

17th September, 1962

Record of a Meeting held on Monday 17th September between Mr. Stikker, Secretary General for NATO, and the Representatives of the Four Powers about Berlin Contingency Planning

Present:

Mr. Finletter	-	United States
Sir Paul Mason	}	- United Kingdom
Mr. Tomlinson		
Mr. Von Walther	-	Germany
Mlle Campana	-	France
Mr. George Vest	}	- International Staff
Mr. Gregh		
Mr. Bendall		

Mr. Finletter opened the meeting in stating that the representatives of the Four Powers had held a meeting in the morning to determine in which way the new paper, worked out by the Ambassador's Group in Washington (BQD-M-30 Revised) could be best brought into the discussion which is to take place about Berlin Contingency Planning on the basis of the Secretary General's appeal (PO(62)581) and of the military plans of the Supreme Commanders and the assessment by the Standing Group (SGM(479)62. What Mr. Finletter and his colleagues intend to discuss now with the Secretary General is about _____ and agree with those present the new paper. They have thought of a brief paper by the four delegations which would emphasise the reasons underlying the conditions under which the Council will be asked to open its discussions about the military contingency planning. The Four Powers would wish that their new paper would not be sent back to capitals. It would be better if the members of the Council asked them what did not seem clear in order to enable further and complete explanations to be given. Any formal interpretation of BQD-30 would come only after this exercise was complete. The brief would also make clear that the Four Powers are not asking for immediate approval of this paper (the sequence paper). What the Four Powers are aiming at is to get the consensus of the Council on the sequence paper but its discussion would not involve any formal action or approval to the philosophy which has been worked out by the Four Countries. Then at some stage before full discussion is opened on the

sequence paper bercun plans would be discussed in full in the Council.

Mr. Finletter then explained that the powers main concern about Berlin were not that the military contingency plan had been submitted to the Council for approval. It is true that the instructions to the Military Commanders (C-M(61)104) spoke of approval but he felt that the word "approve" was too strong here.

Mr. Von Walther expressed his views on the same lines and expressed also his feeling about formal approval of what was after all only a catalogue of plans. Formal approval of one or another of these plans would have to be given by the Council only at the time it had to be decided to implement some of these plans.

Mr. Stikker expressed his concern about the new situation created by BQD-30. Many papers were involved now - PO(62)581, the Military Plans, the Appraisal of the Standing Group and on the top of these the new tripartite paper. He is well assured that delegates would wish to go back to their governments to obtain their views and this will entail new delays at a time when it appears that a year has elapsed since the instructions were given to the Supreme Commanders by the Council.

Sir Paul Mason then expressed his views that the bercun and marcon plans are the result of the requests of the Council to the Supreme Commanders that come with the appraisal of the Standing Group. The Council should make sure they are the right kind of plans but they constitute a catalogue of plans. They are not briefly presented in a preferred order; the choice will have to be made when the time arises.

The Council, if it had to adhere itself to these plans, might think they involve the plunging into bercun or marcon operations after there is some interference with regards to Berlin. The BQD 30 paper shows that phase 2, as organized and commented upon by the Four Powers, is of vital importance; up to this phase 2 there is nothing really very serious. Diplomatic action as well as economic sanction do not mean war. On the contrary we cross very considerable rubicon so in effect PO(62)581, in the views of Sir Paul Mason, is a paper which should not give rise to apprehensions in the Council.

Mr. Stikker is still worried in determining what the Council will be asked to do. This new paper has suddenly appeared. Other countries will have the feeling that the tripartite group has been working alone and they may not understand why their new

set of ideas is brought forward for discussion in the Council at so late a stage, and governments, that of Norway and Luxembourg, he felt that many of his visitors had a strong feeling that new discussion with the Council on the Berlin situation should take place. There was a strong chance that the Russians might sign a peace treaty with the DDR in November or December. What would this mean if it was firmly about the three points to which NATO is ready to stand as it has always been understood or would it put the actions to be taken before the associations (which are not liked by the French). Are there modalities to live with after the peace treaty is signed? Unity is badly needed and if we are going to talk for hours about how to deal with the DDR once it would be given or not to govern access, it might prove to be bad for the unity of the Alliance in the public opinion so a paper must be given right now to open such a discussion on the follow up about Berlin but we must be very careful and exercise restraint otherwise the three strong issues might be prejudiced.

Mr. Finletter agreed entirely to Mr. Stikker's views. He has received many cables from Washington. His authorities want to avoid any impression that there is no agreement within NATO.

Sir Paul Mason stated once more that he thought it would be better to have a go at Berlin plans only after BOD-30 had been discussed.

It was finally agreed on Mr. Stikker's proposal that at the end of the next meeting of the Council on Tuesday morning the 18th September, he would in a short way explain BOD-30 as had just been discussed, call the attention of the Ambassador to this paper and explain that there would be a first discussion about it at the meeting of the Council on Wednesday 19th. One of the Ambassadors, presumably Lord _____, would explain the reason for this paper and what is behind it. It was further understood that if the discussion could not be ended that day it would be resumed on 27th September and at the same time full discussion of PO(62)581 of the military plans would take place. The Standing Group's Appraisal would also be discussed at this meeting.