

on April 4, 1966 the Chronicle Herald was wondering if "de Gaulle's strategy does not have much to commend it" since there are those who agree "any continuation of an armed alliance like NATO will do more harm than good." The Star had taken this stand as far back as 1964, when it said de Gaulle had "rightly seized on the fact that NATO, as originally conceived, had lost its purpose." (14-12-64). When the crisis broke in 1966 the paper agreed with the President of France that NATO as "originally set up ...has served its purpose," but there was no reason to assume the changes brought about by de Gaulle were not changes for the better. (22-3-66).

The remainder of the English speaking press took the middle road between the Ottawa Citizen and, the Montreal Star and Halifax Chronicle Herald. The Winnipeg Free Press saw de Gaulle's action as "a complete reversal of the integrating trend in Europe," and this trend increased the danger of U.S. and French isolationism (19-3-66). The Free Press felt the General's plea for a pre-war alliance system was a "retreat from reality". However, the crisis would pass if the alliance members stood together to strengthen NATO by "extending its integration, military, political, and economic." (28-3-66). The Winnipeg paper saw the French action as quite a severe blow to their continual theme of Atlantic unity. For its part, the Toronto Globe and Mail, as early as 1960, saw General de Gaulle as a threat to solidarity within the alliance (3-12-60), and in 1965 warned that unless the differences over strategy between the U.S. and France were settled the latter "probably will become little more than an associate member of NATO." (3-6-65). In this same editorial entitled "NATO must be saved" the Globe concluded the French attitude "should not be allowed to wreck the solidarity of a valuable and necessary alliance." (Two years later, according to the Globe, the alliance was neither valuable nor necessary). When the break occurred the Globe asked other NATO members to "take a long-range view, rather than lapse into angry retaliation." (15-3-66), and supported Mr. Martin's stand, while rejecting the charge that his motives were based on domestic considerations. Interestingly enough while most papers disagreed with de Gaulle's position, very few showed outward hostility of a personal nature.

The French press in Canada showed tendencies similar to the English press, but stressed the imbalance of power within the alliance, and generally felt the U.S. could have acted sooner to prevent the split. (Le Droit, 5-4-66). They tended to have more sympathy with de Gaulle's position, but in spite of this both Le Droit and Le Soleil supported the Government. Le Droit took the position that "on peut ne pas croire avec le général de Gaulle que le danger a disparu", (23-2-66), and when the break came the paper felt Canada "est très bien placé pour concilier les vues divergentes de ses associés." (22-3-66). Furthermore, the split did not mean the Atlantic Alliance had lost its raison d'être since the U.S. UK, France, and Canada "sont des alliés naturels." However, "pourquoi maintenir l'OTAN... quand les Etats-Unis, en prenant parti contre les pays d'Europe occidentale, renforcent les positions de l'URRS (ou de la Chine) dans le monde?"(29-3-66). Despite Le Droit's criticism of the U.S. it still tended to support the Government. Le Soleil in an editorial "L'utilité du compromis" (10-6-66) took a position similar to Le Droit on the need to find a compromise, but both La Presse and Le Devoir were more favourable to de Gaulle's position than the Canadian.