

26 bis 20 07

NATO SECRET

Private Meeting of the Council in the
Office of the Secretary General, 9th June 1965

Present State and Future Progress of the Alliance
(Canadian Proposals)

The Secretary General opened the meeting by referring to his letter of 4th June 1965 to all Permanent Representatives.

Mr. Ignatieff then explained the spirit in which his Authorities had made their proposal. He agreed with the Secretary General that Part II of the Canadian paper might be a good starting point of the discussion, which he emphasised should be quite informal in character. He advocated a gradual, stage by stage, approach, and deprecated the establishment of working groups at this stage.

The Greek Permanent Representative said his Authorities would fully cooperate in this exercise; they had no suggestions to make at this stage but might do so later. He emphasised the importance of the nuclear question and referred in this context to the proposal made by Mr. McNamara at the recent Defence Ministers' meeting. Mr. Brosio agreed that the nuclear question was very relevant to the subject now under review but thought that procedurally it should be handled separately.

The Danish Permanent Representative felt, however, that the nuclear issue was so interrelated with the present and future state of the Alliance that its separation from the present discussion might raise difficulties. He reiterated

..

his Authorities' great interest in the present exercise and agreed with his Canadian colleague that flexible procedures should be adopted.

The German Permanent Representative said it was his understanding that the present meeting was chiefly intended to organise the Council's work on the basis of the Canadian paper. He also favoured step by step informal discussions in highly restricted meetings. He accepted the Chairman's proposal to start with Part II of the Canadian proposal but thought that apart from discussing the new factors (part II) Permanent Representatives should also examine how far these new factors were relevant to the purposes of the present exercise. This latter question, to which he attached much importance, should be incorporated into the Canadian paper between Part II and Part III.

The British Permanent Representative, agreeing with Mr. Grewe, thought that the factors listed in Part II might be profitably rearranged, and the factor mentioned sub (f) should really be discussed first of all; he referred in this context to Mr. Ball's points made at the London Ministerial meeting which included these factors as well as other related ones. The next question to be discussed in his opinion was the nuclear one, to be followed by the factor "Underdeveloped Countries". He proposed that Part II of the Canadian paper should be rearranged, and that Mr. Ball's points should be included. He concluded by saying that he would comment at a later stage on the expression used sub (d) "The new unity

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2017)0025 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MIS EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

of purpose and economic strength of Western Europe". He could not help thinking that this expression perhaps did not accurately reflect the real state of affairs in Western Europe.

The French Permanent Representative said his Authorities' interest in possible changes in NATO was well known. He would certainly participate in the discussions in a constructive manner but he had no concrete suggestions to offer, nor would he be in a position to do so before next year or perhaps even later. In fact, as of this moment, no French proposals were in existence. He referred in this context to the fact that Presidential elections would take place in France at the end of this year.

Both the Secretary General and the German Permanent Representative felt that this French position would be no obstacle to the present exercise since obviously the stage where proposals should be formulated would not be reached for a long time.

The Netherlands Permanent Representative welcomed this exercise; so did the Turkish Permanent Representative; but Mr. Birgi felt it would be better to start in an empirical fashion with the study of all possible factors, in order to find out whether or not they were relevant to either the structure or the methods of the Alliance. Mr. Brosio concluded from this statement that Mr. Birgi aimed at avoiding the establishment of any order of priority as between the questions which might arise, such as might result from the

rearrangement proposed by the British and German Permanent Representatives.

The Belgian and Italian Permanent Representatives were in favour of the rearrangement, and of a sharper formulation of Part II; Mr. Alessandrini also pointed out, agreeing in this respect with Sir Evelyn Shuckburgh, that the organisation of the Alliance left little to be desired: the essential question on which attention should be concentrated was how to strengthen the will to use this organisation.

The United States Permanent Representative welcomed this exercise as a very useful and even necessary one. Referring to an earlier remark of the British Permanent Representative, he felt that even those who were satisfied with the present structure and methods of the Alliance should carefully ponder whether there was still room for improvement or whether the purposes of the Alliance were still in harmony with present-day international realities. The original purpose of the Alliance was not only to protect us but also to get us away from European and, in general, Western Balkanisation. Unity was not only necessary for the sake of defence but also for other reasons. This, in his opinion, was the fundamental problem to be discussed in this exercise.

The Secretary General concluded the discussion by proposing that the International Secretariat, in consultation with the Canadian Delegation, should be instructed to rearrange