**

**REPORT**

submitted on behalf of the Committee for  
Parliamentary and Public Relations  
by Mr. Roman, Rapporteur



*The WEU Institute for Security Studies*

**REPORT** <sup>1</sup>

*submitted on behalf of the  
Committee for Parliamentary and Public Relations* <sup>2</sup>  
*by Mr. Roman, Rapporteur*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION

on the WEU Institute for Security Studies

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

submitted by Mr. Roman, Rapporteur

- I. Introduction
- II. The origins and tasks of the Institute
  - (i) Stages in the Institute's creation
  - (ii) The Institute's tasks
- III. Structure and activities of the Institute
  - (i) Structure and operation
    - (a) The Director
    - (b) The research staff
    - (c) Organogram and budget
  - (ii) Activities
    - (a) Reports and studies for the Council
    - (b) Other studies and works
    - (c) Seminars and study groups
    - (d) The Institute's external relations
- IV. Achievements and prospects
  - (i) The Institute and the question of the academy
  - (ii) Relations between the Assembly and the Institute
- V. Conclusion

---

1. Adopted unanimously by the committee.

2. *Members of the committee: Mr. Masseret (Chairman); Sir Russell Johnston, Baroness Gould of Potternewton (Alternate for Dr. Godman) (Vice-Chairmen); MM. Amaral, Benvenuti, Birraux, Bühler (Alternate: Junghanns), Decagny, Dionisi, Sir Anthony Durant, Mrs. Err, Mr. Eversdijk, Mrs. Fischer (Alternate: Müller), MM. Ghesquière, Gouteyron, Sir John Hunt, MM. Kempinaire, Martins, Mattina, Mitolo, Pfuhl, Reimann, Robles Fraga, Sainz Garcia, Mrs. Sanchez de Miguel (Alternate: Roman), Mrs. Verspaget.*

N.B. *The names of those taking part in the vote are printed in italics.*

***Draft Recommendation***  
***on the WEU Institute for Security Studies***

The Assembly,

- (i) Noting with satisfaction that the WEU Institute for Security Studies has successfully accomplished the tasks assigned to it since its creation;
- (ii) Stressing the importance of the activities of the Institute for the emergence of a European awareness of security and defence questions;
- (iii) Welcoming the vital rôle played by the Institute in the development of relations with the Central and Eastern European countries, associate partners of WEU;
- (iv) Noting with interest the initiatives taken by the Institute to make WEU and other European organisations aware of the problems of the Mediterranean and the Maghreb;
- (v) Welcoming the fact that the Institute's expertise was called upon in the context of the International Conference on Peace in former Yugoslavia, thus demonstrating the reputation enjoyed by the Institute among European research institutes;
- (vi) Stressing the Institute's active policy of openness towards European countries seeking membership of the European Union and WEU;
- (vii) Noting that the enlargement of WEU entails an increase in the Institute's responsibilities towards new members, associate members, associate partners and observers, but that there has been no adjustment of the Institute's means to meet this new situation;
- (viii) Noting that the present structure of the Institute is not such as to be able to meet all expectations arising from enlargement and from the emergence of a new European security and defence identity;
- (ix) Recalling the declaration of the WEU member countries, annexed to the Maastricht Treaty, in which the Council undertook to study "the transformation of the WEU Institute into a European security and defence academy";
- (x) Recalling Recommendation 474, requesting the Council to "take no measures that may involve relations between the new institute and the Assembly without securing the latter's prior agreement";
- (xi) Regretting that the Assembly may not always be in a position to take advantage of closer and more direct co-operation with the Institute, to their mutual benefit,

RECOMMENDS THAT THE COUNCIL

1. Consider forthwith the Institute's transformation into a European security and defence academy, in accordance with the Council's own wishes as expressed in 1991;
2. Encourage member countries to resume holding advanced European defence study sessions, with the support of the Institute, and to ensure the continuity of such sessions;
3. Provide the Institute with appropriate means for handling the increase in its requirements and activities stemming from the enlargement of WEU and the development of relations with countries seeking membership of the European Union and with the Mediterranean countries;
4. Redefine, as necessary, the tasks of the Institute assigned to it at the time of its creation and adapt them to the new European situation in view of whatever changes may result from the 1996 intergovernmental conference;
5. Permit the development of co-operation between the Institute and the Assembly, without the former having to request the permission of the Council on each occasion in order to respond to a request for information or collaboration from the Assembly;
6. Ask the Institute to make declassified versions of its studies available to the Assembly and ensure that, in its work, it takes account of the Assembly's point of view on topics of common interest;
7. Associate the Assembly with the process of examining the transformation of the Institute into an academy, and, if necessary, establish procedures for close co-operation between the latter and the Assembly with a view to achieving the openness and transparency necessary for fostering European awareness of security and defence matters.

## *Explanatory Memorandum*

*(submitted by Mr. Roman, Rapporteur)*

### *I. Introduction*

1. Among the European and world-wide research institutes studying defence and international relations, the WEU Institute for Security Studies is an institution unique of its kind.

2. Its European dimension, its structure, its methods of operation and its tasks contribute to the original character of this institution, created by a ministerial decision of the Council on 13th November 1989.

3. Unlike governmental, non-governmental and international research institutes and national think tanks (be they private or attached to an international organisation) the Institute, in addition to traditional research and consultancy activities, was assigned the rôle, from the outset, of promoting a European security identity<sup>1</sup>. This objective gave the Institute a unique European and international dimension, thus distinguishing it from other research institutions working in the same area.

4. Since it started work on 1st July 1990, the Institute has developed in various directions ranging from research to establishing contacts with institutions dealing with defence and security matters in most European and several non-European countries and including the promotion of a European awareness of security issues<sup>2</sup> in academic circles and public opinion.

5. After four years of work, the overall result is positive and the Institute has won its place in the research world through the quality of its work and activities – seminars, colloquies and study groups – and through its European spirit and efforts at openness towards third countries in Europe and elsewhere.

6. However, attention should also be drawn to certain aspects of its tasks and rôle in WEU that reflect a degree of ambiguity and uncertainty on the part of the Council towards the Institute and the latter's relations with the Assembly.

7. In the framework of the present report, which, together with the reports of the Technological and Aerospace Committee on the WEU

Satellite Centre<sup>3</sup> and the Defence Committee on the WEU Planning Cell<sup>4</sup>, constitutes a tripartite study of the subsidiary organs of the Council, an attempt will be made to describe the Institute, its tasks and achievements and also to analyse its rôle in WEU and make proposals which seem appropriate for guiding co-operation between the Institute and the Assembly in a direction profitable to the two institutions, with the aim, ultimately, of contributing to the emergence and development of a European security and defence spirit.

### *II. The origins and tasks of the Institute*

#### *(i) Stages in the Institute's creation*

8. The ministerial decision on the creation of the Institute, reached by the Council in Brussels on 13th November 1989, was the outcome of thinking regarding the development and future of WEU which began in Rome in 1984<sup>5</sup> and was implemented with the adoption of the Hague platform on 27th October 1987<sup>6</sup>.

9. The WEU Assembly played an important rôle in the Institute's creation as far back as in 1986 by recommending that the Council "Provide the Assembly with detailed information on the steps it has taken to strengthen co-operation between existing European institutes for security studies" (Recommendation 438, 2nd December 1986).

10. In Recommendation 442 (Luxembourg, 27th April 1987), the Assembly asked the Council to ensure "co-ordination of member countries' participation in the course to be organised by the French Institut des hautes études de défense nationale in 1988"<sup>7</sup> and the "development of subsequent courses so as to promote public awareness of European security requirements in all member countries". Further to this recommendation, the Council entrusted the Secretariat-General with the task of participating in the preparatory work for this European seminar.

1. Ministerial decision concerning the setting-up of a WEU Institute for Security Studies, Brussels, 13th November 1989, Document 1219, Annex I.

2. Document 1253, reply of the Council to Recommendation 484, 30th November 1990.

3. The development of a European space-based observation system – Part II, Document 1393, 8th November 1993, Rapporteur Mr. Valleix.

4. The WEU Planning Cell, Document 1421, 19th May 1994, Rapporteur Mrs. Baarveld-Schlaman.

5. Rome declaration, Document 989, 27th October 1984.

6. Platform on European security interests, Document 1122, 27th October 1987.

7. During the meeting of the Council in Luxembourg on 13th and 14th November 1986, the French Government proposed organising a first European defence seminar in 1988.

11. In the light of the success of this undertaking, other European defence courses were scheduled and it was decided to set up an association of alumni under the auspices of WEU and with WEU logistic support<sup>8</sup>.

12. On 16th March 1989, at the initiative of the Presidential Committee, the Assembly adopted Recommendation 467 on the creation of a European institute for advanced security studies. This text recommended that "a European institute for advanced security studies be established under the terms of Article VIII, paragraph 2<sup>9</sup>, of the modified Brussels Treaty in order to promote a European spirit in matters of defence".

13. In London, on 3rd April 1989, the ministers "instructed the Permanent Council to continue its efforts to review the question of an institute for strategic studies (...) with a view to a further discussion at its next meeting"<sup>10</sup>. Further to this decision, the Permanent Council reconstituted the Institutional Working Group with the task of considering the mandate, tasks and structure of the Institute.

14. The Institutional Working Group, which met four times: on 1st June, 3rd July, 18th September and 19th October 1989, prepared a report which was transmitted to the Council of Ministers. Meeting in Brussels on 13th November 1989, the Council adopted the report and decided to create the WEU Institute for Security Studies, recalling at the same time the Assembly's rôle as a catalyst.

15. On 17th January 1990, the Council appointed Mr. John Roper to the post of Director of the Institute. Mr. Roper took up his post on 1st April and on 13th June the Council approved appointments by the Secretary-General, on the proposal of the Director of the Institute, to the four research fellow posts. The Institute became operational on 1st July 1990.

(ii) *The Institute's tasks*

16. While the need for the creation of the Institute seemed obvious to the Assembly and the majority of the Council<sup>11</sup>, discussion of tasks

8. Second part of the thirty-fourth annual report of the Council (July 1988 - December 1988), Document 1177, 17th March 1989.

9. This text stipulates that "[the Council] shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be considered necessary".

10. WEU Ministerial Council, London, 3rd April 1989, Document 1180, 10th April 1989.

11. At the June session 1989, Mr. Younger, Secretary of State for Defence of the United Kingdom, and then Chairman-in-Office of the Council, stated before the Assembly: "The United Kingdom approaches the idea with an open mind but it is not self-evident that there is a need for such an institute. There are already over twenty in the field... We will therefore need to be convinced that a new institute would have a genuinely distinctive and useful rôle."

reveals differences of assessment likely to affect relations between the Assembly and the Institute.

17. The common point of departure for the examination underway is to be found in the address by Mr. Michel Rocard, then Prime Minister of France, to the first European session of the French Institut des hautes études de défense nationale, on 15th November 1988.

18. In his speech, Mr. Rocard stated that he wished to see "the creation of a European institute for advanced security studies, attached to WEU under arrangements still to be defined. This would enable WEU, still uncertain of its course, better to choose its direction... The tasks of such an institute would be training and teaching, in order to propagate a common defence spirit and create an awareness among national public opinions of the notion of European collective security... In the absence of a shared grammar, how can one speak with a single voice?"<sup>12</sup>

19. In June 1989, the Assembly adopted a report by the Political Committee, section IV of which broaches the question of the creation of a European institute for advanced security studies attempting to define its tasks and its operation. According to the Rapporteur, Mr. van der Sanden, the Institute should have a threefold task: information, study and training and "aim to promote an awareness of security questions among national public opinions by acting on those in influential positions in a wide range of capacities".

20. The Institute thus created was to benefit from a large measure of autonomy, indeed independence, and "it should be directed by an administrative board on which all parties are represented, composed of the Chairman-in-Office of the Council, the President of the Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Clerk with whom might be associated a small number of persons... This administrative board would appoint a director-general of the Institute who would select his own limited staff".

21. "The Institute would organise conferences on general topics ... and seminars on well-defined topics with a smaller number of participants. It would also have the support of existing national institutes and ensure the continuity of the European sessions organised by the latter."<sup>13</sup>

22. Addressing the Assembly at the same session, Mr. Chevènement, then Minister of Defence of France, declared himself in favour of a light-weight structure, divided into three units corresponding to the three tasks of the Institute: re-

12. Défense Nationale, January 1989, page 25.

13. Future of European security - reply to the annual report of the Council, Document 1185, Rapporteur Mr. van der Sanden.

search and publications, liaison with independent institutes with authority in the field, follow-up of the sessions of the Institute for advanced European defence studies. According to the Minister, "the common underlying objective of all three units might be defined as the harmonisation of the security doctrines of the member countries"<sup>14</sup>.

23. Two aspects, information and co-ordination with other institutes, are the common points of these two approaches. This emerges clearly from the description of the Institute's tasks by the Secretary-General, Mr. van Eekelen, in his information letter on the activities of the intergovernmental organisations according to which "there is undoubtedly a rôle for such an institute... in the area of co-ordination of both security research... and the promotion of public awareness of the European security identity in the member countries"<sup>15</sup>.

24. Finally, in its ministerial decision of 13th November 1989, the Council decided to assign five main tasks to the Institute:

- to carry out research, principally for the Council, and in consultation with the Secretary-General...;
- to encourage and help the existing institutes in the member states promote a greater awareness of European security issues and particularly to organise seminars and courses to that end;
- in collaboration with existing institutes, to organise meetings with institutes and countries not belonging to Western Europe, particularly those in the Central and Eastern European countries;
- to establish and keep up-to-date a data bank for the purposes of research into the defence efforts of the WEU member countries and studies relating to European security;
- to contribute to academic work on the same topic.

25. The development of relations with the Central and Eastern European countries will eventually become one of the most important tasks of the Institute. As Mr. Schäfer, then Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Germany, stated in his speech to the Assembly at the 1989 December session, the Institute must as a priority "contribute to the development of concepts for a new form of European security thinking, in part through contact with comparable institutions in Central and Eastern Europe"<sup>16</sup>.

14. Official report of debates, first part of the thirty-fifth ordinary session, June 1989.

15. Information letter on the activities of the intergovernmental organs (June - September 1989), Document 1196.

16. Official report of debates, second part of the thirty-fifth ordinary session, December 1989.

26. The use of the Institute as a bridge between WEU and the Central and Eastern European countries receives clear mention by the Council in the communiqué issued after its meeting in Brussels on 23rd April 1990 which calls upon the Institute to play "an active rôle in pooling ideas and in drawing together the new strands of thinking being developed in both the East and the West"<sup>17</sup>.

27. As the start of the Institute grew closer, the nature and content of its tasks became increasingly specific. According to the first part of the thirty-sixth annual report of the Council, the Institute was assigned two essential tasks<sup>18</sup>:

- "study and research for the governments of the member states of WEU represented by the Council and in consultation with the Secretariat-General...;
- stimulating the wider debate on European security issues..."

28. In December 1990, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Roland Dumas, defined the two main tasks of the Institute as deepening the debate on matters of European security and developing dialogue with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe<sup>19</sup>.

29. From the information presented above, the three major tasks for the Institute finally emerge:

- that of assisting the Council (through reports and studies provided to it on request or on the initiative of the Institute, or possibly through oral presentations by the Director of the Institute);
- that of stimulating debate on European security, a task translated into practice by the organisation of seminars, colloquies and study groups, establishing contacts with other such institutions and publication of studies directed towards a wide readership;
- external relations directed towards the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and other non-WEU countries of varying closeness to the organisation (for example, the Nordic countries, Slovenia and the Maghreb and Mediterranean countries).

30. Although some of the Assembly's proposals on the tasks of the Institute have been taken up by the Council - such as the information function, thinking on European security, autonomy in the implementation of the Institute's tasks, organi-

17. Document 1224, 4th May 1990.

18. First part of the thirty-sixth annual report of the Council (1st January - 30th June 1990), Document 1247.

19. Official report of debates, second part of the thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Assembly, December 1990.

sation of seminars, relations with Central and Eastern European countries – it should also be noted that, aside from certain declarations of limited scope<sup>20</sup>, the Council, by placing the Institute under its sole authority, ruled out any possibility of the Assembly subsequently having an influence on the tasks and activities of the Institute. By acting in this manner, the Council contributed to reducing the scope of a co-operation between the two institutions, which had nevertheless frequently been termed desirable<sup>21</sup>.

### *III. Structure and activities of the Institute*

31. Since the start of its work the structure of the Institute has remained stable, without significant alteration from that decided by the Council in 1989 and 1990: namely a lightweight structure, a small staff complement and a fairly rapid turnover of research staff (contracts limited to three years). In the Ministers' view, these options are justified on the one hand by budgetary considerations, and on the other to emphasise the Institute's European character by encouraging a continual flow of research staff from WEU countries.

32. This has not prevented the Institute, from the outset, from developing an intensive programme of work, organising open or restricted seminars and other activities directed towards government circles, other research institutions in Europe and elsewhere, and university circles. This work of contact and stimulation of the debate on European security has been accompanied by the publication of various studies, reports and other works deriving from the deliberations and information tasks pursued by the Institute.

#### *(i) Structure and operation*

##### *(a) The Director*

33. The Director is appointed by the Council of Ministers on the basis of nominations submitted by the WEU member countries. Experience in research, in political and military analysis and in managing a research institute are some of the fundamental criteria in the appointment of the Director of the Institute. Other criteria are linguistic

20. At the June 1990 session, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, Mr. Eyskens, Chairman-in-Office of the Council, stated that "the creation of the WEU Institute for Security Studies should enable the Council and the organisation as a whole, and hence the Assembly, to benefit from academic expertise in security matters". Official report of debates, June 1990.

21. In its reply to Recommendation 474, the Council stated that "dialogue between the Assembly and the Council regarding the tasks to be carried out by the Institute is desirable in that the Institute's work will be widely available to the public and that its thinking will naturally complement the Assembly's discussions". Document 1233, 1st June 1990.

skills and also, although this is not an overriding factor, being a national of one of the major WEU member countries.

34. The term of office of three years has been extended by two years for the current Director (the three-year term expired on 30th June 1993). It might be desirable, when the new Director is appointed in 1995, for the Council to consider the possibility of offering a longer contract or of making it renewable for at least one further term. This will prevent recourse to extensions of the term of office and contribute to increasing the stability of the office of Director who has important management as well as research duties.

35. Broadly speaking, the Director's functions are as follows:

- (a) determining the work programme of the Institute, leading its research team and contributing to its outputs;
- (b) liaison with the Council;
- (c) responsibility for the Institute's publications; approval of subject and content, "quality control";
- (d) external representation of the Institute and following up contacts with other institutions;
- (e) selection and appointment of Institute research staff;
- (f) management and control of the budget;
- (g) managing and ensuring the smooth running of the Institute.

36. On 17th October 1990, it was also decided that, "subject to the views of the Council or its working groups, and depending on the agenda, the Secretary-General would invite the Director of the Institute to attend or be represented at their meetings"<sup>22</sup>.

##### *(b) Research staff*

37. Proposals for the appointment of research staff are sent to the Council by the Director. The Council gives its approval and may also reject an applicant if it feels the latter does not fulfil all the necessary criteria for working in the Institute.

38. Contracts are for three years and may not be renewed and selection of applicants also takes account of nationality distribution. At the time of appointment, priority is given to countries not yet represented. Alongside the nationality criteria, age, experience in the areas of defence, European affairs, international relations and other fields of interest to the Institute are taken into account.

22. Second part of the thirty-sixth annual report of the Council (1st July - 31st December 1990), Document 1265, 19th April 1991.



39. The diversity of geographical origin and age represented in the Institute appears to correspond to the wishes of the Council to enable qualified people from different backgrounds to work together in a European environment. The fixed-term contracts allow a constant flow of staff, even although, according to the Director, it would be desirable to be able to renew contracts, if only for a further year.

40. The activities and functions of the research staff are of varying kinds:

- undertaking research work on topics falling within the province of the Institute and of WEU;
- organising and preparing seminars and other external activities of the Institute;
- follow-up of the Institute's work in a specific field of expertise; for example relations with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean;
- keeping abreast of the current situation in one's own country; establishing contacts with national institutes;
- written or other contributions to the activities of similar institutions in fields relevant to the Institute's activities.

41. Assessment of the work of the research staff and the Institute is carried out in varying ways. The research team itself assesses the documents sent to the Council and undertakes an analysis of seminars and other external activities. There is no formal evaluation of publications, the Chaillot Papers or other written contributions. Acceptance of and interest in these documents from similar institutions, researchers and other recipients is in itself an assessment of the quality of the Institute's work. In certain cases the advice of experts outside the Institute may be sought on specific subjects.

42. Alongside its research staff, the Institute also accepts, for short periods (normally three months) award-holders working on subjects relating to European security and WEU, selected according to their academic attainments and their experience in political and military research. They may participate in the preparation and organisation of seminars and the results of their research may be published in the Chaillot Papers.

#### (c) *Organogram and budget*

43. In 1990, the Institute's organogram consisted of 23 posts: the Director (hors grade), the Head of Administration (grade A), four research staff (grade A), two translators (grade L), secretaries, an accountant and a member of staff in charge of documentation (grade B) and six grade C staff. In 1994, the Institute has 26 posts, includ-

ing two part-time posts. A revision of the staff rules was required to accommodate the part-time contracts.

44. Within the Institute, it is perhaps more appropriate to refer to an intellectual hierarchy than one of grades or responsibility. With the exception of the Director, for obvious reasons, relations between research staff are rather the product of their personal experience and background than of an administrative grading system.

45. The Institute's budget has shown modest regular increases over the years: F 11 380 000 for 1990, F 12 908 400 for 1991, F 13 516 000 for 1992, F 15 205 000 for 1993 and F 15 676 050 for 1994<sup>23</sup>. These increases correspond to the expansion in the activities of the Institute, particularly in relation to travel and increased contacts with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean.

46. So far, the Institute is just able to live within its budget. Nevertheless, the enlargement of WEU and the development of associate member, associate partner and observer statuses will have an impact on the activities and functioning of the Institute, which will lead to an increased budgetary requirement.

#### (ii) *Activities*

##### (a) *Reports and studies for the Council*

47. The Institute works in a spirit of intellectual independence without being submitted to direct control by the Council as regards choice of topics and the manner of dealing with them. The latter is entitled to request the Institute to provide it with studies and other work on questions within its specialist remit. These requests give rise to a dialogue between the Institute and the Council on the topic to be dealt with in which the ideas and suggestions of the two parties are taken into consideration.

48. Equally, the Institute may take the initiative towards the Council, as this also falls within the framework of the Institute's powers. As a research institute its rôle is to monitor current developments and indicate subjects deserving of attention to the Council. The studies are in response to a need for information and provide the Council with conceptual tools (as, for example, in relation to associate partner status and the development of relations with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe).

##### (b) *Other studies and works*

49. In addition to the preparation of documents for the Council, the Institute also co-operates with other institutions in preparing studies within its

23. Opinion on the budgets of the ministerial organs: 1990-1994, Documents 1264, 1303, 1399 and 1425.

purview. These studies are undertaken either at the initiative of the Institute or in co-operation with national or international research institutes. The topics are discussed and selected at meetings of the research team.

50. Thus the Institute prepared a study on the settlement of the crisis in former Yugoslavia at the request of Lord Owen within the context of the International Conference on Former Yugoslavia in 1994. Another example, on co-operation, is the research into transatlantic relations produced in conjunction with the Rand Corporation (United States, 1993).

51. Some of the Institute's research is published in book form (for example, the study on transatlantic relations) and in its Chaillot Papers. These publications are directed principally towards governmental organisations (in WEU member countries and other countries with which the Institute has contact), research institutions and the like active in the fields of defence and international relations (both public and private bodies), universities, parliaments and the press.

52. As a general rule, the Chaillot Papers, which are published five or six times a year, cover topical subjects, are intended to have policy relevance and seek to express a European rather than a national point of view. These works are well-received in specialist circles as illustrated by their reviews in the specialist press or the use made of them by universities and other such institutions in their own work.

*(c) Seminars and study groups*

53. One of the most important activities of the Institute is organising seminars and study groups on European security and other related matters (minorities, nuclear and ballistic proliferation, co-operation between regional and international organisations, etc.).

54. A number of seminars are held each year. The open seminars are directed towards a larger audience including participants from other research institutes as well as the governments of WEU member countries, associate partners and observers. In addition, representatives are invited from other European organisations. The restricted seminars are open only to senior civil servants in the defence and foreign affairs ministries of WEU member countries and other countries, as determined by the subject under discussion.

55. These activities enable the Institute to become better known and to develop its contacts abroad (with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean and Asia). The seminars are held in Paris and sometimes in other countries. The subjects dealt with are prepared by the research team on the basis of documents and studies by the Institute and may be published in a Chaillot Paper.

56. The study groups bring together Institute members and specialists from government bodies (such as the armed forces, foreign affairs specialists, etc.) or from other research institutes and the universities. Some of these groups (task forces) operate on a virtually permanent basis, their work extending over several months (such as, for example, research work into the defence industries, in preparation for a seminar on this topic in 1995). The subjects tackled, which may form the basis of a Chaillot Paper, relate to questions concerning WEU and the security and defence of Europe in a wider, non-exhaustive perspective (problems pertaining to the Mediterranean, for example).

57. The seminars and study group activities are subject to regular assessment by the Institute and reports are sent to the Council on the outcome of such assessments, together with the seminar or study group conclusions on the subject under discussion.

*(d) The Institute's external relations*

58. Since 1990 the Institute has established a wide network of contacts with other similar institutions, universities, international and regional organisations in Europe and on other continents.

59. The Institute has close relations with research institutes in the member, associate member, associate partner and observer countries. It is strengthening its relations with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Baltic states and developing contacts with institutes in the Maghreb countries and Egypt.

60. Initiatives in this area are many and varied. The Institute also offers researchers from non-member countries the opportunity of working in other European research institutions through a programme of research awards. It also supports the organisation of conferences and training courses for senior political and military officials of the countries with which it co-operates.

61. Beyond the circle of WEU member countries and others with links with the organisation, the Institute has on-going relationships with several political and military research institutes in Russia and with the Rand Corporation, in the United States.

62. As regards international and regional organisations, the Institute has contacts with the European Union, NATO, the CSCE and the United Nations including the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in Geneva. This list is by no means exhaustive and the Institute's energetic efforts in this area are amply demonstrated by the range and frequency of its outside activities.

#### IV. Achievements and prospects

63. The Institute has established itself firmly on the European security and defence research scene where it is vigorously accomplishing the tasks assigned to it by the Council within the limits of the staffing and material resources available to it. Nevertheless, this success has also raised the question of how the institution should evolve.

64. This issue is one of major importance at a time when WEU is growing, not only by opening up to other European countries, but also in developing its structures and seeking new fields of action, as the creation of the Satellite Centre and the Planning Cell and the transfer of IEPG's responsibilities to WEAG<sup>24</sup> all serve to demonstrate. Such development makes it essential to examine the rôle that the Institute might play in this process.

##### (i) *The Institute and the question of the academy*

65. In spite of its present flexible and efficient structure, the Institute will have difficulties, from a financial and logistical point of view, in meeting the requirements of the enlargement of WEU. Furthermore, the framework in which it operates is far from being that of an academy, a matter to which the Ministers proposed, in their declaration on the rôle of WEU and its relations with the European Union and the Atlantic Alliance, to give consideration.

66. Paragraph C of this text on the operational rôle of WEU states "Other proposals will be examined further, including: ...development of the WEU Institute into a European security and defence academy"<sup>25</sup>. However, the Council has not subsequently clarified further what it meant by the word "academy" nor as to when examination of this question might begin.

67. Transforming the Institute into an academy in fact involves providing it with the structures and means of undertaking a training and teaching rôle in addition to its research work. This approach was developed in the address by Mr. Rocard, then Prime Minister of France, at the first European session of the French Institut des hautes études de défense nationale, on 15th November 1988<sup>26</sup>. In 1991, President Mitterrand and Chancellor Kohl also stated that they were in favour of trans-

forming the Institute into a European security and defence academy<sup>27</sup>.

68. At the same time, this implies a reform of the Institute's structures and logistical and budgetary means in line with the objectives to be achieved. Perhaps for this reason the Council did not yet appear to be in a hurry to reach a clear decision on this matter. However, it is also possible that this lack of action may be due to an absence, within the Council, of a consensus on what the present and future tasks of the Institute should be and on the rôle the latter should have within the European security and defence structures.

69. The ministers' hesitation is in part justified by the forthcoming reviews in 1996 and 1998. The 1996 intergovernmental conference on the European Union, which must to some extent deal with the achievements of the common foreign and security policy (CFSP) will have implications for WEU which, since the Treaty of Maastricht, has been identified as the "defence component of the European Union"<sup>28</sup>.

70. In 1998, the modified Brussels Treaty is due to expire<sup>29</sup>. Under Article XII thereof "after the expiry of the period of fifty years, each of the High Contracting Parties shall have the right to cease to be a party thereto". This does not in any sense mean that the treaty is dissolved, but that any decisions that are taken at the 1996 intergovernmental conference (in which all WEU members will take part) might determine what will happen after 1998.

71. In the meantime, it is difficult to envisage the Institute's transformation into an academy in the short term. Moreover, when reference is made to the various descriptions of its tasks the ministers and the Secretariat-General have presented to the Assembly, all the uncertainties and questions over the future rôle of the Institute immediately become obvious.

72. In these descriptions, some of which are discussed in the first part of this report, the Institute's rôle is considered primarily in a national rather than a European perspective. France has seen it as a political planning cell for producing independent strategic analyses (Mr. Chevènement, June 1989) and for in-depth examination of European defence issues (Mr. Dumas, December 1990), Italy has attributed it "ambitious tasks" of

24. The Western European Armaments Group was formed following a decision by the Council on 4th December 1992 which led to the transfer of the IEPG's activities to WEU.

25. Document 1315: second part of the thirty-seventh annual report of the Council to the Assembly of WEU, Annex III, 25th May 1992.

26. *Défense nationale*, January 1989, page 25.

27. Document 1290: information letter from Mr. van Eekelen, Secretary-General of WEU, on the activities of the ministerial organs, 25th November 1991.

28. Document 1315: second part of the thirty-seventh annual report of the Council to the WEU Assembly, Annex III, 25th May 1992.

29. The start of the fifty year period referred to in Article XII is the subject of a debate in the Assembly and the Council. According to the latter, the treaty period starts from the entry into force of the Brussels Treaty on 17th March 1948.

stimulating ideas and research (Mr. Vitalone, December 1989), Germany has emphasised the rôle that the Institute might play in contacts with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (Mr. Schäfer, December 1989), Belgium considered that it should enable the entire organisation, including therefore the Assembly, to benefit from academic expertise in security matters (Mr. Eyskens, June 1990).

73. Only a United Kingdom minister, Mr. Younger, questioned the need for the Institute (June 1989), but at a time, if truth were known, when discussions on its formation were in progress. The Secretariat-General initially envisaged the Institute as a co-ordinating structure between universities, those responsible for planning and other institutions (Mr. van Eekelen, December 1989). The Assembly envisaged that the Institute should function on two levels: those of research and analysis work and of co-ordinating the European activities of national institutes with similar objectives (Mr. Fourré, Vice-President of the Assembly, June 1989).

74. Once the Institute was established, the matter of its rôle and activities no longer tended to be discussed. The Council makes regular reference to the activities of the Institute in its annual report and in its communiqués and declarations. With the exception of a passing mention in 1991, at the time of the signature of the Maastricht Treaty, no further indications have come from the ministers on the future of the Institute. The Secretary-General referred to the matter in his information letter on the activities of the ministerial organs in 1992, but without giving any details<sup>30</sup>.

75. The Institute, for its part, has submitted proposals for its development into an academy on several occasions, to which the Council has not as yet responded. This issue remains a crucial one for the future of the Institute. Were it to become an academy, its co-ordinating and European rôles would be strengthened and consolidated, contributing to its development and to the emergence of a true European security and defence thinking. As to the Assembly, although suggestions have not been lacking, the fact remains that its relations with the Institute are neither as open nor as close as it would originally have wished.

*(ii) Relations between the Assembly and the Institute*

76. In June 1989, in answer to a question from Mr. Baumel on the future status of the Institute, Mr. Chevènement, then Minister of Defence of France, replied that it would be desirable for this institute to be under WEU's authority. It would

30. Document 1391: information letter from Mr. van Eekelen, Secretary-General of WEU, on the activities of the ministerial organs, 22nd March 1992.

draw up its own programme of work, report to the Assembly and be responsible for its publications."<sup>31</sup>. This reply concurred with the position frequently expressed by the Assembly that the Institute should carry out its work in co-operation with the Assembly.

77. With this in mind, in December 1989, the Assembly, in its Recommendation 474, had requested that the Council "take no measures that may involve relations between the new Institute and the Assembly without securing the latter's prior agreement"<sup>32</sup>. The Council replied that "during its discussions on the practical arrangements for establishing a WEU Institute..." it had taken the Assembly's point of view on that question into account<sup>33</sup> and reiterated its position, when the decision was taken on 13th November to establish the Institute, that "the Assembly may, with the Council's approval, assign to the Institute studies relating to the Assembly's own activities".

78. In point of fact, this effectively limited any possibility of direct co-operation between the Assembly and the Institute or of establishing co-ordination in joint actions in the interest of the two institutions (for example, seminars or developing studies on topics of common interest). The situation, in short, is as follows: if the Assembly has need of the Institute's expertise for a study on a topic within its area of responsibility, the latter must refer to the Council, which will decide, solely on its own criteria, on the appropriateness of such a step. As decisions of the Council are collegiate decisions taken by consensus, the question must necessarily arise of the time-scale required for obtaining a reply, not to mention the matter of on which other topics the Assembly might obtain the Institute's co-operation in such instances.

79. It was inevitable that in this situation areas of disagreement should arise between the Assembly on the one hand and the Council and the Institute on the other, even though the latter is protected by the decisions of the ministers. The first area of disagreement emerged in 1991, when the Presidential Committee requested the Permanent Council and, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General, the Institute, for information on the situation in former Yugoslavia and on the conditions under which WEU might possibly intervene. The Institute could not provide the information requested, not having been authorised to do so by the Council<sup>34</sup>.

31. Thirty-fifth ordinary session: official report of debates, Volume II, June 1989.

32. Document 1233; Recommendation 474 on WEU in the single European market – reply to the half-yearly report of the Council, paragraph 4.

33. *Idem*.

34. Official report of debates, December 1991, second part of the thirty-seventh session of the Assembly.

80. This case in point serves to illustrate the narrowness of the Council's interpretation of the possibilities of co-operation between the Assembly and the Institute. In the four years the two bodies have existed side by side in Paris, the Institute has prepared one document only for the Assembly – on relations with the Central and Eastern European countries, in the framework of the colloquy organised by the Assembly on this topic in Berlin in 1992. A request for a study on national and reserve forces of WEU countries<sup>35</sup> has seemingly also been rejected by the Council.

81. As far as direct relations between the two institutions are concerned, the picture is far from being wholly negative. The Institute endeavours, within the limits that are permissible to it, to inform the Assembly of its research and activities. Parliamentarians and officials of the Office of the Clerk are regularly invited to seminars organised by the Institute and the Chaillot Papers and the Letter of the Institute are sent to the Assembly on a regular basis, thus giving the latter the opportunity of being informed of the Institute's current activities.

82. The Director of the Institute, himself a former member of the Assembly, was invited to speak to the Presidential Committee in 1992, thus contributing his specialist knowledge to a discussion on topics of common interest and he, and his research team, have assisted in preparing the present report. Nevertheless, co-operation between the two institutions is far from satisfactory and its sporadic nature, on a case-by-case basis, is far from meeting the wish for co-operation expressed by the Assembly throughout the process of the Institute's formation and the four years of its existence.

83. In its recommendations, the Assembly has on several occasions asked the Council to request the Institute to study one or other subject and, in so far as possible, to associate the Assembly with its work, particularly in relation to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean. Although the ministers have sometimes accepted its recommendations, the Assembly has never truly been able to profit from the work of the Institute, as it would have wished. This situation is the more reprehensible in that the Assembly, composed of representatives of the national parliaments, is denied any co-operation with the Institute by ministers who are answerable to those same parliamentarians in their respective countries.

35. Recommendation 534 on European security – reserve forces and national service, paragraph 10, 3rd December 1992.

84. Is it conceivable that the British, Spanish or French Governments would seek to prevent their parliaments from approaching a national defence institute to request studies and information on the political and defence orientations of governments? A situation such as this, which is unacceptable at national level, should not be tolerated in WEU.


### *V. Conclusion*

85. Through its work, the reputation of its research for quality and its dynamic contacts in Europe, both in the framework of WEU and beyond, the Institute has fulfilled the hopes engendered by its creation. Discussion must now begin on reforms to consolidate its position as a genuine European research institute. Transforming it into an academy is one possible solution and doubtless the one which can contribute most effectively to the emergence of a real European awareness in security and defence matters which is not simply the existence, side by side, of national positions, a sort of European lowest common denominator.

86. Another option might be to retain the present structure of the Institute and concentrate its activities on developing WEU's contacts with the associate partners and the countries of the Mediterranean, as the Council and also the Assembly have both suggested on several occasions; however, this would restrict the Institute to the rôle of a liaison body with these countries until their status evolved within WEU and the European Union, which does not really correspond to the tasks assigned to it. However praiseworthy the work of the Institute in this area may be it should not be used to gloss over the absence of consensus in the Council as regards WEU's relations with these countries.

87. The Assembly, for its part, intends to pursue its policy of seeking closer and more direct co-operation with the Institute, which is in the interest of the two institutions and of WEU in general. In so doing, it is aware that the Institute is not responsible for any obstacles that might arise. The Institute, on the one hand, should know that it can count on the Assembly to urge the Council to direct its efforts towards reforms that might strengthen every aspect of WEU's operational capabilities – political, military and space, not to mention research and the stimulation of intellectual debate. Together, the Assembly and the Institute are better placed to participate fully in the establishment of a true defence Europe, in the interests of peace and the security of the continent.

---

**IMPRIMERIE  ALENÇONNAISE**  
Rue Édouard-Belin : 4<sup>e</sup> trimestre 1994  
N° d'ordre : 30292

---

**PRINTED IN FRANCE**



