

CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

EXEMPLAIRE N° 349
COPY

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH
6th February, 1968

NATO SECRET
SUMMARY RECORD
C-R(68)4

Summary record of a meeting of the Council held at the
Headquarters, Brussels, on Tuesday, 23rd January, 1968,
at 4 p.m.

PRESENT

Chairman: Mr. Manlio Brosio

BELGIUM
Mr. A. de Staercke

CANADA
Mr. Ross Campbell

DENMARK
Mr. H. Hjorth-Nielsen

FRANCE
Mr. R. Seydoux

GERMANY
Mr. D. Oncken

GREECE
Mr. P.A. Cavalierato

ICELAND
Mr. N.P. Sigurdsson

ITALY
Mr. C. de Ferrariis
Salzano

LUXEMBOURG
Mr. L. Schaus

NETHERLANDS
Mr. H.N. Boon

NORWAY
Mr. G. Kristiansen

PORTUGAL
Mr. A. Fortunato de
Almeida

TURKEY
Mr. Nuri Birgi

UNITED KINGDOM
Sir Bernard Burrows

UNITED STATES
Mr. Harlan Cleveland

INTERNATIONAL STAFF

Deputy Secretary General:

Mr. J.A. Roberts

Assistant Secretary General for
Political Affairs:

Mr. J. Jaenicke

Executive Secretary:

The Lord Coleridge

ALSO PRESENT

Chairman, Military Committee: Lt.Gen. Baron ~~C.P.~~ de Cumont

NATO SECRET

CONTENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Paragraph Nos.</u>
I.	Non-Proliferation Treaty	1 - 9
II.	Date of the next meeting	10

I. NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

1. The ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVE recalled that when, on 18th January, the United States Representative submitted to the Council the draft Treaty agreed by the two Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, he had expressed his appreciation of the constructive efforts made by the negotiators, while at the same time stressing the need for further consultations. The Chairman, too, had emphasised in his summing-up that the Council should continue its discussions on this subject. The position he had outlined in the Council had been confirmed by the statements made on the same day by the Italian Foreign Minister, Mr. Fanfani, in Rome and by Ambassador Caracciolo in Geneva. Italy considered that in order to achieve the desired objective - namely, a genuinely effective and well-balanced Treaty, capable of securing the widest possible support - it was essential that the latest phase in the negotiations should be accompanied by adequate consultations within the Council. He did not wish to go into the various points on which he would no doubt have an opportunity to express his Government's views in the near future; however, it would be recalled that just before the submission of the two Co-Chairmen's draft, he had drawn the Council's attention to certain of these points, with special reference to the qualitative principle recommended by Italy for deciding the number of ratifications required and for the approval of amendments. In the light of the new wording now proposed, his Authorities were at present considering other aspects of the Treaty, such as the safeguards, the peaceful use of nuclear energy, periodic conferences, the duration of the Treaty and the United States memorandum of understanding. In conclusion, he stressed that the Italian Delegation was preparing to make what it trusted would be a positive contribution during the Council's forthcoming discussions, so that the resultant Treaty would secure a wide measure of reasoned support and thus represent an authoritative and effective barrier to nuclear proliferation.

2. The UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE said that, to begin with, he would like to return to the German Representative's comments on 6th December, 1967 regarding the statement of understanding submitted to the Council by the United States on 20th April, 1967(1); it would be remembered that the Italian Representative had expressed support for these comments at the meeting on 19th December. He recalled that the first paragraph of the United States memorandum was composed of

(1) See C-R(67)53 and C-R(67)54

questions and answers. This paragraph stated that the Treaty dealt only with what was prohibited, not with what was permitted. The German Representative had pointed out that this interpretation was no longer valid, since it was proposed to insert Articles in the Treaty dealing with what was permitted; he therefore felt that this interpretation should be revised. The United States took the view that this would be neither necessary nor desirable. The statement of understanding had been prepared as a result of discussions between Mr. Rusk and Mr. Gromyko on Articles I and II, the wording of which had been proposed by the United States. It was, in effect, the United States negotiators' reply to the questions of their Soviet counterparts dealing with the transfer provisions of Articles I and II. Since the interpretation under consideration had not been challenged by the latter, it was considered preferable to leave it as it was.

3. With respect to the forthcoming negotiations, the UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE said that he wished to draw the Council's attention to the new procedural situation which had arisen as a result of the submission of the draft Treaty by the two Co-Chairmen. Despite its imperfections, the draft Treaty was the negotiated version most acceptable to the Soviet Union. He also stressed that proposed amendments would, in future, be negotiated multilaterally and that in each case the United States position would depend on the amount of support for a given amendment which the sponsors of that change could generate. As the Canadian Representative had pointed out at the previous meeting, the primary task henceforth was to make a positive effort to determine how the outstanding differences could be overcome. He fully agreed with the Italian Representative that the Council would still provide the best forum for consultations between member countries. He felt that it was desirable that governments should keep the Council informed of any amendments they proposed, so that these could be judged on their intrinsic merits and the breadth of support they had received.

4. The GERMAN REPRESENTATIVE recalled that immediately after the announcement of a Soviet/United States agreement on the draft Treaty, the Federal Government had circulated a statement expressing satisfaction that the Disarmament Conference was now, for the first time, in a position to examine a complete draft Treaty. It had also recognized that during the negotiations in which the Federal Government and the governments of other non-nuclear-weapon Powers had co-operated, it had been possible to make improvements in the draft. The statement had stressed the particular importance his Government attached to agreement on safeguards and on verifications. Finally, the Federal Government had expressed the hope that the seventeen governments represented at the Geneva Conference would soon be in a position to agree on a universally acceptable draft Treaty taking account of the Resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly.

5. While stressing that his Government reserved the right to study the draft Treaty in greater detail, the German Representative said that he would like to expand on the above comments as follows:

- the Federal Republic was favourably disposed to a Non-Proliferation Treaty which was universally acceptable and took into account the United Nations Resolutions;
- it recognized that the new draft represented an essential step towards such a Treaty;
- since the two major nuclear-weapon Powers had now agreed on a complete draft, the Federal Republic assumed that the non-nuclear members of the Geneva Conference - to whom this draft was primarily addressed - would now put forward comments and propose amendments;
- the Federal Republic assumed that in the course of the forthcoming Geneva negotiations, those German interests which had not been accepted in the United States/Soviet negotiations and on which the Federal Republic's position was well known would be taken into account;
- consultations between the Allies should be continued in the NATO Council as well as on a bilateral basis.

6. He added that the Federal Government welcomed the spirit underlying the latest Italian proposal that the rights of individual groups of States be formulated in accordance with their specific obligations, so as to introduce a fair balance into the Treaty. His Government shared the Italian view that the civil nuclear countries - i.e. States with a large peaceful nuclear industry, and particularly those with the technical potential to produce nuclear weapons within a relatively short time - bore a special responsibility for preventing a further spread of nuclear weapons, and that this should be taken into account in finalising the Treaty. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the Council would hold a series of detailed discussions on the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a whole so that he could bring up a number of questions which his Authorities had not been able to examine closely owing to the limited time available.