NATO CONFIDENTIAL

Référence GAS/67/74

3-1-02 B Sp.Gp

NATO UNCLASSIFIED AND PUBLIC DISCLOSED

11th July, 1967

To: A.S.G. for Political Affairs

From: C.A. Chapman

Subject: Future tasks of the Alliance - your meeting with the Secretary General

The present schedule of work of the four sub-groups, as I have been able to ascertain it, is as follows:

Sub-Group 1: A draft report to be completed by the beginning of September. A meeting lasting two days - 18th and 19th September.

Sub-Group 2: A meeting 9th and 10th October to consider a draft report to be completed at an unspecified date.

Sub-Group 3: A draft report to be completed by the end of July. A meeting in Washington at the end of September.

Sub-Group 4: A meeting on 14th September to consider a new draft report.

The view has also been expressed that there should be another meeting of the Rapporteurs around the middle of October.

There is general agreement that Rapporteurs should be given fullest freedom to draft their initial reports. This then poses the question of the presentation of these reports by the sub-groups to the Special Group: If the Rapporteurs are free to present their reports without prior approval from the sub-group, how can the Special Group give its approval to the four reports which it will receive?

A meeting of the Rapporteurs in Bonn on 20th July was organised because of the widespread feeling that there was need for coordination generally and on certain specific points:

Over-lapping. Generally there is a feeling that over-lapping at this stage is in itself not a bad thing. Since the Rapporteurs are free to write their own reports, it would seem that the question of over-lapping and coordinating the reports will arise as a real problem only after the draft reports have been completed.

Consultation. Since each sub-group has been asked to make its own recommendations with regard to consultation, as it applies in its field of study, there will manifestly be a need to harmonise the conclusions reached in the four reports on this subject.

Proposals for organizational changes in NATO. It is possible that such proposals may be made in each of the sub-groups, e.g. - the U.S. proposal in Sub-Group 1 for a permanent committee to keep East-West relations under constant review, Dr. Patijn's suggestion in Sub-Group 4 for a policy planning group. A need for coordination here is evident.

Publicity. As has been emphasised throughout this exercise, one of its purposes is to gain greater public support for NATO. Thus, the question of what publicity to give to the findings of the study will be one that will require considerable attention. For the time being, however, it seems that it is too early to consider usefully.

Certain specific issues of interest to two or more sub-groups, e.g. the question of security in Europe as it affects détente as well as the defence policy of the Alliance. The pragmatic solution here, which seems to have been adopted, is for the responsible Rapporteurs to get together and agree on how to proceed.

CAC/JFD