

D. J. Adler and A. Snejdarek

PSGE-35

REPORT ON THE WORK OF
THE PUGWASH STUDY GROUP ON EUROPEAN SECURITY
(December 1965-July 1966)

I. INTRODUCTION	Page 2.
II. GERMANY	
A. General considerations	- 3.
B. Frontiers	- 3.
C. Peace Treaty	- 3.
D. German Re-unification	- 4.
E. Berlin	- 5.
F. Suggestions for continued studies	- 5.
III. SECURITY	Page 5.
IV. INTEGRATIONAL PROCESSES	
A. Theoretical point of departure	- 6.
B. Political implications	- 7.
C. Economic Co-operation	- 8.
D. Co-operation in Science and integration of science policies	- 8.
E. Political Co-operation	- 9.
Appendix I.	List of participants at the first three meetings.
Appendix II.	List of papers presented up till July 1966.
Appendix III.	Co-chairmen's letter of transmittance to the Pugwash Continuing Committee.

I. INTRODUCTION.

A.

Various Pugwash Conferences have in the past considered ways leading to the peaceful settlement of the German problem and to the establishment of a security system in Europe, which would make possible a lasting elimination of tensions among the nations in this continent. On this background the Czechoslovak and the Danish Pugwash Committees initiated the creation of a study group with participants nominated by Pugwash Groups and other relevant groups or institutes in smaller European states as well as both German states, which are most affected by threats to European Security.

At the constituting meeting held in Prague in December 1965, the work of this Group was started. Further meetings were held in Hälsingborg and Geneva. During these meetings problems of a peace treaty with Germany, of the reunification of Germany, of European security, of more extensive co-operation among European countries and of integrational processes have been reviewed. Many papers on these subjects have been presented by the participants and by some others. A part of these papers has been elaborated in common by authors from East and West European countries. Some items, as for instance the inventories of the security needs of various European countries or problems of relations between the European states, have developed into long-termed projects. Interim sub-groups on the most important issues have been created, and have presented the results of their deliberations to the Study Group. In some of the countries so far represented in the Pugwash Study Group on European Security, national study groups on problems of European security have been set up.

The main target for these activities has been the elaboration of a report to the 16th Pugwash Conference in Sopot. This report, drafted by the co-chairmen, is based on the work of the Study Group and is submitted to the 4th meeting of the Study Group in Jablonna, September 7th-8th for endorsement with possible qualifications.

The meetings of the group have been made possible by generous support from the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, from the Carlsberg Foundation in Denmark, from the Polish Academy of Sciences and from some private sources.

B.

The division of problems chosen here into three main areas - the "German problems", questions related to security and problems in connexion with the integrational processes - may seem arbitrary, although the two last mentioned presumably represent a closely knit correlation in international affairs in general. For obvious geographic, historical, military and economic reasons the "German problem" will inevitably command a special position in every discussion on European affairs.

In terms of improved international relations in the European continent there seem to be an intrinsic interdependence between all the three main areas considered by our group. This leads us to believe that no substantial progress should be expected in any one of the three areas without progress in the two others. On the other hand this also gives us some reason to think that a measure of progress in one area will tend to catalyze progress in the others, while substantial set-backs in any one area may impede progress in the others.

We have seen it as one of our main tasks in the very short period of initial work, to establish just where in this chain of interrelated and mutually dependent main problems change could be most easily brought about at present. After close study of presented papers and of the discussions at the three meetings, which our Group has had, we have reached the following conclusions:

II. GERMANY.

A.

The complex of issues usually referred to as the "German Problem" seems still to be far the most difficult to tackle. Although a large part of the time at our meetings as well as a large part of the presented papers concentrated on the German Problem, no substantial progress was achieved. We have come to think that no significant progress regarding the solution of these issues can be expected in the immediate future without further changes in the two other aspects of the European affairs considered by our Group.

However, we must note with satisfaction that our colleagues from both parts of Germany did participate in our discussions in a very active way, and that the very long joint talks, they had in our presence, took place in a cordial and constructive atmosphere. We must also note with the greatest satisfaction that pursuant to a recommendation made at our 3rd meeting participants in our Group from the two German states met as a separate sub-group in Hamburg in July 1966. It is our impression that also these talks developed in a constructive way, and that the participants will be able to report on them themselves to the 16th Pugwash Conference.

It has been established that the main target of the Anti-Hitler Alliance, i. e. that never again German territory should become the starting point of a new war, is still the main interest of all European countries. It has been equally established that in the existing situation every lasting security system in Europe must include peaceful settlement of the German question. As already mentioned, there is an interdependence between the solution of the German problem and the European Security and cooperation between the European States. Every step taken in the sphere of the relations between the European countries outside Germany effects the relations between both German States and vice versa.

As for the discussion on the concrete issues at our meetings it may be summarized in the following way:

B. Frontiers.

Full agreement was reached to the effect that any effort to change the existing frontiers in Europe must be considered as incompatible with the European security. The legal invalidity and the political danger of the so-called "heimatsrecht" have been demonstrated. A sub-group composed principally of legal experts was charged with making recommendations on further studies on this subject.

C. Peace Treaty.

There has been extensive discussion on the problem connected with the possible conclusion of a Peace Treaty with Germany, and most legal and political points of view presented so far have been examined in our Group.

The fundamental anomaly of the situation is that such a long time has elapsed since the de facto termination of the state of war, and - especially - that developments with such great implications have taken place in Germany itself. In reality, we face a situation, where we have brought the defeated opponent up to a greater military and industrial strength than before the war started. There seems to be no precedence for this neither in international law nor in history. All previous peace treaties in history have been concluded in a situation, where the provisions of the treaty as well as the procedure of negotiations leading to a treaty were formed out of the will of the victors, while all possible concessions were obtained through the diplomatic skill of the defeated. As it has been pointed out in one paper presented to our Group (PSGE-3), we are now facing a situation where it apparently requires great skill of the victorious powers even to have negotiations started, and where the final provisions of the treaty very much have become dependent on the will of the defeated.

This feature has been fully acknowledged by the governments of all the four

big powers and - in fact - by the spokesmen themselves from both at present existing German governments at the Meeting of Foreign Ministers at Geneva in 1959.

This situation lead us to formulate the question whether it is at all necessary or possible to conclude a Peace Treaty with Germany to-day, what problems had to be solved through a possible "minimum" peace treaty and what other forms of agreements or declarations might, alternatively, constitute a legally satisfactory solution.

At our 2nd meeting participating lawyers took upon themselves to establish a sub-group in order to review these problems. The sub-group of lawyers presented its report at the 3rd meeting of our Group in Geneva in May 1966.

The report stated i. a. that a Peace Treaty is not necessary according to international law, that establishing a European security system might represent the shorter and more promising way toward a European peace settlement, and that the procedural problems also seemed to make such other means worth considering. Among problems discussed was, whether the boundary issues had to be solved in a peace treaty, and some doubts were expressed whether a security pact really would be more easy to conclude than a peace treaty. However, it was also argued that problems which could not be solved now, ought to be left over to the next generation and maybe in due course forgotten.

D. German Reunification.

It was agreed that the present division of Germany is a result of the period generally described as the "cold war" and that the line of division between the two existing German states is still also the line of demarcation between the main power structures in Europe. Every improvement of the relations between those power structures can in itself be a contribution to the solution of the problem of German unity. The general feeling was expressed that the actual improvement in relations between Eastern and Western Europe is for the time being not sufficiently strong to any serious hope for immediate, substantial progress on this issue.

However, as briefly mentioned above, we took the issue for further investigations in joint private talks with our colleagues from the both German states both at the 2nd and the 3rd meeting of the Group.

Our point of departure in these talks was the fact that the possibility of creating some sort of an official consultative joint German body has up till now been the only suggestion of major political consequence which both present German states have been near to agree to in principle. The idea of such a joint German body was brought forward from both the Soviet Union and the United States at the Conference of Foreign ministers at Geneva in 1959, where spokesmen from both German governments were present.

In our private consultations with our German colleagues there was agreement that reunification is a national aim of paramount importance, and that it will remain so in a foreseeable future.

It was stated that there are differences in opinion on the form of an ultimate reunification, but that the immediate difficulty is to get talks between the governments concerned started. On the other hand it was pointed out that the two governments do already now have talks with each other in a number of fields of a technical or commercial nature, and that the spokesmen of the two governments took an active part in international meetings on the very issue of reunification during the Conference of Foreign Ministers mentioned above.

Factors which could be expected to make suggestions conducive to both governments were discussed very openly and in great detail.

Two proposals concerning the methods of starting talks on reunification evolved from the discussion. They were slightly revised the continuation of these private consultations at the occasion of the 3rd meeting of our Group in May 1966. In their final form they read as follows:

to the creation of a Group or joint committee of eminent and esteemed scientists and other outstanding personalities from both German states - perhaps within the Pugwash framework, perhaps outside - with the aim of discussing ways leading to a German reunification, including the specific aspects of timing and modalities of a referendum. The quasi-authoritative character given to the group by the governments concerned should not imply that those governments necessarily should associate themselves with the possible results of the work of the group, neither need it be interpreted as a mutual recognition.

2. A joint German Group inside the framework of the Pugwash Study Group on European Security should be initiated. It should in detail study:

- (1) The relations between the two German states and the ways how to develop their co-operation.
- (2) The ways leading step by step to reunification.
- (3) The various alternative forms which a reunified German state make take and the different possibilities to achieve this.
- (4) The political implications of a German reunification under the various forms studied.

E. Berlin.

After a very short exchange of views the problem of the status of Berlin was left for further studies at a future date.

F. Suggestions for Continued Studies.

We have the hope that the sub-group of participants from both German states will be able to continue its present work.

Other issues that ought to be studied in connexion with the German questions are

1. Possibilities how to give an encouragement to the development of talks between different organizations of the two German states.
2. Legal problems of normalization of relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and other states in Eastern Europe for the future reunification of Germany - to be considered especially by the sub-group of lawyers.

II. SECURITY.

Presumably significant progress may be envisaged regarding the solution of the security problems confronting the European nations jointly as far as newly, actually emerging trends may be taken as a point of departure. From our discussions we got the feeling that actual changes in international affairs in the last five years or so definitely have improved the possibilities of solving problems which for long period remained amazingly unchanged. Especially it would seem profitable now to review a number of older proposals and ideas in the light of this new development.

Time seems not yet ripe for devising a complete security system for the European nations, that would substitute the present existence of the two power blocs, as this would obviously as a precondition require somewhat of a complete solution of the "German problem" mentioned above and for more mutual confidence than is presently existing. But we have reached the conclusion that a time has certainly come for promoting more systematic talks between the various governments involved. At one of our meetings a special sub-group even recommended the establishment of a standing (permanent) high level European Security Conference including all the state members of the two military pacts which still are dominating European security affairs, as well as neutral states. Perhaps even this proposal is prema-

ture, but on the other hand it is basically in conformity with proposals already put forward this spring inside both military-organisations - i.e. the proposal put forward by the Danish government at the NATO ministerial meeting in May 1966, and the proposal adopted by the ministerial meeting of the Warsaw Pact countries in June 1966.

Also other levels of contacts between the European countries have been reviewed in our group, and suggestions were put forward regarding a number of possibilities

While contacts on governmental and other official levels would not immediately lead to any formal agreements they should at least contribute to the introduction of some degree of deference to the possibilities of future East-West agreements into the policy planning of the various countries involved. Similarly the contacts on the institutional or private levels between scholars and scientists engaged in research on these problems would contribute to the shaping of an intellectual infrastructure for future designs related to European security.

As far as security is concerned it would seem natural that the present Pugwash Study Group in its continued work could present detailed reports on some of the elements which most presumably would be present in some form or another in any comprehensive European Security system of the future. From a vast number of proposals and ideas put forward in the Group up till now, we have selected the following items as the most promising and significant for such research efforts:

1. De-nuclearized zones and other aspects of the disengagement concept in Europe.
2. Security qualifications of a German reunification.
3. Principal modalities of the enforcement of collateral disarmament measures in Europe.
4. Control with atomic energy applications and the role of the IAEA in Europe.

Taking into consideration that most thinking on security in Europe is still so overwhelmingly dominated by the existence of the two international defence organizations and that there are still strong reminiscences of mutual fear and distrust among European nations, it seems only natural that all possible proposals considered by this Group should be submitted to the criteria laid down by the Zorin-McCloy agreement of 1961 for negotiations on general and complete disarmament - i.e. that all measures should be balanced and that they should be carried out in such a way that there may be no reasonable doubt regarding their agreed implementation.

In order however to accomplish further progress as well as preserving and strengthening the actually emerging pattern, which may be the most important source for such future changes, it seems essential to increase the amount of integrational processes in the European affairs - in this context particularly integrational processes between countries belonging to different military systems - and to inhibit as far as possible the disintegrational processes resulting from the "cold war" pattern in Europe.

III. INTEGRATIONAL PROCESSES.

A. Theoretical Point of Departure.

It was agreed that no substantial political or economic integration for the whole of Europe can be considered as an imminent possibility, although there are already strong pressures for integration in certain specific fields of advanced science technology and economy where the limited resources distributed among a number of small nations on the European continent has begun to hamper further growth.

These integrational processes seem in other words to be growth-conditioned, and the pressures behind these processes may be regarded objective in the sense that they are not influenced by political decisions other than those affecting growth in the various fields mentioned. This leads to an important distinction between such "objective" or "ecological" integrational processes and those initiated only as part of concrete political actions, although the resulting structures in all integrational processes will depend on political decisions, invariant also to the "ecological" processes in so far they meet their growth-conditioned requirements.

The observation was made that there seems to be strong indications that "ecological" integration contains certain elements which tend to reduce tensions in political as well as social affairs. The question how far these processes influence international tensions has however not been sufficiently studied, and the recommendation was made to include research on this fundamental problem into a larger program of research.

Since it seems probable that integrational processes will tend to follow the channels of most intensive communication and co-operation, a task of imminent importance for the tension-reducing effects of future integration in the East-West context seems to be to increase cooperation and communication in the various economic, technological and cultural fields between all European countries.

B. Political Implications.

In consistency with the theoretical point of view mentioned above and in conformity with the concepts of international co-operation generally used, increasing co-operation and communication between nations may catalyze the integrational processes between them, and thus lead to a reduction of tensions. To establish and reinforce patterns of co-operation and communication across political and ideological battlelines in Europe is of course of particular importance if future integrational processes are to be expected to reduce tensions of the present nature. At the same time, the point of view developed here supports in a defined way the generally accepted belief that co-operation and intensified communication between nations even in the most trivial spheres of activities should tend to increase mutual confidence and diminish tensions.

An important implication of the condition of growth introduced in our notion of integrational processes is that pressures for integration will occur irrespective of present political differences and divergences between the different social systems existing in Europe to-day. With the increasing rate of technological change requiring constantly growing resources in terms of money, specialized skills and other assets, the comparatively small nations, which form the vast majority of countries in Europe, are forced to integrate more and more of their economic, scientific and social activities. In some cases their requirements can temporarily be met of course by integrational processes inside the established political and economical frameworks - notably the EEC and the KOMEKON. In an increasing number of areas, however, even these organizations have turned out to be too small or otherwise ill-fit as points of departure for the necessary cooperation and integration. Under all circumstances, the nations of Europe are confronted with the important task of developing patterns of communication and cooperation which in appropriate time in each field of economic, scientific and social activity may channel and sustain the integrational processes required. Quite apart from supporting the tension-reducing effects of those future developments, the intensification of East-West cooperation and communication especially in the economic field will also restore what from a geographical (and thereby transport-economic) point of view may be termed as a natural pattern in relations, which was broken after the 2nd world war.

Various possibilities for progress along these lines have been briefly reviewed, and there has been an evaluation of needs for further and more specialized studies to be undertaken in the various spheres.

C. Economic Co-operation.

A sub-group of economists reviewed in a preliminary and general way the economic relations between Eastern and Western European countries.

They reached the conclusion that it is important that projects of integration or cooperation within the existing political and economic blocs should avoid discrimination against future partners in various fields of economic cooperation. The institutional framework in which East-West trade takes place contains very rigid regulations on both sides, which to a large extent stems from political and administrative considerations, which have become obsolete.

Some recent trends in pricing policies in Eastern European countries seems to encourage trade relations between East and West by making prices reflect relative costs in a more exact way. This is likely to give more stability to commodity trade making possible a better division of labour.

Some of the most important, technical obstacles to an increase in trade as well as in internationally co-operative production seem to be related to the differences in standardization used in Eastern and Western Europe. This obstacle may have much more farreaching consequences than any actually existing custom barrier.

Some of the other obstacles discussed, touched the problems of national prestige and the influence of national security considerations. Reliable procedures for exchange of technological know-how would tend to reduce the hesitation of smaller European nations towards international cooperation in production.

Recommendations along similar lines have repeatedly been made by various UN bodies and conferences, and nearly all the issues dealt with here are currently being reviewed by the Economic Commission for Europe. However, the recommendations adopted in the EEC and in other UN bodies seem to be only insufficiently observed by European governments, when it comes to practice. The causes for this should be studied.

D. Co-operation in Science and Integration of Science Policies.

The field where the needs for co-operation - or even integrated efforts - are most strongly felt by the European nations is without any doubt that of science. This situation is currently underlined by the mounting difficulties of formulating and implementing sensible science policies on a national base in most European countries. These difficulties are intrinsically present in the very nature of modern science, by

1. The costliness of the advanced branches of science - e.g. experimental high energy physics and space research,
2. The growing specialization reducing the number of scientists in any particular field in a way, which may not only be detrimental to the development of science itself but also to the sheer formulation of national science policies, the allocation of funds etc.
3. The growing need for inter-disciplinary approaches, which tends to increase the difficulties created by (2).

All this lead to the frustration all too well known already to science policy makers and indeed to active scientists in the smaller countries of Europe: The uncontrolled "brain-drain", the financial insecurity constantly surrounding even fully accepted projects, the often fatal delayments of eperiments and the ever present danger in certain fields that on-going, from a scientific point of view: promising projects have to be cancelled because they are unexpectedly becoming too expensive.

Big international science centers and other joint operative organizations can only be considered as a partial solution to these problems - although they in certain, very costly fields are bound to play a very prominent role.

9/15

C 35-2816

After the discussion in the Group we have reached the conclusion that when such international centers are being established, it should be on the basis of genuine co-operation of all European states from East and West. Moreover such international centers should preferably be established where national traditions or institutions have already created a scientifically fertile environment.

In this connexion our Group also had a special discussion on facilities in high energy physics. The point was raised that even the Centre Europeenne pour la Recherche Nucleaire, CERN - generally regarded as one of the most successful examples of integrated international science cooperation - has developed certain shortcomings in the sense of political exclusiveness.

Special attention was paid to the fact that CERN is planning to build a 300 GeV particle accelerator (costing about 1,600 million swiss francs if placed at another site than the present CERN establishment). The opinion was voiced that this big machine should be build on the basis of a broader collaboration than that of the present CERN - with participation of elementary particle physics institutions from all European countries. The decision was made to recommend the Continuing Committee to attract the attention of the CERN directorate as well as that of the CERN member governments to such a possibility. However, it was also pointed out that any increase in number of participants at this rather late stage of the planning would tend to delay actual construction. Even if for this or other reasons, change in the present plans is felt to be impractical a special point could still be made for much more intensive institutional collaboration between scientists engaged in this field of physics.

In order to solve the more fundamental science policy problems touched upon above, we think that a time has come for at least making a start in the long and presumably highly complex process which may lead to internationally integrated science policies in Europe. We are convinced that such a process would be of paramount importance both as a solution of the increasingly grave and difficult problems facing science planning and scientists all over Europe to-day, and as a contribution to the reduction of political tensions in Europe, keeping in mind the more and more crucial role of science for the economical and political affairs of nations.

Therefor we will attach the greatest significance to studies related to these problems in the future work of the Group, and we will try to coordinate specific investigations into the framework of an international Science Policy Project for Europe.

E. Political Co-operation.

The Pugwash Study Group might in its further work get in touch with various institutions which deals with the question of co-operation between European states. A consistent co-operation of such institutions in different European countries should be established for the joint investigation of subjects related to political co-operation.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTSAT THE MEETINGSDecember 1965 - May 1966

- D. J. ADLER (chemistry)
Secretary of the Danish Pugwash Committee,
Heslegaardsvej 45, Hellerup, Denmark. Telegraphic address: Pugwash
- Horst AFHELDT (law)
Hamburg-Blankenese, Strandweg 57, Deutsche Bundesrepublik.
Telephone: Office, 465430. Private, 867861.
- Rolf BJØRNERSTEDT (physics)
Research Institute of National Defence, Stockholm 80, Sweden.
Telephone: 63 15 00 extension 259.
- G. BLUHM (law)
Institut für Internationales Recht, Universität Kiel,
Deutsche Bundesrepublik.
- J. DELBRÜCH (law)
Institut für Internationales Recht, Universität Kiel,
Deutsches Bundes Republik.
- P. FRYDENBERG (international relations)
Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
Parkveien 19, Oslo, Norway.
- Vavro HAJDU (law)
Institute for the Science on the State and Law, Narodni 18, Praha 1,
Czechoslovakia.
Institut für Internationales Recht, Universität Kiel, Deutsche Bundesre-
publik. Telephone: 51131/2149.
- Peter HESS (economics)
Vice-Director of the Institute for Economics, German Academy of
Sciences, 108 Berlin, Leipziger Strasse, Deutsche Demokratische Re-
publik. Telephone: 22 04 41. extension 218.
- Ib HØJME Col. - It.
Kastellet, Copenhagen K., Denmark.
- Alfons KLAFFKOWSKI (law)
Professor of International Public Law, Poznan University, Poznan,
Poland. Telephone: 6 51 44.
- O. KOFOED-HANSEN (physics)
Danish-AEC, Risø, Roskilde, Denmark.
- K. D. LAPTEK (history)
Sandomierska 21 nr. 11, Warsaw 12, Poland.
- R. LECLERCQ (law)
Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium.
- Ladislav LISKA (international relations)
Institute for International Politics and Economics, Praha 1, Vlasska 19.
Czechoslovakia. Telephone: 53 23 18.
- S. LUNDGREN (economy)
Institute for International Economics, University of Stockholm,
Stockholm, Sweden.
- T. NEMEC (international relations)
Secretary, international relations, Czech Academy of Sciences,
Praha 1, Narodni 3, Czechoslovakia.

- I. MALECKI (physics)
Nowowicjska 22 nr. 12, Warsaw, Poland.
- L. MATES (international relations)
Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Makedonska 25,
Beograd, Yugoslavia.
- Torkel OPSAHL (law)
Institute of Public and International Law, University of Oslo, Oslo 1.
Norway, Telephone: Office, 41 02 90 extension 34. Private 55 32 13.
- Joachim PECK (law)
Leiter der Arbeitsstelle für Völkerrecht an der Deutschen Akademie der
Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 108 Berlin, Leipziger Strasse 3/4, Deutsche
Demokratische Republik. Telephone: Office, 22 04 41 extension 318.
Private, 64 50 42.
- J.P. PRONK (economics)
Netherlands Economic Institute, Pieter de Hoochweg 118, Rotterdam,
The Netherlands. Telephone: 010 - 25 65 20.
- Laszlo RECZEI (law)
Budapest, Hungary. Telephone: Office, 383-554, Private, 386-137.
- J. ROTBLAT (physics)
Professor of London University, Secretary General fo the Pugwash
Continuing Committee, 8, Asmara Road, London NW 2, UK.
- M. SAETER (international relations)
Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
Parkveien 19, Oslo, Norway.
- Roman SEXL, (physics)
Wien 9, Osterreich, Telephone: 34 73 02.
- Antonin ŠNEJDÁREK (history)
Institute of International Politics and Economy, Praha, Czechoslovakia.
Telegraphic address: Pugwash, Praha.
- Åke SPARRING (international relations)
Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Wenner-Gren Center,
Stockholm, Sweden. Telephone: Office, 10 71 79, Private, 7 77 25 93.
- P. VALKENBURGH (methodology of the behavioral sciences)
Sociological Institute, Groningen University, Netherlands.
Telephone: Office, 05900/33010, Private, 05900/51794.
- P. STROOT (physics)
CERN, Geneva, Switzerland. (Belgium)
- I. SUPEK (physics)
Institut teorijske fizika, Marculiw trg. 19,
Zagreb, Yugoslavia.
- H. TOLHOEK (physics)
Institute of Theoretical Physics, Groningen, Netherlands.
- Johan WILHJELM (law)
Secretary general, Foreign Policy Society, Farvergade 4, Copenhagen K.
Denmark. Telephone: (01) 14 88 86.
- Harry WUNSCHÉ (law)
Professor für Völkerrecht and der Deutschen Akademie für Staats- und
Rechtswissenschaft, Institut für Internationale Beziehungen, Potsdam-
Babelsberg, Deutsche Demokratische Republik. Telephone: Potsdam
76 801.

12/15

C 35-2816

PSGE-35
Appendix II

LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND PAPERS
PRESENTED AT THE THREE MEETINGS
OF THE PUGWASH STUDY GROUP ON
EUROPEAN SECURITY - December 1965 - May 1966

PSGE-1	Aide memoire, December 1965
PSGE-2	Czechoslovak-Swedish Joint Paper: Forms and Intensity of the Danger to European Security arising out of the German Question. Czechoslovak and Swedish Perceptions.
PSGE-2/Add. 1	Dutch Perceptions to PSGE-2.
PSGE-2/Rev. 1	Common Conclusions to PSGE-2.
PSGE-3	D. J. Adler: Reflections on the German Problem.
PSGE-4	H. A. Tolhoek: Easing of Tensions and the Future Political Organization of Europe. (not presented)
PSGE-5	K. D. Lapter: Papers from Former Pugwash Meetings Related to the Problems of European Security.
PSGE-6	Danish Foreign Policy Society: List of Selected Statements on German Reunification and Security.
PSGE-7	P. Valkenburgh: French Point of View with Regard to Proliferation.
PSGE-8	Czechoslovak-Danish Group: Security Qualifications of the Unification of Germany. (not presented)
PSGE-9	I. Højme: An Inventory of Danish Security Needs.
PSGE-10	A. Klafkowski: The Potsdam Agreement and the Peace Treaties.
PSGE-11	H. Thirring: Steps Toward Disarmament in Europe.
PSGE-12	E. Menzel: Möglichkeiten einer konstruktiven Europa-politik.
PSGE-13	H. Linnemann, J. P. Pronk and J. Tinbergen: Convergence of Economic Systems in East and West.
PSGE-14	GDR-Group: The Interdependence Between the German question and European Security.
PSGE-15	Sub-Group: On the Question of a Peace Treaty with Germany.
PSGE-16	The Co-chairmen: A Summary of Consultations on German Reunification.
PSGE-17	Aide Memoire II - March 1966.
PSGE-18	The Co-chairmen_ Recommendations for the Third Meeting.
PSGE-19	R. U. Sexl_ Austrian Security Needs.
PSGE-20	Report of Working Group 3, 11th Pugwash Conference, Dubrovnik, Sept. 1963: Denuclearized Zones, Especially in Central Europe and the Balkans.
PSGE-21	The Danish Group: On De-nuclearized Zones.
PSGE-22	D. J. Adler: Integrational Processes.

PSGE-23	A. Šnejdársek, L. Liska: Security in Europe and More Extensive Co-operation of European Countries.
PSGE-9/Add. 1	I. Højme: Documentation of the Inventory of Danish Security Needs.
PSGE-24	V. Hajdu, E. Menzel: Report on the Problem of a Peace Treaty with Germany and a European Security System.
PSGE-25	Hans Thierring: Security Needs for European Countries.
PSGE-26	The Norwegian Group: Norwegian Security Needs, Some Aspects.
PSGE-27	K. Lapter: Poland's Security and the German Question.
PSGE-28	E. Menzel: Addendum to the Report on the Problem of a Peace Treaty with Germany and a European Security System.
PSGE-29	L. Reczei: Proposals on German Re-Unification and European Security.
PSGE-30	G. Bluhm, H. Afheldt: Security in Europe.
PSGE-31	Lawyers' Subgroup: Report of the Subgroup on the Question of a Peace Treaty with Germany.
PSGE-32	Working Group I: Report on European Security.
PSGE-33	P. Hess, S. Lundgren: Notes on Economic Cooperation between East and West.
PSGE-34	Aide Memoire III - May 1966

14/15

C 35-2816

PSGE-35

Appendix III

CO-CHAIRMEN'S LETTER OF
TRANSMITTANCE TO THE PUGWASH
CONTINUING COMMITTEE

The Pugwash Continuing Committee
London.

Prague the 27th of July 1966

In submitting the enclosed report for the 16th Pugwash Conference as well as a forthcoming statement of endorsement (and possible qualification), which is to be expected from the 4th meeting of our Group on 7th and 8th September 1966, the main task which we took upon ourselves in December 1965, has been accomplished.

Realizing the many shortcomings in our work as well as in the present report we must ask for your indulgence, and draw your attention to the fact that the Group has only been working less than one year on the wide range of highly complex questions connected with the reduction of tensions in Europe. Even in spite of these shortcomings, we hope that the report - as well as the subsequent statement on the part of the whole Group - will prove to be of some value for the discussions at the 16th Pugwash Conference. We should also like to draw your attention to the many papers presented by individual participants. Through the Secretary-General the Continuing Committee has received copies of all these papers; furthermore, they have now been abstracted for the Pugwash Newsletter.

The frankness of our discussions as well as the cordial and constructive atmosphere, in which they have invariably taken place, encourage us to propose to the Continuing Committee that the work of the Group should be continued.

In doing so, we are however of the opinion that certain changes in the structure of the Group as well as in its methods of work should be introduced.

First of all, we think that the present somewhat arbitrary limitation in the composition of the Group (including participants from only a smaller number of countries) should be abolished. The sole purpose of this limitation was to keep down the size of our meetings in the initial and necessarily experimental period of work. We still think it is essential to restrict the size of the meetings also in the future - preventing them from developing into a new kind of Conferences, and maintaining the study group nature of the Group. But we reached the conclusion that this end would be better served, if in the future the meetings would concentrate on more specialized topics, and the participants - from any country - each time could be invited on the sole merit of his contribution to the particular topic under consideration. Still maintaining a rough balance between "East" and "West" among the participants at each future meeting, we should very much like to see some 12-20 participants as the norm for the future meetings.

We should be extremely grateful if we, in the interest of our work, were allowed to seek the advice and consent of the Continuing Committee in the issuing of invitations to the meetings in the future.

In the enclosed report you will find a number of suggestions of topics, which we feel significant for further consideration in the future work of the group. This "list" should of course by no means be regarded neither as complete nor as exclusive. Especially we shall look for further guidance in the Working Group Reports from the 16th Pugwash Conference.

If changes of the above mentioned nature could be introduced in the structure and method of work of the Pugwash Study Group on European Security, we trust that the Group - however small and informal - may turn out to be a useful tool for the Pugwash Continuing Committee and for the future Pugwash Conferences.

As however, we would by no means expect to bind the Continuing Committee to introduce all the reports we are possibly making at the agendas of future Pugwash

Conferences, we will at the same time ask for permission, to submit such reports regularly - either through the Continuing Committee or directly - to institutes of international and economic affairs and to the Pugwash Committees in Europe.

There has been the suggestion that in addition to the studies mentioned here, the mutual confidence developed between the participants from the various countries up till now present at the meetings of our Group, should be used as a base for institutionalizing more far reaching consultations between institutes of international affairs and similar institutes in Europe. We have considered this idea, which may have important implications for the improvement of relations between European countries. And we have reached the conclusion that we will gladly try to be instrumental in bringing about the very first steps in the said direction. But we do not think that the present Group have possibilities of doing more than just that, and furthermore, we do not feel convinced that responsibility for such an institutionalized body is compatible with the kind of work, which we are hoping to do.

Finally we shall take this opportunity to express our sincere gratitude to the Continuing Committee for the kind attention it has up till now given the work of our Group. Especially we have been encouraged by the presence at our meetings of the Secretary-General, Academician Khvostov and other members of the Continuing Committee.

We remain,

most sincerely yours

A. Snejdársek

D.J. Adler