

14. As will be stated in greater detail in the succeeding section on NATO, this principle of consultation has already been initially established in the NATO context. Ways and means now are being worked out to make that principle effective both in the Atlantic Council, if circumstances permit such formal consultation, or on a more immediate basis through tripartite "alert" procedures agreed in advance between London, Washington and Ottawa.

15. The problem of reducing the possibility of unilateral action by the United States in relation to a local or limited war is much more complicated and will be discussed further under the succeeding section entitled "Limited or Local Wars". However, once satisfactory procedures of consultation are worked out in the NATO context, it should be possible to argue in Washington that since even the "measured" or "limited" use of nuclear weapons in local wars runs the risk of leading to world conflict, it would be highly desirable that there should be consultation with those allies which are likely to bear some at least of the consequences, before any use of nuclear weapons is authorized by the United States anywhere in the world. In trying to find a solution to this important problem of consultation, the critical question arises: how far is the United States really prepared to go or can be persuaded to go in taking its allies into its confidence in its military-political planning? The progress already made in recent years, provides the basis for hope that further advances in understanding on matters of such mutual concern to the security of both countries is possible.

NATO

16. At its Ministerial meeting in December 1954, the North Atlantic Council approved a report of the Military Committee on the most effective pattern of NATO military strength (Document M.C. 48(Final) of November 22, 1954) over the next few years, which in effect incorporated the strategy of the nuclear deterrent in future NATO defence planning and preparation. The relevant conclusion in this report was as follows: "It is militarily essential that NATO forces should be able to use atomic and thermonuclear weapons in their defence and that the NATO military authorities should be authorized to plan and make preparations on the assumption that atomic and thermonuclear weapons will be used in defence from the outset."

17. The approval of the Council was for purposes of planning and preparations only, and reserved to governments the right of decision with respect to putting such plans and preparations into action. The relevant Council resolution read as follows: "The Council approves the report M.C. 48 as a basis for defence planning and preparations by the NATO military authorities, noting that this approval does not involve delegation of the responsibility of governments for putting plans into action in the event of hostilities."

18. In approving this resolution on behalf of the United States (which of course provides most of the nuclear capability on the allied side), Mr. Dulles explained what he understood to be the effect of this approval on the right of decision of governments. An examination of Mr. Dulles' remarks reveals that there are two particular ways in which, in his view, governments have retained the freedom of power and exercise of their political responsibilities:

- (a) responsibility for deciding on belligerent action, and
- (b) responsibility for evaluating the nature of the threat posed (i.e., determining whether it is a threat that should be dealt with by a "limited" or by an "all-out" defence).

General Gruenther, also, in the course of the discussion of the Military Committee's report, made an explanatory comment which is not out of line with Mr. Dulles' understanding. General Gruenther's comment was summarized in the record as follows: "It is unquestion-