

CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

EXEMPLAIRE N° 370
COPY

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
and
PUBLIC DISCLOSED

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
23rd April, 1954

~~NATO SECRET~~
SUMMARY RECORD
C-R(54)18

Summary Record of a meeting of the Council
held at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris, on
Friday 23rd April, 1954 at 3.30 p.m.

PRESENT

Chairman : H.E. Mr. Georges Bidault (France)
Vice-Chairman
and Secretary
General : The Lord Ismay

BELGIUM

H.E. Mr. P.H. Spaak (Minister for Foreign Affairs)
Mr. A. de Staercke (Permanent Representative)

CANADA

The Hon. L.B. Pearson (Secretary of State for
External Affairs)
H.E. Mr. L.D. Wilgress (Permanent Representative)

DENMARK

H.E. Mr. H.C. Hansen (Minister for Foreign Affairs)
H.E. Mr. A. Vestbirk (Permanent Representative)

FRANCE

H.E. Mr. Hervé Alphand (Permanent Representative)

GREECE

H.E. Mr. Stephanos Stephanopoulos (Minister for Foreign Affairs)
H.E. Mr. Georges Exintaris (Permanent Representative)

ICELAND

Mr. H. Andersen (Permanent Representative)
Mr. P. Benediktson (Icelandic Minister to Paris)

ITALY

H.E. Mr. Attilio Piccioni (Minister for Foreign Affairs)
H.E. Mr. Alberto Rossi-Longhi (Permanent Representative)

LUXEMBOURG

H.E. Mr. J. Bech (Prime Minister and Minister
for Foreign Affairs)
Mr. G. Heisbourg (Acting Permanent Representative)

NETHERLANDS

Mr. J.W. Beyen (Minister for Foreign Affairs)
 H.E. Jonkheer A.W.L. Tjarda van
 Starckenborgh Stachouwer (Permanent Representative)

NORWAY

Mr. H. Lange (Minister for Foreign Affairs)
 H.E. Mr. Arne Skaug (Permanent Representative)

PORTUGAL

Prof. Dr. Paulo Cunha (Minister for Foreign Affairs)
 H.E. Comte de Tovar (Permanent Representative)

TURKEY

H.E. Mr. Fatin R. Zorlu (Permanent Representative)
 Mr. I. Sadi Kavur (Assistant Secretary General
 for NATO Affairs)

UNITED KINGDOM

The Rt. Hon. Anthony Eden (Secretary of State for
 Foreign Affairs)
 Sir Christopher Steel (Permanent Representative)

UNITED STATES

The Hon. John Foster Dulles (Secretary of State)
 Mr. J.C. Hughes (Permanent Representative)

ALSO PRESENT

Vice-Admiral R. Dick (Standing Group Permanent Officer)

INTERNATIONAL STAFF

Mr. H. van Vredenburg (Deputy Secretary General)
 Mr. S. Fenoaltea (Assistant Secretary General for
 Political Affairs)
 Mr. L.P. Weicker (Assistant Secretary General for
 Production and Logistics)
 Mr. R. Sergent (Assistant Secretary General for
 Economics and Finance)
 Mr. R.D. Coleridge (Executive Secretary)

CONTENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
I.	Consideration of the International Political Situation (Continuation of the discussion)	1
II.	Possible extension of Political Consultation within NATO	3
III.	Soviet Government's Announcement of the granting of "Full Sovereignty" to East Germany	4

(111)

NATO SECRET
C-R(54)18CONTENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
IV.	Duration of the North Atlantic Treaty	4
V.	Date and place of the next Ministerial Meeting	5
VI.	Permanent site for NATO Headquarters	6
VII.	Press Communiqué	6

(111)

I. CONSIDERATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL SITUATION
(Continuation of the discussion)

Documents: C-M(54)33
C-M(54)36

1. Mr. PICCIONI (Italy) said that his Government, in connection with the fifth anniversary of the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty some weeks before, had examined the progress made by the Organization in the past five years. That progress seemed to have been successful, in that the fourteen countries represented in NATO had put up an effective resistance to the threat that menaced them. Peace in Europe had been preserved, and it seemed that NATO had started on the right lines and that it should continue on those lines.

2. His Government was concerned with a wider consideration than the build-up of the defence effort. It had been frequently stated that peace in the world was indivisible: to achieve peace in the world, preparations for peace must also be indivisible.

3. His Government's views on the aims of Soviet policy remained unchanged: the USSR continued to hope for the disruption of the West. It was only Soviet tactics that had altered. NATO remained the most effective body to meet the threat from the USSR. At the same time, the Italian Government continued to think in terms of Article 2 of the Treaty, and preferred to talk of the "Atlantic Community" rather than of the "Atlantic Alliance".

4. So far as the EDC was concerned, his Government had recently submitted to the Italian Parliament legislation providing for the ratification of the Treaty. That had been rendered necessary by the new elections to Parliament. In fact, the previous Parliament had not been able to achieve ratification for lack of time, although the competent committee had approved the Treaty. The Italian Government considered the EDC a fundamental factor in the policy it had been pursuing in recent years. It would therefore do its utmost to avoid delays in ratification. The Italian Government noted with satisfaction two recent statements in this connection: those of the United Kingdom and the United States Governments giving pledges of their close co-operation with the EDC.

The Italian Delegation, at previous meetings of the Council, had been consistent in recommending that decisions relating to the general policy of NATO should reflect unanimity among NATO governments. For that reason, his Government believed that every effort should be made to achieve a closer system of consultation among member governments, so that the Council could become a real instrument in co-ordinating and fusing national views.

5. Mr. LANGE (Norway) thought that the paper prepared by the Secretariat was of great value to member governments in that it gave them an agreed basis for evaluating Soviet intentions. He hoped that at future meetings a paper on the same lines would be available. He agreed with the Foreign Secretaries of the United Kingdom and of the Netherlands that the ratification of the EDC Treaty was of great importance to NATO: he said this with some diffidence, as Norway, for reasons of which they were all aware, could not become a member of the EDC. He also agreed with the United Kingdom and Netherlands Representatives that further delay in associating Germany in the defence of the West, and in giving Germany its proper place in the Western Community, would be fatal.

6. So far as the question of increased political consultation among members of NATO was concerned, he was glad that the habit of exchanging views freely and frankly in the Council was growing. His Government realised that the problems of defence, and of peace or war, were world-wide. At the same time, Article 6 of the North Atlantic Treaty laid down certain geographical limits to the Organization. It was therefore important, so far as the public opinion of member countries was concerned, not to give the impression that NATO was extending its commitments. It was important to distinguish between:

- (a) discussions in the Council based only on the desire to exchange information and,
- (b) discussions which might lead to material decisions.

Provided that this distinction was kept clear, interlocking security arrangements which might embrace the whole world could be contemplated. There was support in Norway for the Organization because NATO was not only a geographical area, but was also a community of nations with common ideals and a common pattern of life: in particular, there was respect for the individual and the rule of law in all NATO countries. That was why it was a genuine community. He hoped that the feeling of an Atlantic Community would not be weakened by over-expanding the geographical area of NATO.

7. Mr. HANSEN (Denmark) thought that the views expressed by the Foreign Secretaries of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands on the EDC were sound. Though Denmark was not a member of the EDC, it was vitally interested in finding a constructive solution for the German question, particularly in view of its geographical position. He hoped that their Chairman's battle for the ratification of the EDC Treaty would be crowned with success.

8. The CHAIRMAN said that he was grateful for the understanding of the difficulties of the French people expressed by his colleagues. He greatly appreciated statements such as those made by Mr. Eden and Mr. Beyen, particularly when they stressed that the EDC proposal was concerned not only with purely military considerations, but also with the place which Germany should take in the free world. The three powers at Berlin had put forward proposals which might have made it possible to bring about a free, unified, democratic Germany. Those proposals had borne no fruit. His colleagues had understood the emotional feeling in France with regard to the EDC, and he was grateful for their understanding. He also wished to thank the United Kingdom and the United States Governments for their pledges in connection with the EDC. If a forward strategy was to be maintained in Europe, pledges of that kind were of the greatest value. Further, the recent statements by the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States, to the effect that they regarded their adherence to the North Atlantic Treaty as being of unlimited duration, were also of great value.

9. The COUNCIL:

- (1) took note of the report on Trends and Implications of Soviet Policy submitted by the Secretary General (C-R(54)53); and of the paper on the Current Appraisal of Soviet Strength (C-R(54)36);
- (2) took note of the statements made in the course of the discussion on this item of the Agenda.

II. POSSIBLE EXTENSION OF POLITICAL CONSULTATION WITHIN NATO

10. Mr. PEARSON (Canada) said that his Delegation had prepared a resolution on this subject which was before the Council. There was nothing revolutionary in the resolution, which simply expressed the desire that the Council should be used to the greatest possible extent in this field. Those who had been familiar with the work of NATO in the past 5 years would be glad to see the extent to which the NATO Council had developed as a mechanism for political consultation. The purpose of the resolution he was submitting was to develop that tendency. Opportunities for political consultation were an important factor in creating the feeling of political unity. The Norwegian Foreign Minister, in his opinion, had been right in distinguishing between two kinds of consultation:

- (a) consultation referring to problems in which obligations and commitments might be involved (under Articles 5 and 6 of the Treaty);
- (b) consultation where no obligation was involved, but where discussion might be of value (Article 4 of the Treaty).

11. Without parliamentary approval, consultation under (a) above should not be undertaken. On the other hand, he felt it would be unwise to limit the kind of consultation contemplated under (b). The resolution he had submitted, and the remarks he had made, were not intended to imply any criticism or complaint. All he hoped was that, in the future, the views expressed in the resolution would be taken into account.

12. Mr. LANGE (Norway) supported the views expressed by the Canadian Foreign Minister. He had been impressed by the amount of consultation that had taken place in the first 5 years of the history of NATO, and hoped that it would continue. Above all, he hoped that consultation would take place well in advance of decisions on important political issues being taken by member governments.

13. Mr. DULLES (United States) supported the Canadian resolution on the understanding that consultation would be limited within the bounds of common sense. Countries like his own with world-wide interests might find it difficult to consult other NATO governments in every case. For a sudden emergency, it was more important to take action than to discuss the emergency. In other words, consultation should be regarded as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that he, too, could support the Canadian resolution, provided that the Organization did not forget that its purpose was a defensive one, and that discussion of decisions did not take place merely for the sake of discussion.

15. Mr. PEARSON (Canada) accepted the interpretations of the United States Foreign Minister and of the Chairman.

16. The COUNCIL:

- (1) approved the resolution submitted by the Canadian Delegation and took note of the comments made in the course of the discussion;

- (2) agreed that the resolution could be released for publication.

III. SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE GRANTING OF "FULL SOVEREIGNTY" TO EAST GERMANY

Document: C-M(54)37(Revised)

17. The CHAIRMAN thought that the Council could agree on a general principle, that is, that it did not recognise the so-called Democratic Republic as an independent government. It could then leave it to the Permanent Representatives to work out the details of a Resolution to this effect.

18. Mr. HANSEN (Denmark) said that while his Government was in general agreement with the principle expressed in the draft resolution, he was faced with certain constitutional difficulties with regard to this item. Questions of this kind, under present political circumstances in Denmark had to be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and he had not had time to do this. His provisional approval of the Chairman's suggestion was therefore subject to confirmation.

19. After a brief discussion, the COUNCIL:

- (1) agreed that the general principle expressed in the draft resolution (C-M(54)37(Revised)) was acceptable and could be referred to in the communiqué to be issued at the end of the session of the Council;
- (2) agreed that the Council in permanent session should agree a Resolution on this subject.

IV. DURATION OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

20. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of France, said that the French Government had welcomed the statements by President Eisenhower and Mr. Eden, to the effect that their governments considered that the Treaty, so far as they were concerned, was of unlimited duration. Could other Ministers make a statement to the same effect?

21. Dr. CUNHA (Portugal) said that he was surprised that this question had been raised at the present meeting. The Permanent Representatives had had a preliminary discussion of it only two days before, and Ministers had not had time to consult their Cabinet colleagues. For that reason he did not think that a decision could be taken at the present meeting of the Council.

22. Mr. SPAAK (Belgium) thought that the question was one of great importance. Whatever their views on the wording of Article 13 of the North Atlantic Treaty might be from a purely juridical point of view, he felt that the Council should welcome the statement by the United States and United Kingdom Governments, and should go on record to this effect.

23. Mr. BEYEN (Netherlands), felt that the Council should welcome the United Kingdom and United States statements in general, and should not ask the Permanent Representatives to try to interpret the text of the Treaty from a legal point of view.

24. Mr. DULLES (United States) pointed out that President Eisenhower's statement was subject to the proviso that its conditions would apply only when the EDC Treaty came into force.

25. The COUNCIL:

- (1) agreed that, in the communiqué, it should be stated that the Council had warmly welcomed the statements made by the United States and United Kingdom Governments;
- (2) agreed that member governments should consider the possibility of making similar declarations as to their intent with regard to Article 13 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

V. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT MINISTERIAL MEETING

26. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, unless urgent business made it necessary for the Council to meet earlier, the next Ministerial Meeting should take place in the Autumn, with consideration of the final report on the 1954 Annual Review as its principal task. The report should be ready for ministerial consideration by mid-November, provided that all countries replied to the Annual Review Questionnaire by the agreed dates. He suggested that it should be left to the Council in permanent session to decide the best date for the meeting.

27. There was then the question of the place for the next Ministerial Meeting. It had been suggested that there would be advantage in the Council occasionally meeting elsewhere than in Paris, but for the Autumn meeting, at which the Annual Review was to be considered, he thought that for purely practical reasons it would be very difficult to hold it anywhere other than at the permanent site in Paris. This was because a very large number of advisers would be required for such a meeting, and because a great deal of last minute work would have to be done on the Annual Review itself.

28. Mr. DULLES (United States) agreed in principle with the Chairman's suggestion. At the same time, he pointed out that circumstances might make it desirable to hold a meeting of the Council before the Autumn. His colleagues would remember that at the last Ministerial Meeting he had stressed the importance of ensuring German participation in the defence of the West through the EDC, and he still held firmly the views he had then expressed. Since the December meeting of Ministers, some progress had been made in the way of ratification; and his own government and that of the United Kingdom had given pledges which, he thought, would help the supporters of the EDC. However, there were forces at work strongly opposed to ratification of the EDC in certain countries. For that reason it might be necessary to call a meeting of the Council before the Autumn. He agreed that it should be left to Permanent Representatives to decide the date of the meeting, subject to the comments he had just made.

29. The COUNCIL:

agreed that the Council in Permanent Session should decide the date of the next Ministerial Meeting, which would be held in Paris in the Autumn of 1954 to consider the Annual Review, unless political circumstances made an earlier meeting desirable.

VI. PERMANENT SITE FOR NATO HEADQUARTERS

30. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Council that the French Government, since NATO Headquarters had moved to Paris, had been anxious to find a site which would be suitable for a permanent headquarters of the organization. In 1952, the French Government had selected a site outside Paris near SHAPE. After accepting the French proposal, the Council had decided that it was not wholly suitable, and had asked the French Government, although the land had already been purchased, to reconsider the question and to see whether it would not be possible to find a site in Paris.

31. Various possibilities had been considered, and he was now happy to inform the Council that the French Government could place at the disposal of NATO a site which met the views expressed by national delegations. It was in the area of the Porte Dauphine. He hoped that Permanent Representatives would examine the site in the near future to consider the conditions in which buildings could be constructed to form the permanent headquarters of the organization.

32. The SECRETARY GENERAL thanked M. Bidault, as representative of the French Government, in the name of the international staff and of national delegations. It was a generous gesture to make the site available free of charge. He pointed out that the international staff served the Council in a corporate capacity and the staffs of delegations served their governments in an individual capacity. At the same time, both were serving the interests of NATO as a whole, and the international staff and the delegations, in effect, formed a team. For that reason he very much hoped that delegations would find accommodation in the new building with the international staff.

33. The COUNCIL:

took note, with gratitude, of the offer made by the French Government and invited the Council in permanent session to examine the technical aspects of the problem.

VII. PRESS COMMUNIQUE

34. A draft press communiqué was submitted by the Press Communiqué Working Group. A number of amendments were made in the course of discussion.

35. The COUNCIL:

approved the communiqué as amended in the course of discussion (for final text see Press Release).

36. The CHAIRMAN:

declared the 13th Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council closed.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE