

THIRD SITTING

Tuesday, 14 June 2005

The sitting was opened at 15.00 with Mrs Papadimitriou, Vice-President of the Assembly, in the Chair.

The PRESIDENT – The sitting is open.

1. Attendance register

The PRESIDENT – The names of those substitutes present at this sitting which have been notified to the President will be published with the list of representatives appended to the minutes of proceedings.

2. Adoption of the minutes

The PRESIDENT – In accordance with Rule 23 of the Rules of Procedure, the minutes of proceedings of the previous sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments on the minutes? ...

The minutes are adopted.

3. Security cooperation between the EU and its eastern neighbours

The PRESIDENT – The next order of the day is the resumed debate on the report of the Political Committee on security cooperation between the EU and its eastern neighbours, Document [1895](#). We will then proceed to vote on the draft recommendation in that document and on the three amendments and two sub-amendments.

The debate is open. I call Mr Bychkov.

Mr BYCHKOV (*Ukraine*) – It gives me great pleasure to congratulate Mr Masseret and Mr Ates, who have done a great job on what is a profoundly important report. The issues raised in the report point us towards our common European future. I want to use this opportunity to express, on behalf of my colleagues in the Parliament of Ukraine as well as millions of Ukrainians, our gratitude to the members of the respected body of the Assembly, who supported our struggle for democracy during those difficult days at the end of last year.

I would also like to express my personal gratitude to Javier Solana, EU High Representative, whose efforts during the negotiations contributed to the success of the peaceful Orange Revolution. That providential event opened to Ukraine the realistic prospect of regaining its place among the commonwealth of European states, a place almost lost to it during the more tragic periods of its history.

The report states that for Ukraine the “Euro-Atlantic choice is a choice of civilisation”. The citizens of Ukraine expressed their support for a system of values that has proved successful in many countries whose representatives are present here. That system of values is the basis for high standards in a number of spheres: economic, social, political and humanitarian.

For the majority of Ukrainians, decisions on enlargement, the formation of a security system, the legal and practical issues which feature in European constitutions are as important as the decisions taken by our Ukrainian authorities. We share the view of the Rapporteurs, outlined in paragraph 42, on the need to enhance cooperation with Ukraine. Such mutually beneficial cooperation could prove indispensable in building the ESDP, since Ukraine’s potential in that field as in many others is great, as the report points out.

Let me make a few points about the parts of the report that need to be more detailed or require improving. First, taking a historical perspective and present trends into account, paragraph 28 should emphasise the fact that Ukraine was the first country to express a willingness to embark on nuclear disarmament. And yet, Ukraine still has not received full compensation for the value of material lost. Moreover, Ukraine has guarantees regarding the inviolability and integrity of its territory. But in the early 1990s, there were real threats to the integrity of the state and national sovereignty was jeopardised, a fact

referred to directly in paragraph 49. We cannot avoid pointing out that the guarantor state was actually the source of those threats to our security.

Secondly, paragraph 33 underestimates the potential for the involvement of Ukraine's military-industrial complex in the European defence system. Thirdly, we cannot deny that there is a low level of support (15%) for Euro-Atlantic integration, but we must not forget the reasons. On the one hand, there has been no communications strategy and this has resulted in a distorted public view of NATO. Furthermore, throughout last year NATO was being deliberately discredited by the former Ukrainian authorities, the ex-Prime Minister and the defeated presidential candidate. Now, about 20% of the population support NATO. Earlier, levels of support were even higher at 34%, which was a good start.

Paragraph 54 of the report refers to Ukraine's differences with Romania over navigation on the Danube. Ukraine presented documents in support of its position over the building of a canal. Moreover, the consequences of the project for the countries concerned will be economic not environmental.

Finally, the statement about Ukraine's aspirations for a less complicated visa regime with EU countries should be brought together with the information on Ukraine's abolishing its visa regime for EU and Swiss citizens. To improve the report I hope that the Rapporteurs consider all these comments.

The PRESIDENT – I call Mr Gubert.

Mr GUBERT (*Italy*) (summary) said that the report provided a wealth of information and analysis, and that both the draft recommendation and the explanatory memorandum deserved a favourable vote. On a number of occasions, the report mentioned the diverse interests of the EU and Russia. The EU represented an area of economic development which contrasted with that of the states of the former Soviet Union. The legacy of the Soviet period made it easy for one form of authoritarianism to be replaced with another. In the case of Georgia and Moldova, Russia had erected a number of obstacles.

It was the destiny of the EU to become federal. Problems did not arise through differing customs, but rather there was a major area in which democratic principles did not exist. The United States of America had pronounced its security policy, the aim of which was to prevent the establishment of another power. Russia wanted to become a pole in a multi-polar world. However, as long as Russia retreated behind authoritarian powers, its relationship with the EU would remain ambivalent. Western and central Europe were surrounded by large territories, and both the EU and Russia had to give further thought to this. The United Kingdom had forgotten this. Russia had also to leave the past behind as reason dictated a common future.

The PRESIDENT – I call Ms Petrescu-Marculeț.

Ms PETRESCU-MARCULEȚ (*Romania*) (summary) congratulated the co-Rapporteurs on an excellent report and said this was a complex subject. Moldova had a dangerous situation in Transdniestria, where the mafia stood to gain if the conflict continued. Despite Moldovan wishes, Russia was not prepared to pull its troops out of the area, and while this went on, the population was suffering. The local language had been banned in Transdniestria and Moldova had tried to impose Russian as its second national language. The President of Moldova now wanted to move closer to the EU but Russia had different interests to the EU, and this had caused problems.

The report said WEU should ask the EU to offer Moldova the chance to be part of the south-east European stability process. The WEU Assembly was the only interparliamentary forum competent to discuss security matters and although Moldova had never been invited to WEU, it would be a good idea to invite it so as to bring it closer to WEU. Delegations of observers could be invited to plenary sessions, and then later offered permanent guest status and allowed to attend committees meetings. Only through dialogue could the problems of Moldova be solved.

The PRESIDENT – I call Mr de Puig.

Mr de PUIG (*Spain*) (summary) said that the report was relevant and opportune. It analysed the scope of proposals for Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus. The idea of ESDP presupposed the integration of those countries and it was necessary to set up contacts with them and look towards a greater Europe. It was not possible to have common defence without involving neighbouring countries. The frontiers of EU after enlargement could stretch as far as Iraq and there would be many countries surrounding the EU. Association agreements should therefore be set up with those countries and with others in the Middle East and the southern Mediterranean. Such associations would be like membership but with no institutions

involved. Those countries wanted to be involved in the process. Good cultural relations were needed but peace and stability were fundamental. This included military aspects, fighting crime and fighting terrorism. If no agreement on defence and security was forthcoming, it would be a missed opportunity. All the countries concerned belonged to the Council of Europe, although Belarus had recently been expelled. They were all aware of human rights issues. The concept of democracy was important and he supported the report.

The PRESIDENT (summary) called Mr Cherginets.

Mr CHERGINETS (*Belarus*) (summary) thanked the Assembly and congratulated it on its 50th anniversary. He also congratulated WEU on moves to strengthen cooperation. He said that, as Belarus and WEU were united by common borders and common problems, which included environmental issues, drugs, crime, trafficking in people and international terrorism, they should face and fight these together. A comprehensive approach was needed, and that was only possible through close cooperation and assistance. Belarus had shown its intentions by eliminating a number of warheads and intercontinental missiles which it had inherited from the former Soviet Union. Belarus was in favour of disarmament and against weapons of mass destruction. Belarus wanted a ban on these and had presented a resolution to the United Nations to ban new types of weapons of mass destruction. Belarus had taken the initiative in proposing a demilitarised zone in central Europe. This should be supported by WEU. WEU should also support Belarus in resolving the problems of potential environmental disasters in the Baltic Sea and the North Sea. The prevention of such disasters would be less costly than dealing with their aftermath and Belarus proposed an international conference to draw up a common action plan. Belarus considered it important to reduce conventional weapons and had destroyed 10% of its arsenal. The CFE Treaty had been ratified in 2000 and Belarus called on WEU members who had not done so to ratify the Treaty.

Belarus shared common borders with WEU countries and had become a transit place for illegal immigrants. In 2003, 3 000 illegal immigrants had been intercepted but between 27 000 and 37 000 had got through. Belarus could not resolve this alone and needed help from other countries. Belarus proposed an action plan for regional cooperation to control illegal immigration and illegal weapons trafficking in accordance with the Prague Summit of 2002.

Belarus owed thanks to WEU for its attention. It would participate fully in all of the activities which had been outlined.

The PRESIDENT – The debate is closed.

Does the Co-Rapporteur or the Rapporteur wish to speak?

Mr MASSERET (*France*) (summary) thanked colleagues for their contribution, and said that Mr Wilkinson had shared his vision and his detailed knowledge. His message was one of optimism. Mr Bychkov had given his view that the issue of nuclear weapons had not been given sufficient attention. However, the issue had been covered in the report. Following discussion of cooperation between the EU and Ukraine on satellite technology, the explanatory memorandum would be supplemented. Mr Gubert had emphasised the degree of uncertainty which remained. This was why the Committee had suggested tackling the issues step by step. It was true that the EU needed to develop as good an understanding with Russia as it possibly could.

Ms Petrescu-Marculet had commented that Moldova had been invited to the WEU Assembly very quickly. This was a matter for the Presidential Committee. Mr de Puig had addressed the core subject of security and concluded that military capability was an absolute necessity. It was essential that democratic principles were respected. Mr Cherginets had outlined valid proposals but the need for democratic development in Belarus remained.

The PRESIDENT – Thank you, Mr Masseret.

Does the Chairman of the Committee wish to speak?

Mr AGRAMUNT FONT de MORA (*Spain*) (Translation) – I have nothing further to add. The Committee has adopted the report unanimously. Two sub-amendments will be put to the vote.

The PRESIDENT – The Political Committee has presented a draft recommendation to which three amendments have been tabled. Two sub-amendments have also been tabled.

Amendment 1 reads as follows:

“At the end of recital (vi) of the preamble to the draft recommendation, add:

“and convinced that the reform process needs active foreign assistance that has practical effect on the daily lives of the Ukrainian people;”

I call Mr Jonas to move the amendment.

Mr JONAS (*Germany*) (summary) said that it was evident from the contributions to the debate that the report would meet with approval. The amendment made clear the fact that Ukraine would continue to need support from the EU.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to oppose the amendment? ...

What is the view of the Committee?

Mr AGRAMUNT FONT de MORA (*Spain*) (Translation) – The amendment is only acceptable subject to the sub-amendment being agreed to.

The PRESIDENT – The sub-amendment to Amendment 1 reads as follows:

“In Amendment 1, delete the words ‘needs active foreign assistance that has practical effect on the daily lives of the Ukrainian people’ and insert:

‘needs specific aid from the European Union that will have a practical effect on the social and democratic situation of the Ukrainian people;’.”

I call Mr Masseret to move the sub-amendment.

Mr MASSERET (*France*) (summary) said that the Committee did consider the amendment but concluded that it was not specific enough and that the sub-amendment was more precise in setting out the need for the EU to provide aid to the reform process.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to oppose the sub-amendment? ...

I will now put the sub-amendment to the vote.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

The sub-amendment to Amendment 1 is adopted.

I will now put Amendment 1, as amended, to the vote.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

Amendment 1, as amended, is adopted.

We now come to Amendment 2, which reads as follows:

“After paragraph 2 of the draft recommendation proper, add the following new paragraph:

‘Provide more support for the democratic movement and the development of civil society in Belarus;’.”

I call Mr Jonas to move the amendment.

Mr JONAS (*Germany*) (summary) said that as the Assembly had heard, and as Mr Masseret in particular had underlined, events in Belarus necessitated a great deal of support on the part of the EU.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to oppose the amendment? ...

We have heard the opinion of the Committee.

The sub-amendment to Amendment 2 reads as follows:

“In Amendment 2, delete ‘and the development of civil society’.”

I call Mr Masseret to move the sub-amendment.

Mr MASSERET (*France*) (summary) said that the Committee had wanted to delete the words “and the development of civil society”, and to retain the words “Provide more support for the democratic

movement in Belarus”. It was possible to provide support for democracy but the Assembly had no competence in relation to the development of civil society.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to oppose this sub-amendment? ...

I will now put the sub-amendment to the vote.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

The sub-amendment to Amendment 2 is adopted unanimously.

We will now put Amendment 2, as amended, to the vote.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

Amendment 2, as amended, is adopted.

We now come to Amendment 3, which reads as follows:

“After paragraph 6 of the draft recommendation proper, add the following new paragraph:

‘Step up its contribution to attempts at conflict resolution in the Caucasus and to the economic and social reconstruction in the region;’.”

I call Mr Jonas to move the amendment.

Mr JONAS (*Germany*) (summary) said that the situation in the Caucasus was a matter of great concern to the EU. Stability was of paramount importance and it was essential to make that point with regard to the integration of the region.

The PRESIDENT – Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment? ...

Mr MASSERET (*France*) (summary) said that he understood the concern behind the amendment, but it was not germane to the report. An earlier report had tackled this problem but it was not relevant here.

The PRESIDENT – I will now put the amendment to the vote.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

Amendment 3 is rejected.

We will now vote on the draft recommendation contained in Document [1895](#), as amended.

Under Rule 35 of the Rules of Procedure, if five or more representatives or substitutes present in the Chamber so desire, the Assembly shall vote by roll-call on a draft recommendation.

Does any member wish to propose a vote by roll-call? ...

That is not the case. We will vote by show of hands.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

The draft recommendation, as amended, is adopted.

4. The development of interparliamentary cooperation in the Balkans

The PRESIDENT – The next order of the day is the presentation of and debate on the report of the Committee for Parliamentary and Public Relations on the development of interparliamentary cooperation in the Balkans and vote on the draft resolution Document [1892](#).

I call the Rapporteur and Chairman, Mr Budin, to present the report.

Mr BUDIN (*Italy*) (summary) thanked the President and said that the report had taken up a topical subject. In the early 1990s a number of parallel initiatives to reactivate parliamentary and democratic processes had been established. These efforts were now being renewed. Inter-regional relations had changed with enlargement. Some countries had become members of the EU and others would follow in the near future. The countries were united in different ways and areas of interest could shift.

This situation could be advantageous and disadvantageous. Some member states of the European Union might deprive others of a driving force. Those countries should invest in developing cooperation

with south-eastern Europe. They could not rely on links created by the past. The question arose as to how interparliamentary cooperation could respond. The work at parliamentary and interparliamentary level was important for countries which were becoming more stable. There were many programmes in this area such as that of the Central European Initiative, the Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organisation of Black Sea Economic Cooperation, and the Commonwealth of Independent States.

The report drew attention to the importance of institutions in this area, and their work should be supported. The region in question had suffered from destabilisation during the 1990s and this had led to a breakdown in parliamentary communications, and mistrust and resentment. These represented an obstacle to regional cooperation. The international community was called upon to monitor this process of cooperation. Cooperation provided the best guarantee that interests could dovetail. Policies should be based upon strategic values and not upon ethnic policies. There was a paradox which could be seen in the case of Montenegro, where people talked of possible separation in order to join the European Union.

The report did not contain any new ideas or proposals, but showed the support of the Assembly for democracy and stabilisation in this area.

The PRESIDENT – Thank you, Mr Budin.

The debate is open.

I call Mr Arlovic.

Mr ARLOVIC (*Croatia*) (summary) said that, since the Roman period, attempts had been made to unite Europe, but this was the first time that divergent interests and peaceful agreements were being considered. Some forms of cooperation had disappeared, and that had been used by political leaders to conquer other territories. The region needed to live in peace and to develop. Among many of the countries that emerged from the former Yugoslavia, cooperation was good, given the problems of war. In this context, parliamentary cooperation was developing. There had been a number of fruitful exchanges between parliaments in the region.

The speakers of the parliaments in the region recognised that their countries faced many challenges, and that there was no alternative to cooperation. They wanted to ensure that the recent referendums did not disturb future progress, and that countries were dealt with on an individual basis. Countries could lose confidence if the process slowed down and wanted to know that they were supported by the EU. The countries in question faced a number of common problems, such as judicial reforms and visa regimes.

He had had the honour of participating in a recent meeting of parliamentarians, and wanted to report that cooperation had been established at a higher level. This emphasised the need to extend the hand of friendship to the countries of the Balkans. It was in their interest and that of the EU to do this to help bring forward the construction of a greater Europe reaching to the Black Sea and beyond. This would allow the EU to be a strong partner for the United States, and that would be in the EU's interest.

The PRESIDENT – The next speaker is Mr Clerides.

Mr CLERIDES (*Cyprus*) – It is appropriate that an esteemed Greek parliamentarian should chair these proceedings on interparliamentary cooperation in the Balkans.

We all support the draft resolution, which aims to strengthen interparliamentary cooperation in a positive fashion, but we need to bear in mind the fact that we support such cooperation for a very specific reason. The European Union has in the past made mistakes in its Balkan policies, which is why it was left to the Americans, based thousands of miles away, to take it on themselves to “solve” Balkan instability.

We need certain objectives for interparliamentary cooperation in the Balkans. The primary objective is to secure peace and stability between the Balkan countries: in short, to promote reconciliation – always with due respect for the principles of international law and international boundaries.

The second objective, I would suggest, would be to inculcate in the Balkan states respect for human rights, the rule of law and democracy. The draft recommendations specifically mention this objective.

Thirdly, we should help the region to develop economically and socially. Parliamentarians from this Assembly, the Council of Europe and the European Union bear a great responsibility to pursue this objective.

Fourthly, an enhanced relationship between the Balkans and the EU must be developed. I know that these are difficult times. I know that there is scepticism about any further enlargement of the EU. I know that the talk is of deepening the EU, as opposed to enlarging it. But the sooner the EU gets over the “no” votes in the referendums, the better for stability in this area.

Fifthly, another objective of interparliamentary intervention would be to bring to an end the presence of foreign troops in the Balkans as soon as possible. They are not there to stay forever; they are to assist in the process of bringing these countries back to normality.

Finally, all these Balkan states are members of the Council of Europe. One way or another they also participate in the Assembly of WEU. This offers great potential for helping to realise the objectives that I have outlined. Parliamentarians must ensure that because Balkan states are members of the Council of Europe they will, sooner or later, have to implement the European Convention on Human Rights; furthermore, they will have to understand that their citizens have a right of recourse to the European Court in Strasbourg – a proven and effective way of establishing the rule of law and respect for human rights. All member countries of the Council of Europe know full well that they have to abide by the European Convention and rulings by the Strasbourg Court.

The PRESIDENT – The next speaker is Mr Manzella.

Mr MANZELLA (*Italy*) (summary) said that the report was exhaustive and that he agreed fully with the resolution. Interparliamentary cooperation to date had been the best means of extending democratic life in a multi-state organisation. The most practical way was to create agreements between political and parliamentary groups. Meetings between MPs were more constitutional than diplomatic and this created the embryo of constitutionalism by creating political empathy. That was why interparliamentary cooperation was valid for the Balkans.

The process of EU integration had begun in the EU but at different speeds and there needed to be balancing mechanisms to mitigate the effects of this. There should be a unitary framework to maintain regional interests despite the different pace of integration. Different bodies such as the EU and WEU could provide the framework for the rationalisation of this process.

The PRESIDENT – I call Mr Krstevski.

Mr KRSTEVSKI (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) – I congratulate the Rapporteur, Mr Budin, on a comprehensive report covering the various aspects of interparliamentary cooperation in south-eastern Europe.

This report gives a very clear overview of the activities and the structure of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Central European Initiative, its role, goals and objectives, as well as its prospects for the future. The WEU Assembly has already discovered the Central European Initiative. At its 44th Session, Mrs Squarcialupi, on behalf of the Committee for Parliamentary and Public Relations submitted a report on the CEI. The Assembly adopted the order in which it instructed the Presidential Committee to strengthen relations with the CEI on matters of common interest, and in particular on security problems in south-eastern Europe.

I would also like to draw your attention to the report “sub-regional organisations in Europe and their parliamentary dimension”, submitted at the 46th Session by Mrs Cadarso and Mrs Akgönenç, on behalf of the same Committee, where you can find detailed information on the CEI and its parliamentary dimension.

I am particularly proud that the cooperation between the WEU Assembly and the CEI parliamentary dimension was especially successful and productive during the Macedonian Presidency of the Central European Initiative in 2002. The Chairman of the CEI Parliamentary Dimension addressed the members of the Political Committee and of the Parliamentary and Public Relations Committee at the joint meeting of the two Committees organised in the framework of the first part of the 48th Session of the WEU Assembly. He informed the parliamentarians of the activities and engagements undertaken by the Macedonian Presidency and answered questions about the functioning of the CEI Parliamentary Dimension.

The Chairman of the CEI Parliamentary Dimension that year also participated in the WEU seminar on Security in the Western Mediterranean, held in Lisbon. Moreover, a representative of the Assembly of

Western European Union attended the meeting of the CEI Parliamentary Assembly, held in November 2002 in Skopje.

The Rose-Roth seminars of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly are another example of successful cooperation among the countries in south-eastern Europe. The Delegation of the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly regularly participates at the seminars, where the participants discuss a variety of issues of common interest.

Of course in this context, we should also mention the activities in the framework of the Parliamentary Dimension of the Stability Pact, the south-east European Cooperation Process, as well as of the east-west Parliamentary Practice Project, where the parliamentarians of the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia are actively involved.

The Republic of Macedonia is actively contributing to the promotion of good-neighbourliness, security, stability and cooperation in south-eastern Europe. We are very much aware that the cooperation among the countries of the region can help us to realise the commitment for speedier development and faster European integration.

I am deeply convinced that a lasting commitment to peace, democracy and development is not possible without the active participation of the elected representatives of the citizens of our country. Regional parliamentary cooperation can foster mutual understanding, tolerance and good neighbourly relations among our countries.

The PRESIDENT – The debate is closed.

Does the Rapporteur wish to speak?

Mr BUDIN (*Italy*) (summary) thanked the speakers for their comments, which demonstrated how much interest there had been in this subject both from within the region and in neighbouring countries.

The PRESIDENT – We will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution contained in Document [1892](#). No amendments have been tabled.

Under Rule 35 of the Rules of Procedure, if ten or more representatives or substitutes present in the Chamber so desire, the Assembly shall vote by roll-call on a draft resolution.

Does any member wish to propose a vote by roll-call? ...

That is not the case. We shall vote by show of hands.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

The draft resolution is adopted.

5. The European Technology and Acquisition Programme (ETAP) – reply to the annual report of the Council

The PRESIDENT – The next order of the day is the presentation of and debate on the report of the Technical and Aerospace Committee on the European Technology and Acquisition Programme (ETAP) – reply to the annual report of the Council and vote on the draft recommendation Document 1901.

I call the Rapporteur and Chairman, Mr O'Hara, to present the report.

Mr O'HARA (*United Kingdom*) – Thank you, Mr President. European countries have for the last ten years or more been involved in the ambitious task of building a European Defence Industrial and Technological Base or EDITB. Governments, institutions for intergovernmental cooperation and enterprises are working together and in parallel, although at times not in phase, towards maintaining, strengthening and developing Europe's defence industrial and technological capabilities in order to make Europe autonomous in those areas and ensure security of supply, and also to make it internationally competitive in the face of strong competition from the United States and other countries active in the sectors concerned.

There has been a lengthy sequence of European initiatives in this connection: the European Independent Programme Group in 1976, the Western European Armaments Group in 1992, the Western European Armaments Organisation in 1996, the Organisation for Joint Armament Cooperation in 1998, the Letter of Intent and Framework Agreement concerning measures to facilitate the restructuring and

functioning of the defence industry in 2000 and latterly the European Defence Agency within the European Union framework in 2003. Those instances of variable geometry cooperation seek to rationalise European industrial and technology endeavour, making it more coherent and defining priorities for research, technology and development.

Of all those initiatives, OCCAR and the Framework Agreement have played a major part as they bring together the major western European armaments producers, responsible for 90% of production in common, which also constitute the driving force in research and defence technology, responsible for over 95% of investments in this area of the total of the NATO and EU member states, in particular Germany, France, Spain, Italy, the United Kingdom and Sweden – the big six.

Those are the countries in whose hands lie the strengthening and development of Europe's defence research technology and development. Yet cooperation between them, essentially between governments, is curtailed by different, even divergent, perceptions and priorities, the development of the Eurofighter, Rafale and Gripen fighter aircraft being a case in point. Despite the growing Europeanisation of the defence industry as exemplified by such consortia as the EADS and Thales groups, leading national companies such as BAe Systems in the United Kingdom, Dassault in France, Saab in Sweden, Alenia in Italy, Casa in Spain and Rheinmetall in Germany all retain a significant influence in those countries.

ETAP forms part of a logical sequence of initiatives by certain European nations with a view to strengthening and developing the EDITB. It involves the setting up of underlying cooperation frameworks, initially involving limited numbers of participants with shared objectives and of roughly the same level of industrial and technological development.

The other important aspect is the capacity to invest in defence or dual-usage R&T. The three salient features in those types of partnerships are objectives, means and capacities. However, for political and practical reasons, European cooperation is also characterised by an inclusive approach and an open and consensual character, the effect of which is to hold objectives and means at a level accessible to the greatest number. That leads in some cases to the fragmentation and duplication of effort and has been a factor in slowing down or holding up progress.

ETAP is the result of the implementation of undertakings under the LoI/Framework Agreement concerning measures to facilitate the restructuring and functioning of the European defence industry. On 8 December 1997, the Heads of State and Government of France, Germany and the United Kingdom adopted a joint declaration on the need to restructure the electronics and aerospace sectors of the defence industry. On 20 April 1998, Spain and Italy joined the project, which became on 6 July 1998, the LoI, signed also by Sweden.

The LoI was converted into a Framework Agreement, an international treaty, on 27 July 2000 at the Farnborough International Air Show in the United Kingdom. Unlike OCCAR, which has expanded to take in new members since it was set up, the Framework Agreement covers only the major European producers/investors in defence R&T and equipment. It has thus become a crucial factor and the rules defined within it necessarily govern any reform or reshaping of the EDITB. That is one of the tasks of the EU's new European Defence Agency.

ETAP is made up of the six principal European nations in the fields of civil and defence aeronautics and defence R&T, all sectors taken together. The European aerospace sector is also the best organised and where companies such as EADS, BAe Systems, Alenia, Dassault and Saab are to be found. Such companies have their own "captive" national and export markets, cooperate over some programmes and compete with one another in regard to exports. The governments for their part, even if, ideally, they aim to harmonise their requirement in air combat systems of the future, are not always able to coordinate and to synchronise their equipment planning, because they have different strategic analyses, doctrines and organisation of the armed forces and because of specific national needs, military missions for example. They adhere to different production, planning and systems procurement cycles and show differences in their defence spending.

Interpretation of the final objectives of ETAP also depends on national perceptions and priorities. In the declaration of 19 November, there is explicit reference to the fact that management of technology programmes developed in the ETAP framework could "be assigned in whole or in part to OCCAR in due time". That would be logical inasmuch as OCCAR is the only European manager of defence programmes and takes an approach that seeks to underpin and to integrate. However, OCCAR's membership – Sweden

is not a member – is different from ETAP's, where Belgium and the Netherlands are not members. Besides, OCCAR's specificity is connected with its non-application of the "juste retour" principle still common in bilateral and multilateral cooperation arrangements in the defence equipment sector.

The debate in Europe on transatlantic cooperation, the supposed technology gap and interoperability between Europeans and Americans has the advantage of drawing attention to the fragmented state and random nature of European efforts over the past ten years or more. More or less wide-ranging partnerships are formed, declarations and statements are made regularly but to little practical effect when one considers the potential. Different political perceptions, operational priorities that are neither harmonised nor synchronised, and competing industrial interests are some of the factors contributing to that state of affairs.

In fact, start-up programmes are losing momentum or being side-tracked, thus adding to the cost of the final product and recourse to variable geometry structures with countries joining and leaving at will, making it almost impossible to build a long-term vision. The European fighter aircraft of the future, envisaged in the 1980s to 1990s, led to the production of the Typhoon-Eurofighter and Rafale at the same time as Sweden was developing its own Gripen aircraft. Frigates and armoured land vehicles, anti-aircraft and missile defence systems suffered the same fate with projects being constantly duplicated and modified.

WEAG, WEAO and OCCAR, the Framework Agreement and ETAP, regardless of their respective merits and achievements, can be thought of as intermediary stages in building "Armaments Europe" and European defence research, technology and development. That is not to neglect the work done in NATO and its panels and bodies specialising in those areas. However, since the Maastricht and Amsterdam treaties of 1991 and 1996, the European Union has emerged as the prime mover finally bringing together all those European initiatives with a view to building an integrated EDITB. This was confirmed in the European Council's Cologne and Helsinki declarations of 1999, which heralded the foundation of "a European Agency in the field of defence capabilities development, research, acquisition and armaments".

When it comes to defence equipment and research and technology, there is no getting away from the transatlantic dimension. However, since the end of the cold war, United States dominance here has been increasingly open to challenge. The major European countries involved in this area want to be dealt with as genuine partners and suppliers and not merely – as happened previously – potential sub-contractors dependent on American products and technology. This is a complex and antagonistic relationship into which cooperation, complementarity and competition all enter.

In the high-tech, high-value, strategically important aerospace field, relations between the United States and Europe have been under considerable strain at times in recent years over civilian programmes such as Airbus and Boeing, owing to public and private financing arrangements, and military ones or programmes with defence applications. The restrictions that the United States imposes on technology transfers to Europe, including for special allies, and the difficulties European firms experience in getting a toehold in the American defence market and competing for Pentagon contracts are two of the very many areas of distinction and contention between the two sides of the Atlantic.

From the European point of view, what is striking about the Joint Strike Fighter programme is the high levels of investment agreed by two of the main ETAP signatories, the United Kingdom and Italy, accounting for €3 billion from 2001 up to the first aircraft delivery. Those sums may be revised, probably upwards, according to the way in which the programme and its total cost evolve. It is certain that both countries, having entered into a commitment of this sort, are tied in for over a decade to a United States project that makes no industrial or technological contribution to EDITB.

The results of such cooperation could have provided the starting point for joint programmes with the United States in the framework of effective multilateral cooperation, a key concept of the European Security Strategy. Instead, European cooperation continues to be plagued by fragmentation, piecemeal development and duplication of effort, and ETAP's limitations are plain for all to see in the absence of a unifying project, providing overall direction, that is practicable and has adequate funding and support.

That is the challenge the European Defence Agency has to take up and its outcome will determine whether, as far as armaments programmes and defence research and technology are concerned, Europe becomes an active and responsible player or a sub-contractor for the Pentagon and the United States majors in a supposedly integrated transatlantic defence market.

I recommend the report to the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT – Thank you, Mr O’Hara. There are no speakers, and no amendments have been tabled. We all know that when Mr O’Hara speaks about a subject, there is nothing to add and nothing to amend. Since Mr O’Hara will not be with us in December, may I take this opportunity to thank him for the serious work he has done, the excellent reports he has produced and the good spirits, solidarity and friendship he has shown to all of us? We know that this is only a temporary absence from WEU and the British Parliament and we hope to see Mr O’Hara continuing to participate in our work.

We will now proceed to vote on the draft recommendation contained in Document [1901](#). No amendments have been tabled.

Under Rule 35 of the Rules of Procedure, if five or more representatives or substitutes present in the Chamber so desire, the Assembly shall vote by roll-call on a draft recommendation.

Does any member wish to propose a vote by roll-call?...

That is not the case. We shall vote by show of hands. I call on the Assembly to vote unanimously for the report

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

The draft recommendation is adopted unanimously.

6. Network-centric operations: European capabilities

The PRESIDENT – The next order of the day is the presentation of and debate on the report of the Defence Committee on network-centric operations: European capabilities and vote on the draft recommendation, Document [1899](#).

I call the Rapporteur, Mr Jonas, to present the report.

Mr JONAS (*Germany*) (summary) said that he had heard a United States army commander in charge of tactical missile defence projects talking about Iraq and the conduct of operations there. The commander said that he would have swapped some of his rockets for better communications capability. Opinion on the war in Iraq was diverse but that statement illustrated the reality of the situation.

The report had set out to define network-centric operations. Although it seemed simple, the concept was very complex. It entailed the commissioning and deployment of forces in a multi-service and inter-operable network of people, positions and force components. The report also sought to provide a context for discussion of the concept.

In the last few years, network-centric operations had played a crucial part in the reform of armed forces. The alteration of force structures and forward-looking processes amounted to a transformation in defence capabilities at a national level. These new developments had significant implications for defence on an international scale.

Information, and the development of an “information society” in particular, would have an increasingly important role to play in defence. The civilian market had overtaken the military market in terms of research and development productivity. Progress on robotics and miniaturisation had created new possibilities for the exercise of military power. The EU could not remain aloof because the future development of European defence was tied up with defence developments in individual states.

The EU had taken steps towards a common policy in order to meet security and defence challenges worldwide. Network-centric operations represented both an opportunity and a challenge. Adoption of a common concept and improvement of communications were crucial to the transformation of the armed forces.

A key challenge facing network-centric operations was the human factor. Only when humans could adapt their view would network-centric operations be successful. It was important to develop European capabilities whilst ensuring transatlantic operability. Key to this was the bilateral exchange of information. The Iraq war had shown that military operations would increase challenges. There was only one thing more difficult than introducing a new way of thinking and that was to leave the old one in place.

(Mr Goris, President of the Assembly, took the Chair)

The PRESIDENT – The debate is open. I have one speaker on my list.

I call Mr Arlovic.

Mr ARLOVIC (*Croatia*) (summary) congratulated the Committee on the report, and said that he wanted to stress the human component. The Iraq and Balkan conflicts had shown a new dimension to war: combat was linked to different factions, and factions led to the isolation of groups of civilians. In the light of new technologies, new abuses were appearing. The first was the violation of human dignity, and the second was the recognition of guards as key personnel. It was in this situation that it was necessary to establish a network of indicators that could be used to identify this type of phenomenon, for example the Red Cross and other international organisations. There was a double objective here: to protect the people and to prevent situations occurring under which guards could commit crimes. The Geneva Convention, unfortunately, allowed the Red Cross to work only on an ad hoc basis. Recent conflicts had shown that it was vital to allow non-governmental organisations to remain present on a permanent basis. He appealed to the Croatian Red Cross to provide the WEU Assembly with a draft of its recent initiatives, so that these could be evaluated.

The PRESIDENT – I call the Rapporteur to reply to the debate.

Mr JONAS (*Germany*) (summary) thanked Mr Arlovic for his contribution and said that it was the process of transfer that would bring changes in the military sphere, and people would need to be prepared for that. The changes would involve local military leadership and individual soldiers as well as political leaders. Although this was not mentioned in the report, objectives could be achieved with fewer soldiers, and it was important to know what the limits were in the reconstruction process.

The PRESIDENT – Does the Chairman wish to speak?

Mr WILKINSON (*United Kingdom*) – On behalf of the Committee, I warmly thank our Rapporteur for an excellent piece of work. It is a subject that would have daunted most members of the Assembly, but he has tackled it with rigour and persistence, and with the assistance of the secretariat he has produced a report that has not been challenged in the Assembly. It also went through the Committee unanimously.

This is a subject with which we shall have to become more and more acquainted, because it lies at the heart of modern operational techniques. Once again, I am exceedingly grateful to the Rapporteur. We also note the important remarks made by Mr Arlovic. I was glad that he spoke as he did about the human element. We hope that the Assembly will accept our recommendations.

The PRESIDENT – We will now proceed to vote on the draft recommendation contained in Document [1899](#), to which no amendments have been tabled. Under Rule 35 of the Rules of Procedure, if five or more representatives or substitutes present in the Chamber so desire, the Assembly shall vote by roll call on a draft recommendation.

Does any member wish to propose a vote by roll call? ...

That is not the case. We will vote by show of hands.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

The draft recommendation is adopted unanimously.

I congratulate the Rapporteur on this excellent result.

7. The fight against international terrorism: defence aspects

The PRESIDENT – The next order of the day is the presentation of and debate on the report of the Defence Committee on the fight against international terrorism: defence aspects and vote on the draft recommendation Document [1900](#).

I call the Rapporteur, Mr Cosidó Gutiérrez, to present the report.

Mr COSIDIÓ GUTIÉRREZ (*Spain*) (summary) said that today freedom faced a new and powerful enemy in the form of terrorism. Terrorism was the worst form of violence and could even be considered worse than war itself, as it involved the indiscriminate killing of civilians. In order to face the threat, it was necessary to adopt a joint approach, as terrorism was a threat facing all members of the EU. It was important to step up the cooperation in the military field, and to take account of the transatlantic element.

In the fight against terrorism, the most important factor was the desire to defeat terrorism. Terrorists wanted our societies to cave in to their demands. A broad consensus was needed and this was a job for society as a whole, not just individual governments. Three main weapons in the battle against terrorism were the intelligence services, the security forces and the armed forces. Intelligence was the main instrument and the report recommended better use and coordination of intelligence services. Intelligence was also crucial in investigating and dismantling terrorist networks.

There was also the need to strengthen defence policies and to develop the role of military style security forces which were flexible and effective. The idea of a European gendarmerie was worth studying. The armed forces were not the only instrument in the fight against terrorism but their role should not be forgotten. European countries needed to adapt to allow more cooperation between their armies in stopping the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. There should not be any confusion in their role. The armed forces needed to be under the strict control of civilian authorities and needed to operate with strict rules of engagement. It was necessary to complement the role of the army with other organisations such as military police and those running border controls.

The fight against terrorism had to be conducted under international law and with the cooperation of NATO. It was necessary to define both the external dimension of the fight against terrorism and future policies. The European Security Strategy stated that terrorism was the main threat to the EU but it was also the main threat to the world. An in-depth security review was needed. He thanked the Assembly staff for their assistance and the committee members for their contribution to the report. The report was proof of unity and the determination to defeat terrorism.

The PRESIDENT (Translation) – Thank you, Mr Cosidó Gutiérrez. I understand that this is the first time that you have presented a report, and you did it extremely well.

The debate is open.

I call Lord Judd.

Lord JUDD (*United Kingdom*) – In thanking the Rapporteur for his salutary and challenging reminder of the magnitude, seriousness and urgency of the problem, I will perhaps take a slightly different line in my arguments. But first of all, I want to say that nobody should underestimate the dangers involved; nor should we ever forget those who have died, suffered or been bereaved. Of course, our Spanish colleagues are very much in my mind when I say that.

I do just make an observation to give the issue the seriousness that it deserves: as politicians with overall responsibility for political affairs, we also need to keep a sense of proportion and, for example, remember that climate change will kill more people, cause more economic disruption and suffering than terrorism is ever likely to do.

I find that there is a contrast between the preamble to the recommendations and the recommendations themselves. Sub-paragraph (*iv*) of the preamble is, as if I were a preacher, the text of my message: “Recognising that the best political response to terrorism is the unswerving upholding of human rights, the rule of law and democratic norms”. I just wish that that had been more explicitly and fully reflected in the recommendations to the Council.

We must examine the causes of terrorism. Frequently, the causes lie in a combination of different social realities, economic and social deprivation, the fact that people find themselves totally excluded from influence and any part in the deployment of power in the management of world affairs and hopelessness. That can be very dramatically evidenced.

We can have a knee-jerk reaction to suicide bombing – suicide bombing is a terrible crime, given the way in which it kills, maims and bereaves the innocent – but we do not get very far if we just have a knee-jerk reaction. Why does a young person throw his or her life away? What is it that led them to the desperation of taking action of that kind? Of course, the sinister manipulators are at work. Of course, they are prepared to hijack religious faith and to distort it as a means of working up extremist fanaticism. It would be naïve not to recognise those realities but if we are really serious about not just reacting to terrorism but removing its causes, the issues that I have just spelled out must be addressed.

If I have one message that I would like to share above all with colleagues, it is this. If we are to win that battle for hearts and minds, the principles that we say underpin our political community have to be

evident at all times. Respect for human dignity, enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights, is crucial. I will give just one example of where that applies. None of us would argue in favour of the free migration of people. It is just not feasible. We have to have immigration policies but if, in the application of our immigration policies, we alienate and humiliate people, what are we doing in terms of extending the recruiting ground for the manipulators who want to use terrorism to further their objectives?

Let us look at another example: the administration of law. I will look at my own country in this context. It would be wrong not to say here what I have said in my own country. I am concerned about the derogation from the European Convention on Human Rights. That is exactly what the terrorists want us to do. They want to be able to say, "There is all this talk of human rights but as soon as any dangers arise it all falls to pieces". It is desperately important, in the application of law, to demonstrate due processes: not just that law is being done but that it is manifestly, clearly and transparently being administered.

Think of the position of a young person in an immigrant community, who is under immense pressure from the manipulators and the extremists, when a short cut is taken on the law. That plays straight into the hands of the manipulators. Human rights and the observation of the rule of law and all that entails is not an optional decoration in our policy. It is central to the success of what we are trying to achieve.

We talk a lot about the defeat of terrorism but do not let us be defeated by terrorism. Do not let us start to dismantle the quality of our civilization because of that extremist action. That is to give the terrorists a victory. We must be tough but in the context of a commitment to law, justice and human rights. I will go to my grave believing that the only real alternative to extremist fanaticism is reasonableness, rationality, human rights and transparent, open democracy.

The PRESIDENT – The next speaker is Mr Mota Amaral.

Mr MOTA AMARAL (*Portugal*) (summary) congratulated the Rapporteur and the Committee on their report, and said that it provided interesting food for thought on terrorism and the threat that it brought to society. No quarter should be given in the battle against terrorism, which should be combated by the rule of law. Fanaticism was at the heart of terrorism and often lived side-by-side with democratic institutions, as had ETA and the IRA. This was an attempt to dismantle the rule of law and should not be allowed to happen. Different countries had different responses and the response of the United States, United Kingdom, Spain and Russia to their terrorist threats had accordingly been different, but it was necessary to confirm WEU's commitment to fight terrorism. The Rapporteur had identified better coordination of terrorist services and the combating of illegal financing and "dirty money" as areas that needed developing.

Cooperation produced results and should continue to be used, particularly by the police and the judiciary. However, the armed forces could not be excluded and it was often necessary to use military assets to continue the struggle. This had been seen, for example, in Afghanistan and in other countries where terrorists could find sanctuary. The international community could not accept the protection of terrorists by individual states and must use force in these circumstances. However, it was still necessary to abide by the Charter of the United Nations, as had happened in Afghanistan. These principles had to be followed to maintain Europe's freedoms.

The PRESIDENT – The next speaker is Mr Gubert.

Mr GUBERT (*Italy*) (summary) thanked the President, and said that the Defence Committee had put to the Assembly a report which showed how armed forces could contribute to the fight against international terrorism.

The risks in using military resources to combat terrorism were always present. Military assets represented only one way of protecting people. The use of force might be more effective in the short term but other strategies to remove the underlying social and political causes of terrorism would be more effective in the long term.

It was unfortunate that in the aftermath of the attack on the World Trade Centre, the military aspect of the fight against terrorism was given priority. Whilst it was vitally important to avoid a repetition of the attack, human rights must always be respected.

European countries had to work together in order to coordinate their intelligence systems. It was imperative to remain aware of the possibility that terrorist organisations might have motives other than

those which had been attributed to them in the past. Cultural, political and religious dimensions must be understood.

There were many questions to be addressed. Was it fair that the wealthy countries drew more benefit from resources – such as oil – than did those countries in which the resources were found? Should the distinction between the political and religious spheres be maintained? Agnosticism could undermine the common values which allowed us to co-exist. Countries should be wary of falling into line with ultra-secular states such as France and the Netherlands.

An enhanced sense of justice and a greater respect for cultural and religious traditions would discourage terrorists. Progress towards self-determination should be made in peace. Chechnya was a case in point here.

The priority should lie with social processes and the achievement of a more appropriate balance in terms of world order and, for example, globalisation and multinationals. The best defences against terrorism were development and justice.

The PRESIDENT – The next speaker is Mr Arlovic.

Mr ARLOVIC (*Croatia*) (summary) congratulated his colleague on an excellent report and paid tribute to all victims of terrorist action. He supported the continuation of the debate.

Any discussion of the fight against terrorism should encompass consideration of the consequences and the causes of terrorism. Social reasons, such as poverty, created conditions which served as a recruiting ground for terrorists. The question was how to solve this problem in an increasingly globalised world. It had to be remembered that terrorism was an irrational form of action.

Everyone had to do more than make declarations. Work had to be done to re-establish the balance between those who had benefited from economic and political conditions and those who had no power. Otherwise, the international effort to eradicate terrorism would not be successful.

A single victory against terrorism should never open up a whole new front of war. Religious freedoms should never be affected by the fight against terrorism as they had been in Iraq. Religious rights and freedoms should be maintained and Europe should open itself to diversity. In this way, the threat of terrorist action would be reduced and the scope of irrational influences limited.

Croatia was a member of the anti-terrorism coalition. It realised that there were some channels in Croatia which allowed not just free trade and free movement, but also terrorist elements, to pass through.

These issues should be debated more frequently in order to identify more possible causes for terrorism and those involved in the fight against terrorism should be properly equipped and properly trained.

The PRESIDENT – I call Mr Walter.

Mr WALTER (*United Kingdom*) – Thank you, Mr President. This is an excellent report, and the Rapporteur is to be congratulated on it. We have discussed it in the Defence Committee, and I have already expressed much of what I am about to say in that Committee. It is an excellent report, but my concern – which has also been expressed by others in this debate – is that the message should not be that the fight against terrorism consists only of a military response. It goes much further than that, and I believe that it should.

I should like to refer to a couple of documents that we have before us this week. I shall start with the implementation of the European Security Strategy – reply to the annual report of the Council, which we considered in the Assembly yesterday. On international terrorism, paragraph 88 states: “Following the most recent informal meeting of the EU defence ministers held on 21 March 2005, the Luxembourg Presidency stated that ‘all Defence Ministers believe that ESDP does not have a crucial role to play in combating terrorism, but rather a back-up role’. Even if this seems true in the case of the majority of likely scenarios, one must always keep in mind the danger of terrorism using weapons of mass destruction.”

Paragraph 92 of the document refers to a more worrying aspect of this issue. It states: “Apart from questions of definition the general approach to the fight against terrorism also needs to be discussed, in particular with the United States. In this connection there is a fundamental divergence between the United States and the European Union. The United States National Defense Strategy states right at the start of the

document that ‘America is a nation at war’. This does not in any way resemble the approach by Europeans whose every effort is concentrated on the fight against terrorism using a wide range of non-military instruments. While the European Security Strategy considers that deterrence is not an effective response to terrorism, the United States National Defense Strategy takes the view that: ‘While it is harder to deter certain non-state actors such as terrorists and insurgents inspired by extremist ideologies, even these actors will hesitate to commit their resources to actions that have a high likelihood of failure. Our deterrence must seek to influence these actors’ cost benefit calculations even as we continue prosecuting operations against them’. Europeans, on the other hand, invariably endeavour to determine and eliminate the causes of terrorism which they regard as tied in with the pressures exerted by modernisation, cultural, social and political crisis and the alienation of young people living in foreign societies.”

Those are telling comments. I want to refer to another document, the annual report from the Council of the European Union to the European Parliament on the main aspects and basic choices for the Common Foreign and Security Policy for 2004. This document was approved by the European Council on 25 April this year. In chapter 1, paragraph 2, it clearly states: “The fight against terrorism has been a major priority in the CFSP. The EU has concentrated on terrorist financing and improving information exchange through a coherent approach, including an agreement on controls of cash entering or leaving the EU and the Europol-Eurojust Agreement. (...). The European Council in December 2004 reiterated its determination to combat terrorism by continuing the comprehensive and integrated approach.”

Those observations are significant to the matters that we are considering today. Terrorists often use the cover of political action to justify their use of terror with political aims. There is an old saying that one community’s terrorist is another community’s freedom fighter. We cannot just rely on security measures, military threats and military responses. If we do, our public buildings will be permanently under siege, with high wire fences, concrete walls and armed guards. Eventually, we would separate the governors from the governed, the elected representatives from those who elected them, and parliaments from their peoples.

Throughout our history, groups – whether small communities, ethnic groups or whole countries – have been disadvantaged or oppressed. There are many historical examples of legitimate demands for human rights and democracy that have resulted in direct action, violent or otherwise. I can illustrate this point with an example from my own country, by examining the relationship between the United Kingdom and the island of Ireland. I apologise to Irish colleagues, as my potted history might be quite simplistic, but there is not time in this debate for a long lecture on that subject. It is worth reflecting, however, that Ireland became part of the United Kingdom in 1800 and, as parliamentary democracy evolved in the United Kingdom, it too sent members to Parliament. However, that did not prevent people on the island of Ireland from having a feeling of disadvantage and oppression, and, in 1916, an uprising took place. It was among the actions taken by the Irish Republican Army – the IRA – a name with which we are all too familiar. In 1922, the island was separated into two parts, one of which eventually became the totally independent Republic of Ireland.

However, the north-east corner of the island, a predominantly Protestant section, remained part of the United Kingdom, with a very high degree of local self-government. But that local self-government was carried out essentially by one party representing one religious group.

By the mid-1960s, a civil rights movement had begun to take to the streets and caused governments to sit up and take notice. This period also saw the re-emergence of the IRA, whose political belief was that these problems could all be solved by the unification of Ireland. But its means were not political: its means were terror, intimidation and killing. In the intervening years, bombings, murders, political assassinations have taken place, both in Ireland and on the mainland of Great Britain. In those 40 years, as well as responding to the terror, successive governments have sought political solutions. Now all parties and all communities, the Government of Ireland included, agree that we have reached a balance in terms of the agreements that have been struck – recognising the rights, obligations and aspirations of all communities.

The IRA still exists, but it exists now as a terrorist body that has no supporters among those who have participated in the political process. Even their own supporters, through their political party Sinn Fein, claim to have rejected terror.

This is an excellent report, and my plea is that we should adopt it. We must never overlook the political dimension of the solution to the terrorist threat that faces us all.

The PRESIDENT – The next speaker is Mr Gülçicek.

Mr GÜLÇİCEK (*Turkey*) (summary) thanked the Rapporteur for having produced a report on such an important subject. At both the national and international level terrorism played a crucial role. In the case of Turkey, this was nothing new. Turkey had had to deal with ideological separatism, and many had fallen victim to terrorism as a consequence. Valuable resources had been expended on terrorism when they could have been used for other matters. No country was invulnerable to terrorism, and it was therefore important to take measures against it through international cooperation. There was no difference between good and bad terrorism and people who tolerated it were inexcusable. The 11 September terrorist attack was an atrocious act. In the Middle East, there had been many tragic events, and it had become a hotbed of terrorism. New forms of terrorism were spreading and these needed to be assessed. The United Nations and NATO had an important role to play in combating terrorism.

The PRESIDENT – The next speaker is Mr Jauregui Atondo.

Mr JAUREGUI ATONDO (*Spain*) (summary) said that events had shown that the fight against terrorism was not a military matter. The report stated that it was necessary to consider different means. It was a matter for our intelligence services and not the military. Although armies needed to consider how to defend themselves against terrorism, much could be done instead in the political sphere to combat terrorism. For example, nationalist terrorism could be dealt with through certain political organisations.

The PRESIDENT – I call Mr de Puig, who is the last speaker on the list.

Mr de PUIG (*Spain*) (summary) expressed gratitude that the Rapporteur had achieved consensus in his report, and thanked him for dealing with such a timely subject. He said that terrorism was something which worried governments, societies and individuals. Society viewed terrorism with great anxiety. The Rapporteur had rightly restricted his report to defence aspects of the combat of terrorism, as otherwise the report would have had to deal with too many other issues.

Terrorism was a new threat and was different from anything else that had confronted us in the past. The enemy was invisible and did not declare war. Terrorists were evil, as they could do anything at any time against any member of society. This intangible but very real enemy was difficult for the military to combat. It required discretion, silence, research, calm and much information to investigate terrorism. The report did not suggest a military response, even though there were groups which felt it was necessary to fight a war on terrorism. Israel had acted in Palestine on that basis. This should not be the basis of a reaction to terrorism. Defence could, however, contribute towards the process by protecting boundaries and important buildings, as well as through the military intelligence services. It was necessary for there to be comprehensive cooperation. It was fundamental that terrorists were not pursued, but instead that terrorism was avoided.

Europe needed to attack the many cultural and religious causes of terrorism, and it was necessary to implement strategies and policies to prevent terrorism from existing. Planning and perseverance were necessary but so was respect for the rule of law; democracy should be increased not surrendered. Giving more importance to security and less to individual freedom gave a victory to terrorists. All actions by military and defence forces should be subject to democratic scrutiny.

The PRESIDENT – Does the Rapporteur wish to speak?

Mr COSIDÓ GUTIÉRREZ (*Spain*) (summary) thanked colleagues for a high-quality and lively debate. He said that the report was limited to defence issues. While not fundamental, they were an important contribution to the fight against terrorism. British speakers had noted the need to fight the causes of terrorism. This was not at issue, but it was suicidal not to be prepared to defend ourselves and that was not incompatible with fighting the causes of terrorism.

War had disappeared in democratic states as a way to solve problems and the more open and democratic societies were, the better they were able to fight terrorism. The report said it was a huge moral and strategic error to ignore the rule of law when fighting terrorism. Terrorism required a different response and the rule of law should be improved to protect against terrorism without reducing the position of the law. Some speakers had noted that there was a strategic divorce between the United States and the EU in fighting terrorism and it was more effective if we had a joint strategy. There were those who thought the use of military forces counter-productive, but this was not always the case. Sometimes, military methods could be the only way to fight terrorism, as had been shown in Afghanistan, where

military action was supported by the United Nations and was the ultimate recourse in the fight against terrorism. What was most important was the determination to fight terrorism.

The PRESIDENT – Thank you, Mr Cosidó Gutiérrez.

Does the Chairman of the Committee wish to speak?

Mr WILKINSON (*United Kingdom*) – I am sure that the Assembly, and likewise our Committee, would wish to express deep appreciation to Mr Cosidó Gutiérrez for his excellent work. It has been a labour of great intensity. Our discussions in Committee were prolonged and thoughtful. I hope that the Assembly will feel that the recommendations that we have before us merit support. As usual, our Committee would like to thank the secretariat.

Lord Judd spoke about this being a battle of hearts and minds and so it is. He hoped that we would beat terrorism by never losing our democratic principles, by never giving up on the rule of law and by applying rationality at all times. Nevertheless, as our Rapporteur reminded us, we must be ready in the ultimate circumstance to have recourse to military means and to have the military means available appropriate to the task.

Mr Mota Amaral spoke about the illegal fundraising that sustains so much terrorism around the world. We think of the FARC in Colombia, the dirty money – that was the phrase he used – and the narco-trafficking that makes so much terrorism possible.

Mr Gubert spoke about the diversity of the problem and the need to counter poverty, which is the fertile ground within which terrorism grows all too frequently. Our Croatian friend, Mr Arlovic, spoke about Iraq and the causes of terrorism. While it is true that we must always fight against the causes of terrorism, I must commend the Rapporteur for the rigorous way in which he has undertaken the task that he was set, namely, to deal with the defence aspects. As he said, perhaps we can leave the causes to the Political Committee if that is the wish of the Assembly.

The Basque representative, Mr Jauregui Atondo, was too pessimistic and said that all wars against terrorism have failed. That is not true. My country won against the communists in Malaya and in another confrontation in Indonesia. In South America, there are many instances of bloody civil wars in countries where democracy now prevails, such as Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua. Even Sendero Luminoso in Peru did not succeed because the intelligence agencies were particularly effective.

We must not ever be depressed. We must be resolute and optimistic against even the most difficult background. Our Rapporteur has given us hope that if we address our task with resolution and determination we will have the means at our disposal to deal with an inhumane scourge.

The PRESIDENT – We will now proceed to vote on the draft recommendation contained in Document [1900](#), to which no amendments have been tabled.

Under Rule 35 of the Rules of Procedure, if five or more representatives or substitutes present in the Chamber so desire, the Assembly shall vote by roll-call on a draft recommendation.

Does any member wish to propose a vote by roll-call?...

That is not the case. We shall vote by show of hands.

(A vote was taken by show of hands)

The draft recommendation is adopted unanimously.

8. Date, time and orders of the day the next sitting

The PRESIDENT – I propose that the Assembly hold its next public sitting tomorrow morning at 10.00 with the following orders of the day:

1. ESDP developments and the Headline Goal 2010 – reply to the annual report of the Council. (*Presentation of and debate on the report of the Defence Committee and vote on the draft recommendation, Doc. [1898](#)*)

Rapporteur: Mr Konstantinos VRETTOS (Greece, Socialist Group)

2. Parliamentary debates and trends in public opinion on ratification of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe. (*Presentation of and debate on the report of the Committee for Parliamentary and Public Relations*, Doc. [1893](#))
Rapporteur: Lord RUSSELL-JOHNSTON (United Kingdom, Liberal Group)
co-Rapporteur: Mrs Vilija ALEKNAITE (Lithuania, Federated Group)
3. Address by the Right Hon. Jack Straw, MP, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Chairman-designate of the WEU Council, representing the incoming United Kingdom WEU/EU Presidency. (Address delivered by Sir John HOLMES, KBE, CVO, CMG, Her Britannic Majesty's Ambassador, Paris)
4. Parliamentary debates and trends in public opinion on ratification of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe. (*Resumed debate on the report of the Committee for Parliamentary and Public Relations and vote on draft resolution and amendments* Doc. [1893](#)).

Are there any objections?

The orders of the day for the next sitting are approved.

Does anyone wish to speak?...

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 18.35)