




Canada and NATO

CAI
EA
80C15
DOCS





M
64266456







Table of Contents

NON - CIRCULATING /
CONSULTER SUR PLACE

What is NATO?	4
Why was NATO formed?	6
What part did Canada play in the creation of NATO?	8
Was Canada satisfied with the constitution of NATO?	12
Is it satisfied with the direction NATO has taken?	12
How is NATO organized?	14
What does Canada contribute to the Alliance?	16
Is NATO still needed?	18
Should Canada continue as a member of NATO?	20


LIBRARY DEPT. OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES




What
is
NATO?

NATO stands for "North Atlantic Treaty Organization", a defensive alliance of 15 countries: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States.

All liberal democracies, they share a common belief in the importance of maintaining international peace and security and stable East-West relations. They further believe that the security of each of them can only be preserved by protecting the security and independence of Western Europe and North America as a whole.





**Why
was NATO
formed?**

During the Second World War and after it, the western allies neither sought nor made any territorial gains. By contrast, the Soviet Union greatly enlarged its territory in Europe by absorbing in succession, parts of Finland, the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, eastern Poland, and substantial parts of pre-war Germany, Romania and Czechoslovakia.

Between 1945 and 1948, the Soviet Union fostered the establishment of Communist governments in Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) and, finally, Czechoslovakia, thereby bringing 91 million people in eastern Europe under its control.

These ominous developments clearly had to be countered, in the first place by the countries that were immediately endangered, those of Western Europe. In 1948, Britain proposed a defensive union of the former western allies and subsequently, in Brussels in March of that year, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg concluded a treaty. The most important provision was contained in Article IV: "If any of the High Contracting Parties should be the object of armed attack in Europe, the other High Contracting Parties will, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of

the United Nations, afford the Party so attacked all the military and other aid and assistance in their power".

Article 51 of the UN Charter forbids the use of force in the settling of international disputes. At the same time, it upholds "the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations", which is precisely the point the Brussels Treaty wanted underlined. The pact was meant to be purely defensive.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.

They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security.

They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty:

In witness whereof, the under signed Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty. Done at Washington, the fourth day of April, 1949.

FOR THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM:

J. N. Spier *Siering*

FOR THE GRAND DUCHY OF LUXEMBOURG:

Josbert *Hugues-Bellefleur*

FOR THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS:

J. K. N. van Kleefpen
Allen

FOR THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY:

Harald H. Lange
Alfstein *Anders* *Andersen*

FOR PORTUGAL:

José *Luís* *de* *Almeida* *Gouveia*
Pedro *Teófilo* *de* *Almeida* *Teófilo*

FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND NORTHERN IRELAND:

Robert *Bevan* *Oliver* *Frank*

FOR CANADA:

Arthur *B.* *Parsons*
H. H. Lang

FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

Dean *Rusk*

FOR FRANCE:

René *Plémont* *André* *Goussard*

FOR ICELAND:

Ólafur *Benediktsson* *Thor* *Thor*

FOR ITALY:

Giorgio *Alleanza* *Archives*

FOR THE KINGDOM OF DENMARK:

Anders *Rasmussen* *Arnold* *Karstensen*

What part did Canada play in the creation of NATO?


Canada has been called "the midwife at the birth of NATO". In the interim year before the signing of the NATO Treaty, the Soviet Union blockaded West Berlin, causing deep concern in Western capitals. Canadian leaders stated clearly, and before anyone else, that the liberal democracies on both sides of the Atlantic had to work as closely together in peace as they had in wartime, and that another world conflict could best be deterred by a show of determination on the part of them all to resist aggression.

This was the opening move in what became a Canadian "crusade" aimed at transforming the Brussels Treaty into a strong North Atlantic regional pact, an undertaking that will always be linked with Louis St. Laurent, soon to become Prime Minister, with Lester B. Pearson, his Secretary of State for External Affairs, and Brooke Claxton, his Minister of National Defence.



The Atlantic Alliance

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Belgium | 9. Luxembourg |
| 2. Canada | 10. Netherlands |
| 3. Denmark | 11. Norway |
| 4. France | 12. Portugal |
| 5. Fed. Rep. Germany | 13. Turkey |
| 6. Greece | 14. United Kingdom |
| 7. Iceland | 15. United States |
| 8. Italy | |



**Was Canada
satisfied
with the
constitution
of NATO?**

**Is it
satisfied
with the
direction
NATO has
taken?**

The Canadian architects of NATO had in mind something more far-reaching than what emerged in the 1949 Treaty. They thought in terms of an "Atlantic community" which would tie its members closely together, not only in defence of their freedom, but also in political, social, economic and cultural spheres.

The political climate of 1948/49 did not permit the realization of so great a design. The Western European countries felt immediately threatened and were thus primarily interested in defence against and deterrence of aggression. The United States was committed to a policy of worldwide decolonization and was not prepared to bind itself politically to countries which at the time were still colonial powers: Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Portugal.

The best that could be achieved was a general statement of principles in Article 2, often referred to as "the Canadian article". It says that the NATO states "will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations", and that they "will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them".


Canada continued to translate these principles into concrete action and, through time, the activities of the Alliance have ex-

panded into spheres other than that of security, including economics, science and ecology, mainly in the area of research.



In a report, "the Future Tasks of the Alliance", it was stressed that NATO is indeed "an effective forum and clearing house for the exchange of views and information" that gives each ally the chance to "decide its policy in the light of close knowledge of the problems and objectives of others".

NATO members are sovereign states which do not have to subordinate their policies to collective decision, but political consultation in NATO helps find a common ground when they wish to act in unison.

All in all, while it is still not the "Atlantic community" initially envisaged by Canada, NATO, in addition to its primary function as a defensive military alliance, is now also an important forum for consultations on political questions of key concern, including East-West relations.



How is NATO organized?



MAJOR NATO COMMANDERS



SACLANT NORFOLK (U.S.A.)	SACEUR MONS (BELGIUM)	CINCHAN NORTHWOOD (U.K.)
WESTERN ATLANTIC Norfolk U.S.A.	NORTHERN EUROPE Kobles Norway	NORE CHANNEL Rozyth U.K.
EASTERN ATLANTIC Northwood U.K.	CENTRAL EUROPE Brunsum Netherlands	PLYMOUTH CHANNEL Plymouth U.K.
SUBMARINES Norfolk U.S.A.	SOUTHERN EUROPE Naples Italy	BENELUX CHANNEL Walcheren Netherlands
IBERIAN ATLANTIC Lisbon Portugal	ACE MOBILE FORCE Sackenheim Germany	COMMAIRCHAN Northwood U.K.
STRIKING FLEET Afloat	UNITED KINGDOM AIR FORCES High Wycombe U.K.	STANAVFORCHAN** Afloat
*STANAVFORLANT Afloat	*STANAVFORLANT Standing Naval Force Atlantic.	**STANAVFORCHAN Standing Naval Force Channel (Mine Counter Measures).


The headquarters of NATO is in Brussels, Belgium. Its supreme body is the 15-member North Atlantic Council (NAC) which, when it deals with military policy, sits as the 13-member Defence Planning Committee (DPC). France and Greece do not participate in the DPC, although they maintain liaison and would honor their Treaty obligations in a crisis.

The NAC/DPC is chaired by the Secretary-General and conducts its regular business at the level of ambassadors, acting on behalf of their respective governments. An International Secretariat backs up the NAC/DPC and its subsidiary committees, working groups, etc. These latter bodies provide the NAC/DPC with assessments and recommendations on a wide variety of specialized areas, such as political and economic affairs, defence matters, armaments issues, and so on.

Advice on military matters is provided by the Military Committee, composed of the Chiefs-of-Staff of 12 of the member countries. (In addition to France and Greece, as Iceland has no armed forces, it is not represented on the Committee.) The day-to-day work is carried out by Permanent Military Representatives, supported by an International Military Staff.

The Military Committee also provides guidance to the Allied Commanders and subordinate military authorities. There are three principal NATO Commands - Atlantic, Europe and Channel - under the Supreme Allied Commanders Atlantic (SACLANT), Europe (SACEUR) and the Commander-in-Chief Channel (CINCHAN). Each has its own headquarters - Norfolk, USA; Mons, Belgium; and Northwood, UK - and is sub-divided into a number of subordinate commands.





**What does
Canada
contribute
to the
Alliance?**


In addition to the important non-military initiatives Canada has taken and the ongoing political consultation, there is also the Canadian contribution to common allied defence.

Canadian forces in Europe are "assigned" forces and constitute a mechanized brigade group, as well as an air group of three jet fighter bomber attack squadrons - some 5,000 troops in all, based in Lahr, West Germany. In the Atlantic, a Canadian warship is at all times attached to the SACLANT sub-command, the Standing Naval Force Atlantic, which is the only naval formation permanently under NATO command operating in these waters.

The rest of the Canadian Atlantic fleet and the maritime air squadrons serving with it are "earmarked" for NATO. So is one of the three land formations stationed in Canada, the Special Service Force in Petawawa, Ontario. Known as the "CAST Brigade Group", it is trained and equipped to operate under extreme winter conditions - as are two CF-5 tactical air support squadrons. One of these squadrons and one battalion of the "CAST Combat Group" are also assigned to the multinational Allied Command Europe (ACE) Mobile Force, NATO's quick reaction deterrent force.

In addition, Canada's role in North American air defence constitutes a contribution to the collective defence of the Canada-United States region of NATO.

All in all, about half of Canada's regular military forces of just under 80,000 are available directly or indirectly, or if need be, to NATO.



Is NATO
still
needed?

Being militarily prepared to discourage and, should deterrence fail, to repel aggression is essential to maintaining peace. It is equally important to seek to reduce or eliminate tensions which can threaten that peace. Hence the guiding principles of the Alliance have been deterrence, defence and détente.


In examining the strategic situation, as there is very little or no public scrutiny or discussion of government policies in the Warsaw Pact countries, Western analysts can only make educated guesses as to their possible intentions. However, in planning defensive measures, one has to look at their capabilities.

For example, the Soviet Union is believed by some experts to be spending between 11 and 13 percent of its Gross National Product for military purposes, versus around 6 percent for the United States. Canada spends only about 2 percent of its GNP for defence. In the last five years, the Soviet Union has moderately increased its standing armed forces to just under 3.8 million whereas U.S. forces have decreased to less than 2.1 million. Canadian regular forces have remained at around 80,000.

Money and manpower go further in the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact states than in Western countries, simply because the conditions of military service - pay, housing,

food, and the like - are of a much lower standard than in the West. In the Soviet Union, conscription is in force, whereas the United States, Britain and Canada have all-voluntary services in which pay and other benefits must be competitive with those in civilian life. Consequently, personnel costs make up a much higher proportion of military budgets in the NATO countries than those of the Warsaw Pact; the latter can put more money into armaments.





**Should
Canada
continue as
a member
of NATO?**





Two world wars have taught Canada that it cannot remain aloof from developments in Europe. In fact, the defence of that continent is the first line of defence for Canada. As a member of the Alliance, Canada's defensive capability is far greater than if Canada were "to go it alone".

As so much of Canada's national income is derived from foreign trade - 80 to 90% with our partners in NATO - we are interested in open trade routes and a stable world. Also, if the Soviet Union and the United States superpowers came to blows, Canada lies directly in the path of bombers and missiles - another reason to be concerned for the preservation of peace through adequate collective security.

Last, but not least, in political terms NATO is a valuable link with the United States and with Europe. NATO provides the environment for effective political interaction and the mapping out of concerted lines of conduct toward others, as witness the West's handling of its relations with the Warsaw Pact. No one member country could have done as well alone. NATO is needed. Canada needs NATO as NATO needs Canada ... as it did 30 years ago and as it will for a considerable time to come.

