

ably a political decision to decide whether or not there is an act of war, and there is no thought in our headquarters (SHAPE) that there should be a military decision — and certainly not one that our headquarters should make. But, it having been decided that there was an act of war and that it was an *all-out act of war*, and not simply a *local war*, he felt it was not feasible to go to this or that strategy.”

19. The Council's approval of M.C. 48, which raises the stakes involved in the East-West conflict, would seem to have two main political implications for the NATO alliance. One is to impose a restriction on the freedom of Soviet action, and thus to strengthen the position of the West by issuing a clear warning that, if an armed attack does occur involving the commitments of member governments under Articles V and VI of the North Atlantic Treaty, the probability is that the ensuing war will be a nuclear war. Judging from the reactions of Soviet propaganda on the theme that NATO is preparing an atomic war, this implication has not been lost on the Soviet leaders. Indeed the risks, military and political, that nuclear warfare would involve for the Soviet Government may well exclude direct aggression in Europe as a likely measure of Soviet policy, particularly since in most cases war is probably not essential to the pursuit of basic Communist aims.

20. This in turn increases the probability that the Soviet Union will use other methods of pursuing their aims which will not provoke nuclear retaliation — well-known Communist methods of diplomatic manoeuvre and political warfare designed to weaken the unity and effectiveness of the Western Coalition. Against such methods reliance on nuclear weapons will not be of much avail, and it becomes all the more necessary to take other measures in NATO, particularly non-military measures such as various forms of political and economic cooperation under Article II, which will strengthen the unity and morale of the coalition.

21. The other political implication is to restrict our own freedom of action, or rather to place a devastating price on any miscalculation. It becomes of prime importance to Canada and the rest of the NATO countries to be able to judge quickly and accurately, in the event the deterrent is not effective, whether a given hostile action is such as to merit all-out defence, involving nuclear retaliation, or just limited defence, involving measures short of nuclear retaliation. This question is, of course, vital to Canada in particular, not only because we are a member of NATO but also because, in the event of a Soviet nuclear attack, Canada would probably be the scene of the air battle.

22. Under these circumstances the exercise of effective control by governments over all stages of “alerts procedures” is particularly important. The ability of governments to make an evaluation of the facts which give rise to apprehension of the imminence of war obviously depends on having access to intelligence reports on indications of enemy mobilization measures. This consideration would be relevant if the outbreak of war were preceded by a period of increasing international tension. In the event of a sudden all-out attack the problem of evaluating the facts would not, of course, arise; they would presumably be self-evident and would call for immediate action for survival.

23. There is also an important military implication. The nuclear deterrent has for a long time been implicit in the NATO strategic concept, but with the approval of M.C. 48 it has now been explicitly adopted as an integral part of NATO defence planning and preparations. Consequently it becomes all the more important that there should be effective co-ordination of defence planning in NATO as between North America and the rest of the NATO area and that the organization of the defence of the nuclear deterrent in North America should be related to NATO defence planning as a whole. This may mean some re-organization of the Canada-United States Regional Planning Group, although it must be