

MEETING OF SUB-GROUP NO. 4 OF SPECIAL GROUP (AC/261)
ON 18th APRIL, 1967 AT 10.30 A.M.

Record of the Discussion

The CHAIRMAN, after his opening remarks, proposed that the Sub-Group approach its task by examining the problems they were faced with under the following six specific points:

- (1) The drafting of the Terms of Reference for the Sub-Group;
- (2) The examination of member countries' commitments outside the NATO area and the way in which they affect the Alliance.
- (3) Could NATO develop (a common policy of behaviour) by extending its consultative machinery beyond purely procedural aspects of the problem?
- (4) Is there a task for the Alliance outside the NATO area?
- (5) The possibility of setting up policy-planning machinery for the Alliance.
- (6) Should NATO concern itself with aid to less-developed countries? if so, should NATO lay down policy guide-lines in this matter to be followed by member countries?

Ambassador CLEVELAND (United States) proposed that Point (2) above be examined before Point (1) and suggested that the following be included amongst the regional problems that the Sub-Group could address itself to:

- (i) Events in the Middle East.
- (ii) Events in Latin America.
- (iii) United Kingdom withdrawal from East of Suez.
- (iv) Famine in India.

Mr. BÜCKER (Germany) proposed the following preliminary procedure:

- (1) A list of problems outside the area affecting the Alliance as a whole.
- (ii) A list of problems outside the area affecting individual members of the Alliance.
- (iii) A list of problems which could be usefully dealt with by NATO including classification of them under the following three headings:

- (a) Problems threatening world peace.
 - (b) Problems threatening the security of the Alliance.
 - (c) Problems affecting the effectiveness of the Alliance.
- (iv) A final list of methods by which we could deal successfully with these problems, bearing in mind the possibility that NATO could act either collectively or individually after collective consultation.

Ambassador RITCHIE (Canada), Mr. d'AVIGNON (Belgium), Mr. de RANITZ (Netherlands), Ambassador VASCA da CUNHA (Portugal), Mr. MELEK (Turkey) all agreed that the Sub-Group in its approach to its task should adopt a flexible attitude and try to avoid any duplication of work with other existing NATO bodies.

During the ensuing discussion on the Chairman's six-point exposé, Ambassador CLEVELAND said that Point (2) was too narrowly defined and proposed that the Sub-Group examine general regional problems rather than specific commitments of individual member countries. As for the possibility of developing a common policy of behaviour, he said that some progress had so far been made in that direction and reminded the Sub-Group members of the six-monthly reports prepared by Political Experts for the Ministers and various periodical reports on regions outside the NATO area by the Committee of Economic Advisers. Finally, he included in this category the so-called Athens guide-lines in the nuclear field.

Mr. ROBERTS (Deputy Secretary General) said that the Secretariat would prepare an aide memoire on past examples of NATO agreements on specific points for the information of the Chairman.

Ambassador CLEVELAND (United States), intervening during discussion on Points (4) and (6), said that under Point (4) consultation already existed within the NATO machinery on problems outside the NATO area because the majority of NATO member countries were also represented at the Action Agency which dealt with these problems, e.g. United Nations. Referring to Point (6), Ambassador Cleveland said that food and population growth problems, which were once considered as being of a purely economic nature, have recently assumed a growing political significance. For instance, the Sub-Group could ask itself whether it would consider a solution to the so-called constitutional crisis now threatening the cohesion of broader international organizations dominated by rich countries. It was becoming more and more apparent that poor countries preferred to operate within the framework of international organizations dominated by themselves such as UNCTAD and the United Nations. Perhaps the Western World needed another Bretton-Woods Agreement. Ambassador Cleveland also mentioned the problem of developing the right ~~amount~~ ^{method} of institution approach to new fields of technology, e.g. developments in weather control might in the near future give one country the power to control the weather in another.

Mr. ROBERTS (Deputy Secretary General) strongly urged Sub-Group members to broaden the field of work to include economic, technological and sociological problems.

The following decisions were taken at the end of the meeting:

- (1) Those members who had concrete proposals as regards to the presentation and contents of their report should communicate them in writing to the Chairman within two weeks from today.
- (2) The Chairman would prepare a draft outline of their projected report to the Ministers and circulate it in time for examination at their next meeting.
- (3) It was agreed that the next meeting of the Sub-Group be held on 23rd May at 10.30 a.m. and 2.30 p.m. if necessary.
- (4) It was agreed that if the Sub-Group decided to submit a report for the information of Ministers in June, this could only be a progress report without reference to capitals.
- (5) It was noted that there will be further meetings of the Sub-Group in June, September and October and that the final report should be ready for examination by the Ministers in December.