

CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD  
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

*Index*

ARCHIVES  
THIS COPY IS ON LOAN AND MUST  
BE RETURNED TO INDEX UNIT

EXEMPLAIRE  
COPY N° 361

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH  
20th June, 1961

NATO CONFIDENTIAL  
SUMMARY RECORD  
C-R(61)25

Summary record of a meeting of the Council,  
held at the Permanent Headquarters, Paris, XVIe.,  
on Wednesday, 14th June, 1961, at 10.15 a.m.

PRESENT

Chairman: Mr. A. Casardi

<u>BELGIUM</u> Mr. A. de Staercke	<u>GREECE</u> Mr. M. Melas	<u>NORWAY</u> Mr. E. Ulstein
<u>CANADA</u> Mr. J. Léger	<u>ICELAND</u> Mr. H. Andersen	<u>PORTUGAL</u> Mr. F. de Magalhães Cruz
<u>DENMARK</u> Mr. T. Oldenburg	<u>ITALY</u> Mr. A. Alessandrini	<u>TURKEY</u> Mr. Nuri Birgi
<u>FRANCE</u> Mr. P. de Leusse	<u>LUXEMBOURG</u> Mr. P. Reuter	<u>UNITED KINGDOM</u> Sir Paul Mason
<u>GERMANY</u> Dr. G. von Walther	<u>NETHERLANDS</u> Jonkheer J.A. de Ranitz	<u>UNITED STATES</u> Mr. R.L. Thurston

INTERNATIONAL STAFF

Deputy Secretary General - Assistant Secretary General for Economics and Finance:	Mr. F. D. Gregh
Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs:	Mr. R.W.J. Hooper
Assistant Secretary General for Production, Logistics and Infrastructure:	Mr. Johnson Garrett
Assistant Secretary General for Scientific Affairs:	Dr. W. A. Nierenberg
Executive Secretary:	The Lord Coleridge

ALSO PRESENT

Standing Group Representative: Chairman of the Auxiliary Budget Committee:	Rear Admiral C.B. Brooks
Chairman of the NATO Board of Auditors:	Mr. H. Massberg (for Item I)
	Mr. R. de Grandsaignes (for Item I)

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

CONTENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Paragraph Nos.</u>
I.	Steering Committee for the NATO long-term scientific studies	1 - 11
II.	Procedure for the 1961 Interim Review and Draft Resolution on the conduct of the 1961 Interim Review	12 - 15
III.	Agreement between Canada and the United States concerning the air defence of the North American Continent and production sharing	16 - 20
IV.	Transfer of Greeks from Poland to Bulgaria	21 - 23
V.	Date of the next meeting	24

I. STEERING COMMITTEE FOR THE NATO LONG-TERM SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

References: SGM-630-60  
SGM-178-61  
C-R(61)21, Item IV

Documents: C-M(61)41  
PO/61/541  
PO/61/546

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that when the Council had considered at its meeting on 17th May, 1961, the first supplementary budget for AGARD (C-M(61)41), it had agreed to defer discussion and to ask for an examination of the expenses already incurred by AGARD on behalf of the von Karman Committee(1). The Council now had before it the report by Mr. de Grandsaignes, Chairman of the Board of Auditors (PO/61/546). He drew attention to three statements in this report:

Firstly; "The Council would seem to be the only body entitled to take the measures needed for the determination of the organization and operation of a NATO service".

Secondly; "It is regrettable that AGARD should have submitted in arrears a supplementary budget estimate designed, in part at least, to cover the reimbursement of funds already committed without prior authorisation".

Thirdly; "In brief, although it is certain that at the outset errors and irregularities occurred, there is nothing to suggest, disregarding these questions of principle, that the operations of the von Karman Committee can be the subject of serious criticism by the auditors".

2. The Council also had before it document PO/61/541, from which it would note that no further supplementary budget would now be necessary. In the light of these two documents, he invited the Council to consider the recommendations in paragraph 8 of C-M(61)41.

3. The BELGIAN REPRESENTATIVE welcomed the clear statement of the position in the report PO/61/546, and the fact that a further supplementary budget would not now be necessary. Before approving the recommendations in C-M(61)41 he asked the Assistant Secretary General for Scientific Affairs

---

(1) Reference C-R(61)21, paragraph 12

firstly whether these studies were valuable to NATO, and secondly whether they did not overlap with other NATO studies.

4. Dr. NIERENBERG (Assistant Secretary General for Scientific Affairs) confirmed that these studies were of great interest for NATO. On the second point he said that his division was careful to ensure that in fact no duplication of work took place. For example, when the Science Committee had recently authorised a study on communications, his Division had deferred work thereon pending the conclusions of the von Karman study. However, while in the practical organization of work duplication was avoided, it was true that some of the von Karman studies might have been carried out elsewhere in NATO under the terms of reference of existing bodies. He thought, nevertheless, that since the purpose of the von Karman Committee was to carry out a global study to predict scientific developments which might influence tactics and strategy in the next 15 years, the possibility of duplication of work was not serious, and could in practice be avoided.

5. The BELGIAN REPRESENTATIVE asked in the light of this statement whether it was not desirable to establish greater co-ordination between the work of the Scientific Affairs Division and that of AGARD.

6. Dr. NIERENBERG replied that this would be desirable; his Division had studied the question and was prepared, if the Council so desired, to present a detailed plan for such co-ordination.

7. The NETHERLANDS REPRESENTATIVE recalled that he had raised this question on 17th May(1). He re-emphasised the need to avoid duplication of work in the future. He approved the recommendations in C-M(61)41, and hoped that the work of the Committee, which was of great importance to NATO, would continue. He asked why it was now unnecessary to present a further supplementary budget.

8. Mr. MASSBERG (Chairman of the Military Budget Committee) said that the Military Budget Committee had studied the first supplementary budget and had been prepared to approve the funds, subject to Council approval of the principle, and on the understanding that the von Karman Committee indicated the total estimate of funds required. If the Council gave its approval, these credits could now be released by the Military Budget Committee. For the future, if no further funds were requested, the work of the von Karman Committee would, it appeared, be financed mainly nationally, only minor administrative expenses being financed internationally.

---

(1) C-R(61)21, paragraph 9.

9. The ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVE associated himself with the comments expressed by the Netherlands Representative. He was instructed to support international financing for the administrative expenditure referred to by the Chairman of the Military Budget Committee.

10. Commenting on the question of duplication of work, the CHAIRMAN noted that it was stated in paragraph 7 of C-M(61)41 that there existed no duplication with other NATO activities. However, among the items studied by the von Karman Committee, in the context of 1970-75, were some included in the 20 projects for common production now or in the near future, for which the Armaments Committee and the Production, Logistics and Infrastructure Division were responsible. He suggested that the Council should agree that every effort should be made to avoid duplication and to ensure a free exchange of information on all such items between those concerned. He thought that the Secretary General might wish to consider the general question of co-ordination between the Scientific Affairs Division and AGARD.

11. In conclusion, the COUNCIL:

- (1) took note of the report by the Chairman of the NATO Board of Auditors on the Financial Operations resulting from the Studies of the von Karman Committee (PO/61/546);
- (2) endorsed the proposal of the Standing Group for the use of the AGARD machinery for the provision of administrative support for the von Karman Committee Long-Range Studies;
- (3) agreed to the eligibility for international financing of the additional expenditure incurred by AGARD for the administrative support mentioned in (2) above;
- (4) referred to the Military Budget Committee the detailed examination of requests for funds submitted in respect of the administrative support mentioned in (2) and (3) above, taking into account the funds available in the AGARD budgets already approved;
- (5) agreed that every effort should be made to avoid duplication of work and to ensure a free exchange of information among the NATO bodies concerned.

NATO CONFIDENTIAL  
C-R(61)25NATO CONFIDENTIALII. PROCEDURE FOR THE 1961 INTERIM REVIEW

References: C-M(61)24  
                   C-R(61)11  
 Document: C-M(61)50

and DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE CONDUCT OF THE 1961 INTERIM REVIEW

Document: C-M(61)49

12. The CHAIRMAN recalled that on 29th March, 1961, the Council, in approving the recommendations of the Annual Review Committee in its report concerning the postponement of the 1961 Triennial Review, had agreed that an interim review be held in 1961 covering the year 1962, in order to obtain from countries firm commitments regarding their force contributions for the year 1962.

13. The Council had also noted that the Annual Review Committee would, in due course, submit a more detailed report on the procedure for the 1961 Interim Review, together with a draft resolution on its conduct. These documents were now before the Council.

14. In view of the fact that the review would cover the year 1962 only, the procedure proposed by the Committee in C-M(61)50 comprised a number of simplifications or modifications in relation to that of previous years. The Council was invited to take note of this report, and to approve the resolution on the conduct of the 1961 Interim Review.

15. The COUNCIL:

- (1) noted the report by the Annual Review Committee (C-M(61)50);
- (2) approved the resolution on the conduct of the 1961 Interim Review (C-M(61)49) /Subsequently circulated as C-M(61)49(final)/.

NATO CONFIDENTIALIII. AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING THE AIR DEFENCE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN CONTINENT AND PRODUCTION SHARING

16. The CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE drew the attention of the Council to the announcements made on 12th June in Ottawa and Washington concerning an agreement concluded that day between the Governments of Canada and the United States which was

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

designed to ensure the most effective use of certain resources which each Government was prepared to make available, pursuant to the objectives of NATO, for improving the air defence of the Canada-United States region of NATO, for furthering the Defence Production Sharing Programme of the two Governments and for the provision of assistance to certain other NATO Governments. Full details of the agreement had been circulated to all delegations on 13th June.

17. In laying this agreement before the House of Commons, Mr. Diefenbaker had said that it reflected a genuine effort to find a way for each country to co-operate with the other to the benefit, not only both countries, but of mutual allies as well. It made possible a more substantial contribution towards the security of the Alliance than could be made by either Government acting alone.

18. If, after studying the papers which had been circulated, members of the Council had questions concerning the agreement, he would be glad to ask for further information from Ottawa.

19. The UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE, supporting the statement made by the Canadian Representative, said that both Governments felt that by such agreements they were improving the collective strength of the Alliance.

20. The COUNCIL:

took note of the statements by the Canadian and United States Representatives.

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

#### IV. TRANSFER OF GREEKS FROM POLAND TO BULGARIA

21. The GREEK REPRESENTATIVE said that his Government had asked him to inform the Council that it had recently learned from a number of sources simultaneously that the Bulgarian Government had agreed with the Polish Government to transfer to Bulgaria, and install near the Greek frontier, several thousand Greeks who had been settled in Poland since the failure of the Communist aggression against Greece. Those involved were mainly former communist guerillas who had taken refuge behind the iron curtain either alone or, in rare cases, with their families. Their transfer near the Greek frontier after more than twelve years in which they had naturally been subjected to intensive brain-washing could not obviously be looked upon as an accident or as an incident devoid of political importance. So far, the explanations given by the Bulgarian Government in reply to enquiries by the Greek Legation in Sofia had been evasive, in spite of the fact that the attention of that Government had been drawn seriously to the consequences that its

decision would inevitably have on relations between the two countries. The Greek Government found it difficult to avoid drawing the conclusion that this transfer was a preliminary step to an attempt at infiltration. It was following the matter with the closest attention, and would keep the Council informed as necessary.

22. The ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVE said that his Government had information which confirmed this situation, which it thought should be followed closely.

23. The COUNCIL:

took note of the statements by the Greek and Italian Representatives.

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

V. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

24. Wednesday, 21st June, 1961, at 10.15 a.m. (Plenary Session).

OTAN/NATO,  
Paris, XVIe.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE