

MEMORANDUM

September 12, 1974

SUBJECT: GOODPASTER RETIREMENT, HAIG NOMINATION

BACKGROUND -- On September 9 or 10, Sonnenfeldt called and said that all the necessary cables that are needed would be out within an hour. They weren't. He called me at home at 8:00 p.m. on September 11, and said that the messages had, as of then, gone out concerning the Goodpaster matter. Haig is anxious to have it finished fast. I told him that I would do it as fast as I could and I agreed that it should be done as fast as possible without rupturing relationships. He then added that all the cables hadn't come out because the USMILREP hadn't gotten his through the JCS channel. Later that evening the courier arrived at the house with the cables Sonnenfeldt had referred to, giving the scenario and suggesting that I get to work with Luns and the Permreps in working it out. Later that evening Haig's background information arrived.

I came into the office at 8:00 a.m. on September 12 and checked with Weinell and he still had not received the JCS communication which put me in a position of not being able to call for a DPC meeting because of the fact that the Military Committee was supposed to be notified simultaneously. I asked Weinell to get ahold of Washington and see if he could speed it up.

At 10:15 a.m. at ~~my~~ <sup>US</sup> request, ~~I~~ <sup>RUMSFELD MET</sup> went to ~~meet~~ with de Staercke (Belgian) in his office. When I got there ~~we~~ <sup>and</sup> called Pansa and Van Campen in. It turns out that ~~Joseph~~ <sup>SYG</sup> Luns was ill, and therefore the



~~meeting I had asked my secretary to set up right after the  
de Staercke meeting couldn't be held since he is home in bed.~~

RUMSFELD

I reported to de Staercke and Pansa and Van Campen my under-

(USNATO 4889)

standing of the scenario. ~~I reported to them that before the~~

~~meeting on Wednesday that I had reported to Joseph Luns that~~

~~Washington did want to go ahead with the Goodpaster retirement~~

~~and the Haig nomination. De Staercke said that Luns had not~~

~~told him, and I said that I had told him at 10:00 or 10:15 a.m.~~

~~on September 11, and de Staercke said, "Yes, I heard about it,~~

~~but only through the Dutchman, who apparently Luns told. But Luns~~

~~after I told him on Wednesday had a Council meeting and then~~

~~he had a meeting with Mavros that evening and had not called a~~

~~meeting of the Twelve as he should have. Van Campen said his~~

LUNS

~~intention was to call a meeting of the Twelve today, Thursday~~

~~September 12,  
the twelfth.~~

AGAIN, RUMSFELD TOLD

2' After running through the scenario ~~and telling~~ Van Campen

~~and Pansa, the Acting Secretary General, and de Staercke that~~

~~HE~~ FROM PRESIDENT FORD RUMSFELD POINTED OUT

~~I had the letters and was ready to go, I said that the Military~~

~~Committee was leaving town on Saturday or Sunday for a week~~ SEPTEMBER 15 SEVEN DAY TRIP,

~~THAT, WITH~~ UP, HE ~~and the weekend was coming and I personally felt that in these~~

~~matters once the consultation was over that it was probably~~

~~desired and the result was clear, that it was probably desirable~~

~~to move on it, and not let it run over the weekend. De Staercke~~

~~said, to my amazement, "Oh, no, there will have to be another~~

INSISTED ON

~~meeting of the Twelve." I said, "Well, that wasn't my impression~~

RUMSFELD SAID HE HAD CLEAR

~~from Joseph, and to be perfectly honest, it isn't an impression,~~ SYG THAT NO FURTHER MEETING WAS NECESSARY OR

~~DESIRABLE. HE TOLD DE STAERCKE THAT HE AND~~

~~I took the cable I sent to Washington to Joseph and had him~~





HAD ACTUALLY CLEANED TEXT OF USNATO

~~personally clear it. McAuliffe took it to him. I told him what~~  
~~was in the cable, and he said that the situation is that there~~  
~~will have to be another meeting of the Twelve now that they know~~  
~~for sure that the U.S. wishes to go ahead. I said, "Well fine,~~  
~~couldn't you have a meeting of the Twelve this morning at 11:00~~  
~~o'clock and then have the DPC this afternoon, or if it is going~~  
~~to take two DPC's have one this afternoon and one on Friday.~~

De Staercke said that was fine with him. At that point Van Campen

~~thought he ought to call Luns, so de Staercke and Van Campen~~

~~talked to Luns on the phone and kind of filled him in. Luns,~~

~~home in bed, felt that that was going a little too fast, and~~

~~said he thought maybe the thing to do was to go ahead and call~~

~~a meeting of the Twelve and then see what happens, after that.~~

~~So I told Van Campen, de Staercke and Pansa that I certainly~~

~~wasn't going to push the DPC countries into doing it by Friday,~~

~~that it would be very bad tactically for me to do it, and I~~

~~recognized this; however, I did feel that it ought to be done~~

~~by Friday, and I wanted them to know it, and to know the reasons,~~

~~that I think that once this thing is sorted through and everyone~~

~~seems to be in agreement that it is important to close the loop~~

~~and not allow day-after-day for more leaks to come out of Holland~~

~~or for someone to take a pot shot at. Secondly, it seems to me~~

~~that the sooner it is done the less ripples there will be and~~

~~I felt that was useful from the standpoint of NATO, but this is~~

~~the first thing that President Ford has requested of NATO and I~~

~~would like to have it go smoothly and have him have a good~~



4889 WITH LUNS TO MAKE CERTAIN THERE COULD BE NO MISUNDERSTANDING.

THE SECOND ON SEPTEMBER 13.

THEN

LUNS SUGGESTED

A

RUMSFELD SAID HE

HE

SEPT 13

HE

TIME

IN ADDITION, THIS

IF IT GOES

WE WILL

59

THE ALLIANCE

impression of it. Quite honestly the leaks out of the Netherlands were not helpful in my judgment, but that I wasn't going to push, it was up to Van Campen and Pansa and de Staercke to get the time schedule as tight as possible and I would go along with it.

But that I wanted them to feel a sense of responsibility to the extent that they agree with my arguments. <sup>De Staercke, Pansa and Van Campen</sup> They then left for the

<sup>Am</sup> 11:00 o'clock meeting of the Twelve Permreps. <sup>SOME</sup> to discuss this THIRTY MINUTES LATER PANSA INVITED RUMSFELD TO matter. I came back to my office.

At 11:30 a.m. I received a phone call indicating that the Twelve Permreps wanted me to join them to discuss the matter. I walked in and ~~said that I would~~ recapped where we were and quoted what Luns had told me.

JOHN THOMAS MCKEITHEN





<sup>TV</sup>  
<sup>SAID</sup>  
~~I was then told by Pansa, who was chairing the meeting, that~~  
~~he felt that he thinks I can assume that the final decision~~  
<sup>US CAN</sup>  
~~will be favorable, but that there is some doubts on the~~  
<sup>ARE</sup>  
~~decision and on timing and that some Ambassadors are not~~  
<sup>YET AUTHORIZED TO</sup>  
~~in the position to accept today.~~

<sup>(UK)</sup>  
<sup>^</sup>  
~~Peck then said that the letter that President Ford sent to~~  
~~the Prime Ministers in the last paragraph left the countries~~  
<sup>US</sup>  
~~with the impression that the United States would not go ahead~~  
<sup>RECEIVED</sup>  
~~in Brussels until they had received a reply from all the~~  
<sup>^</sup>  
~~nations and that some nations had not replied. I said "Well,~~  
<sup>RUMSFELD SAID WE UNDERSTOOD THAT</sup>  
~~I haven't got a tabulation in front of me but there are very~~  
<sup>HAD NOT</sup>  
<sup>PECK, HARTOGH (NETHERLANDS) AND</sup>  
~~few that haven't replied." He said "Well, we haven't." And~~  
<sup>MINZIES (CANADA) SAID THEIR GOVERNMENT HAD NOT REPLIED.</sup>  
~~the Netherlands said they hadn't, and Canada said they hadn't,~~  
<sup>KRAPE (FRG)</sup>  
~~and Germany said that he understands informally that the~~  
<sup>YET</sup>  
~~letter has been signed in Bonn but it has not been sent out.~~

~~So there are at least four countries that haven't replied.~~

<sup>HARTOGH</sup>  
~~The Netherlands said that the matter is scheduled to be taken~~  
<sup>discussed</sup>  
<sup>Sept 13</sup>  
~~up Friday, tomorrow, in the Council of Ministers meeting in THE HAGUE.~~

~~Canada then said that he had advised his Prime Minister that~~  
~~the normal procedure is for consultation among the Twelve in~~  
~~Brussels to take place before the capitals reply and therefore~~  
~~his impression is that Ottawa has held off until the consultation~~  
~~of the Twelve took place, which was just Tuesday. In any event,~~



~~several then expressed the opinion that the US should not go forward until all the replies are in and some of the replies were being held up for one or more reasons. In any event, the long and the short of the meeting was that the Netherlands, Canada and the UK particularly felt that the DPC meeting should not be held until Monday. Canada and the UK felt that it ought to be on Tuesday. I then suggested Monday morning. We then left that question open and talked about what would be done at the meeting of the DPC and all agreed that only one meeting would be needed at this stage -- that is to say at the DPC meeting, Luns would inform them of the letter from President Ford concerning Goodpaster's retirement, they would agree to release Goodpaster; they would ask the Americans to nominate a successor. A then would nominate Haig and provide the letter and his biographical information. They then would agree; and a matter of hours later we would agree to a joint release. and that simultaneously or in between the release and the DPC meeting, the Military Committee would be notified. I then said "Well, if it can all be done in one meeting rather than having it Monday morning I would be perfectly agreeable to having the meeting Monday afternoon, but this is not what Washington had wanted, obviously, and frankly not what I had expected. I had expected that we would have been able to do it today and tomorrow,~~

~~but that if there is this strong sense that the US should not~~



HAVING SECURED AGREEMENT TO THOSE  
SCENARIO, RUMSFELD AGREED



TO RECOMMEND TO

~~go forward until the other countries have sent their letters~~  
~~out, I am perfectly willing to go back to Washington on it and~~  
~~recommend that a meeting be held at 3:30 Monday afternoon, at~~  
~~which time the entire package is completed.~~  
 DPC FOR P.M. SEPTEMBER 16,  
 WOULD BE

SAID  
 Pansa then brought up another subject saying that there  
~~several allied governments feel~~  
~~were a number of countries that felt that General Goodpaster~~  
 should not be retired prior to the December Ministerial meetings,  
 both from the ~~standpoint of~~ NATO <sup>as</sup> and from a personal courtesy to  
 him, so that he could be properly congratulated and thanked and  
 kind of complete a cycle. I said "Well, so that I could report  
~~when Rumsfeld pressed for specifics,~~  
~~accurately back to Washington, which countries specifically~~  
~~want the date to be December 15 instead of December 1?"~~ They  
 said there are no countries that have instructions on this.

I said "What are the countries on a personal basis where the  
 Ambassadors of  
 Ambassadors feel this should be the case?" The UK, the Netherlands,  
 A

Turkey and Italy all joined in saying that on a personal basis  
 CHANGES DATE RUMSFELD REPLIED  
 they felt that the date should be December 15. I said "I will  
 ALTHOUGH HE DID NOT  
 certainly report that, but I don't know what complications there  
 WITH RESPECT  
 might be and I know that sometime dates and statutes and

provisions for retirement might enter into it but I would be  
 THEIR FEELINGS. HE THEN ASKED  
 happy to report it. But my second question that comes: Is

WETHINK ALLY  
 there any country here that anyone thinks would make their approval  
 GENUINE  
 of Haig or their agreement to complete the entire process of

SEP 16  
 Formalities on Monday afternoon contingent on having the date  
 THEM REPLY WAS  
 changed from December 1 to December 15. They said no, there



NEGATIVE ; BUT

SAID

~~were not.~~ Peck ~~spoke saying he just simply~~ felt it was a proper courtesy and it would help dampen some of the ~~speculation and~~ <sup>OFTEN ACCOMPANY A CHANGROVER.</sup> rumor that ~~runs around when these things take place,~~ but that it was not conditional. That was the end of the meeting.

NOTE: Copies of these tapes should go to McAuliffe immediately after they are typed and a cable should go out as quickly as possible. The key points are: (1) when is Weinel going to get his JCS thing so we can go ahead on that on Monday and that will not be a problem; (2) what about the Ambassadors in the bilateral capitals suggesting that the countries that still have not responded to Washington on this matter get their response out this weekend, Friday, if that is desirable; and (3) what about the question of the date, December 15 as opposed to December 1, is that any problem and if not I would like a cable agreeing to that and then requesting instructions for me to go ahead on this basis because at this point I still do not have instructions, I am simply told I should report back on the choreography.

GENE: You should make sure that we have Haig's biography ready to pass out to people on Monday and then you should get me the answer as to how I answer that question on top command and staff posts so I will know. Maybe we ought to include that in the cable also. Although I think





that is better done by phone if someone here can't figure out what I should answer. But I would like to have that by tomorrow.

