

Mr Van Campen

WATC CONFIDENTIAL

RS/67/107

(Handwritten mark resembling a stylized 'P' or a large checkmark)

25th September, 1967

FUTURE TASKS OF THE ALLIANCE
REPORT ON THE DISCUSSION IN SUB-GROUP 1
ON MONDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1967
ON PART I OF THE DRAFT REPORT

This report has been re-run as a blue in order to meet requests for additional copies.

W. J. NEWTON,
POLITICAL DIVISION.

WLN/SW

FUTURE TASKS OF THE ALLIANCE

REPORT ON THE DISCUSSION IN SUB-GROUP 1
OF PART I OF THE DRAFT REPORT

(First part of meeting on Monday, 18th September, 1967)

Ambassador Watson invited general comments on Part I (East-West Relations, Détente and European Settlement) of the draft report distributed on 11th September, 1967.

The BELGIAN REPRESENTATIVE wanted the report to make more explicit the relation between the Alliance and the question of East-West relations. He also pointed out the ambiguity of terms such as "European Security" which were used in a quite different sense by the Soviets.

CANADA said that more emphasis should be placed on economic relations.

The NETHERLANDS, like DENMARK, wanted it to be clear that at present the report would go forward under the responsibility of the rapporteurs. The NETHERLANDS joined ITALY in pointing out that the reference on page 6 to "a politically and economically attractive alternative to the present state of Europe" was left in the air, unless we were to assume that Part III of the report (Practical Steps and Procedures) is supposed to fill this gap. But Part III is more a description of difficulties which prevent offering such an attractive alternative. The NETHERLANDS were disappointed that Part III did not fulfil the object of the Maxwell Exercise, which was "meant to open windows".

The CHAIRMAN said that to fill out the blank on page 6 would need a lot of able people working continuously over a year. (Later in the discussion on the same point the Chairman said "a whole-time body would be needed on this" and not a body such as Sub-Group 1, meeting only occasionally.) As regards the present status of the discussions, he accepted that comment on a governmental level would come at the Special Group and ministerial level.

NORWAY, like the NETHERLANDS, also expressed disappointment. The expectations aroused by statements of Ministers were not reflected in the conclusions of the report and there is likely, therefore, to be a negative reaction from public opinion, not only as far as East-West prospects were concerned but also as to NATO's future role in this context. He asked that greater prominence should be given in the report to the point made on page 13 (paragraph 10) "States and communities with differing social systems should not only co-exist but collaborate to their mutual

benefit". The CHAIRMAN said that the question of what would be made public would be up to Ministers to decide - as drafted the report was confidential.

The UNITED STATES suggested (1) that the rapporteurs should preface their report with a synopsis; (2) that the report should conclude with a more specific recommendation about the nature of consultation and with a more explicit statement of the task of the Alliance in the 70's. Professor Brzezinski defined the principal task for the future as going beyond the previous task of peace and security for NATO countries, to include over and above this the role of promoting the development of an East-West security system and a general peace settlement for Europe.

The meeting then went through Part I of the report paragraph by paragraph and the rapporteurs took note of the various detailed suggestions for verbal and other changes.

After this discussion of textual points, there was a further discussion on the question of publicity. The CHAIRMAN again emphasised that at the present stage the report was drafted on a confidential basis with no specific idea of publication; the question of publication could best be taken up in the Special Group with all the texts of the Sub-Groups in front of it. This was supported by BELGIUM and ITALY.

CANADA (Ambassador Ross Campbell) suggested that the Special Group will decide on the form of the report for submission to Ministers, and could at the same time give someone the task of drafting a version of the report in the form in which it might later be published: this version should also be submitted to Ministers.