

*I have all the documents*  
*Def. 4-4-04*

To : Secretary General

From: F.D. Gregh

cc.: Deputy Secretary General  
MSG Political Affairs  
SGRMP



BERLIN CONTINGENCY PLANS

I attach a note which attempts to summaries very briefly the "state of play" on the various topics which have come up in the Council during the last three months under the general heading of Berlin Contingency Plans. This reflects the position as it stood on the eve of the December Ministerial meeting.

2. There was no specific discussion during the December meeting of the contingency plans themselves, although a number of passing references were made to the subject in the broader context of East-West relations. A number of ministers stressed the importance of making progress in the field of political contingency planning for Berlin. Among the more insistent was the Canadian Foreign Minister, who pressed once again for a "catalogue" of political plans, and specifically for the consideration of what should be the nature of NATO countries' relations with the East German regime in the event of a separate peace treaty or the sudden convocation of a peace conference by the Soviet Union. Mr. Luns of the Netherlands called for a more thorough study of the problem than that contained in the Four Power paper already submitted to the Council on possible reactions in the event of the signature of a Soviet-DDR peace treaty, as well as an examination of handling in the U.N.

3. The proposal made by Mr. Rusk that the Alliance should turn its attention to "crisis management within the Alliance...including such obvious facilities as the most effective communication among governments" and the parallel remarks by other Foreign Ministers (notably Mr. Piccioni, Mr. Spack and Mr. Lange) to the effect that the Council should re-examine the effectiveness of its methods of political consultation, though related in part to Berlin, evoke the whole problem of East-West relations and the lessons to be drawn from the Cuban affair. These will understand be dealt with by MSG Political Affairs in a separate submission.

*J. B...*  
*to FD...*

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

A N N E X

REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S DISCUSSION ON BERLIN CONTINGENCY  
PLANNING FROM LAST OCTOBER TILL THE EVE OF THE MINISTERIAL  
MEETING

---

(a) Berlin Contingency Planning (PO/62/641 - paras. 4 to 8)

The Council approved in principle and for planning purposes, the Major Commanders' plans in the BERCON and the MARCON series (meeting held on 31st October, 1962, C-R(62)53, paragraph 14). Any significant changes in those plans should be submitted for approval to the Council. At the Council meeting of 30th November, Mr. Tyler suggested that MARCON planning might be reviewed in the light of the Cuban experience. It will also be recalled that Mr. Nitze on 19th September indicated that supplementary national or tripartite naval measures were under examination, although no more has been heard of this suggestion (PO/62/641, paragraph 30). In both cases further action depends on initiative from the United States.

(b) Relationship between NATO and the Three Powers in Planning of Berlin Contingency Operations (PO/62/641, paras. 9 to 11)

The Council took note, as a basis for further planning, of the Three Powers' recommendations concerning relationship between NATO and the Three Powers themselves in the planning and control of Berlin Contingency operations, as contained in CTS 62-9 (Council meeting held on 31st October, 1962, C-R(62)53, paragraph 14).

No further action is required by the Council in this matter.

(c) Preferred Sequence of Military Actions (PO/62/641, paras. 12 & 13)

The Council accepted the "preferred sequence" of military actions as a general framework for the continuing discussions of the overall problem of coordinating actions and policies of the Allies in the event of a worsening of the Berlin situation (Meeting held on 31st October, 1962, C-R(62)53, paragraph 14)

No further action is required by the Council in this matter for the time being, although the document may need

re-examination in due course in light of developments in political contingency planning and in the field of alerts.

(d) Political Contingency Plans (PO/62/641, paragraph 14)

So far the Four Powers have transmitted their proposals concerning the measures to be taken in the event of the signature by the Soviet Union of a separate treaty with the Pankow régime. The Council agreed in the meeting held on 14th November to use the paper as a basis for further planning. The Four Powers have still to give supplementary information on other points listed in paragraph 14 of PO/62/641, viz. diplomatic action in LIVE OAK context: action in the U.N.: problem of keeping open channels of communication with the Soviet Government (Mr. Rusk commented on this at the Ministerial meeting): interference with German access to Berlin.

On 30th November Mr. Tyler briefed the Council on the results of the current United States staff work on a broad East/West confrontation in the light of the Cuban lesson.

In view of the interest expressed by Ministers in pressing forward with political contingency planning, the Council should doubtless follow up its discussions in the New Year. The Four Powers should accordingly be urged to expedite the studies which they have announced.

(e) Economic Contingency plans:<sup>‡</sup> (PO/62/641, paragraphs 15 to 18)

1. Civil Aviation

The Council agreed that in the event of the Soviets enforcing a partial interdiction of NATO air traffic (civil or military) to or from West Berlin, the three measures listed in RDC/61/382 namely:

- closure of NATO airports to Soviet bloc aircraft;
- prevention of transit overflights and technical stops by Soviet bloc aircraft in NATO countries;
- prohibition against NATO country aircraft calling at Soviet bloc airports;

constitute an appropriate response. It is understood that if such a situation arose, the Council would at once meet to decide what action would be taken. (Document C-R(62)4).

2. Economic embargo

The Council agreed that in the event military and civilian access, air or ground, to West Berlin is blocked,

<sup>‡</sup> See also PO/62/691 (Revised) of which the following is an extract.

the immediate imposition of significant countermeasures amounting to a total economic embargo against the Soviet bloc would be an appropriate response.

3. Assistance and co-operation

The Council agreed that exceptional economic assistance on a collective basis should be provided under the principles set out in document C-M(61)114 to those members of the Alliance who would be most seriously affected by economic countermeasures and a form of special economic cooperation among NATO members and possibly in conjunction with other countries of the free world, should be provided under the principles set out in document C-M(61)150 in order to mitigate the effects of the economic countermeasures on their economies and the economies of the rest of the free world.

4. Partial economic counter-measures

The Council agreed on the principle of application of partial economic countermeasures for certain particular situations and as a response to hostile moves by the Soviet bloc. In the event that such moves take place, the Council will meet and, acting under the guidance of governments, will consider what action should be taken. Countries have been invited to take the necessary administrative measures for the implementation of such partial measures if the need arises.

(Council meeting 24th October 1962 - C-R(62)52).

5. Follow-up action required

- NATO countries which do not yet possess the legal and administrative powers to apply an immediate total economic embargo should take the necessary preparatory administrative steps, but would not be expected to proceed with the actual passage of legislation which should however be ready for immediate introduction.

(Council meeting 24th October 1962 - C-R(62)52).

It is suggested that the Secretary General may wish to place this matter on the Council's agenda again in February with a view to ascertaining what progress has been made by governments.

- The Council instructed the Committee of Economic Advisers to undertake further studies which appear useful

at this stage, with a view to implementing the principles defined in documents C-M(61)114 and C-M(61)150. In its last meeting held on the 29th November the Committee of Economic Advisers agreed that the interested delegations should come forward with proposals as to the ways and means of implementing the Council's instruction.

The Secretary General may wish to await the Committee's report on this subject.

(f) Alert measures in support of Berlin Contingency Plans

(PO/62/641, paras 19 to 26 - Council meeting held on 28th November 1962, C-R(62)56).

(i) Subject to confirmation of the Turkish Government's approval, the Council took note of the phasing of alert/stages measures as outlined in SGM-593-62(Revised) as a basis of further detailed planning, inviting at the same time the NATO Military Authorities to report to the Council at an early date the results of the recently resumed bilateral negotiations with governments on the general problem of Alerts and also on the particular aspect of Alert Measures in support of Berlin Contingency Plans. The Standing Group has requested the Major NATO Commanders to report their results quarterly beginning 1st January 1963.

It is presumed that a report from the Standing Group will be available for consideration by the Council by the end of January.

(ii) In addition to a recommendation that national authorities should review their reservations on Alert measures with a view to removing as many as possible, paragraph 20 of document SGM-593-62 emphasises the importance and urgency of implementing the following actions:

- 1) Rapid consultation between the Council and the NATO Military Authorities. In this connection a suitable liaison has been established. SGREP has explained the arrangements made with SHAPE and the Standing Group to the Acting Secretary General. It is understood that the Acting Secretary General is satisfied with these arrangements and does not consider that they need be brought before the Council.
- 2) Development of emergency operating procedures by the Council, including rapid and secure communications between delegations and their respective national capitals. A draft paper has been prepared on this matter by the Executive Secretary and forwarded to the

U.S. delegation for comment. A reply is expected by the 15th January 1963, following which the Executive Secretary's paper would presumably be circulated to delegations for consideration in the Council.

At its meeting on 28th November the Council invited national authorities to implement insofar as they were concerned, the requirements set out in paragraph 20 of SGM-593-62 and agreed that they would keep their own arrangements for dealing with emergencies under constant review. Accordingly, when the Council comes to consider the Executive Secretary's paper referred to in 2) above, it may be desirable to seek confirmation that emergency operating procedures do in fact exist in all Ministries of Defence.

(g) Legal implications (PO/62/641, para 29)

At the request of the Secretary General, a study dated 25th September 1962 has been prepared by the Legal Adviser of the International Staff and has been circulated to delegations for comment under cover of a letter from the Secretary General. So far six delegations have transmitted to the International Staff their Governments' comments on the paper:

Netherlands	:	19 October 1962
United Kingdom	:	8 November 1962
Greece	:	13 November 1962
Turkey	:	20 November 1962
Denmark	:	23 November 1962
Canada	:	27 November 1962

It is understood that the Legal Adviser is to review his original study in the light of the comments from member governments. It might be useful to enquire at the next Council meeting on Berlin Contingency Planning whether any other governments have in mind to submit comments in order that the Legal Adviser may finalise his paper.