

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

Control N° 0335

MESSAGE

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

PRIORITY
P 211723Z MAR 67
FM MCREP
TO RUEPDA/NAMILCOM
INFO RKFPSAW/SACEUR
RXGAB/SACLANT
RXDBC/CINCHAN
ACEX
BT

21
REGRADED NATO UNCLASSIFIED
(Approved for Public Disclosure)

Per Authority IMSM-0462-02
By *Kouskova* Date 18.6.2003

N A T O S E C R E T L O C O M 7 8 3 7
SUBJECT IS POSITION OF FRANCE WITH REGARD TO CONSULTATION IN TIMES
OF CRISIS - GROUP OF FOURTEEN MEETING, 21 MARCH 1967
REFERENCES: A. GF(67)D/6, 16 MAR 67
B. L O C O M 7 7 4 5 , 2 1 F E B 6 7

1. SEGEN OPENED THE DISCUSSION BY STATING THAT HE REALIZED MANY DELEGATIONS WERE AWAITING INSTRUCTIONS ON GF(67)D/6 AND THAT CONCLUSIONS COULD ONLY BE REACHED AT THE NEXT MEETING. HE STATED THAT HE BELIEVED A DISTINCTION SHOULD BE MADE BETWEEN FRENCH PARTICIPATION IN CONSULTATION IN TIMES OF CRISIS AND THE STUDIES ON PROCEDURES FOR SUCH CONSULTATION. ON THE FORMER, HE BELIEVED THAT FRENCH PARTICIPATION MUST BE ACCEPTED. SHOULD THEY HAVE A DIFFERENT OPINION DURING CONSULTATION, THE COUNCIL SHOULD TAKE NOTE OF THIS AND THEN PROCEED TO GO ON. HE REALIZED THAT SOME PROBLEMS SHOULD, OF COURSE, BE DISCUSSED ON THE ONE HAND IN NAC, AND ON THE OTHER HAND, IN THE DPC, NPG OR NDAC. SOME COMPROMISES WOULD BE REQUIRED, BUT AT THIS TIME HE DID NOT DESIRE TO PREJUDGE THE STUDY ON PROCEDURES. HE REAFFIRMED THE FRENCH WERE WILLING TO TAKE PART BOTH IN CONSULTATION IN TIMES OF CRISIS AND IN STUDIES ON PROCEDURES, BUT TO DATE HAD OFFERED NO DETAILS.

2. THE ITALIAN PERMREP STATED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES HAD JUST RECEIVED GF(67)D/6 AND THAT HE WAS NOT IN ANY POSITION TO EXPRESS ANYTHING NEW. THE POSITION OF HIS AUTHORITIES WAS THE SAME AS EXPLAINED ON 21 FEBRUARY. ON A PERSONAL BASIS, HE BELIEVED IT WAS DIFFICULT TO MAKE A DISTINCTION IN THE THREE PHASES OUTLINED IN PARA 3 OF GF(67)D/6 AND HE WOULD HAVE TO RESERVE ON FRENCH PARTICIPATION IN ALL THESE PHASES. FOR REASONS OF OPPORTUNITY AND PRINCIPLE, HE STILL BELIEVED THAT THE PROCEDURES SHOULD BE THE NPG, NDAC AND/OR DPC AND THEN THE NAC FOR SUCH CONSULTATION. THE NETHERLANDS PERMREP STATED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES DID HAVE COMMENTS AT THIS TIME, ALTHOUGH IT WAS UNDERSTOOD THAT FULL AGREEMENT ON THIS MATTER HAD NOT YET BEEN REACHED. HIS AUTHORITIES AGREED THAT, SINCE FRANCE IS A MEMBER OF THE ALLIANCE, AS MUCH OF HER COOPERATION AS OFFERED SHOULD BE ACCEPTED. HIS AUTHORITIES ALSO APPRECIATE THE INTEREST THAT FRANCE HAS SHOWN IN COUNCIL. ON THE OTHER HAND HIS AUTHORITIES DO DRAW ATTENTION TO THE FACT THAT FRANCE HAS WITHDRAWN FROM CERTAIN FIELDS OF THE ALLIANCE. THIS WITHDRAWAL HAS CREATED SOME DOUBTS CONCERNING HOW SHE WOULD ASSIST THE ALLIES UNDER ARTICLE V. THUS CONSULTATION PROCEDURES SHOULD REMAIN FLEXIBLE AND HIS COLLEAGUES SHOULD NOT LOSE SIGHT OF THE FACT THAT UNDER ARTICLE IV ANYONE CAN CALL FOR EMERGENCY CONSULTATION IN COUNCIL.

3813

1967

Dec 1

DA IN 117476

SCD FORM 36
1 MAY 62

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

DECLASSIFIED-PUBLIC DISCLOSURE IMSM-0462-02 DECLASSIFIE-MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

MESSAGE

NR: LOCOM 7837

HIS AUTHORITIES CONCLUDE THAT THE FOURTEEN MUST DISCUSS WITHIN THEIR OWN CIRCLE THE PROCEDURES AND AT THE SAME TIME ENCOURAGE THE UTMOST FRENCH PARTICIPATION IN THE PRACTICE ARRANGEMENTS. HIS AUTHORITIES DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THE DIVISION IN THE THREE PHASES AS SET FORTH IN PARA 3 OF GF(67)D/6 IS AS RIGID AS PRESENTED. IN REGARD TO SUBPARAS 5(B)(1) AND (1), HIS AUTHORITIES BELIEVE THAT IF FRANCE WERE EXCLUDED, THIS MIGHT LEAD THEM TO BE MORE GENEROUS THAN IF THE HAND OF PARTICIPATION WERE EXTENDED BEFOREHAND. AS TO THE THREE POSSIBILITIES IN PARA 10 OF GF(67)D/6, HIS AUTHORITIES HAVE PREFERENCE FOR (B):

3. THE CANADIAN PERMREP OFFERED A PRELIMINARY REACTION TO THE EFFECT THAT HE WAS NOT CONVINCED THAT AN AGREEMENT ON ANY OF THE POSSIBILITIES IN PARA 10 OF GF(67)D/6 WAS REQUIRED. HE STILL BELIEVED THAT THE STUDIES IN PROCEDURES SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN IN NAC AND THAT IT WAS POSSIBLE THAT CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THIS STUDY SHOULD BE HANDLED IN THE NPG OR DPC.

4. THE FRG DEPUTY PERMREP STATED THAT HE HAD NO INSTRUCTION, BUT THAT THE PAPER WAS BEING EXAMINED BY HIS AUTHORITIES AND AT THIS MOMENT CERTAIN QUESTIONS HAD BEEN TURNED UP. HE BELIEVED THAT CRISIS MANAGEMENT WAS IN FACT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE POLITICAL AUTHORITIES AS IT WAS POLITICAL ACTION IN THE FULLEST SENSE. HE THEREFORE FELT THAT THE WHOLE MATTER OF CRISIS MANAGEMENT SHOULD COME UNDER THE APPROPRIATE NATO POLITICAL BODY, I.E., POLADS. HE UNDERSTOOD THAT, SHOULD THE NATO COMMITTEES BE REORGANIZED IN THE FUTURE, CRISIS MANAGEMENT COULD FALL ELSEWHERE; BUT FOR THE TIME BEING, HE BELIEVED THAT IT FELL IN THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE. HIS AUTHORITIES DID NOT OBJECT TO PHASES I OR II AS DEFINED IN PARA 3 OF GF(67)D/6; HOWEVER, IN REGARD TO PHASE III, THEY QUESTIONED WHETHER ONE COULD USE CONVENTIONAL AND/OR NUCLEAR FORCES UNDER THE TERM QUOTE CRISIS UNQUOTE. SUCH USE WOULD APPEAR TO BE WAR. HE BELIEVED IT WAS NECESSARY TO GET DEFINITIONS FOR THESE PHASES WHICH DO NOT OVERLAP AS, FOR EXAMPLE, CRISIS MANAGEMENT COULD BE ACTIVITIES PRIOR TO MILITARY AGGRESSION AND POSSIBLY COULD INCLUDE BORDER INCIDENTS AND THE THREAT TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS. HOWEVER, CRISIS MANAGEMENT APPEARS TO PASS TO CONTROLLED WARFARE WHEN THE CONFLICT BEGINS AND THIS SHOULD BE ALSO EXAMINED TO SEE IF A LIMITED USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS COULD BE INCLUDED. AS TO FRENCH PARTICIPATION, HIS AUTHORITIES' POSITION IS THE SAME AS EXPRESSED ON 21 FEBRUARY, WHICH WAS THAT THEY WERE IN FAVOR OF BOTH FRENCH PARTICIPATION IN CONSULTATION DURING TIMES OF CRISIS AND IN THE STUDIES ON PROCEDURES AS FAR AS IS POLITICALLY FEASIBLE.

5. THE ITALIAN PERMREP HAD DIFFICULTY IN UNDERSTANDING WHAT THE FRG MEANT IN REGARD TO POLITICAL DISCUSSION AND DECISION IN CONNECTION WITH CRISIS MANAGEMENT. AT THIS POINT, THE CHAIRMAN INTERVENED AND STATED THAT IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO GO FURTHER ON THIS MATTER TODAY AND HE HOPED THAT THE FRG WOULD NOT REPLY TO THE ITALIAN QUESTION UNLESS IT WAS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY.

6. THE CHAIRMAN THEN SUMMARIZED THAT THE ITALIAN QUESTION UNLESS IT WAS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY.

DA IN 117476
JCD FORM 35
1 MAY 62

PAGE 2

MESSAGE

NATO SECRETARIAT OF THE ARMS
STATE COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

NR : LOCOM 7837

6. THE CHAIRMAN THEN SUMMARIZED THAT THE SECRETARY GENERAL IN GF(67)D/6 HAD PUT THIS PROBLEM OF CONSULTATION IN SOME FORM OF ORDER AND THAT IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT FRENCH PARTICIPATION IN CONSULTATION WAS DESIRABLE. AS TO THE STUDY ON PROCEDURES, GF(67)D/6 COULD BE USED AS A STARTING POINT AND SOME PRELIMINARY VIEWS HAD BEEN GIVEN TODAY. THE GROUP OF FOURTEEN WOULD ALL ATTEMPT TO GET INSTRUCTIONS AND PURSUE THIS MATTER AT THEIR NEXT MEETING.
BT

DECLASSIFIED-PUBLIC DISCLOSURE IMSM-0462-02 DECLASSIFIE-MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

ACTION: NAMILCOM
DISTR : USLO SACLANT
DA IN 117476

PAGE 3

SCD FORM 35
1 MAY 62

0000