

Canadisk indberetning fra mødet den 10. oktober 1962 i NATO om NATO's beredskabsplaner om Berlin (Berlin Contingency Planning)

DOWNGRADED TO SECRET
REBUT A SECRET
LIS(H&IA)

FILE COPY

50341-A-2-40
43 50

FM NATOPARIS OCT 11/62 ~~TOPSEC~~ FEB 27 1985

TO EXTERNAL 2360 PRIORITY

INFO CCOS EMBPARIS LDN WASHDC PRIORITY

REF YOURTEL DL107 OCT9

BERLIN CONTINGENCY PLANNING

COUNCILS DISCUSSION IN RESTD SESSION OCT 10 TOOK ACCOUNT OF

PO/62/641. IT WAS UNFORTUNATE THIS USEFUL SUMMARY OF THE COMPLICATED ACCUMULATION OF PAPER ON THIS SUBJECT HAD NOT RPT NOT BEEN CIRCULATED EARLIER. AS IT IS, DISCUSSION REMAINS CONFUSED. NO RPT NO DECISIONS HAVE BEEN TAKEN. A FURTHER MTG WILL BE HELD OCT 12.

2. THE STANDING GROUP HAD NO RPT. NO REPLY TO OUR QUESTION ABOUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS. THEREFORE I GAVE THE STATEMENT I SENT YOU IN MYTEL 2307 OCT5, INCORPORATING BOTH THE AMENDMENTS YOU SUGGESTED IN PARA1 YOUR REFTEL. THIS PRECIPITATED CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION. WE RECEIVED SUPPORT FROM NORWEGIANS AND BELGIANS, BUT A NUMBER OF OTHERS ARE OPPOSED. THEIR CHIEF OBJECTION IS THAT TO REQUEST THE EXCLUSION OF THE NUCLEAR CONTINGENCY PLAN AT THIS STAGE WOULD RE OPEN A QUESTION WHICH WAS DEBATED PAINFULLY AND AT LENGTH A YEAR AGO IN COUNCIL. OTHERS UNDERSTAND OUR OBJECTIONS VERY WELL; THE DIFFICULTY IS THEY DO NOT RPT NOT SHARE OUR VIEW. THEY POINT OUT THAT USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, LIKE ALL CONTINGENCY PLANS, WOULD BE SUBJECT TO A POLITICAL DECISION BY GOVTS AT THE TIME AND IF COUNCIL AGREED TO PULL OUT ONE PLAN OF THIS CATALOGUE, INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS COULD BE RAISED TO ALL THE OTHERS. FROM PRIVATE CONVERSATIONS WITH A NUMBER OF MY COLLEAGUES, I BELIEVE THIS VIEW TO BE STRONGLY HELD BY SOME DELS, NOTABLY FRENCH. IT IS TOO EARLY TO SAY WHAT WILL EMERGE FROM THE DISCUSSION, BUT WE MAY HAVE A TOUGH FIGHT.

3. THE OTHER IMPORTANT POINT DEALT WITH OCT 10 WAS THE ONE RAISED IN PARA4 OF YOUR REFTEL. HERE AGAIN, THERE IS A DEEP DIV OF OPINION. AT ONE EXTREME IS BOYESSEN, NORWEGIAN PERMREP, WHOSE PERSONAL VIEW IS THAT WHOLE IDEA OF APPROVAL IS MISCONCEIVED. HE LOOKS ON CONTINGENCY

...2

DOWNGRADED TO SECRET
REFUT A SECRET
LLS(H&IR)
FEB 27 1995

PAGE TWO 2360

PLANNING AS A CONTINUOUS PROCESS, IN WHICH IDEAS WILL BE SUBJECT TO CONSTANT REVIEW. HE FEARS THAT APPROVAL OF PLANS IN SOME FORMAL SENSE WILL TEND TO FREEZE PLANNING. THIS HE THINKS WOULD BE DANGEROUS BECAUSE THE WHOLE SERIES OF PLANS IS BUILT UP ON A SERIES OF ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT SOVIET REACTIONS WHICH COULD WELL BE FALSIFIED BY EVENTS. AT THE SAME TIME, HE EMPHASIZES THAT NORWEGIAN AUTHORITIES ARE FIRMLY CONVINCED OF THE NEED FOR CONTINGENCY PLANNING, SO LONG AS IT DOES NOT RPT NOT LEAD TO CLOSED MINDS AND OVER-FORMAL RESULTS.

4. NO RPT NO OTHER PERMREP GOES THIS FAR. EVEN DANE, WHO GENERALLY SUPPORTS NORWEGIAN, ANNOUNCED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES APPROVED PLANS QUOTE IN PRINCIPLE UNQUOTE. ITALIAN USED A SIMILAR FORMULA. THIS WAS DESPITE CLEAR INDICATIONS THAT BOTH ITALIAN AND DANISH AUTHORITIES HAVE SERIOUS RESERVATIONS ABOUT THE PLANS AND THEREFORE UNDERSTAND APPROVAL IN PRINCIPLE IN A BROAD AND LOOSE SENSE. DANES OBJECT TO APPROVAL BY GOVTS OF PLANS WHICH INCLUDE ACTS CONTRARY TO INTERNATIONAL LAW. (AS LEGAL ADVISOR SUGGESTS IN PO/62/637 SOME OF THE MARCON PLANS WOULD BE). ITALIANS HAVE SERIOUS DIFFICULTIES ABOUT ALERTS, AND LIKE US ARE STILL WORRIED OVER THE QUESTION OF TRANSFER OF CONTROL FROM TRIPARTITE TO NATO COMMAND.

5. DISCUSSION OF THIS POINT WILL HAVE TO BE PURSUED TOO. SOME DELS HAVE NOT RPT NOT RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS YET. AT THE MOMENT, HOWEVER, IT SEEMS THAT AT LEAST SEVEN DELS-THE FOUR PLUS BELGIUM, ITALY AND DENMARK-WOULD PROBABLY BE PREPARED TO SUBSCRIBE [TO SOME FORMULA APPROVING THE PLANS IN PRINCIPLE FOR PLANNING PURPOSES AS A CATALOGUE, THE EXECUTION OF ANY ONE PLAN, OR ANY COMBINATION, TO BE SUBJECT TO A SPECIFIC POLITICAL DECISION BY GOVTS AT THE TIME.] BOYESENS VIEW IS PERSONAL; HE IS NOT RPT NOT CERTAIN HIS GOVT WOULD SHARE IT. MY OWN VIEW IS THAT, WHILE A NUMBER OF HIS COMMENTS ARE WELL TAKEN, IT IS REALLY GOING TOO FAR TO EXPECT THAT THE COUNCIL, HAVING DIRECTED A YEAR AGO THAT PLANS BE PREPARED, WOULD NOT RPT NOT REACT IN SOME FORMULA OR ANOTHER TO THE PLANS NOW THEY HAVE BEEN PRESENTED.

...3

000742

DOWNGRADED TO SECRET
REBUI A SECRET
LLS (H&IR)

PAGE THREE 2360

FEB 27 1985

6. THIS DEALS WITH PARAS 1, 2 AND 4 OF YOUR INSTRUCTIONS; PARA 3 RAISES DIFFERENT PROBLEMS. YOU MENTION ALERTS. I WILL BE REPORTING ON THIS ASPECT SEPARATELY. YOUR SECOND POINT WAS ABOUT OUR QUESTION ON THE TRANSFER OF CONTROL. ON THIS, I UNDERSTAND FROM PRIVATE TALKS THAT TRIPARTITE PLANNERS ARE RELUCTANT TO BUDGE FROM ANSWER THEY GAVE US EARLIER. HOWEVER, NO RPT NO ANSWER TO OUR SECOND PRESSING OF THIS POINT HAS BEEN RETURNED. CHAIRMAN RECOGNIZED AT OCT 10 MTG THAT A NUMBER OF DELS COULD NOT RPT NOT BE EXPECTED TO MOVE FORWARD UNTIL STANDING GROUP HAD REPLIED TO QUESTIONS DELS HAD ASKED. HE PRESSED STANDING GROUP REP STRONGLY TO GET THE ANSWERS QUICKLY. AT THE MOMENT, THE BALL IS IN THE PLANNERS COURT ON THIS POINT.

7. FINALLY, YOUR PARA 3 MENTIONS ECONOMIC COUNTERMEASURES. IN A FORMAL SENSE, THIS QUESTION IS SEPARATE FROM APPROVAL OF BERCOM/MARCON PLANS. THE THREE HAVE NOW MADE CLEAR THAT ECONOMIC COUNTERMEASURES WOULD BELONG LARGELY TO PHASE II OF A CRISIS. ALL THE BERCOM/MARCON PLANS BELONG TO PHASE III. THUS IT WOULD BE THEORETICALLY POSSIBLE TO APPROVE THEM WITHOUT NECESSARILY ACCEPTING FURTHER DECISIONS ON ECONOMIC COUNTERMEASURES. HOWEVER THE TWO FORMS OF RESPONSE ARE LINKED IN POSSIBLE PROGRESSION OF MEASURES. IF WE TAKE THE INITIATIVE TO RAISE THIS QUESTION, THE RESULT WILL BE IMMEDIATE PRESSURE ON CDA, SINCE CDA HAS THE MOST RESERVED POSITION ON THE WHOLE QUESTION OF ECONOMIC COUNTERMEASURES. EVEN IF WE DO NOT RPT NOT RAISE THE QUESTION OURSELVES, IT CANNOT RPT NOT BE AVOIDED MUCH LONGER; YOU WILL NOTICE PARA 17 OF PO/62/641 SAYS THE SUBJECT WILL BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA AT AN EARLY DATE

IGNATIEFF*****

000743