

The first point worth mentioning is the close similarity between the distribution of papers in table No. 12 with those in table No. 10. The only inconsistency exists in the case of the Vancouver Sun which has been classified as generally anti-NATO for the external issues, but when discussing the future accepts the existing alliance structure. For the remainder of the papers, those who see NATO functioning at its present level (or higher) were generally pro-NATO, while those that see it being revised downward or dismantled were generally anti-NATO. To what extent this indicates the affective evaluation as being dominant is difficult to say: but it may imply that internal issues, such as the nuclear weapons debate and unification of the armed forces, have not had an important affect on overall attitudes toward NATO.

The three papers advocating revision upwards stressed two main points: i) the need for NATO to remain a strong alliance to serve collective self-defence within an integrated command structure, and ii) the need for revision within the alliance to bring NATO up to date and, hopefully, to broaden the base to encompass the economic and political aspects of the treaty. The Ottawa Citizen on April 12, 1966 stated that a strong alliance was needed to deter possible Russian aggression, to control West European rivalries, and to complement the EEC. Three days later it pointed out that NATO has not been capable of adapting to new circumstances and this is a necessity if NATO is to save itself. Apparently this was partly achieved at the Paris meetings during December, 1966 since "a sense of direction" was restored "to an organization that remains a cornerstone of Western security." (17-12-66). The Winnipeg Free Press (31-3-66) emphasized the need for a strong NATO, but earlier had pointed out that the alliance was "very sick" and strong leadership (24-3-66), along with a drastic re-organization (8-10-66), was needed to restore the confidence of the late 1950's. In making these points it should be remembered that both the Ottawa Citizen and the Free Press are among the staunchest supporters of NATO.

For the three papers advocating NATO is no longer necessary (the Halifax Chronicle Herald (19-4-67) implicitly takes this position) the main arguments are similar to those of the revisionists. Jean-Marc Léger writing for Le Devoir presents the following case:

Les deux grandes alliances...ne correspondent plus au climat des relations internationaux aux conditions politiques présentes et au rapport des forces. Davantage, elles interdisent toute issue, paralysent toute initiative vers une nouvelle phase de la détente...Une nouvelle étape est devenue nécessaire: celle d'une large coopération entre tous les pays européens, mais cette coopération est rendue impossible par le maintien d'alliances désormais périmées, inutiles et dangereuses. (20-6-66).

The Montreal Star (22-3-66, 14-12-66) takes substantially the same position as Le Devoir, but emphasizes the need for a shift to peacekeeping. (27-5-67).

The Toronto Globe and Mail is fairly indicative of those papers who advocate a downward revision of NATO. According to the Globe, NATO has been a "cornerstone of foreign policy. But because there has been no substantial