

NATO A-Pause Plan

30, 1966

Second class postage paid at Washington,
D.C. Printed at 1515 L st. nw. 20005

WTOP-TV. (9) Radio (150) TEN CENTS

Dropped by U.S.

Automatic A-Response Proposed

McNamara Offers
New Policy in Talks
With 4 Nations

By Don Cook
Los Angeles Times

LONDON, April 29—The United States has quietly dropped its doctrine of "nuclear pause" in defense planning for Europe, and is now proposing to its Allies a new policy based on an automatic but limited and controlled nuclear response to attacks on NATO territory.

This fundamental shift in American nuclear doctrine has emerged in two days of secret talks among five key NATO defense ministers—from the United States, Britain, Italy, West Germany and Turkey—meeting under the chairmanship of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

Also taking part in the discussions were NATO Secretary General Manlio Brosio and the two NATO supreme commanders, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer from SHAPE near Paris and Adm. Thomas H. Moorer from

Atlantic Command in Norfolk, Va.

Time for Reflection

Under the "pause theory," it was laid down that there would be no automatic nuclear response to any attack—that the President of the United States would make the decision under the circumstances of an attack.

The idea was to give time for reflection before allowing an attack to develop into nuclear war. The "pause" might last 20 minutes or 48 hours or even a matter of days.

In place of the "pause theory," which was instituted by President Kennedy in 1961 to the particular irritation of the French, the United States is now moving back to the idea of limited but automatic nuclear response to any attack against NATO.

The Americans are proposing that plans be drawn up for use of nuclear weapons in three carefully controlled categories.

The first category would be
See NATO, A8, Col. 1

Under Secretary Ball
sees peril to Europe in
de Gaulle "grand design."
Page A9.

NATO—From Page A1

NATO 'A-Pause' Plan Is Dropped

The pre-positioning of nuclear demolition charges or land mines, which would be used to block strategic invasion points if NATO territory were to be invaded.

The second would be the use of nuclear anti-aircraft weapons in the event of an air attack against national territory.

The third category would be nuclear anti-submarine weapons in the event of an attack against naval forces or ports or harbors.

In all cases, this nuclear response would be purely defensive, limited to tactical weapons that would go off either on the territory of the invader rather than the invader, or at sea.

Any decision to escalate and retaliate with strategic weapons or with tactical air strikes against the territory or cities of the attacker would remain an entirely different question. But the new American proposals would end the present uncertainty in NATO as to whether, and when, nuclear weapons would be used in European defense.

The pause theory has meant that nobody in Europe knew when the President of the United States might give the word, and it has enabled the French in particular to harp on the doubts and uncertainties as to the American nuclear commitment for European defense.

French Premier Georges Pompidou, in defending President de Gaulle's anti-NATO policies before the French National Assembly last week, pointed to the fact that the pause theory was instituted by President Kennedy and the Pentagon without the slightest consultation with the rest of the alliance.

McNamara's new proposals, put forward in two days of meetings at the British ministry of defense, will go a long way toward restoring a balance, and putting nuclear

weapons back into the NATO war plans. At the same time, by limiting this automatic use of nuclear warheads to purely defensive response to attack, the new plan avoids risks of instant escalation.

This "nuclear planning working group," which first met in Washington in February, will meet again in July, possibly in Paris despite (or to spite) De Gaulle.

The ministers then plan what they expect to be a final meeting in Rome in the autumn, and after that they expect to recommend that this planning group be made permanent with a permanent staff as part of the general result of the ouster of the alliance from France.

In effect, this would become a "nuclear standing group."

[The three-point McNamara program also was reported Friday by William H. Stone-

man of the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service.

[Stoneman said the points involved in pre-placed demolition charges would be west of the Iron Curtain and thus nuclear explosions could not be used by the Russians as a provocation for using intercontinental missiles against the United States or intermediate missiles against Western Europe.

[Stoneman also noted that the idea of nuclear demolition charges had been mentioned at a NATO Council meeting in December, 1964.]

News agencies reported:

The communique marking the end of the London meetings said the Defense Ministers agreed to plans for a chain of new commands across Europe to control the 6000 nuclear weapons at the disposal of NATO.

No details were given, but sources said the plans would call for regional groupings within NATO. The United States would be a member of each of the regional groups. Probably there will be three—one for southeastern Europe, another for southern Europe and a third for northern Europe.

The communique said the Defense Ministers would take up the problem of nuclear participation for non-nuclear nations at their July meeting.

It said they would consider "possible modifications in organization and procedure to permit a greater degree of participation in nuclear planning and to make possible appropriate consultation in the event their use is considered."