

Military Cooperation in Europe

*From World War Two to the Treaty of the Western
European Union (WEU)*

Engelina Johanna Maria Aimée van Rens
Masterclass Montesquieu Institute: Behind the Scenes of the EU
5 June 2008

PREFACE

The last few months I participated, with much of pleasure, in the Masterclass of the Montesquieu Institute 'Behind the Scenes of the EU'. The information that was presented by several prominent guest speakers inspired me to deepen my knowledge about the history of European cooperation and the background of decision-making in the European Union.

I was very pleased when I heard that my paper would be based on the subject of the first Masterclass-lecture: "From European Community of Coal and Steel to European Union: a historical overview of the development of the EU". This gave me the opportunity to learn more about the historical development of the European military community, a subject that has interested me for some years.

European military cooperation interests me because the first debates on a European army started sixty years ago, right after World War Two. Today, military cooperation in Europe is still an important issue. In 2006 Dutch politician Alexander Pechtold argued that the European Union should have an army to counterbalance the military power of the United States.¹ In this paper I will research the attempts of the political leaders of Western Europe to create the necessary framework for this military cooperation in the first ten years after World War Two.

I would like to thank the Montesquieu Institute for selecting me as one of the participants of the Masterclass, and I wish to convey my special thanks to Lisette Pennavaire.

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
1. Theory	5
2. The United States turns towards Europe	7
2.1 Europe after the Second World War	7
2.2 The foundation of the Treaty of Brussels	8
2.3 The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)	9
3. The debate on the European Defence Community (EDC)	11
3.1 NATO's Forward Defence Strategy	11
3.2 Pleven Plan	12
3.3 Problems of ratification	13
4. The Western European Union (WEU)	15
4.1 A new solution for the issue of West German rearmament	15
4.2 The foundation of the Western European Union	16
4.3 The Treaty of the Western European Union	17
4.4 Undermining the WEU	18
5. Analysis and Conclusion	20
Notes	23
Bibliography	24
Annex I	27
Annex II	31
Annex III	33

INTRODUCTION

After the Second World War Europe was both psychologically and economically exhausted. The continent played only a marginal role on the world stage in the shadow of the two super powers: the United States and the Soviet Union.

The European leaders asked themselves how they could prevent the outbreak of a new war in the future. As the rivalry between the superpowers intensified, it became clear to the European leaders that only European cooperation and the foundation of common European institutions could restore former European influence and would grant European security.

In 1949 Western Europe collaborated in the military, economic and social fields as a result of the Treaty of Brussels. NATO membership moreover secured it against Communism and the Soviet Union. Six years after the foundation of NATO and nine years after the end of the Second World War, the Western European Union (WEU), of which the former aggressor Germany was a member, was founded. This can be seen as an interesting move, because at first sight it does not seem very logical to have yet another military organisation next to the Brussels Treaty and NATO. It is in my opinion even more remarkable that Germany was incorporated in a European military treaty nine years after the Second World War. The central question in this paper is therefore: *“What were the main reasons for the foundation of the intergovernmental Western European Union, nine years after the end of the Second World War?”*

This paper is divided into five chapters. The first chapter shortly outlines the differences between the federal, supranational and intergovernmental views on European cooperation. The second chapter gives an overview of the circumstances in Europe after World War Two, the turn of Western Europe towards the Americans, the foundation of the Treaty of Brussels (the precursor of the Western European Union) and the foundation of NATO. The third chapter deals with the European Defence Community (EDC), one of the most ambitious projects of the advocates of supranational cooperation. The fourth chapter presents the foundation of the Western European Union and gives an outline of how it works. In addition, an overview of the Western European Union after 1955 and an analysis of its status today will be given. In the last chapter I will seek answers as to why the Western European Union was created nine years after the Second World War.

1. THEORY

European cooperation: federalism, supranationalism and intergovernmentalism

The process of European cooperation in the first years after the end of World War Two can be analysed in the light of the following three theories: federalism, supranationalism and intergovernmentalism. I will briefly outline these three views on European cooperation.

Federalism

Bainbridge describes federalism as a form of a political organisation characterised by a division of responsibility between a central authority and component parts –usually states, regions or provinces- enjoying autonomy in certain fields (Bainbridge et al., 2000: 278-279)

Siedentop explains that the character of federalism is the resolve to leave to each locality and region enough authority and power to manage its own affairs while carrying to the centre only enough authority and power to deal with matters of general interest (Siedentop, 2000: 79-94).

MacDonald uses the term federalism to describe those who are favour of a stronger federal government (for example, with governance under the European Union) and weaker national governments. The main goal of the European federalists is, according to MacDonald, to create an integrated Europe based on the creation of new supranational institutions and structures (MacDonald et al., 1999: 5).

Following the end of World War II, several movements, such as the European Movement, advocated the establishment of a European Federation. These federalists campaigned in favour of a directly elected European Parliament and were among the first to put a European Constitution on the agenda. Jean Monnet was among one of the strongest advocates of a full-scale European Union, including political, military and economic cooperation (Davies, 1997: 1083).²

The proposed creation of the European Defence Community (chapter 3) can be considered as an attempt to create a more federal Europe. The EDC required the foundation of a central and supranational authority, and a decrease in national sovereignty, as it would have been unworkable for its members to have independent foreign policies alongside a new European army.

Supranationalism

Supranationalism describes a certain level above that of the nation state, whose powers take precedence over the powers of member states (Jones, 2001: 37). Member states can decide to transfer parts of their sovereignty from the national government to these supranational authorities. Decisions are made by majority voting and have a direct effect on domestic law. The French politicians Robert Schuman and René Pleven, both former French Prime Ministers, can be considered as strong advocates of supranational European cooperation (Davies, 1997: 1083-1084).

Examples of supranational cooperation are the European Defence Community and the European Coal and Steel Community where decisions were taken by majority voting.

Intergovernmentalism

The term intergovernmentalism is used by Bainbridge to describe institutional arrangements and decision making procedures that allow governments to cooperate in specific fields while retaining their national sovereignty (Bainbridge et al., 2000: 329-330). In the institutional bodies, decisions are taken unanimously and every member state has the right to use its veto power to block a decision. The strongest advocate of European intergovernmental cooperation has historically been the United Kingdom, but French Gaullists also had an intergovernmental view on European cooperation (Davies, 1997: 1072-1086).

Examples of intergovernmental organisations are NATO and the Western European Union, where decisions are made unanimously and where national sovereignty is not diminished.

2. THE UNITED STATES TURNS TOWARDS EUROPE

2.1 Europe after the Second World War

The Second World War had disastrous consequences for the European continent. The economy of Western Europe was devastated by the bombings which had destroyed almost all important industrial zones.

The defeat of the Axis powers did however not bring back stability in international relations. The main points of contention were the reconstruction of Eastern Europe, and the future of Germany. The ideological differences between the capitalist West and the communist Soviet Union grew increasingly. It was also unclear what role the United States would play in the new Europe and what the extent of the new Soviet empire would be (Eekelen, 1994: 1).

The political leaders of Western Europe knew that if they wanted to regain their former strength, they had no choice other than to work together in the economic and military fields. Belgium and the United Kingdom felt that the British should lead this economic and military cooperation, with France as its most important partner. Great Britain was the only European successor of World War Two, but was economically and politically too exhausted to take the lead in Western Europe. The French were not qualified as leaders of Western Europe as France had lost World War Two. The aim of the Belgians was close cooperation between the British and the French, so that the British economy could be repaired. This way Great Britain could counter Soviet and American power. The other West European countries had an interest in an European defence strategy under a Franco-British leadership because they felt that it was better than subjecting themselves to Soviet or American influence.

Very quickly however it became clear that the economies of Western Europe did not recover as fast as one had hoped. Also Europe could never defend the continent against the two superpowers, without the help of one of them. Rebuilding Europe under Soviet leadership was not a viable option because of the ideological differences between the West and the East. Western Europe was however equally sceptical about a close cooperation with the United States. On the other hand, the two superpowers had a great interest in Europe as well. The Soviet Union saw Europe as a new breeding ground for communism, while the United States felt that they could benefit economically from rebuilding Europe (Palmer, 1992: 883).

At the same time communist parties were very popular across Western Europe and fared well in the post-war elections, especially in France and Italy (Dinan, 1994: 15-16). The communist threat did not only come from within Western Europe however; some European countries, including Greece and Turkey, encountered serious problems fighting communism.

Great Britain, who financially supported the Greek in fighting communist guerrillas from Yugoslavia, made it clear to the United States that it could no longer bear the high costs of such financial aid (Beliën, 1993: 337).

The U.S. reaction to this call for help was the Truman Doctrine (1947) with which President Harry S. Truman introduced a new direction in U.S. policy.³ The U.S. would provide political, military and economic assistance to all democratic nations under the threat of external and internal authoritarian regimes.

Soon after the Truman Doctrine the Americans set up the European Recovery Programme, also known as the Marshall Plan (Gleason, 1947: 230-239). American aid to bring Europe back on its feet was offered to all European countries, capitalist and communist. Moscow however refused to cooperate with the West and did not allow Eastern Europe to profit from the recovery programme (Belien, 1993: 337). The Marshall Plan was not only important to Europe. The United States benefited from this West European economic recovery as well. Without the economic growth in Europe, American export would decline and could eventually lead to an economic depression in the United States (Gleason et al., 1947: 230-232).

Marshall aid gave the initial impetus to economic cooperation within Europe, because of the foundation of the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC⁴) that allocated the Marshall Aid dollars.

Due to large American investments in Europe, the economies of Western Europe recovered very quickly. Yet at the same time Marshall aid divided Europe even more clearly into the two power blocks: the countries that belonged to the Marshall aid-group, and those that joined the communist Cominform.⁵

2.2 The foundation of the Treaty of Brussels

Tensions between the East and West did not only grew in the economic but also in the military field. This is why the British and the French signed the Treaty of Dunkirk on 4 March 1947 (Bloed et al., 1994: xiii).⁶ The two signatories agreed to give each other mutual support should the event of renewed German aggression show its face again⁷ – even though the assumption of German aggression was hypothetical, and the two countries were more worried about the internal weakness of Western Europe itself (Holland, 1965: p.19). For this reason the Treaty also included possibilities for mutual economic assistance and economic cooperation. The Treaty of Dunkirk was the first Treaty to include military cooperation in Europe. This was very important, as the Treaty formed the basis for the Western European Union.

On 17 March 1948, two weeks after the signing of the Dunkirk Treaty, it was extended to Belgium Luxembourg and the Netherlands, and was renamed the Treaty of Brussels (Bloed

et al., 1994: xiii). It was only several weeks after the communist coup in Prague, which caused a wave of anti-Russian feelings in public opinion (Biscop, 2000: 13).

The Treaty of Brussels (see: annex I) was short in length: it counted only ten articles, but the content was comprehensive and gave the signatories the possibility to defend themselves collectively, and to work together on economic, social and cultural matters. The most important was Article IV which stated that if any of the High Contracting Parties should be the object of an armed attack in Europe, the other High Contracting Parties will give all necessary military assistance and other aid that lays in their power to the country under attack. Essentially, an attack on one of the member states of the Treaty of Brussels constituted an attack on all member states. Another important article was Article VII, which outlined the creation of a Consultative Council to discuss matters covered by the treaty. The Treaty of Brussels still mentioned Germany as the main aggressor, due to the legacy of World War Two, as did the Treaty of Dunkirk, but the Brussels Treaty was in large part signed as a reaction to the growing Soviet threat (www.weu.int).

As said before, the Treaty of Brussels entailed more than mere military cooperation: Articles I, II and III also dealt with political, social and economic aspects.

2.3 The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)

The Treaty of Brussels never really did get off the ground because NATO became an important competitor. In addition, cultural and economic collaboration as outlined in the Treaty of Brussels was advantageous to Western Europe, but not very interesting for the United States (Bloed et al., 1994: xiii).

The United States became increasingly involved in European security and defence after the mounting tensions in Central and Eastern Europe and the Berlin Blockade of May 1948. America did not want Germany, as had been the case at the end of World War One, to remain economically weak and politically isolated, because they felt a stable Western Germany was a necessary prerequisite for European security. The size of its population, its potential industrial capacity, its sheer size and geographical position made Germany an extremely important country. The United States wanted to integrate the Federal Republic of Germany (founded in 1949) into the West European camp and to slowly reconstruct the German economy and sovereignty. Most of the Western European countries, especially France, were not particularly in favour of a rebuilt Germany so soon after the end of World War Two (Holland, 1965: 38).⁸ The French felt it was more important to keep the U.S. army in Europe so that they could protect Western Europe against a possible Soviet (or German) attack. As the United States had not signed the Treaty of Brussels, a new Treaty that included the Americans was deemed necessary by both the United States and the West European countries.

Only two weeks after the signing of the Treaty of Brussels, the discussion on European security was started by the American minister of Foreign Affairs, George C. Marshall. The goal of this was an Atlantic pact, based on mutual assistance and the recognition of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations (www.nato.int).⁹

Nevertheless, when in the summer of 1948 the negotiations for an Atlantic Treaty between the United States and the signatories of the Brussels Treaty started, Belgium and France no longer felt the need of Atlantic cooperation. Essentially, this was because the United States had already promised Europe not to withdraw its troops from Europe. A long-term political pact on military assistance was therefore no longer deemed necessary for either country, as a treaty would not add anything. Substantial. The United States were not amused by this and threatened to end all military assistance to the countries that did not join the new Atlantic organisation. The French knew that European economic and military integration led by Great Britain was not an option however. The British economy was not sufficiently viable and the political situation was not stable enough for the British to take the lead in Europe. In the end there was therefore no other option than to join the Atlantic Alliance. When the draft of the NATO Treaty was nearly finished, Iceland, Italy and Norway were also invited to become member states. On 4 April 1949 the Five of Brussels and the above mentioned three countries, the United States and Canada signed the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington. Signing the NATO Treaty made the turn of Europe towards the United States irreversible. Although the United States had carefully suggested to consider a German military contribution, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) did not become a member of NATO until 1955. The memories of World War Two were still too fresh in 1949 for the French to accept German rearmament.

In 1949 NATO was not the same organisation as it is today, because it did not yet have a political structure, a joint command or military forces for Alliance defense. The most important article of the NATO-Treaty was Article V (see Annex II). Yet this Article was much less far-reaching than Article IV of the Brussels Treaty. The NATO member states were, in case of an armed attack on one of the contracting parties, only expected to take such action as was deemed necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the NATO member states. Article IV of the Brussels Treaty demanded direct military assistance in the case of an attack on one of the member states. Moreover, even though the two Treaties were closely linked together, the NATO Treaty did not include a single reference to the Treaty of Brussels (www.nato.int).

3. THE DEBATE ON THE EUROPEAN DEFENCE COMMUNITY

The European Defence Community was one of the most ambitious projects of the supporters of European unity in the nineteen-fifties. The attempt to build an European army tied to the political institutions of a supranational Europe was nevertheless too ambitious for the time. National armies and the defense of one's own country were key elements of national sovereignty and no Western European country was yet prepared to give them up.

3.1 NATO's Forward Defence Strategy

Although West Germany did not become a member of NATO in 1949, the United States felt that rearmament of West Germany was inevitable in the long run. The integration and rearmament of the Federal Republic of Germany became a pressing matter after the outbreak of the Korean War on 25 June 1950.¹⁰ Western Europe feared that the war in Korea was a diversionary tactic of the communists and that it would force the Americans to send some of their European based troops to Korea. If these troops were transferred to Asia, the Soviet Union could invade the militarily weakened West European countries (Furdson, 1980: 68). The United States felt that what was happening in South-Korea could also happen in Western Europe and they decided to keep their troops in Europe. To form a strong defence against the Soviets, the strategic placing of Western divisions in Europe and in West Germany were thought to be necessary (Birk, 1999: 48-52).

In September 1950, during a meeting of NATO in New York, NATO member states decided to move Europe's defence line as far as possible to the East, somewhere between the Rhine and the Elbe, and to shift their strategic focus towards a forward defence strategy. This new defence strategy would only be successful if the number of troops was increased. The Americans did not have the intention to deliver all additional troops themselves, and made it clear that Europe was to contribute to its own security (McGeenhan, 1971: 48-49).

Enlargement of European troops was not possible without military assistance from West Germany, but a rearmed Germany only five years after World War Two was for no European country very appealing. However, as German military troops were necessary for European defence, the Western European countries decided to sit down and find a solution for the West German rearmament and the possibility of European control of it.

On 26 September 1950 NATO decided that the Federal Republic of Germany was allowed to contribute to European security only if the West European countries could reach consensus on this matter.

3.2 Pleven Plan

German rearmament remained a very delicate topic in France, so the French tried to find a solution that would take into account both American demands and French problems regarding German rearmament. The outcome was the 'Pleven Plan',¹¹ designed in 1950 by the French Prime Minister René Pleven. The Pleven Plan presented a solution for the issue of German rearmament and ruled out a future German policy of aggression. According to the Pleven Plan Germany could contribute to the defence of Europe within a supranational European army -a merger of Europe's armed forces- built on the principle of integration. Pleven wanted to integrate West Germany into a new European structure with supranational institutions, where decisions had to be taken by majority voting. Plans from Robert Schuman to place the production of coal and steel under supranational European control were to be realised by the ECSC. The French proposed to extend this supranational European cooperation to the military field and named it the European Defence Community (EDC) (Marquebielle, 1998: 32-33).

The Pleven Plan did not receive a warm welcome in Europe, and it became clear that many modifications were necessary to make it into a success. For Great Britain the Pleven Plan contained too many supranational elements. West Germany, Italy and the Benelux-countries believed that Europe would be in safer hands with the Americans than in the hands of a European army (Jansen et al., 1985: 107-111).

At the start, the United States were also not in favour of the European Defence Community, as proposed by Pleven. Therefore, the U.S. designed a new plan, the so-called 'Spofford Plan' in December 1950 (Holland, 1965: 55-56).¹² The main goal of the Spofford Plan was to rearm Germany within the framework of NATO and the creation of a European army¹³, without rebuilding a German army (Dockrill, 1992: 204-207).

The negotiations on both the Spofford Plan and on the EDC started at the same time. As mentioned earlier, the United States were no strong supporters of the French plan for a European army, but in the summer of 1951 the United States, under the influence of the first NATO-Commander-in-Chief Dwight D. Eisenhower, changed their views. General Eisenhower convinced the American government that the EDC was the only possibility for the German rearmament and making Western Europe military stronger. The price that West Germany asked for contributing to West European defence was political and military equality in the Western community, which made Great Britain hesitant to pursue the direct inclusion of West German armed forces into NATO (Dockrill, 1992: 207).

Because the British did not support the Spofford Plan, the Americans changed their view and accepted that West Germany would become a member of the European Defence Community instead. In 1952, during a NATO-meeting in Lisbon, the potential member states of the EDC

and NATO member states agreed that, in case of a serious crisis, the EDC and NATO would have joint meetings. In this way West Germany would have temporary access to the NATO Council, if considered necessary (Deighton, 1997: 12-18).

Finally, after a year of negotiations and several amendments, the EDC-Treaty was signed on 27 May 1952.¹⁴ Great Britain did not sign the EDC-Treaty because of its supranational nature. The British however did sign a treaty of assistance, which stated that in the case of an armed attack on one of the EDC-members, they would automatically provide military support.

As a result of the EDC-Treaty, the Occupation Statute of Germany would be neutralised the day after its ratification. West Germany would become a member of the EDC, and all controls and restrictions on German industry would be lifted. German participation in the EDC-Treaty was acceptable to most European countries, because it did not mean that Germany would again have a national army: Germany could only take part in military acts on EDC-level. In addition, Germany was prohibited from producing and possessing of ABC-weapons, military airplanes and certain types of warships.

A European army would be set up, in which the military forces of all member states, with the exception of the military forces in Berlin and those of the European colonies, would be integrated. This European army could be brought into action in Europe. Article 18 of the EDC-Treaty stated that from the moment that they would become operational, EDC-troops would be placed under the supreme command of the NATO-Commander-in-Chief. The Commander-in-Chief would bear complete responsibility of the EDC-army during the wartime.

The Council of Ministers was the most important legislative body in relation to the EDC, as it could propose directives with unanimity of votes to the Commissariat. The intergovernmental nature of the Council of Ministers diminished the supranational character of the European Defence Community. Also, by placing the EDC-troops under the command of the NATO-Commander-in-Chief in time of emergency and crisis, the EDC had an Atlantic rather than a European character (www.ena.lu).

3.3 Problems of ratification

Before the signing of the Treaty it was already clear that its ratification would cause serious problems. Belgium was not satisfied with the amount of democratic control on the EDC. In West Germany pacifistic public opinion was against a rearmament of Germany. Although France was the initiator of the EDC, the National Assembly was not a keen supporter of the Plevin Plan. They felt that the EDC would disadvantage France in comparison to Great Britain the United States and Germany. Most French political parties did not have an interest in the federal Europe of Schuman and Plevin, and were strong supporters of the idea of a

Europe of sovereign nation states such as Charles de Gaulle advocated (Davies, 1997: 1072-1087).

It was therefore not the French but the Americans who became keen advocates of the EDC-Treaty after the elections of Eisenhower as president of the United States in 1953.

Eisenhower saw the EDC as more than a mere vehicle for German rearmament. Thanks to the EDC, a large European land force could be set up, which meant a new division of tasks between the United States and Western Europe. Subsequently, the military presence of the United States on the European continent could be reduced, so they could use their energies primarily on nuclear deterrence. In practise this meant that the United States could reduce their defence budget and that a large part of the troops could return to America. To increase support for the EDC Treaty, the American Congress decided that only countries who ratified the treaty would receive military support from the United States. From March 1953 to July 1954 the national parliaments of Federal Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg and Italy ratified the EDC Treaty.

In France the ratification of the EDC Treaty was postponed several times. The French wanted to make several modifications even though it had already been ratified by the other Western European countries. As time passed, French resistance to the EDC Treaty only grew. French political parties formed a coalition, including the Communists and the Gaullists RPF.¹⁵ This coalition split the Socialists and the Radicals in the National Assembly. This coalition felt that France would not benefit from ratifying the Treaty, as Germany would be rearmed, and the United States and Great Britain would preserve their own armed forces. France however would loose the main symbol of national sovereignty: its national army (Patrick, 1965: 130-161).

In addition, the death of Stalin on 5 March 1953, and the end of the wars in Korea and Indochina caused a period of relative relaxation in the East-West relations. France was no longer dependent on the military support of the United States, which had been crucial during the war in Indochina.

At the day of the vote on 30 August 1954, the French voted against the EDC-Treaty, with 319 votes against versus 264 votes in favour (Judt, 2005: 245). So after four years of negotiations, the French ended the project they themselves had created, the EDC.

4. THE WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION

The foundation of the Treaty of the Western European Union was necessary because the United States continued to feel that West Germany should be rearmed. In 1954 nobody expected that the Western European Union would give an impulse to European integration: the texts of the WEU Treaty and the supplementary protocols looked too complicated and complex.

4.1 A new solution for the issue of West German rearmament

The disaster of the European Defence Community created an emergency situation in Western Europe, because a new alternative for West German rearmament was needed (Adenauer, 1955: 178). The United States threatened to temporarily stop their military support to Europe if Western Europe did not solve the issue of West German rearmament. The British government therefore needed to find a solution that would please both the United States and France. This British solution contained three key elements:

1. West Germany had to be rearmed, because both American defence capacity and American nuclear power were necessary for Europe's security;
2. It was impossible to create a common European defence strategy on a supranational level with British (and French) participation. It was clear that the United Kingdom refused to give up its national sovereignty;
3. France would not accept a common European defence strategy without the participation of Great Britain. The French still feared a resurgence of German militarism without the help of the British (Jansen et al., 1985: 133).

Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary, felt that the whole issue could be solved by integrating West Germany into the Treaty of Brussels and to use this treaty as a vehicle to incorporate it into NATO (Dinan, 1994: p.27). From 28 September until 30 October 1954 the British organised a conference in London, where they presented Eden's plans to the Benelux countries, the United States, Canada, France, Italy and West Germany. The political leaders decided that Italy could join the Brussels Treaty, and West Germany was promised WEU membership (Bloed et al., 1994: p.xiv).

During the London conference the French still had difficulties accepting the inevitable rearmament of West Germany. In the end France had no other choice than to give its approval to Eden's ideas, because most of the controversial parts of the EDC Treaty were not included. The French national sovereignty was preserved and the United States and Britain promised to keep their troops in Europe.¹⁶ The fear for a resurgence of German militarism was to be contained by the guarantee that the rearmament of Germany could only

take place under the rules and strict guidance of the Western European Union (Jansen et al., 1985: 133-134).

4.2 The foundation of the Western European Union

The London negotiations were followed up by the Agreements of Paris and the modified Brussels Treaty on 23 October 1954 (see Annex III). The Western European Union (WEU) was born out of this modified Brussels Treaty.

According to the Agreements of Paris West Germany could become a member of both the WEU and NATO - they did so in 1955 – and would again become a sovereign state. The Occupation Statute of Germany would be abolished with some exceptions: the Allied troops would remain in West Germany; West Germany was not allowed to produce any biological, chemical or nuclear weapons; and the German army was limited to a maximum of twelve divisions, unless otherwise decided by the WEU member states. The United States and Great Britain promised to keep their land and air forces in Europe, unless also decided otherwise by the members of the WEU (see Annex III. Protocol No. III).

The French Parliament was still not totally satisfied with the outcomes of the Paris negotiations. Both American and British promises to keep their troops in Europe was seen as a positive development, but West German rearmament and the possibility of a strong German army and state as a new member of NATO was difficult to come to terms with for the French. The French National Assembly was nevertheless aware that it could not disapprove of a European treaty twice in a row and knew that the intergovernmental WEU had advantages over the supranational EDC. This is why the modified Brussels Treaty (see Annex III), with some complementary demands, was ratified by the National.

The United States did not gain much with the establishment of the Western European Union either. The United States, under president Eisenhower, wished to withdraw a significant number of its troops from the European continent and send them back to the United States. Finally also the United States had a rude awakening because they had to remain their troops in Europe.

In many ways the Western European Union had a more Atlantic character than the EDC. To a great extent, the WEU resembled the Spofford Plan, because West Germany could rearm and was allowed to become a member of NATO. It was also decided that the weaponry controls were to be carried out by NATO. As a consequence West German rearmament was largely controlled by NATO, not by the Western European Union, though the WEU-Council had to approve the removal of conventional limitations.

The complexity of the texts hid the limitations of the Western European Union. For one, the Western European Union was limited to the European continent, which meant that the British

armed forces were kept out of the control of the WEU. Also, the authority for the decree of the amount of NATO troops and the control on these troops lay with NATO (www.weu.int).

4.3 The Treaty of the Western European Union

The Western European Union, as founded in 1954, was an intergovernmental organisation that possessed corporate personality and consisted of the following three organs: the Council of Ministers who made unanimous decisions, the Secretariat conducted by the Secretary General and the Parliamentary Assembly.

The Preamble (see Annex III) of the modified Brussels Treaty enumerated the main goals of the Western European Union:

- The encouragement and preservation of fundamental human rights and democracy;
- The strengthening of the economic, social and cultural ties between the member states;
- Cooperation to preserve the international peace, unity and safety;
- The encouragement of the economic recovery, the integration and the collective defence of Europe.

The reference to a renewed aggression of Germany, as stated in the Preamble of the Brussels Treaty of 1948 was replaced by the more neutral sentence: "...to promote the unity and to encourage the progressive integration of Europe...". The WEU-treaty thereby removed all direct and indirect references to a renewal of German aggression. In comparison to the Brussels Treaty, a new Article IV was added to the modified Treaty that recognised the prime responsibility of NATO for the defence of Europe (www.weu.int).

Initially various aspects of European cooperation were laid down in the modified Brussels Treaty (see Annex III). Article I of the Treaty of WEU spoke about the possibilities to cooperate economically and to coordinate the member states' economic activities. This competence was undermined in the first years after the foundation of the Treaty. Only three years later were the economic activities transferred to the European Economic Community (EEC), because the EEC had a broader goal and more means at its disposal (Bloed et al., 1994: xv).

Articles II and III on a higher standard of living and cultural exchanges were soon adopted by the Council of Europe. The most important political activities were transferred to the EEC in 1972, due to the foundation of the European Political Cooperation (EPC).

All these developments meant that only the main goal of the WEU-Treaty, a collective defence as stated in Article V, was kept. Article V of the modified Brussels Treaty (also stated in Article IV of the Brussels Treaty), was further reaching than Article 5 of the North

Atlantic Treaty. Article V clearly stated what was expected of the WEU member states in case of an armed attack on one of the High Contracting Parties: not only automatically military assistance, but also all other aid and assistance within their power. Article V did however not clearly state what was meant by “other aid and assistance” (Bloed et al., 1994: xvi).

4.4 Undermining the WEU

As described above, only three years after the foundation of the WEU were several tasks transferred to other European institutions, and the WEU was put to sleep for the next thirty years.

After reactivating the Western European Union in 1984, and several missions in the Gulf and in Yugoslavia, the role of the WEU had to be redefined after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. The new role of the WEU was described in the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992, where the Western European Union was presented in Article J.4 as an integrated part of the European Union (Vermande, 1998: 342-343). The WEU was given new crisis management tasks, named the ‘Petersberg tasks’. Next to the collective defence of Europe, the WEU could now also intervene in humanitarian operations, rescue operations, peace keeping and crisis management. The Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) linked the Western European Union even closer to the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation under article 17 of the Treaty of European Union, as amended in Amsterdam. (Drupsteen, 2002: 1171-1172).

The Treaty of Nice (December 2000) however removed the tasks that were given to the WEU under the Treaties of Maastricht and Amsterdam. Under the Treaty of Lisbon the role for the collective defence is likely to be given to NATO. All the subsidiary bodies of the WEU, e.g. the Planning Cell and the Satellite Centre are already transferred to the European Union. Today not much is left of the original Western European Union. What has been remained is:

- A treaty, with as its most important articles, Articles V en VIII.3:

“Article V: If any of the High Contracting Parties should be the object of an armed attack in Europe, the other High Contracting Parties will, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, afford the Party so attacked all military and other aid and assistance in their power.” (see Annex III)

“Article VIII: At the request of any of the High Contracting Parties, the Council shall be immediately convened in order to permit them to consult with regard to any situation which may constitute a threat to peace, in whatever area this threat should arise, or a danger to economic stability.” (See Annex III)

Military Cooperation in Europe
From World War Two to the foundation of the Western European Union (WEU)

- A Council which can theoretically still meet, although this has not happened since 2000.
- The WEU Assembly, which since 2000 acts as the inter-parliamentary European Security and Defence Assembly and focuses on the European Security and Defence Policy and the further development of EU civil and military crisis-management capabilities.
- The WEU member states: 10 member countries, 6 associate member countries, 5 observer countries and 7 associate partner countries (www.weu.int).

5. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The central question in this paper is “*What were the main reasons for the foundation of the intergovernmental Western European Union, nine years after the Second World War?*”

European military, economic and social cooperation started right after World War Two. The war had destroyed the European economies, and it was not yet known what role the United States would play in Europe or what the extent of the Soviet Union's empire would be. To prevent a new war on the European continent, the political leaders felt that they had no other choice than to cooperate in the economic and military field. The economies of Western Europe could only be revived by European cooperation, and a common defence policy was needed to defend Western Europe against the superpowers and Germany. This is why the Benelux countries, France and the United Kingdom signed the Brussels Treaty in March 1948. The Brussels Treaty, including Articles on trade, social and cultural collaboration and collective self-defence and thereby united all nations that were ready to cooperate in order to combat external threats. Soon, after the Berlin Blockade, it became clear that European security could only be guaranteed by the military and nuclear power of the United States. Talks in Washington led to the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in April 1949 and provided Europe with a new security regime.

The foundation of the Brussels Treaty and NATO however did not mean the end of further European cooperation. Attempts were even made to create a European army with supranational institutions. Yet, why did Europe want to deepen European integration, and why was Germany allowed to become one of the WEU member states?

There is one obvious reason that explains why a new European organisation had to set up next to the existing Brussels Treaty and NATO: the American threat to end all military assistance to Western Europe, if Europe did not start contributing to its own security. Within the framework of the Brussels Treaty, Europe already had an opportunity to cooperate militarily. Moreover, NATO's new forward defence strategy implied a permanent military organisation in Europe, and a huge amount of additional troops on the European border to the East. Increasing the number of European troops could not be delivered by the five of Brussels alone, as Great Britain already provided a large amount of troops and the Benelux countries only had small armies. The military assistance of the Federal Republic of Germany was thus needed to fulfil the demands of the United States. Because West Germany was neither part of the Brussels Treaty nor of NATO, and the Occupation Statute did not allow

West Germany to have a national army, a new plan was needed for Germany's rearmament. The foundation of the Western European Union solved this problem.

But why was the Western European Union chosen as the most suitable solution for Germany's rearmament? After all, there were also other plans that dealt with this issue.

In the years 1950 and 1954 three such plans were proposed:

- The Spofford Plan was the solution put forward by the Americans. Its main goal was to rearm the Federal Republic of Germany under NATO. The plan did not succeed because Great Britain did not want Germany to have political and military equality in the Western community.

- The Pleven Plan on the EDC (1950), proposed by the French Prime Minister René Pleven. Pleven, following the ideas of Schuman for a far-reaching package of economic, military and political institutions, wanted to create a European army and integrate Germany into a new European structure of supranational institutions. Decisions were to be taken by majority voting. The production of coal and steel were already to be placed under European control through the European Coal and Steel Community. As with the Pleven Plan, Germany would not have a national army. The idea of the EDC came however too early. In the end, Great Britain and also France were not ready to give up their key symbols of sovereignty, a national army, for the sake of a united and federal Europe.

- The plan of the British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden extended the Brussels Treaty to Italy and West Germany and integrated West Germany on a non discriminatory basis into NATO (1954). According to Eden's plans, West Germany was to have a national army, but its membership of the modified Brussels Treaty (renamed WEU), meant that France and the other member states would have a veto over issues of West German rearmament and arms procurement activities.

The three plans mentioned above give a good overview of the various demands of the Western European countries. They felt that the military field touched closer to their countries' national sovereignty, as oppose to cultural and economic matters.

The United States demanded that Germany had to be rearmed and Great Britain was not ready to transfer national sovereignty to supranational institutions.

Post-war French politics were influenced by Charles de Gaulle, who returned in triumph as Premime Minister of France after World War Two, but left the world of French politics after the rejection of the constitution of the Fourth Republic. The main theme of de Gaulle's foreign

policy was national independence, une Europe des Patries'. The 'Europe des Patries' would work together for their mutual benefit and, as a practical consequence, opposed all forms of supranational European cooperation. Although de Gaulle himself was not involved in French politics in the years 1946-1958, he still had many supporters in the French government and the National Assembly. De Gaulle's supporters had no intention of transferring the command of the national army, a key symbol of their national sovereignty to any supranational institution. In the end, the federal plans of Monnet, Schuman and Pleven on supranational (military) cooperation did not reflect the view of most French politicians. Furthermore, France would not accept military cooperation within Europe without the participation of Great Britain, as they continued to fear a renewal of German aggression.

Conclusion:

Military cooperation in the early years after World War Two was dictated by pure power tactics, sheer necessity of American military support and West German rearmament, and realities of the new world that was created after the Second World War. The WEU was a realistic compromise for Germany's rearmament as decisions were made unanimously, and no European country would have to give up parts of their national sovereignty. The WEU probably did not go far enough for the Federalists, but was the best which the intergovernmentalists could accept.

NOTES

¹ “D66 is een voorstander van een Europees leger. Europa moet ingrijpen in de brandhaarden van deze wereld. Het doel is een tegengewicht te bieden tegen de regering van Bush. Hij heeft zich geprofileerd als een politieagent die geïnteresseerd is in olie, het tot in treurens toe najagen van terroristen en mensenrechten aan zijn laars lapt. Er is één antwoord vanuit Europa nodig.”
See: www.nu.nl/news/872834/2000/Pechtold_vecht_tegen_de_peilingen_vk.html for the interview with Alexander Pechtold.

² Jean Monnet (1888-1979) was an economist and had started his career as the head of his family's brandy business in Cognac. From 1920 to 1923 he was Deputy Secretary-General of the League of Nations and in 1940 he gave Churchill the idea of a Franco-British Union. He believed fervently in fullscale European Union –political and military as well as economic. His goal was to be achieved step by step by what was called ‘functionalism’, that is, by steadily transferring an ever increasing number of functions, or spheres of activity, from national to supranational control. Monnet is often called the Father of Europe (Davies, 1997: p.1083).

³ See www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/harrystrumantrumandocctrine.html for the speech of Harry Truman.

⁴ The OEEC was a forerunner of the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

⁵ The Cominform was founded in 1947 at a communist conference in Poland. The conference was organized by Joseph Stalin as a response to differences between the Eastern European governments about whether or not to attend the Paris Conference on Marshall Aid.

⁶ See www.ena.lu for the full text of the Treaty of Dunkirk

⁷ “to take such steps as may be held necessary in the event of renewal by Germany of a policy of aggression”. (Bloed et al., 1994: p.xiii).

⁸ Robert Schuman: “Germany does not yet have a peace Treaty. She has no army and should not have any”. (Holland, 1965: p.38)

⁹ Charter of the United Nations. “Art. 51. *Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.*”
Source: www.nato.int

¹⁰ The Korean War began in 1950, when North Korean troops, supplied and advised by the Soviet Union and China, invaded South Korea. The United Nations and the United States joined the war on the side of the South Koreans.

¹¹ See www.eu-history.leidenuniv.nl/index.php3?c=51 for the full text.

¹² Named after Charles M. Spofford, Chairman of the Council of Deputies of the United States.

¹³ i.e. to create a European NATO army

¹⁴ See www.ena.lu for the full text of the Treaty Instituting the European Defense Community

¹⁵ The Gaullist RPF were supporters of Charles de Gaulle (Premier of France from 1944-1946 and President from 1958-1969). De Gaulle was an advocate of a strong executive and a jealous guardian of French sovereignty, anti-British, anti-American and initially both anti-German and anti-EEC (Davies, 1997: p.1072).

¹⁶ See: *London and Paris Agreements, September-October (1954)*. Department of State Publication 5659, Government Printing Office, pp. 9-29

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aldrich, R.J. (1992). *British Intelligence, Strategy and the Cold War, 1945-51*. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group
- Bainbridge, T., Teasdale, A. (2000). *The Penguin Companion to the European Union*. London: Penguin Press
- Beliën, H.M. (1993). *Europa in de wereld, een Geschiedenis vanaf 1815*. Rijswijk: Nijgh en van Ditmar
- Birk, E. (1999). *Der Funktionswandel der Westeuropäischen Union (WEU) im europäischen Integrationsprozess*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag
- Biscop, S. (2000). *De integratie van de WEU in de Europese Unie, Europa op weg naar een Europese Defensie Organisatie*. Leuven: Acco
- Bloed, A., Wessel, R.A. (1994). *The Changing Functions of the Western European Union (WEU): Introduction and Basic Documents*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers
- Davies, N. (1997). *Europe: A History*. London: Pimlico
- Deighton, A. (1997). *Western European Union 1954-1997: Defence, Security, Integration*. Oxford: St Antony's College
- Dinan, D. (1994). *Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration*. Houndmills: Palgrave
- Dockrill, S. (1992). Britain's Strategy for Europe: must West Germany be rearmed? 1949-51, in: *British Intelligence, Strategy and the Cold War, 1945-51*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group
- Drupsteen, Th. G. (2002). *Verzameling Nederlandse Wetgeving: Deel I: Staatsrecht, Bestuursrecht. 18^e gewijzigde druk*. Den Haag: Koninklijke Vermande
- Eekelen, E. van (1994). *Debating European Security, 1948-1998*. Den Haag: Sdu-Publishers
- Furdson, E. (1980). *The European Defence Community: A History*. London: MacMillan
- Gleason, E., Aandahl F. (1947). *Foreign Relations of the United States volume 3: Western Europe*. Washington D.c.: Department of State publication

Military Cooperation in Europe
From World War Two to the foundation of the Western European Union (WEU)

Holland, V.M. (1965). *Selected National Policies Regarding European Military Integration, 1945-1955*. Washington: University of Washington

Jansen, M. de Vree, J.K. (1985). *The Ordeal of Unity: The politics of European integration 1945-1985*. Bilthoven: Prime Press

Jones, R.A. (2001). *The politics and economics of the European Union: An introductory text (2nd Edition)*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing

Judt, T. (2005). *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*. New York: Penguin Press

London and Paris Agreements, September-October (1954). Department of State Publication 5659, Government Printing Office

Marquebielle, J.M. (1998). *Western European Union: A European Journey*. Ligugé: Aubin Imprimeur

McDonald, F., Dearden, S. (1999). *European Economic Integration*. London: Longman

McGeenhan, R. (1971). *The German Rearmament Question: American Diplomacy and European Defence After World War II*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press

Palmer, R.R. (1992). *A history of the Modern World*. New York: Mc Graw Hill

Patrick, C.W. (1965). *The American Press and the European Army Plan: A study on the Reaction of the American Press with respect to the European Defense Community 1959-1954*. Genève: University of Genève

Siedentop, L. (2000). *Democracy in Europe*. London: Penguin Press

Vermande (1998). *Vermande Verzameling Nederlandse Wetgeving 1998-1999, deel II, veertiende gewijzigde druk*. Lelystad: Koninklijke Vermande

Magazines

Adenauer, K. (1955). *Germany, the New Partner*. Foreign Affairs, vol. 33, nr. 2, January 1955

Websites

www.assembly-weu.org

Military Cooperation in Europe
From World War Two to the foundation of the Western European Union (WEU)

www.ena.lu

www.eu-history.leidenuniv.nl

www.nato.int

www.weu.int

www.assembly-weu.org

ANNEX I

Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence Signed at Brussels on 17 March 1948

[This Treaty entered into force on 25 August 1948]

Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence between His Majesty in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Belgium, the President of the French Republic, Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, and Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands

His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Belgium, the President of the French Republic, President of the French Union, Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands and His Majesty The King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas,

Resolved

To reaffirm their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the other ideals proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations;

To fortify and preserve the principles of democracy, personal freedom and political liberty, the constitutional traditions and the rule of law, which are their common heritage;

To strengthen, with these aims in view, the economic, social and cultural ties by which they are already united;

To co-operate loyally and to co-ordinate their efforts to create in Western Europe a firm basis for European economic recovery;

To afford assistance to each other, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in maintaining international peace and security and in resisting any policy of aggression;

To take such steps as may be held to be necessary in the event of a renewal by Germany of a policy of aggression;

To associate progressively in the pursuance of these aims other States inspired by the same ideals and animated by the like determination;

Desiring for these purposes to conclude a treaty for collaboration in economic, social and cultural matters and for collective self-defence;

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Belgium

His Excellency Mr. Paul-Henri SPAAK, Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Mr. Gaston EYSKENS, Minister of Finance,

The President of the French Republic, President of the French Union

His Excellency Mr. Georges BIDAULT, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Mr. Jean DE HAUTECLOCQUE, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the French Republic in Brussels,

Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg

His Excellency Mr. Joseph BECH, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Mr. Robert ALS, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Luxembourg in Brussels,

Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands

His Excellency Baron C. G. W. H. VAN BOETZELAER VAN OOSTERHOUT, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Baron Binnert Philip VAN HARINXMA THOE SLOOTEN, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Netherlands in Brussels,

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
The Right Honourable Ernest BEVIN, Member of Parliament, Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and
His Excellency Sir George William RENDEL, K.C.M.G., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of His Britannic Majesty in Brussels,

who, having exhibited their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:-

ARTICLE I

Convinced of the close community of their interests and of the necessity of uniting in order to promote the economic recovery of Europe, the High Contracting Parties will so organize and co-ordinate their economic activities as to produce the best possible results, by the elimination of conflict in their economic policies, the co-ordination of production and the development of commercial exchanges. The co-operation provided for in the preceding paragraph, which will be effected through the Consultative Council referred to in Article VII as well as through other bodies, shall not involve any duplication of, or prejudice to, the work of other economic organizations in which the High Contracting Parties are or may be represented but shall on the contrary assist the work of those organizations.

ARTICLE II

The High Contracting Parties will make every effort in common, both by direct consultation and in specialized agencies, to promote the attainment of a higher standard of living by their peoples and to develop on corresponding lines the social and other related services of their countries. The High Contracting Parties will consult with the object of achieving the earliest possible application of recommendations of immediate practical interest, relating to social matters, adopted with their approval in the specialized agencies. They will endeavour to conclude as soon as possible conventions with each other in the sphere of social security.

ARTICLE III

The High Contracting Parties will make every effort in common to lead their peoples towards a better understanding of the principles which form the basis of their common civilization and to promote cultural exchanges by conventions between themselves or by other means.

ARTICLE IV

If any of the High Contracting Parties should be the object of an armed attack in Europe, the other High Contracting Parties will, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, afford the Party so attacked all the military and other aid and assistance in their power.

ARTICLE V

All measures taken as a result of the preceding Article shall be immediately reported to the Security Council. They shall be terminated as soon as the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. The present Treaty does not prejudice in any way the obligations of the High Contracting Parties under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

ARTICLE VI

The High Contracting Parties declare, each so far as he is concerned, that none of the international engagements now in force between him and any other of the High Contracting Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of the present Treaty.

None of the High Contracting Parties will conclude any alliance or participate in any coalition directed against any other of the High Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE VII

For the purpose of consulting together on all the questions dealt with in the present Treaty, the High Contracting Parties will create a Consultative Council, which shall be so organized as to be able to exercise its functions continuously. The Council shall meet at such times as it shall deem fit. At the request of any of the High Contracting Parties, the Council shall be immediately convened in order to permit the High Contracting Parties to consult with regard to any situation which may constitute a threat to peace, in whatever area this threat should arise; with regard to the attitude to be adopted and the steps to be taken in case of a renewal by Germany of an aggressive policy; or with regard to any situation constituting a danger to economic stability.

ARTICLE VIII

In pursuance of their determination to settle disputes only by peaceful means, the High Contracting Parties will apply to disputes between themselves the following provisions: The High Contracting Parties will, while the present Treaty remains in force, settle all disputes falling within the scope of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice by referring them to the Court, subject only, in the case of each of them, to any reservation already made by that party when accepting this clause for compulsory jurisdiction to the extent that that Party may maintain the reservation. In addition, the High Contracting Parties will submit to conciliation all disputes outside the scope of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. In the case of a mixed dispute involving both questions for which conciliation is appropriate and other questions for which judicial settlement is appropriate, any Party to the dispute shall have the right to insist that the judicial settlement of the legal questions shall precede conciliation. The preceding provisions of this Article in no way affect the application of relevant provisions or agreements prescribing some other method of pacific settlement.

ARTICLE IX

The High Contracting Parties may, by agreement, invite any other State to accede to the present Treaty on conditions to be agreed between them and the State so invited. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing an instrument of accession with the Belgian Government. The Belgian Government will inform each of the High Contracting Parties of the deposit of each instrument of accession.

ARTICLE X

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Belgian Government. It shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of the last instrument of ratification and shall thereafter remain in force for fifty years. 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 provided that he shall have previously given one year's notice of denunciation to the Belgian Government. The Belgian Government shall inform the Governments of the other High Contracting Parties of the deposit of each instrument of ratification and of each notice of denunciation.

In witness whereof, the above-mentioned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done at Brussels, this seventeenth day of March 1948, in English and French, each text being equally authentic, in a single copy which shall remain deposited in the archives of the Belgian Government and of which certified copies shall be transmitted by that Government to each of the other signatories.

For Belgium:

Military Cooperation in Europe
From World War Two to the foundation of the Western European Union (WEU)

(L.S.) P.H. SPAAK.
(L.S.) G. EYSKENS.

For France:
(L.S.) BIDAULT.
(L.S.) J. de HAUTECLOCQUE.

For Luxembourg:
(L.S.) Jos. BECH.
(L.S.) ROBERT ALS.

For the Netherlands:
(L.S.) W. van BOETZELAER.
(L.S.) van HARINXMA thoe SLOOTEN.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
(L.S.) ERNEST BEVIN.
(L.S.) GEORGE RENDEL.

C. Nine-power Conference Documents

28 September - 3 October 1954

The Final Act of the Nine-Power Conference, held in London between 28 September and 3 October 1954
Annex I

Draft Declaration inviting the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy to Accede to the Brussels Treaty
Annex II

A. Statement by the United States Secretary of State (the Hon. John Foster Dulles) at the Fourth Plenary Meeting
B. Statement by the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (the Right Hon. Anthony Eden, MP), at the Fourth Plenary Meeting
C. Statement by the Canadian Minister for External Affairs (the Hon. Lester Pearson) at the Fourth Plenary Meeting
Annex III

Conference Paper on "A German Defence Contribution and Arrangements to Apply to SACEUR's Forces on the Continent"

D. Other Documents

11 May 1955

Agreement on the Status of Western European Union, National Representatives and International Staff, signed at Paris on 11 May 1955
Annexes

Declaration by the Governments of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands

Declaration by the Government of Italy

10 March 1955

Message sent by the President of the United States of America to the Governments of Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom

ANNEX II

The North Atlantic Treaty Washington D.C. - 4 April 1949

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security. They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty :

Article 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

Article 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Article 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

Article 5

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security .

Article 6

For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack:

- on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France, on the territory of or on the Islands under the jurisdiction of any of the Parties in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer;
- on the forces, vessels, or aircraft of any of the Parties, when in or over these territories or any other area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the Parties were stationed on the date when the Treaty entered into force or the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

Article 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

Article 9

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall be so organised as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The Council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defence committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

Article 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other States on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.

Article 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

Article 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of other signatories.

1. The definition of the territories to which Article 5 applies was revised by Article 2 of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey signed on 22 October 1951.
2. On January 16, 1963, the North Atlantic Council noted that insofar as the former Algerian Departments of France were concerned, the relevant clauses of this Treaty had become inapplicable as from July 3, 1962.
3. The Treaty came into force on 24 August 1949, after the deposition of the ratifications of all signatory states.

ANNEX III

The Modified Brussels Treaty Paris, 23 October 1954

(The Brussels Treaty signed on 17 March 1948 was amended by the Paris Agreements signed on 23 October 1954)

[The High Contracting Parties,]

Resolved:

To reaffirm their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the other ideals proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations;

To fortify and preserve the principles of democracy, personal freedom and political liberty, the constitutional traditions and the rule of law, which are their common heritage;

To strengthen, with these aims in view, the economic, social and cultural ties by which they are already united;

To co-operate loyally and to co-ordinate their efforts to create in Western Europe a firm basis for European economic recovery;

To afford assistance to each other, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in maintaining international peace and security and in resisting any policy of aggression;

To promote the unity and to encourage the progressive integration of Europe;

To associate progressively in the pursuance of these aims other States inspired by the same ideals and animated by the like determination;

Desiring for these purposes to conclude a treaty for collaboration in economic, social and cultural matters and for collective self-defence;

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

Convinced of the close community of their interests and of the necessity of uniting in order to promote the economic recovery of Europe, the High Contracting Parties will so organise and co-ordinate their economic activities as to produce the best possible results, by the elimination of conflict in their economic policies, the co-ordination of production and the development of commercial exchanges.

The co-operation provided for in the preceding paragraph, which will be effected through the Council referred to in Article VIII, as well as through other bodies, shall not involve any duplication of, or prejudice to, the work of other economic organisations in which the High Contracting Parties are or may be represented but shall on the contrary assist the work of those organisations.

Article II

The High Contracting Parties will make every effort in common, both by direct consultation and in specialised agencies, to promote the attainment of a higher standard of living by their peoples and to develop on corresponding lines the social and other related services of their countries.

The High Contracting Parties will consult with the object of achieving the earliest possible application of recommendations of immediate practical interest, relating to social matters, adopted with their approval in the specialised agencies.

They will endeavour to conclude as soon as possible conventions with each other in the sphere of social security.

Article III

The High Contracting Parties will make every effort in common to lead their peoples towards a better understanding of the principles which form the basis of their common civilisation and to promote cultural exchanges by conventions between themselves or by other means.

Article IV

In the execution of the Treaty, the High Contracting Parties and any Organs established by Them under the Treaty shall work in close co-operation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. Recognising the undesirability of duplicating the military staffs of NATO, the Council and its Agency will rely on the appropriate military authorities of NATO for information and advice on military matters.

Article V

If any of the High Contracting Parties should be the object of an armed attack in Europe, the other High Contracting Parties will, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, afford the Party so attacked all the military and other aid and assistance in their power.

Article VI

All measures taken as a result of the preceding Article shall be immediately reported to the Security Council. They shall be terminated as soon as the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

The present Treaty does not prejudice in any way the obligations of the High Contracting Parties under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Article VII

The High Contracting Parties declare, each so far as he is concerned, that none of the international engagements now in force between him and any other of the High Contracting Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of the present Treaty.

None of the High Contracting Parties will conclude any alliance or participate in any coalition directed against any other of the High Contracting Parties.

Article VIII

1. For the purposes of strengthening peace and security and of promoting unity and of encouraging the progressive integration of Europe and closer co-operation between Them and with other European organisations, the High Contracting Parties to the Brussels Treaty shall create a Council to consider matters concerning the execution of this Treaty and of its Protocols and their Annexes.

2. This Council shall be known as the "Council of Western European Union"; it shall be so organised as to be able to exercise its functions continuously; it shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be considered necessary: in particular it shall establish immediately an Agency for the Control of Armaments whose functions are defined in Protocol No. IV.

3. At the request of any of the High Contracting Parties the Council shall be immediately convened in order to permit Them to consult with regard to any situation which may constitute a threat to peace, in whatever area this threat should arise, or a danger to economic stability.

4. The Council shall decide by unanimous vote questions for which no other voting procedure has been or may be agreed. In the cases provided for in Protocols II, III and IV it will follow the various voting procedures, unanimity, two-thirds majority, simple majority, laid down therein. It will decide by simple majority questions submitted to it by the Agency for the Control of Armaments.

Article IX

The Council of Western European Union shall make an annual report on its activities and in particular concerning the control of armaments to an Assembly composed of representatives of the Brussels Treaty Powers to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

Article X

In pursuance of their determination to settle disputes only by peaceful means, the High Contracting Parties will apply to disputes between themselves the following provisions:

The High Contracting Parties will, while the present Treaty remains in force, settle all disputes falling within the scope of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, by referring them to the Court, subject only, in the case of each of them, to any reservation already made by that Party when accepting this clause for compulsory jurisdiction to the extent that that Party may maintain the reservation.

In addition, the High Contracting Parties will submit to conciliation all disputes outside the scope of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

In the case of a mixed dispute involving both questions for which conciliation is appropriate and other questions for which judicial settlement is appropriate, any Party to the dispute shall have the right to insist that the judicial settlement of the legal questions shall precede conciliation.

The preceding provisions of this Article in no way affect the application of relevant provisions or agreements prescribing some other method of pacific settlement.

Article XI

The High Contracting Parties may, by agreement, invite any other State to accede to the present Treaty on conditions to be agreed between them and the State so invited.

Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing an instrument of accession with the Belgian Government.

The Belgian Government will inform each of the High Contracting Parties of the deposit of each instrument of accession.

Article XII

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Belgian Government.

It shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of the last instrument of ratification and shall thereafter remain in force for fifty years.

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 provided that he shall have previously given one year's notice of denunciation to the Belgian Government.

The Belgian Government shall inform the Governments of the other High Contracting Parties of the deposit of each instrument of ratification and of each notice of denunciation.

2. Background References

A. 1954 Paris Agreements

Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty

His Majesty the King of the Belgians, the President of the French Republic, President of the French Union, Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands and Her Majesty The Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth, Parties to the Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence, signed at Brussels on March 17, 1948, hereinafter referred to as the Treaty, on the one hand, and the President of the Federal Republic of Germany and the President of the Italian Republic on the other hand,

Inspired by a common will to strengthen peace and security;

Desirous to this end of promoting the unity and of encouraging the progressive integration of Europe;

Convinced that the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Italian Republic to the Treaty will represent a new and substantial advance towards these aims;

Having taken into consideration the decisions of the London Conference as set out in the Final Act of October 3, 1954, and its Annexes;

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

His Majesty the King of the Belgians

His Excellency M. Paul-Henri Spaak, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The President of the French Republic, President of the French Union

His Excellency M. Pierre Mendès-France, Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The President of the Federal Republic of Germany

His Excellency Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Federal Chancellor, Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The President of the Italian Republic

His Excellency M. Gaetano Martino, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg
His Excellency M. Joseph Bech, Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands
His Excellency M. Johan Willem Beyen, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Her Majesty The Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland The Right Honourable Sir Anthony Eden, K.G., M.C., Member of Parliament, Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Who, having exhibited their full powers found in good and due form,
Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Federal Republic of Germany and the Italian Republic hereby accede to the Treaty as modified and completed by the present Protocol.

The High Contracting Parties to the present Protocol consider the Protocol on Forces of Western European Union (hereinafter referred to as Protocol No. II), the Protocol on the Control of Armaments and its Annexes (hereinafter referred to as Protocol No. III), and the Protocol on the Agency of Western European Union for the Control of Armaments (hereinafter referred to as Protocol No. IV) to be an integral part of the present Protocol.

ARTICLE II

The sub-paragraph of the preamble to the Treaty: "to take such steps as may be held necessary in the event of renewal by Germany of a policy of aggression" shall be modified to read: "to promote the unity and to encourage the progressive integration of Europe".

The opening words of the second paragraph of Article I shall read: "The co-operation provided for in the preceding paragraph, which will be effected through the Council referred to in Article VIII ...".

ARTICLE III

The following new Article shall be inserted in the Treaty as Article IV: "In the execution of the Treaty the High Contracting Parties and any organs established by Them under the Treaty shall work in close co-operation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

"Recognising the undesirability of duplicating the military staffs of NATO, the Council and its Agency will rely on the appropriate Military Authorities of NATO for information and advice on military matters". Articles IV, V, VI and VII of the Treaty will become respectively Articles V, VI, VII and VIII.

ARTICLE IV

Article VIII of the Treaty (formerly Article VII) shall be modified to read as follows:

«For the purposes of strengthening peace and security and of promoting unity and of encouraging the progressive integration of Europe and closer co-operation between Them and with other European organisations, the High Contracting Parties to the Brussels Treaty shall create a Council to consider matters concerning the execution of this Treaty and of its Protocols and their Annexes.

«This Council shall be known as the 'Council of Western European Union'; it shall be so organised as to be able to exercise its functions continuously; it shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be considered necessary: in particular, it shall establish immediately an Agency for the Control of Armaments whose functions are defined in Protocol No. IV.

«At the request of any of the High Contracting Parties the Council shall be immediately convened in order to permit Them to consult with regard to any situation which may constitute a threat to peace, in whatever area this threat should arise, or a danger to economic stability.

«The Council shall decide by unanimous vote questions for which no other voting procedure has been or may be agreed. In the cases provided for in Protocols II, III and IV it will follow the various voting procedures, unanimity, two-thirds majority, simple majority, laid down therein. It will decide by simple majority questions submitted to it by the Agency for the Control of Armaments.»

ARTICLE V

A new Article shall be inserted in the Treaty as Article IX: "The Council of Western European Union shall make an Annual Report on its activities and in particular concerning the control of armaments to an Assembly composed of representatives of the Brussels Treaty Powers to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe".

The Articles VIII, IX and X of the Treaty shall become respectively Articles X, XI and XII.

ARTICLE VI

The present Protocol and other Protocols listed in Article I above shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Belgian Government.

They shall enter into force when all instruments of ratification of the present Protocol have been deposited with the Belgian Government and the instrument of accession of the Federal Republic of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty has been deposited with the Government of the United States of America.

The Belgian Government shall inform the Governments of the other High Contracting Parties and the Government of the United States of America of the deposit of each instrument of ratification.

In witness whereof the above-mentioned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Protocol and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done at Paris this twenty-third day of October, 1954, in two texts, in the English and French languages, each text being equally authoritative in a single copy which shall remain deposited in the archives of the Belgian Government and of which certified copies shall be transmitted by that Government to each of the other signatories.

For Belgium:
(L.S.) P.-H. SPAAK.

For France:
(L.S.) P. MENDES-FRANCE.

For the Federal Republic of Germany:
(L.S.) ADENAUER.

For Italy:
(L.S.) G. MARTINO.

For Luxembourg:
(L.S.) JOS. BECH.

For the Netherlands:
(L.S.) J.W. BEYEN.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
(L.S.) ANTHONY EDEN.

Annex I

A. Letter Concerning the Application and Interpretation of Article X of the Modified Brussels Treaty, Addressed by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Other Governments Signatory to the Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty

B. Reply to the Letter of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany by the other Governments signatory to the Protocol modifying and completing the Brussels Treaty

Annex II

A. Letter Concerning the Application and Interpretation of Article X of the Modified Brussels Treaty, Addressed by the Government of Italy to the Other Governments Signatory to the Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty

B. Reply to the Letter of the Government of Italy by the Other Governments Signatory to the Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty

Military Cooperation in Europe
From World War Two to the foundation of the Western European Union (WEU)

Protocol No. II on Forces of Western European Union
Agreement Drawn up on 14 December 1957 in Implementation of Article V of Protocol No. II of the Brussels Treaty as modified by the Protocols signed at Paris on October 23, 1954

Protocol No. III on the Control of Armaments

Protocol No. IV on the Agency of Western European Union for the Control of Armaments

Declaration Inviting Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany to Accede to the Brussels Treaty

B. Brussels Treaty

Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence

Signed at Brussels on 17 March 1948

[This Treaty entered into force on 25 August 1948]

Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence between His Majesty in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Belgium, the President of the French Republic, Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, and Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands

His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Belgium, the President of the French Republic, President of the French Union, Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands and His Majesty The King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas,

Resolved

To reaffirm their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the other ideals proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations;

To fortify and preserve the principles of democracy, personal freedom and political liberty, the constitutional traditions and the rule of law, which are their common heritage;

To strengthen, with these aims in view, the economic, social and cultural ties by which they are already united;

To co-operate loyally and to co-ordinate their efforts to create in Western Europe a firm basis for European economic recovery;

To afford assistance to each other, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in maintaining international peace and security and in resisting any policy of aggression;

To take such steps as may be held to be necessary in the event of a renewal by Germany of a policy of aggression;

To associate progressively in the pursuance of these aims other States inspired by the same ideals and animated by the like determination;

Desiring for these purposes to conclude a treaty for collaboration in economic, social and cultural matters and for collective self-defence;

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Belgium

His Excellency Mr. Paul-Henri SPAAK, Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Mr. Gaston EYSKENS, Minister of Finance,

The President of the French Republic, President of the French Union

His Excellency Mr. Georges BIDAULT, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Mr. Jean DE HAUTELOCQUE, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the French Republic in Brussels,

Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg

His Excellency Mr. Joseph BECH, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Mr. Robert ALS, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Luxembourg in Brussels,

Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands

His Excellency Baron C. G. W. H. VAN BOETZELAER VAN OOSTERHOUT, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Baron Binnert Philip VAN HARINXMA THOE SLOOTEN, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Netherlands in Brussels,

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The Right Honourable Ernest BEVIN, Member of Parliament, Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and

His Excellency Sir George William RENDEL, K.C.M.G., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of His Britannic Majesty in Brussels,

who, having exhibited their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:-

ARTICLE I

Convinced of the close community of their interests and of the necessity of uniting in order to promote the economic recovery of Europe, the High Contracting Parties will so organize and co-ordinate their economic activities as to produce the best possible results, by the elimination of conflict in their economic policies, the co-ordination of production and the development of commercial exchanges. The co-operation provided for in the preceding paragraph, which will be effected through the Consultative Council referred to in Article VII as well as through other bodies, shall not involve any duplication of, or prejudice to, the work of other economic organizations in which the High Contracting Parties are or may be represented but shall on the contrary assist the work of those organizations.

ARTICLE II

The High Contracting Parties will make every effort in common, both by direct consultation and in specialized agencies, to promote the attainment of a higher standard of living by their peoples and to develop on corresponding lines the social and other related services of their countries.

The High Contracting Parties will consult with the object of achieving the earliest possible application of recommendations of immediate practical interest, relating to social matters, adopted with their approval in the specialized agencies.

They will endeavour to conclude as soon as possible conventions with each other in the sphere of social security.

ARTICLE III

The High Contracting Parties will make every effort in common to lead their peoples towards a better understanding of the principles which form the basis of their common civilization and to promote cultural exchanges by conventions between themselves or by other means.

ARTICLE IV

If any of the High Contracting Parties should be the object of an armed attack in Europe, the other High Contracting Parties will, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, afford the Party so attacked all the military and other aid and assistance in their power.

ARTICLE V

All measures taken as a result of the preceding Article shall be immediately reported to the Security Council. They shall be terminated as soon as the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

The present Treaty does not prejudice in any way the obligations of the High Contracting Parties under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

ARTICLE VI

The High Contracting Parties declare, each so far as he is concerned, that none of the international engagements now in force between him and any other of the High Contracting Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of the present Treaty.
None of the High Contracting Parties will conclude any alliance or participate in any coalition directed against any other of the High Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE VII

For the purpose of consulting together on all the questions dealt with in the present Treaty, the High Contracting Parties will create a Consultative Council, which shall be so organized as to be able to exercise its functions continuously. The Council shall meet at such times as it shall deem fit.
At the request of any of the High Contracting Parties, the Council shall be immediately convened in order to permit the High Contracting Parties to consult with regard to any situation which may constitute a threat to peace, in whatever area this threat should arise; with regard to the attitude to be adopted and the steps to be taken in case of a renewal by Germany of an aggressive policy; or with regard to any situation constituting a danger to economic stability.

ARTICLE VIII

In pursuance of their determination to settle disputes only by peaceful means, the High Contracting Parties will apply to disputes between themselves the following provisions:
The High Contracting Parties will, while the present Treaty remains in force, settle all disputes falling within the scope of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice by referring them to the Court, subject only, in the case of each of them, to any reservation already made by that party when accepting this clause for compulsory jurisdiction to the extent that that Party may maintain the reservation.
In addition, the High Contracting Parties will submit to conciliation all disputes outside the scope of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.
In the case of a mixed dispute involving both questions for which conciliation is appropriate and other questions for which judicial settlement is appropriate, any Party to the dispute shall have the right to insist that the judicial settlement of the legal questions shall precede conciliation.
The preceding provisions of this Article in no way affect the application of relevant provisions or agreements prescribing some other method of pacific settlement.

ARTICLE IX

The High Contracting Parties may, by agreement, invite any other State to accede to the present Treaty on conditions to be agreed between them and the State so invited.
Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing an instrument of accession with the Belgian Government.
The Belgian Government will inform each of the High Contracting Parties of the deposit of each instrument of accession.

ARTICLE X

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Belgian Government.
It shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of the last instrument of ratification and shall thereafter remain in force for fifty years.
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 provided that he shall have previously given one year's notice of denunciation to the Belgian Government.
The Belgian Government shall inform the Governments of the other High Contracting Parties of the deposit of each instrument of ratification and of each notice of denunciation.

In witness whereof, the above-mentioned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done at Brussels, this seventeenth day of March 1948, in English and French, each text being equally authentic, in a single copy which shall remain deposited in the archives of the Belgian Government and of which certified copies shall be transmitted by that Government to each of the other signatories.

Military Cooperation in Europe
From World War Two to the foundation of the Western European Union (WEU)

For Belgium:
(L.S.) P.H. SPAAK.
(L.S.) G. EYSKENS.

For France:
(L.S.) BIDAULT.
(L.S.) J. de HAUTECLOCQUE.

For Luxembourg:
(L.S.) Jos. BECH.
(L.S.) ROBERT ALS.

For the Netherlands:
(L.S.) W. van BOETZELAER.
(L.S.) van HARINXMA thoe SLOOTEN.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
(L.S.) ERNEST BEVIN.
(L.S.) GEORGE RENDEL.

C. Nine-power Conference Documents

28 September - 3 October 1954

The Final Act of the Nine-Power Conference, held in London between 28 September and 3 October 1954
Annex I

Draft Declaration inviting the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy to Accede to the Brussels Treaty
Annex II

A. Statement by the United States Secretary of State (the Hon. John Foster Dulles) at the Fourth Plenary Meeting
B. Statement by the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (the Right Hon. Anthony Eden, MP), at the Fourth Plenary Meeting
C. Statement by the Canadian Minister for External Affairs (the Hon. Lester Pearson) at the Fourth Plenary Meeting
Annex III

Conference Paper on "A German Defence Contribution and Arrangements to Apply to SACEUR's Forces on the Continent"

D. Other Documents

11 May 1955

Agreement on the Status of Western European Union, National Representatives and International Staff, signed at Paris on 11 May 1955
Annexes

Declaration by the Governments of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands

Declaration by the Government of Italy

10 March 1955

Military Cooperation in Europe
From World War Two to the foundation of the Western European Union (WEU)

Message sent by the President of the United States of America to the Governments of Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom