CHAPTER - III
REGIONALISM IN OPERATION

The Non-Communist World. — A : The NATO.

Theoretical background of regional pacts:

Alliance system has been practised by states from ancient times as an active state craft. It is the spade-work of diplomacy for achieving maximum advantage for the state through minimum entanglement. It is the direct antithesis of universal collective security envisaged by the League or the U.N. The supporters of the alliance policy largely based their faith in the modified balance-of-power-system in contradistinction to global system of collective security. The Bismarckian-type alliance policy, for good or evil, was tried up to the beginning of the Second World War (See Foot Note - 1. )

The alliance system after the Second World War:

After the Second World War there was a reassessment of the conventional alliance-policy, as with the conversion of the world from multipolar to bi-polar, the alliance-system began to revolve round two opposite Super-Powers. The United Nations was created with the object of providing effective collective security on a global base, but despite this, the principle of universal collective security was ignored by the major Powers who put great emphasis upon construction of bloc-wise alliances instead. Thus,

Foot Note-1 : Prof. Organski criticises "balance of power" theory as unrealist and untenable and puts forward power theory instead. Francis B. Sayre also criticises in the same vein, Deptt. of State Bull. vol 8, 1943, p.510.
two distinct sets of alliance developed after post-1945 world — one the non-communist world headed by the United States, the hub of the non-communist world, and the other, the communist alliance, propagated by the Soviet Union, the largest communist power (See Foot Note 7). These two blocs comprise roughly two thirds of the world's population, the remaining portion included within the Third World or non-committed group. Contemporary alliance system also contains other novel features, as in NATO, it requires advance joint military planning for common defense and readiness to serve under one supreme commander. Not only military, but also economic and technological cooperation on a high level is worked out and thereby defense is made correlated with the economics and industry of the country. The casus foederis of such alliance is not uniform in all cases; it is not only "armed attack" as in NATO, but also "any fact or situation which might endanger peace of the area" as in SEATO. Lastly, in some of the alliances as in NATO, the participants aspire for grandiose integration for fostering Atlantic Community.

Background of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation:

We have discussed in Chapter II how great divergence developed between the partners of the "Grand Alliance" over the question of shaping the future world. Even though they subscribed their membership to the general international organisation, the wartime co-operative spirit of the alliance was vastly disappearing. Post-war American foreign policy was largely determined by the

Foot Note: Until China's challenge of the Soviet Union, in the ideological and military fields, the latter enjoyed supremacy in the communist world.
changed balance of world-power coupled with American possession of atom bomb. Several attempts to reach compromise with the Soviets, notably at Yalta and Potsdam proved though not entirely abortive, but extremely difficult in view of almost irreconcilable claims. In Eastern Europe, this posed a great problem, and even the accord agreed to in the "Declaration on Liberated Europe" could not restore normal relations between the contending parties. The United States thought that the Big Three Unity was lost and in March, 1948, President Truman announced his Truman Doctrine for providing economic and military assistance to the war-devastated countries of Europe for resisting alleged Soviet subjugation. The Marshall Plan rolled on Europe and this made the Soviet Union very much repulsive to U.S. moves. This was a turning point and manifestations of the 'cold war' became prominent. The course of events, in the meantime, prompted them to unite. So on March 17, 1948, Britain, France, Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg agreed to sign the Brussels Treaty which subsequently formed the nucleus of the North Atlantic Treaty. By a vote of 64 to 4 the Vandenburg resolution was enthusiastically passed in the U.S. Senate, paving the way for American adherence to the Brussels Treaty to be renamed as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation on April 4, 1949, with the addition of Canada, Italy, Norway, Ireland, Denmark and Portugal. Subsequently, Greece, Turkey, and West Germany

Foot Note: Winston S. Churchill visualised Russia's intention of dominating Europe and as a safeguard, in his famous Fulton speech in 1946 he cautioned against large-scale demobilisation of Western forces in Europe and insisted on achieving unity of the English-speaking people to check Russia. Upon realisation by the West of this hard reality in Europe strains with Russians increased and the cold war developed on a new scale.
were included unanimously to make total membership of fifteen states.

Containment Policy and NATO:

In such a background NATO was formed. It formalised "containment" programme covering political, military, economic, psychological and ideological aspects. Tenaciously advocated by Mr. Kenan and suggesting United States pursuance, in the face of Soviet military challenge this policy would result in "the gradual mellowing of Soviet power." The containment policy found full force in a period when the United States enjoyed sole monopoly of atom bomb. But soon the cards on the table have changed, for, with the Soviet possession of atom bomb in late 1949, and conclusion of the Sino-Soviet Pact in February, 1950, U.S. military superiority was greatly upset and credibility of unilateral military deterrence became questionable.

So, in the next phase, June 1949 to 1953 the members of NATO increased their emphasis on military build-up with large U.S. assistance. The policy of "new" strategy was formulated whereby United States placed greater reliance on local defense for deterring aggression with means of their own choice. Mr. Dulles explained that the free world must maintain the collective means and be willing

1. See Kennan's article: "Sources of Soviet Conduct" in Foreign Affairs, July, 1947.
   Criticism of Kenan is made by R.C. Tucker in "Russia, The West and the World Order", World Politics, Octo.1959. Robert S. Osgood also says, "The anticipated break-up has not materialised." Prof. Osgood tells us that according to Kennan the component elements of containment were not only military but also political, economic and even spiritual. See his Alliances and American Foreign Policy, Ind.Ed.1970, p.37.
to use them in the way which most effectively makes aggression too risky and expensive to be tempting.  

Assumptions of NATO:

The North Atlantic Treaty is based upon certain assumptions.

1. The members were organising this collective security arrangement as a deterrence for protecting their politico-security interests, and this flows from their "inherent rights."

2. It guaranteed defense of a definite area – the North Atlantic area – by the United States.

3. The members gave tacit approval of the U.S. role as defender of democracy and liberty in that area where U.S. economic and military aid heavily flowed.

4. It relied on conventional weapons with which it would, as all regional and quasi-regional security pacts are supposed, to fight wars both local and limited.

5. It was fully consistent with the principles and purposes of the U.N. Charter in the matter of maintenance of international peace and security.

6. Upon a tacit recognition of political duopoly it would provide a tolerable military balance in Europe.

3. John Foster Dulles, Ibid.
American Alliance Policy in NATO:

With U.S. participation in NATO, American alliance policy showed a remarkable departure from the former policy which was considered time-honoured and tested. For since the days of Monroe Doctrine, the United States has successfully avoided participation in direct alliances - pursued a policy that would guarantee freedom of action instead of a direct commitment, as in NATO, to defend the North Atlantic area.

After Berlin blockade by the Soviet Union, U.S.-Russian tensions ran high and U.S. apprehensions against Soviet military challenge crystallized so as to overrule the "isolationists" and the "internationalists" and to prepare the basis of NATO, to be concluded as a direct counterweight against Soviet threat. The United States was interested in a massive programme of economic reconstruction and to be simultaneously achieved with political stability in Western Europe, but all these would hardly be realised except through a framework of military-security pact. To this urgent need NATO supplied the answer.

The Marshall Plan, launched in 1948, known as the European Recovery Programme made an estimated budget for expenditure to the extent of 17 billion dollars by December, 1951. And no sooner had economic collapse of Western Europe been checked, than a programme for defense co-operation was set in to make the change in focus from recovery to rearmament. The accentuating situations in Berlin and Korea made possible for the State Department to carry out a Mutual

---

Defense Assistance Programme, the amount of assistance increased to five times in 1951 in Western Europe in comparison with proportionate increase in other areas.  

Through instrumentalities of alliance the consolidation of the bi-polar United States - U.S.S.R. deterrent balance in Europe was complete. And both of them intended to retain qualified hegemonic control through intra-alliance functions. Through NATO American commitment to Europe was institutionalised not only from the point of security but also from co-ordinated economic development and political stability, and these found a constitutional basis as well as a political vision rarely found in other American alliance.

NATO has been denied by the United States State Department as a "traditional military alliance". It was rather based upon collective security, and as such the State Department asserted, "It is directed against no one; it is directed solely against aggression." It was aimed to strengthen the "balance of principle"; and similar assertions of the treaty were made by the Senate.

United States projection of global strategy in her struggle against communism is a goal of American foreign policy which the Americans are not willing to undervalue even at the cost of increased and sometimes disproportionate liability for their allies.

Despite lack of convergent interests of America and other powers, during last two decades the United States exercised preponderent influence in NATO "in the management of the military balance" in

6. Dept. of State Bulletin, XXII (Feb. 6, 1950) - pp. 198-211.
Europe. Excessive dependence on the U.S. (except by France) and unwillingness to assume reciprocal burden of their own defense have demolished chances of a valid co-operation in the alliance whereby the U.S. has gained greater leverage in the alliance.

American projection of NATO in world politics has stemmed out of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense provided for in Article 51 of the U.N. Charter and applied in the form of a deterrent strategy. Simultaneously with this right the United States, through the body of the Pact and separate official statements has expressed faith in the principles of the Charter and also her willingness to bear major responsibility as a Great Power. This has legitimised NATO as a defensive shield pursuing peaceful aims and yet consistent with the objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

**NATO and Western civilisation:**

The importance of NATO as the key collective defense arrangement of the non-communist world deserves consideration in more than one respect. In fact, it is the first well-conceived, integrated and strong collective defense arrangement in an area of no less vital importance than Europe where Soviet threat is supposed to be imminent and organised than any other part of the world.

Not new is the concept of a Atlantic community. Mackinder as early as 1930, and afterwards Walter Lippman developed the concept of Atlantic Community. The Atlantic area has been the cradle of Western powers who want to defend their basic political, economic and

---

ideological values which have nourished Western civilisation to its present form.

Main features of NATO:

1. The Preamble is an important feature which reaffirmed the faith of the signatories in the principles of the U.N., in the Western ideals of democracy and individual liberty. It expresses the desire of the participants to organise collective defense for peace and security, and even though they organised collective self-defense for promoting peace and stability, they do not retreat from the obligations already imposed as members of the U.N.

2. The parties according to Article 3 seek mutual co-operation "to develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack." Moreover, they aim to accelerate not only military security, but also economic progress among the members.

3. Article 5 is the heart of the treaty. It stipulates that an attack on any one of the parties "shall be considered an attack against them all." In the event of such an attack they will "in exercise of their right of individual or collective self-defense recognised by Article 51 of the Charter" come to the help of the victim and take necessary action including use of armed forces. In fine, the principle of collective security on a regional level is worked out and made automatic.

4. Articles 3, 4, 5 and 6 are complimentary. Article 6 extends jurisdiction of the treaty not only on the territories of the parties, but also "on the Algerian departments of France", on the "occupation
forces of any party in Europe" and so on. In addition to a definite treaty area within which the treaty is applicable, it contemplates to discuss peace and security problems outside its jurisdiction.

5. The parties further affirmed in Article 7 that none of its provisions were contradictory to any one of the U.N. The treaty also did not affect Security Council's prime responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

6. Article 8 stipulates that the parties shall establish a council for implementation of Articles 3 and 5. With the object of achieving concerted action and greater co-operation in defense and political matters it established a Permanent Council with its new headquarters in Paris. Composed of representatives of states at the ministerial level the Permanent Council is the most important organ in NATO set-up.

The organisational set-up of NATO is shown here:

```
Council of Ministers
Permanent Council - Secretary General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defense Production</th>
<th>Military Committee</th>
<th>Financial and Planning Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Board</td>
<td>Three-nation</td>
<td>Economic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standing group</td>
<td>World Ocean Shipping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlantic Command</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Command</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Foot Note: With the achievement of independence by Algeria the relevant clauses of this treaty has become inapplicable from 3rd July, 1962.

By invoking Article 5 Portugal tried but unsuccessfully to extend NATO action in defending her colonial right in Goa against India's claim of emancipation.

7. Any European State in terms of Article 10 may be invited by unanimous agreement to join the treaty for furtherance of the provisions of the treaty. In such manner Greece and Turkey in 1952, and West Germany in 1955, were unanimously included.

8. Article 12 provides for revision of the treaty after the expiry of ten years or afterwards at the request of any one of its members. See Foot Note: 1.

9. According to terms of Article 13 after the treaty has been in force for twenty years any member can withdraw one year after its notice of withdrawal given to the United States. See Foot Note: 2.

10. Last, but not the least important feature, that the Pact bases its authority on Article 51 and thereby makes it completely absolved of the implications of Article 52 to 54. In other words, NATO is not a regional alliance under Chapter VIII of the U.N. Charter. But, there is also reference of U.N. superiority, suggesting adherence to the U.N. principles.

American Justification for NATO:

The United States sought to justify the Atlantic Pact on the following grounds:

1. The Soviet Union has flouted the agreements reached at Yalta and Potsdam, and in contravention to the "Declaration of Liberated Europe" has imposed communist rule in Eastern Europe.

Co-operation

Foot Note: 1. The treaty has not yet been formally revised but after withdrawal by France from the integrated military command, fundamental changes in the structure of NATO have been made.

Foot Note: 2. No member has yet withdrawn from NATO, and although France has withdrawn from the integrated military command, she has retained her membership in the alliance.

from the Soviet Union in the field of reconstructing the post-war world was completely lacking.

2. The United States was entirely justified to adhere to the requests made by Brussels-Treaty-Powers, and Denmark, Norway and Italy for defending Western Europe being run by communism. Commenting on United States participation in the Atlantic Pact, Secretary of State Mr. Acheson stated:

"Our security and peace necessarily rest in the combined security and peace of the democratic world."\(^{12}\)

President Truman on 21 December, 1950 asserted:

"Let there be no mistake about it - the unity of the nations of Western Europe and of the North Atlantic area is vital to their security and to ours."\(^{13}\)

3. President Truman's address on 20 January, 1949 - "Building the Peace" was a sort of clarion call to the American nation to accept the communist challenge and to associate with NATO. He discarded communism as a "false philosophy" antithetical to individual liberty and freedom. The United States was duty bound to extend her generous hand of co-operation in both economic and military fields through NATO, so that, peace and justice could be maintained there.\(^{14}\)

4. In organising a regional collective security pact like

---

12. See Documents on International Affairs, 1949-50, Royal Institute of International Affairs, London.


NATO, the members were within their rights conferred upon them by Article 51 of the Charter. This pact does in no way bypass the United Nations, as the Pact, in its preamble and Articles 5 and 7, has clearly expressed its faith in the purpose and principles of the Charter. Self-defense is the aim of this Pact, and as "individual or collective self-defense" in the case of an armed attack is allowed under Article 51, the members were quite justified in organizing this. Eisenhower asserted on 1 February, 1951, before the members of the Congress that NATO was not a belligerent force with aggressive design, but its aims are peace and security.

5. The Soviet Union has paralyzed the Security Council action by excessive use of veto, the resultant effect of this has weakened the responsibility and authority of the Security Council of the U.N. In the absence of Great-Power-unanimity, the Security Council is handicapped to take enforcement measures against possible Soviet aggression.

6. The entire North Atlantic area (with the exception of Spain) represents the "free world"; its peoples have upheld Western ideals of democracy and individual liberty. Western Europe has developed a high culture synonomous with Western culture and civilisation with which the United States possess the strongest bonds. After the war the United States extended large amount of economic aid and assistance for regenerating war-devastated and shattered economy and industry of

15. NATO, 1949-1959, The First Ten Years, Deptt.of State Publication, 6783. This handbook contains a summary of the activities and achievements of NATO.

that area. The United States laid due emphasis in the field of economic reconstruction and political stability which are termed as "non-military aspects", but nonetheless important for proper and efficient functioning in the military field.\textsuperscript{17} This led the British Prime Minister to opine (in the said Bulletin) that it is "primarily a political alliance and not a military one". NATO has often been referred to as a shield against communism, and this made Winston Churchill to declare: "In the Atlantic Pact we have a great instrument making for world peace.\textsuperscript{18} Further, the supporters of the Pact visualise the formation of a strong Atlantic Community through NATO's Financial and Economic Board and NATO Parliamentarian Assembly and other European organisations e.g. The Organisation for European Economic Co-operation, the European Coal and Steel Community, Western European Union, The Council of Europe, the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM), European Common Market, European Free Trade Association and so on [See Foot Note].

\textbf{Soviet protest against NATO 4}

Soviet reaction to the American standpoint seeking justification for the creation of NATO was categorical and direct. The

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[17.] See NATO, 1949-1959, The First Ten Years Ibid, for discussion on "non-military aspects" of NATO, and for British Prime Minister's Statement. The Canadian Foreign Minister Mr. Pearson also adhered to the concept of Atlantic Community in his article "Canada and the Atlantic Pact", Foreign Affairs, April, 1949.
\item[18.] For Churchill's statement see Documents 1949-50, Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Soviet Union lodged her emphatic protest on the eve of conclusion of NATO and strongly denounced NATO as an aggressive coalition "to establish by force Anglo-American domination over the world" and has charged that it "is a factor undermining the United Nations Organisation."\(^{19}\) The Russian statement on January 29, 1949, in reply to "Truman's address - "Building the Peace" categorised Western Union as the "weapon of aggressive Anglo-American bloc in Europe" created in contravention to the agreements reached at Yalta and Potsdam. Continuing it said, "that these Powers have embarked upon a new policy, highly dangerous for the peace-loving nations with the purpose of establishing their domination over the nations of Europe, not stopping at employing for these ends yesterday's aggressor, who has since the termination of the war become dependent on them."

The Soviet statement denied the propriety of considering the North Atlantic Treaty as a regional arrangement as it was not bound by Article 52 of the Charter. Geographical propinquity was clearly lacking in NATO to be termed as a regional arrangement, as it embraces states in both the hemispheres. It ignores the responsibility of settling various regional problems and at the same time keeps the small powers under constant interference and tutelage of the Anglo-American powers. The reference by State Department of Article 51 seeking justification of NATO is erroneous, as "the formation of North Atlantic grouping can no way find justification in Article 51". The Russian statement further noted that, "the North Atlantic Pact is by no means required for self-defense but for

realisation of policy of aggression." The North Atlantic Treaty is designed to curb the United Nations authority for bringing its complete "disintegration and collapse" for "establishing Anglo-American world domination."

The Soviet Union, just before the conclusion of NATO, submitted her objection dated 31 March, 1949\textsuperscript{20} in a formal way \cite{Foot Note}. 

\textsuperscript{20} Documents on International Affairs, 1949-50, Ibid.

\textbf{Foot Note:} Text of Soviet objection 31 March, 1949, runs as follows: 

1. The North Atlantic Treaty has nothing in common with the aims of self-defense of the States who are parties to the Treaty, who are threatened by no one whom no one intends to attack. On the contrary, this Treaty has an obviously aggressive character and is aimed against the U.S.S.R., which fact is not concealed even by official representatives of the States in their public pronouncements.

2. The North Atlantic Treaty not only does not contribute to the consolidation of peace and international security which is the duty of all members of the United Nations Organisation, but runs directly counter to the principles and aims of the United Nations Charter and leads to undermining the United Nations Organisation.

3. The North Atlantic Treaty runs counter to the treaty between Great Britain and the Soviet Union signed in 1942, under which both States assumed the obligation to cooperate in the maintenance of peace and international security and 'not to conclude any alliances and not to participate in any coalitions, directed against the other High Contracting Party.'

4. The North Atlantic Treaty runs counter to the Treaty between France and the Soviet Union signed in 1944 under which both States assumed the obligation to cooperate in the maintenance of peace and international security, and 'not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against one of the High Contracting Parties.'

5. The North Atlantic Treaty runs counter to the agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States of America and Great Britain concluded at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, as well as other conferences of the representatives of these Powers held both during and after the Second World War, under which the United States of America and Great Britain, like the Soviet Union, assumed the obligation to cooperate in the consolidation of general peace and international security and to contribute to the consolidation of the United Nations Organisation.

\cite{Foot Note}
Soviet protests to Norway, Italy and Germany:

While talks on the Atlantic Pact was in progress, Russia in her note dated 29 Jan, 1949 submitted to the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated that she did not approve Norway's participation in the Pact which was pursuing aggressive aims. Noreigian government in its reply dated February 1, 1949 refuted the Russian charges and claimed that the Pact has only defensive purposes. Italy was an ex-enemy state, and her adherence was condemned by Russia in her note dated July 19, 1949 on the ground that Italian Peace Treaty with the Allies was repugnant to the terms of NATO which is nothing but an aggressive military pact aimed against Russia. The Italian reply dated July 28, 1949 repudiated the above charges and confirmed NATO as "a collective defense pact with peaceful aims." In strongest terms, the Soviet Union condemned German participation in NATO. Russian Foreign Minister's statement dated September 9, 1954 pointed out that the Atlantic powers were taking a very risky step by allowing "remilitarisation of Western Germany" whose inclusion in NATO would again unleash aggression in Europe. United States maintained that since F.R.G. is by every means a sovereign state she was free to conclude alliance with the NATO partners. But the Soviet Union alleged that both Washington and Bonn have complimentary imperialist aims, as such, the United States is keen on making a strong German army as a backbone for NATO.


Strategic objectives of NATO: Some general assumptions

The strategic objective or military rational of NATO has been differently conceived in the United States, but both relying on the genuineness of the need of formation and for maintenance of the alliance. General Lewis Norstad opined in 1954 before the Congress that preparedness of NATO would act as a "brake" against Russian expansion while in the Report of the Draper Committee the concept of "global forward strategy" was outlined which meant that NATO would provide "much more acceptable alternative than surrender or resort to atomic warfare." It is gain saying here that the strategic object is geared into American foreign policy as an essential factor in her global struggle against communism.

In formulating strategic objectives the NATO members assume the following:

First, NATO has no aggressive designs, it is only a defensive organisation.
Second, NATO has been organised to meet Soviet challenge, potential or actual.
Third, NATO will provide a shield of the democratic world.
Fourth, NATO would not resort to atomic warfare, rather it would act as a deterrent to that. [See Foot Note].

Following Soviet acquisition of nuclear weapons, the NATO members in 1957 decided to equip themselves with nuclear weapons, and

---


Foot Note: With rearming of NATO members with atomic weapons this assumption is not applicable.
since then they were equipped with medium range ballistic missiles for establishing "mutual deterrence" in nuclear-missile age.

Assessment:

NATO is considered as the key of anti-communist coalition, as such, it produces an impact of great importance in world politics comparable to none. Moreover, it is established at the very heart of Europe and in direct confrontation with the Soviet bloc.

In 1950, the NATO Council unanimously agreed to "forward policy" for repelling Soviet threat. The question of German rearmament came before the council's meeting in September, 1950, but France disagreed.\(^{24}\) After assuming supreme command of NATO General Dwight Eisenhower asserted on February 1, 1951, that NATO has no aggressive design, but its aims are peace and security.\(^{25}\) In its Paris meeting December, 1952, "the Council reaffirmed their alliance as being for defense, for peace and security.\(^{26}\)

In April, 1954, the Council expressed concern and need for unity for increased Soviet strength. The Soviet Union, in 1954, proposed to the three Western Powers intimating her desire to join NATO in a modified form and laid plans for a General European Security, but the Western Powers rejected this as both incompatible and dangerous. It was decided that West Germany and Italy were to be included in NATO for the contemplated Atlantic Community.\(^{27}\)

\(^{24}\) Keeings, 1950-52, p.10985.

\(^{25}\) Documents on International Affairs (R.I.I.A.), 1951.

\(^{26}\) Documents, Ibid, 1952.

\(^{27}\) Keeings, 1952-54, pp.13500, 13564.
The Council's meeting in July, 1955, emphasised that Germany should remain within NATO system. In this meeting France demanded withdrawal of French forces serving under NATO for sending them to Algeria.\textsuperscript{28} Three NATO Powers - U.K., U.S. and France participated with the Soviet Union in a conference held in Geneva in October, 1955, to discuss the problems of German reunification and European security. The Soviet Union contended that General European Security should precede German re-unification to which the Western Powers did not agree, and no agreement was reached.\textsuperscript{29} In December, 1956, the NATO Council laid emphasis upon non-military cooperation, and sought for political consultation. Agreement was reached for direct settlement of intra-member disputes before resorting to any other international agency. The question of atomic armament also came when the United States expressed that she was prepared to supply non-American NATO forces in Europe with tactical atomic weapons.\textsuperscript{30} In Bonn meeting, in May, 1957, the Council stressed the need for both conventional and nuclear weapons. It bitterly criticised Soviet repression in Hungary and praised the Hungarians for their love of freedom. In the NATO Heads of Government meeting in that year Turkey (a common member of NATO and Baghdad Pact) urged the necessity for "some kind of relationship between NATO and the Baghdad Pact."\textsuperscript{31} The Cyprus issue was discussed in NATO Council and the British Government on the basis of non-military cooperation.

\textsuperscript{29} Keesings, 1955-56, pp.14537-38.
\textsuperscript{31} Deptt. of State Publication 6606 (1958), also Keesings, 1957-58, pp.15723-28.
of that discussion published a White Paper on Cyprus in 1958 whereby she laid plans for peaceful settlement of the problem through a round table conference under the chairmanship of Mr. Spaak.\textsuperscript{32} Difference between France and other NATO members developed when French proposal for creation of a three-Power NATO Political Directorate, composed of U.S., U.K. and France was rejected by Eisenhower and Macmillan. French request for NATO support for Algeria was also not complied with.\textsuperscript{33} In December, 1960, the Council affirmed solidarity and peaceful aims of the alliance, but divergence with France widened when President de-Gaulle stated that France wished to have a share in the control of the Western Powers' nuclear weapons and was determined to create a French atomic striking force. France wanted to cooperate with NATO but not at the cost of her sovereignty and insisted that defense of France would be exclusively under French command.\textsuperscript{34}

In December, 1962, meeting of the NATO Council it appeared that the Alliance as a whole firmly supported U.S. policy in Cuba.\textsuperscript{35} Taking note of the Anglo-American NASSAU agreement France opined that she would remain outside that and she also did not support multi-lateral nuclear force (M.L.F.). In the Council meeting in December, 1963, the members affirmed their faith in the U.N. and urged for solution of German and Berlin problem.\textsuperscript{36} The members in December, 1964, decided to strengthen the alliance in the political field, and

\textsuperscript{32.} Keesings, 1959, p.16643.  
\textsuperscript{33.} Ibid, p.16961.  
\textsuperscript{34.} Keesings, 1961, pp.17847-48.  
\textsuperscript{35.} Documents, Ibid, 1962.  
"reaffirmed their determination" to facilitate an agreed solution of the Cyprus problem. Britain supported a proposal for Atlantic Nuclear Force (A.L.F.) with massive British support. In the communique issued in December, 1964, they stressed the need for unity in the alliance and asserted "legitimate interests of the German people to reunification on the basis of their right of self-determination."\(^3\) In 1965, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated that France did not wish to integrate French forces into NATO for she intended to build her own forces on national basis and wished to withdraw from NATO command in 1969.\(^3\) The year 1966 climaxed NATO development owing to French Memorandum of March 7, 1966 in which she expressed that fundamental changes have occurred since 1949 in international politics, and she did not think it justifiable to continue her military alliance with the American government.\(^3\) Reasons for withdrawal by France from NATO were also elaborated by the French Premier Pompidou on April 13, 1966 before the French National Assembly.\(^4\) Following this, Supreme Headquarters for Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE) was moved from Paris to Casteau (Belgium). In 1967, Brezhnev submitted Soviet proposal for liquidation of the military organisations of the NATO and the Warsaw Pacts in the context of General European Security.\(^4\) In the Council meeting in June, 1968, the members affirmed their

---


intention to promote detente and observed that mutual reduction of forces should be balanced and timely. The Council in its meeting in November, 1968 condemned Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia as unlawful and against the principles of the U.N. Being conscious of Soviet naval pressure in the Mediterranean, they decided to establish Mediterranean Naval Command for NATO. In December, 1969 the Council claimed success of the alliance as a guarantor of security, and its value as a meaningful detente. The Council in its meeting in December, 1970 confirmed that the alliance was aimed at relaxation of tension, and stated that troops reduction in Europe would be on a reciprocal basis with the Soviet Union. The NATO Council in June, 1971, affirmed that the political aim of the alliance is to establish a just and peaceful order in Europe, to solve Berlin problem successfully, and to hold a General European Security conference. The question of troops reduction was taken up by NATO which decided to start exploratory talks with the Soviet Union, so that, "a stable military balance at a lower level of forces" may be maintained in Europe.

Non-aligned Powers and NATO

The NATO is the product of bipolarity which was tenaciously maintained not only by the non-communist bloc, but also

44. Keesings 1969-70, p.24348.
45. Keesings 1971-72, p.24661 A.
by the Communist one. The cold war, search for detente and establishment of rival power blocs coupled with arms race are some of the manifestations of the bipolarity. This bipolarity is not wholly politico-military but politico-military factors have stemmed out of inherent ideological differences between the communist and the non-communist blocs. The non-aligned powers like India, Egypt, Ghana and Ceylon have ardously endeavoured not to be linked either with the anti-communist or communist bloc. More than that they have betterly opposed the utility of these blocs towards maintenance of international peace and security. The late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru is most outspoken in his criticism of NATO which intends to maintain colonies through the cloak of defense-scheme. The vision of Atlantic community is not related to the actual functioning of NATO. Continuing he says that such type of military pacts give a "false sense of security" and it would be harmful for countries "to align themselves with military alliances for the purpose of ensuring their security." The late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru is most outspoken in his criticism of NATO which intends to maintain colonies through the cloak of defense-scheme. The vision of Atlantic community is not related to the actual functioning of NATO. Continuing he says that such type of military pacts give a "false sense of security" and it would be harmful for countries "to align themselves with military alliances for the purpose of ensuring their security." There is considerable reasonableness in Nehru's observation for even after twentyfour years of conclusion of NATO, the sense of insecurity in western Europe still persists.

The North Atlantic Treaty as a Regional Arrangement:

The North Atlantic Treaty has been termed by Goodrich

---

47. Jawaharlal Nehru - India's Foreign Policy, Select speeches, Sept. 1946 - April, 1961, Publications Division, Govt. of India, 1961, pp. 90, 98.

and Hambro, and Prof. Kelsen as a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the U.N. Charter. Among them Prof. Kelsen has made a thorough discussion on the issue. He interprets that "the North Atlantic Treaty fulfills the requirements of a regional arrangement."

He lays the following grounds: (a) It is entered into by some members of the U.N. with the object of exercising collective self-defense within a definite area (North Atlantic area) as stated in the treaty, (b) Article 51 does not preclude "enforcement action taken against an aggressor which is a party" to the collective self-defense treaty, nor the NATO does "exclude the application of Article 5 against an aggressor who is a contracting party to the treaty", (c) The Charter allows contradictory interpretations and "since the exercise of collective self-defense is not expressly referred to in Article 53 of the Charter, it is impossible to consider a treaty for the implementation of Article 51 as an agreement different from a regional arrangement."

Moreover, the NATO declares peaceful aims and is subordinate to the U.N. Charter. Concluding his argument Prof. Kelsen says that excepting Article 1 of NATO which is of doubtful interpretation, "the North Atlantic Treaty does not contain provisions incompatible with Chapter VIII of the Charter."

Several objections were raised by the Soviet Union and others in considering NATO as a regional arrangement, and they decried it on the following grounds:

(a) It is based upon Article 51 of the Charter and it lacks to fulfil obligations within the meaning of Chapter VIII (Articles 52-54) of the Charter.

(b) Its aim is not peaceful, rather it has aggressive designs against Soviet Russia and by making a great coalition of West European countries with the U.S., it has virtually girdled Soviet Russia. It has also lent a new lease to West German militarism.

(c) It is lacking geographical propinquity and as such by making a trans-Atlantic combine has simultaneously lost its true regional character.

(d) It has bypassed the U.N., and has flouted its purposes. By arming NATO with nuclear weapons and by associating with West Germany, it has become a source of constant irritation and has jeopardised peace.

Perhaps the most balanced view has been stated by Sir Elric Beckett of Great Britain. He says that the North Atlantic treaty


is not in the proper sense a regional arrangement on the ground that (i) collective self-defense is not mentioned in the Chapter on Regional Arrangements, and that (ii) in a genuine regional arrangement enforcement action may be applied "in case of a conflict between any two or more members of the Union.

Can a regional arrangement be constructed which will be beyond the control of the Security Council and yet consistent with the Charter? It seems less appropriate unless a very strained meaning of Article 51 is made. Secretary of State Acheson opined before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 27, 1949 that Article 53 has no operation in the functioning of NATO.²²

The truth is that the framers of the Charter did not conceive of formation of regional arrangements under Article 51 of the Charter. They were satisfied that such organisations may well be formed under specific Chapter on Regional Arrangements. Secondly, it was not conceived that the ex-enemy states like West Germany and Italy would join the Allies in forming regional defense pacts, rather the opposite - that, such pacts would be directed against the ex-enemy states in case of renewed aggression was thought. Thirdly, breaking-up of the Grand coalition in post-1945 world, causing changed political situation with its associate complexities brought sharp difference among the Allies, as well as general weakening of the collective security system. Fourthly, due to

²² Mac Closky (U.S.) justifies competence of Article 51 to accommodate NATO. See his The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, New York, p.7. See also NATO, 1949-59, The First Ten Years, Ibid. For Acheson's opinion see Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearings, April 27, 1949.
absence of precise and agreed definition of the terms - "regional arrangement", "region", the whole issue has been subject to interpretation suiting particular needs and interests of powers. Fifthly, a regional arrangement which is concluded under Chapter VIII must contain provisions for enforcement action at the regional level, and it must according to terms of Article 54, inform the Security Council of all enforcement measures. But, these provisions have been consciously and deliberately avoided in order to seek greater freedom of action. It may be concluded that the Charter has virtually changed through usage though not through formal amendment. In this context, NATO may be best termed as a collective defense arrangement for a particular area, but it lacks the requisites of a regional arrangement under strict sense of the term under Chapter VIII.

Conclusion:

The North Atlantic Treaty is the starting point of the U.S. alliance system formed at the height of cold war with the double purpose of political and military containment of the Soviet challenge in Europe. It formalised ideological-based power blocs at the very heart of Europe where the United States took absorbing interest, in defending Western Europe. It is mainly due to United States efforts that the alliance has achieved some amount of solidarity and efficiency in comparison with other anti-communist alliances (SEATO and CENTO). In the matter of defense planning NATO exhibits some super-national aspect as all the members except France have agreed

to establish integrated command.

As we shall now see that the alliance is not all success, for the inherent contradictions as well for lack of its capacity to contribute to the cause of peace and security according to the principles of the U.N. Charter.

Composed of small, medium-sized and Super Power the alliance is lacking homogeneity, and, as such, not reciprocal with the United States in the matter of shouldering defense responsibility. Owing to different national aims and interests the *raison d'etre* of the alliance has become of questionable value. They have failed to achieve basic unity on the main issue of dealing with Soviet threat. 54 Professor R. E. Osgood maintains that owing to absence of agreement on the degree of integration on U.S. lines, the professed goal of Atlantic Community is far away. 55 Emphasising these contradictions A. Gorokhov (Soviet Union) criticises NATO as a "sick coalition" based on "obsolete concepts." 56 Disagreement among members of the alliance specially with U.S. on some specific international issues was most conspicuous and open, causing severe strains within the alliance. For example, most of the NATO-allies were reluctant to be greatly involved in Korea, and Vietnam like the United States. On the issue of recognition of communist China, Britain and France


fundamentally differed with the United States by granting earlier recognition than the U.S. which withheld it till 1972. In Suez Crisis of 1956 the strains of the alliance was maximum when U.S. was opposed to Anglo-French action in Suez. The United States stated that Britain and France, without consulting the NATO council, took unilateral action. An intra-member dispute involving three members - Greece, Turkey and Britain over Cyprus clouded NATO horizon and mediatory efforts of Mr. Spaak, former Secretary General of NATO, proved of little value. France was not only dissatisfied over lack of NATO support over Algeria, but also demanded withdrawal of a portion of French forces serving under NATO for engagement in Algeria. NATO had neither military solutions for the Hungarian problem in 1956 and the Berlin wall in 1961, nor political solutions to the crisis in Algeria, Suez and Cyprus. The members were also not united on the pattern of the alliance and there was cleavage among France and the United States on their respective roles in the control of the alliance. French bid for supremacy and independence at par with the United States was coolly received by the United States. The United States and Britain rejected French proposal for creation of a three-power NATO Political Directorate (U.S., U.K. and France). France insisted that French forces should not be integrated with those of NATO under foreign command,

as such she withdraw from NATO's integrated military command in 1969. Moreover, France thought feasibility of atomic deterrence as unsatisfactory to her. U.S. predominance in NATO has not only been unpleasant to France, but also other small states like Norway, Denmark and Italy. N.Y.Polyanov, a Soviet expert tells us that the Scandanavian members of NATO are unwilling to use their countries as bases of NATO's nuclear weapons, for they become exposed to Soviet nuclear retaliation which they want to avoid at any cost. Western Europe has already improved her economy and places less reliance upon the U.S.A. The members of Western Europe have asserted their independence and they visualise ultimate political union through economic organisations (ECSG and Common Market) without the U.S. In the recent Middle Eastern crisis (Octo, 1973) the rift between Europe and U.S. has become wider; the European partners of NATO have expressed strong resentment over pro-Israeli policy of U.S. In the context of an independent Europe, NATO's Atlantic vision has declined. Commenting upon this rift U.S. News and World Report rightly stated that "on both sides of the Atlantic the future of America's partnership with Western Europe is being questioned as never before."

This suggests that vital issues in NATO have remained unsolved owing to greater control imposed by U.S. on its members.

60. Cited in (40).
The treaty has been repeatedly affirmed as defensive. But, the members under the cloak of defense provisions, of the treaty, which are apparently permissible under the U.N. have glaringly failed to act according to its declared principles and have instead fostered politico-security interests of the U.S. by undermining the aims of the U.N. By exercising her dominance in the alliance, the U.S. is keen to see NATO serve her interests in her global struggle against communism. Secondly, the treaty is based on Article 51 of the Charter with the object of making its operation free from Security Council's superior control in the matter of maintaining international peace. In this sense, it can hardly be classified as a regional arrangement contemplated under chapter VIII of the Charter, and its actual operation also suggests that it has chosen not to work as an agency complimentary to the U.N. Thirdly, although loyalty to U.N. principles were affirmed these were honoured more in its breaches, for the members deliberately made violations of Articles 1 and 7 of the Pact by taking recourse to force and other measures inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the U.N. Charter. Some of the NATO members specially, Portugal, Britain and the United States have continued their trade with the illegal regime in South Rhodesia by flagrantly violating the economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council in 1968. Portugal is still actively pursuing a colonial policy in Africa by ignoring the decisions of the United Nations. Fourthly, small or weak powers adhered to the treaty so long as their interests were served,

65. Ibid.
but as soon as they considered their own interests overlooked, (as in the case of French insistence for greater control in the alliance), they become disinterested or even withdraw from the treaty. French divergence and subsequent withdrawal from NATO's military command is a case to the point. Lastly, peaceful aims, so loudly affirmed by Churchill and others have no real value in the greater context of world peace and are no more than high-sounding phrases declared only to justify heavy armament including atomic weapons for establishing a detente. This has resulted in intensifying rivalry between the blocs and by putting less emphasis upon peaceful settlement and general collective security, has undermined the UN approach to world peace to a great extent. Even the contemplated troops reduction by NATO and Warsaw, aiming at establishing "a stable military balance" at a lower cost, would be nothing more than a precarious military balance without eradicating the root causes of tension. In fine, "the efforts to build a community around the security issues through NATO" are being fruitlessly pursued at the cost of the U.N.