

16 JUL 1967

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

30th June, 1967.

To: Secretary General

c.c. Deputy Secretary General
 ASC for Political Affairs
 Mr. Chapman
 Mr. Vincent
 Mr. de Camaret
 Mr. Menne

From: Secretary of Sub-Group No. 4

Subject: Third Meeting of Sub-Group No. 4 on Developments in Regions outside the NATO Area (AC/261)

Sub-Group No. 4 held its third meeting on 29th June at 3.30 p.m. The Sub-Group had for this meeting four out of five sections of their report, prepared by Professor Patijn (Rapporteur) which in its final form will consist of the following sections:

- I. General Introduction.
- II. Additional Reflections on the Role of NATO in World Affairs.
- III. Categories of Problems which could affect the interests of the Alliance.
- IV. Some Reflections on Development and Economic Aid.
- V. Proposals for Improving Political Consultation.

The first drafts of Sections I and III having been thoroughly discussed at the last meeting, discussion today centred on Sections II and V. The Sub-Group noted the reaction of various representatives to the contents and presentation of these two papers as a whole and later went over the text paragraph by paragraph.

It was generally agreed that the report, at this stage, was still very much Professor Patijn's own report and that he should be allowed to throw up a few stimulating ideas, although these might eventually be found to be unacceptable to delegations. The Canadian, French, German and United Kingdom Representatives

NATO UNCLASSIFIED AND PUBLIC DISCLOSED

-2-

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

nevertheless cautioned Professor Patijn against setting his views too high and suggested that the success of the report would depend largely on the degree of acceptability of the recommendations to member governments; they, therefore, recommended that the report be worded more realistically, bearing in mind what could be practically achievable given the present circumstances. The French and United Kingdom Representatives have particularly sounded a note of warning about any machinery which might make NATO look like having a common policy. The United Kingdom Representative suggested that reference to "common policy" be replaced by "co-ordinated national policy".

The United States Representative, expounding the idea of the "indivisibility of détente", objected to references in the text to a political crisis in NATO, explaining that the word gave the impression that NATO was no longer doing what it had been doing before. He said that NATO's past success had been where its concentration had been, namely in the problems relating to the cold war, but as we were getting closer to détente a new situation had arisen and NATO was trying to adapt itself to this.

During the Sub-Group's discussion of Section V on the machinery for political consultation, both the French and United Kingdom Representatives thought that the existing NATO machinery should be fully utilised rather than duplicated, as suggested in paragraphs 6-7 by the creation of new bodies. The United Kingdom Representative thought that APAG could be re-organized to take on the functions of the proposed "NATO Policy Planning Council" and that the existing Political Expert Groups could cut down their routine meetings and meet ad hoc when they were needed. The French Representative, making a veiled remark about his Government's eventual reactions to the machinery proposed by Professor Patijn, said that his authorities were sceptical about any proposal to promote policy planning within NATO. There was strong opposition to the proposal to form groups, limited to member countries possessing special knowledge of the regions concerned and more particularly from the Turkish Representative who said that his Government would oppose any proposal which would go counter to the principle that all NATO bodies should be open-ended. He was supported by the Canadian, German, Danish and Greek Representatives.

It was finally agreed to postpone further discussion of paragraphs 6-10 on the proposed new machinery to allow Professor Patijn to consult his fellow rapporteurs for a better co-ordination of their final recommendations to the Special Group itself next Autumn. Professor Patijn promised to submit for the consideration of the Sub-Group at their next meeting a new draft report including a Section on economic development and economic aid.

It was agreed that the Sub-Group would meet again on Thursday, 14th September at 10.30 a.m. and 3.30 p.m.