PART IV

THE POSITION IN

COLLECTIVE DEFENCE
CHAPTER X
THE FUNCTIONS AND IMPORTANCE OF THE INSTITUTION OF ORGANIZATIONS FOR COLLECTIVE DEFENSE

(1) LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The conception of collective security was first born with the League of Nations and though no adequate provisions were made in the Covenant, there was a distinct path provided leading to collective action if there was the necessary will and desire among nations, to act as.

Though Article 16(2) of the Covenant of the League conceived of the possibility of collective defense, the Council had no power to order military measures to be taken by any member of the League and hence the Council had to depend on voluntary cooperation of the governments directly or indirectly concerned in the conflict. Thus military measures were kept in the background and left indeterminate. There was no equivalent body in the League of Nations to the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations which could consider and plan military enforcement of the provisions of the Covenant.

(2) COLLECTIVE MILITARY ACTION UNDER UNITED NATIONS.

As both the intention and the effort to collective forces of the member-states for the maintenance of international security was lacking under the Covenant of the League, no military organization was created under its regime and hence the necessity of the Chiefs of Staff idea did not arise. However, the same cannot

---

1 The Article reads as follows:

"16(2) - It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned that effective military, naval or air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenant of the League."
be said of the U.N. where a clear but not quite firm intention can be gathered from Articles 42 to 47 of the Charter, which provide for a military organisation to implement the political decisions of the Security Council. Thus the two-fold functions relating to framing of policy by the Security Council and expert military planning by the Military Staff Committee were entrusted to two distinct organs of the U.N. This proves the fundamental necessity of such a system not only in the national State but also in international organisations which visualise the use of military force in the proper discharge of their functions.

THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF UNITED NATIONS.

Once military action is decided upon by the Security Council under Article 42 of the Charter, the direction of the armed forces, which members are required to place at the disposal of the United Nations, passes into the hands of the Military Staff Committee which is a permanent subsidiary organ of the Council set up under Article 47.

In accordance with Article 46, plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee."

1 Article 46 reads as follows:

"Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee."
the application of the armed forces are to be made by the Security Council, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee. This places the Security Council in the same relation to the Military Staff Committee as other governments are to their Chiefs of Staff. The latter have only such authority as is delegated to them by the Cabinet or other executive authority which bears political responsibility. Under Article 47, a Military Staff Committee is set up to assist and advise the Security Council in all matters.

**COMPOSITION.**

This Committee consists of the Chiefs of Staff, or their representatives, of the permanent members of the Security Council.

The question of the composition of the Military Staff Committee was discussed at great length during the drafting stage and considerable pressure was exercised by the smaller powers to secure wider representation in it. However, this was not possible because the Military Staff Committee working on the analogy of the Chiefs of Staff Committee of a State must, by its nature and functions, be a small compact body. In order to satisfy the smaller powers, provision was made that "any member of the United Nations not permanently..."
permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited to be associated with it", when necessary. As it is, the Military Staff Committee consists of the Chiefs of Staff of all permanent members which would make it an unwieldy body.

FUNCTIONS.

The functions of the Military Staff Committee may be summarised as follows:

1. To advise and assist the Security Council on questions relating to the military requirements for the specific purpose of maintaining international peace and security. This is in effect the "negotiation of the special agreement or agreements" referred to in Article 43.

2. To advise and assist the Security Council in the strategic direction of the forces placed at its command for the purpose specified in Article 42. It is essential to note here that the function of the Military Staff Committee, in connection with the employment and command of forces to be used under Articles 39 and 42, is confined to strategic direction only and does not include tactical command. The Section expressly leaves out the latter aspect by stating that "questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently."

3. To advise and assist the Security Council in the preparation of plans for the "establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments" under the terms of Article 26.

THE MILITARY....
The Military Staff Committee has never actually functioned till today since the agreements visualised under Article 43 could not be successfully negotiated for giving birth to a collective force. Even in the Korean conflict, the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States of America were the principal planners and the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations had no voice in the matter of operational planning.

It is also important to mention that the Military Committee (Chiefs of Staff) under the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and the Western Union Chiefs of Staff Committee of the Brussels Treaty do not come under the over-riding authority of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations. These pacts of collective self-defence do not come under Article 43 and hence the Military Staff Committee has nothing to do with them. It is unfortunate that no agreement could be reached on the recommendations of the Military Staff Committee.

In Article 47 which establishes this important subsidiary organ (Military Staff Committee), lays down its responsibility for advising the Council regarding the military requirements needed to discharge the cardinal function of maintaining international peace and security. On 30th April 1947, the Military Staff Committee reported to the Security Council.....
Security Council its conclusions on the "general principles governing the organisation of the armed forces to be made available to the Security Council by Member-Nations of the United Nations." The report took the form of a series of 41 Articles of which 25 received unanimous agreement but they were not the vital ones. For example, it was unanimously agreed that:

1) The armed forces made available should be composed of units of national armed forces normally maintained as components of armed forces of member nations (Article 3).

2) All members should have the "opportunity as well as the obligation" to place armed forces, facilities and other assistance at the disposal of the Security Council (Article 9).

3) Initially the permanent members would make the major contribution and that as contributions of other members of the United Nations become available they would be added to the forces already contributed (Articles 10 and 11).

4) No member of the United Nations should be urged to increase the strength of its armed forces with a view to make a contribution to the United Nations.

5) ...

---

5) The armed forces should be "under the exclusive command of the respective contributing nations, except when operating under the Security Council."

6) The Military Staff Committee was to be responsible, under the Security Council, for strategic direction of the forces while they were being employed by the Security Council, and that the command of national contingents should be exercised by commanders, appointed by the contributing members, and that these contingents should retain their 'national character' and be subject at all times to the discipline and regulations in force in their own national armed forces (Articles 38 and 39).

There were, however, disagreements on some of the more vital issues. For example, with reference to the size of the contribution of each permanent member there was basic disagreement between the Soviet delegation and other delegations. While the Soviet believed in the principle of equality both as regards overall strength and the composition of the forces, the other delegations brought out the view that the contribution of permanent members should be "comparable" and that "in view of the differences in size and composition of national forces of each Permanent Member" these contributions may differ widely.
as to the strength of the separate components, land, sea and air. Again, there was disagreement as to whether over and above the supreme or overall commander of the armed forces the Security Council should also appoint Commanders-in-Chief of land, sea or air forces acting under the supreme commander. In short, on the basic point of the overall strength and composition of the armed forces to be made available to the Security Council, there was no agreement and the Military Staff Committee has, therefore, not functioned since no collective force on a national-contribution basis has come into existence. Such a force would have come into being had Article 43 been acted upon, but it is quite clear that there are insuperable difficulties in adopting a criteria governing the members’ contribution of armed forces and the “agreement or agreements” provided for in Article 43 would require long and protracted negotiations before they could ever enter the stage of ratification. Foreseeing this difficulty, Article 106 of the Charter provides in effect that pending the coming into force of such special agreements envisaged in Article 43, the five permanent members of the Security Council should consult with one another with a view to such joint action on behalf of the Organisation as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining.....
of maintaining international peace and security.

This clearly indicates that as the political organ is often paralysed because of certain procedural rigidity, the expert military planning cell may never be utilised. This must be so because of the incapacity of the political organ to take decisions. Such has been the fate of the Military Staff Committee in its relations with the political organs of the U.N. However, once the intention of utilising military forces in a collective or an individual fashion is established, the necessity of an expert planning cell is inescapable both for submission of its professional advice to the highest political organ at the top and implementation of the latter's decisions in the actual field of operations by issuing directives to the Commands below.

(3) CONTEMPORARY ALLIANCES FOR "COLLECTIVE DEFENCE".

The great weakness of alliances in the past has been the absence of any permanent machinery for coordination between military affairs and political or foreign policy. This need is underlined today in the military sphere by problems of standardisation of military equipment and by the inability of small nations, on financial grounds, to provide properly balanced forces. Thus a

common feature....
common feature after World War II has been not only for important nations of the world to enter into solemn treaties for collective action in the event of external aggression on the territories of any of the member-States but also to establish permanent military machinery in peace-time with a view to undertaking all future plans including those relating to the production of warlike stores. Efforts in this direction were started by the Treaty of Dunkirk which was signed on the 4th March 1947. Though this Treaty did not set up a permanent peace-time organisation, a little more than a year later, on the 17th March 1948, the Treaty of Brussels was signed between Belgium, France, Luxemburg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. This Treaty which is still in vogue provides for the collaboration of the signatory States in social, economic and cultural fields as well as for common defence. The Brussels Treaty set up the model which was further elaborated by the North Atlantic Treaty which was signed a year later on the 4th April 1949.

The machinery of defence along with the appropriate political and military organs created by these two Treaties needs detailed examination because it reveals the acceptance of the same....
of the same principle of relationship between
the wielders of political power and the
planners of military campaigns, which was
established in the ancient world and has
continued to dominate the Middle Ages only to
be accepted by the latest organisations of
defence which have been collectivised after
World War II.

(1) The Brussels Treaty Organisation.

By Article 7 of the Treaty there is set up
the Consultative Council, This Council is the
supreme authority in the Brussels Treaty
Organisation, and consists of the Foreign
Ministers of the Five Powers, meeting at least
once every year three months in each of the
capitals in turn. A permanent organ of the
Council was clearly necessary to ensure that it
should be able to exercise continuously its
function of enabling the Five Powers to consult
together on all questions covered by the Treaty.
This need was satisfied by the setting up of a
Permanent Commission in London, consisting of
the diplomatic representatives of the four
powers in London, together with a representative
of the New United Kingdom of ambassadorial rank.
This Commission is assisted by a Secretariat and
meets at least once a month. In the political
field, the Permanent Commission constitutes the
permanent organ....
permanent organ for political consultations between the Five Powers. In the economic, social and cultural spheres it organizes and directs the activities of the many committees and sub-committees set up in these spheres.

In the defence field the Commission is kept regularly informed of the work of the Military Committee, the Supply Board, the Chiefs of Staff Committee and the Defence Committee on all non-operational matters. If necessary the Commission can coordinate the activities of the defence organisation and give political advice. It also acts as the channel through which information from the defence organisation is passed on to the Consultative Council.

The Defence machinery of the Organisation.

Under the general direction of the Consultative Council, the defence organisation set up under the Treaty is the responsibility of the Defence Ministers of the Five Powers, sitting as the Western Union Defence Committee. This Committee was formally set up on the 30th April 1948 and a Military Committee to Permanent was established to advise Ministers as the constitution .......
constitution and functions of the subordinate bodies which should be set up. This Permanent Military Committee has its headquarters in London. In September 1948, the Defence Ministers, acting upon reports by their Chiefs of Staff and by the Permanent Military Committee, gave instructions for a permanent organisation to be set up to fulfil the common defence policy which, it was agreed, should govern the work of their national military staffs. The organisation was divided into two main branches, one concerned with military planning, and the other with problems of production and supply.

The organisation of the military planning branch was as follows:

(a) the Committee of the Chiefs of Staff of the Five Powers; and

(b) a permanent Five Power Military Planning Staff consisting of full-time delegates provided by each country and directed by the Permanent Military Committee.

The organisation relating to Production and Supply consisted of:

i) a Military Supply Board, and

ii) a permanent Five Power staff provided by each country.

The expert military body of the collective Chiefs of Staff

The Committee of the Chiefs of Staff of the Five Powers, consisting normally of one Chief of Staff from each Power, meets regularly to examine the work done by their staff and to make ...
The function of the Chiefs of Staff Committee is to advise the Defence Committee on all matters affecting the defence of the Western Union as a whole, including overseas territories, and to investigate and consider in detail all matters which may be referred to it by the Defence Committee. The special tasks of the Chiefs of Staff Committee are to ensure that within Western Europe:

1. the military resources of the five countries are organised to meet the strategic requirements of the Allies;
2. the forces of the various nations are welded into an effective fighting machine;
3. a proper balance is maintained between the requirements of internal security and home defence on the one hand, and the joint defence of Western Europe on the other;
4. there is a proper evaluation, preparation and distribution of the necessary resources, in particular to the joint commander for the defence of Western Europe, whose special task will be to make necessary operational plans and to put them into operation.

This Chiefs of Staff Committee is thus organised on lines similar to the Combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington during the World War II. Although the Chiefs of Staff meet frequently, there is a Permanent Military Committee in London to carry on work between such meetings. This Committee consists of the heads of the various delegations from each country which form the permanent Secretariat serving the Chiefs of Staff Committee. This Secretariat is organised on a unified...

---

1 See Command paper 7883, H.M. Stationery Office.
The creation of Commands controlled by the Collective Chiefs of Staff organisation.

In September 1948, it also decided that there should be set up a Military, Naval and Air Command, under a Permanent Military Chairman, to study the tactical and technical problems of Western Union defence. This Committee of Commanders-in-Chief was originally placed under the Chairmanship of Lord Montgomery, with a Commander for each arm chosen from one of the Allies. Any Ally who did not provide such a Commander, was not to be represented on the Committee, which was responsible to the Chiefs of Staff Committee for working out detailed plans for defence.

Thus a very important step was taken when on the 5th October 1948, the Five Powers announced the appointment of regular commanders in the various regions of Europe. The Commander-in-Chief of the Land Forces, Western Europe, was a French General d'Armée, Jean de Lattre de Tassigny. The Commander-in-Chief of the Air Forces, Western Europe, was an English Air Chief Marshal, Sir James Robb. Similarly, the Flag Officer Western Europe, as Naval representative, was Vice Admiral Jaujard. The Staffs of the Military Chairman and Commanders-in-Chief included high-ranking officers from the three smaller States of the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg.

The production ...
The production and supply side of the organisation under the Brussels Treaty is under the control of the Western Union Military Supply Board, consisting of a member from each of the Five Powers, set up to deal with common questions of production and procurement of military equipment and to make recommendations on these matters to the Defence Committee. It is the task of the Military Supply Board -

a) to advise the Defence Ministers on all questions affecting military supplies.

b) to arrange for the assembly and collation of estimates of the requirements, in weapons and equipment, of the forces which the Five Powers decide should be raised and maintained for their common defence purposes.

c) to ascertain what can be done to meet these requirements and to report their conclusions to the Defence Committee.

d) to seek any advice they require for these purposes from the Western Union Chiefs of Staff Committee, and to give the latter any advice they need for their purposes on supply questions.

In the same way, as in the case of the Chiefs of Staff Committee, the Military Supply Board has a permanent Five Power staff in London, comprising full-time delegations provided by each country and directed by a Supply Executive Committee composed of the heads of the delegations. A chart explaining the organisation of collective defence set-up by the Treaty is given as Appendix 'A' to this Chapter.

The Western Union Defence Organisation is of a revolutionary character in time of peace.

The traditional ...
The traditional military alliance in time of peace has usually been designed to set up a combination of powers to resist aggression in time of war. Co-operation in peace time never visualised full coordination of military forces and political policies which was achieved with much effort on the outbreak of war. In the case of Western Europe, however, it was obvious that unless there was set up some authority whose decision would not be seriously impeded or delayed by subsequent differences of opinion among the States, and unless this authority could integrate the forces of the Five Powers into a unified force, the alliance would be ineffective, since the swiftness of future wars would give little time for such coordination after the outbreak of hostilities.

There must be some method of effective consultation between staffs, and an agreement on joint foreign policies and joint war plans. The contingencies which must be provided against and the magnitude of the resources available are political questions, bound up with foreign policy. Once these problems have been decided, the execution of such policies in the field of defence depends upon a finance department for the raising of funds; a supply department for the administration of the funds, and for the raising of supplies and equipment; a staff for the planning of operations; and a command for handling and directing the forces. All these elements ...
elements are present in the Brussels Treaty Organisation. The Organisation recognises the fact that foreign affairs and defence are inextricably bound together. Those who conduct foreign affairs are best equipped to inform the military commanders as to the type of danger against which preparation should be made. The conduct of foreign affairs must be related to the extent of armed might available if necessary. Co-operation in defence, therefore, demands a common foreign policy, so that potential friends and enemies can be distinguished and possible warlike operations considered. The Consultative Council of Foreign Ministers, at the head of the Organisation, ensures that there is no divorce between diplomacy and defence.

The Western Union defence organisation broke other new grounds in the field of military collaboration between powers in peace-time. The decision to set up a Chiefs of Staff Committee, consisting normally of one Chief of Staff from each Power, who presents in the Committee the combined views of all the three Chiefs of Staff in his own country, is a remarkable advance in coordinated planning. In the working of the Permanent Military Committee which serves the Chiefs of Staff, the principle of joint staffs, in which individual officers present a unified view on behalf of their countries, irrespective of their Service arm, carries this concept a stage further. Although at lower levels problems are considered which affect the operation ...
operation of a single Service only, at the level of the Chiefs of Staff Committee and the Permanent Military Committee, the basis of single representation for all the three Services is firmly established.

The Brussels Treaty, therefore, laid the foundation for the creation of an organisation which may be said to have a collective political personality backed by an appropriate living military organisation with planners at the Headquarters and commanders in the field. Though confined to a portion of Europe and, therefore, on a small scale, it was indeed a unique effort in establishing a system of collective defence which hitherto the United Nations Charter, despite the specific intention of Article 43, had failed to create. But the Brussels Treaty would have failed despite the sincerity and earnestness of the members behind it, had U.S.A. not come to its aid with all its economic and military resources. With the entry of U.S.A., the Brussels Treaty was merged into the North Atlantic Organisation to introduce a new chapter full of great possibilities in the history of collective effort.

(ii) The North Atlantic Treaty

From the earliest days of the Brussels Treaty Organisation, the United States and Canada had been associated with its work through military observers. The pioneering work carried out by the Five Powers undoubtedly proved to be of the greatest assistance, not only in moulding the shape ...
shape of the Organisation established under the North Atlantic Treaty, but also in creating the right atmosphere in international affairs and in questions of defence in which the conclusion of such a Treaty was possible. On the day on which the Brussels Treaty was signed, President Truman said, in a statement to the Congress, "I am sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them to do so." This was followed by a Resolution of the Senate in June 1947, defining as one of the objects of the United States policy "the association of the United States, by constitutional processes with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based upon continuous self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security."

On 1st January 1949, the President of the United Nations announced that the United States and other nations are engaged in working out the details of an Atlantic Pact. The seven original members were joined by five others, so that the North Atlantic Treaty was signed by twelve States on the 4th April 1949. In addition to the Five Powers of the Western Union and the United States and Canada, the Treaty was signed by Norway, Denmark, Italy, Portugal and Iceland.

The primary ...
The primary obligation of the signatories to the Treaty is defined in Article 5 thereof in the following terms: "The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered to be an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that should such an armed attack occur, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked, by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area".

The organs of North Atlantic Treaty

The higher political machinery:

THE COUNCIL: Under Article 9 of the Treaty, a Council was set up consisting of the Foreign Ministers of each of the twelve Powers, charged with the responsibility of considering all matters necessary for the fulfilment of the objects of the Treaty and for the setting up of any essential subsidiary bodies. This Council is the principal body of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and all subsidiary bodies are subordinate to it. If the Foreign Ministers are unable to attend meetings of the Council, then plenipotentiary representatives take their place. To enable the Council to meet promptly at any time, the diplomatic representatives of the parties in Washington are empowered to act as their governments' representatives...
representatives whenever necessary, though there is no equivalent body to the Permanent Commission set up under the Brussels Treaty. The Council is convened by the Chairman and meets in ordinary session annually, and at such other times as the majority of the parties may consider necessary. In addition, extraordinary sessions may also be called at the request of any party invoking Articles 4 or 5. Article 4 provides for consultation whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened. Under Article 5, the parties agree that an armed attack against one is to be considered as an attack against them all, and that all action necessary to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area shall immediately be taken. The Chairmanship of the Council is to be held in turn by the parties.

The organisational chart of the North Atlantic Treaty as it existed in February 1950 is given as Appendix 'B' to this Chapter. It clearly indicates that what was brought into existence was an organisation which had a distinct political as well as a military sphere. If the North Atlantic Council consisting of foreign ministers legislated on behalf of the member-States the fundamental principles of the policy to be followed, it was the North Atlantic Defence Committee assisted by its Chiefs of Staff, the Military Committee and the Standing Group which were entrusted with the task of implementing
that policy. Thus was created in embryo a political State for the ad hoc purpose of organising collective defence.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENCE COMMITTEE: Under the Council, two Committees have been established at a ministerial level, the North Atlantic Defence Committee, comprising the Defence Ministers of the twelve powers, and the North Atlantic Defence Financial and Economic Committee, comprising the Finance Ministers. The Defence Committee is composed of one representative of each party, either the Defence Minister or his representative. The Defence Committee, under the chairmanship of the representative of each party in turn, is convened by the Chairman and meets annually, or at such times as a majority of the members of the Defence Committee may require. The task of this Committee is to recommend measures necessary under the Treaty for the development of the individual and collective capacity of members to resist an armed attack.

Under the Defence Committee, two main branches of the defence organisation have been set up, one concerned with military planning and the other with problems of supply.

The military machinery:

THE NORTH ATLANTIC MILITARY COMMITTEE is composed of one representative from each party, normally ...
normally the Chief of Staff or his representative. This Committee, which normally meets in Washington, has the duty of providing general policy guidance of a military nature to its Standing Group, of advising the Defence Committee and other agencies on military matters and of recommending to the Defence Committee military measures for the unified defence of the North Atlantic area. It is virtually the Chiefs of Staff Committee of the political body, the Defence Committee, and, as in the case of individual States, it is responsible for furnishing strategic appreciation and giving professional expert military advice to the Defence Committee.

In order to ensure the rapid and efficient conduct of the work of the Military Committee, there has been set up a sub-committee of the latter known as the "Standing Group", composed of one representative each from France, United Kingdom and the United States. This Group is permanently stationed in Washington. In accordance with the general policy guidance provided by the Military Committee, the Standing Group is expected to "provide such specific policy guidance and information of a military nature to the Regional Planning Groups and any other bodies of the organisation as is necessary for their work." To achieve the unified defence...

1) See Terms of Reference of the Military Committee of War in Command Paper 7883.
defence of the North Atlantic area. The Standing Group coordinates and integrates the defence plans which originate in the Regional Planning Groups, and makes appropriate recommendations thereon to the Military Committee. It is, of course, recognised that it is the primary responsibility of the Regional Planning Groups to prepare plans for their respective regions, and for the individual governments to carry out the plans to which they have agreed. Therefore, it is understood that, before the Standing Group makes recommendations on any plan or course of action involving the use of forces or resources of a party not represented thereon, which differs from arrangements previously agreed to by the party concerned, such party shall have the right to participate in the Standing Group in the work of preparing such recommendations. Furthermore, when communicating their regional plans to the Standing Group, the Regional Planning Groups are entitled to have their plans presented and explained by any of their members and not necessarily by a member of the Standing Group. In order to keep close contacts with the Standing Group, members not represented thereon may appoint a special representative to provide permanent liaison with the Standing Group.

REGIONAL PLANNING GROUPS were set up, under the Standing Group, to meet the need for more planning bodies to study specific aspects of the security of the North Atlantic Area.

Thus ...
Thus both the Standing Group and the Regional planning groups are an improvement on the Brussels Treaty, and are described in detail in the organisational chart at Appendix *B*.

The task of each Regional Planning Group is to develop and recommend to the Military Committee, through the Standing Group, plans for the defence of the region, and to co-operate with the other Regional Planning Groups with a view to eliminating conflict in, and ensuring harmony among, the various regional plans. Before a Regional Planning Group makes any recommendations affecting the defence of the territory or involving the use of forces, facilities or resources of any party not a member of that Group, that party should have the right to participate in the Group in the work of formulating such recommendations. Furthermore, any Group which considers that a party, not a member of the Group, can contribute to the defence planning of that Group's region, can call upon that party to join in the planning. The Defence Committee decided at its meeting in October 1949, that it was best to leave questions of procedure and organisation to the decision of each individual group. This leaves it open to the Groups themselves to decide how far it is desirable that meetings of the Defence Ministers of the countries represented within each Group should ...
should be convened. It was thought that the introduction of a formal committee at a Ministerial level between the Chiefs of Staff of a Region and the Military Committee and its Standing Group in Washington, would be both unnecessary and cumbersome. The matter is, therefore, left flexible.

MILITARY PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY BOARD: The North Atlantic Military Production and Supply Board composed of a representative of sub-ministerial rank from each member, reports directly to the Defence Committee. It is the function of the Board to ensure that the military production and procurement programme shall effectively support the defence plans, and to work in close cooperation with military bodies helping in the task of promoting standardisation of equipment and providing them with technical advice on the production and development of new or improved weapons. In particular, the Board is responsible to the Defence Committee for reviewing the military supply situation, for recommending means of increasing supplies of materials which are insufficient, and for promoting more efficient methods of the production of military equipment and supplies. Again, it is also responsible for standardisation of parts and products and to watch over the production and the use of strategic and critical materials. The day to day work of the Board is carried ...

1 For more details of the functions of the Board see page 28 of Command Paper 7883.
carried out by a Permanent Working Staff, stationed in London and composed of qualified personnel from each State; a Liaison Section of the Board is maintained in Washington for closer working with the Standing Group of the Military Committee.

The linking of Brussels Treaty with North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

It would have been noticed that the composition of the Western European Regional Planning Group is identical with that of the Brussels Treaty Organisation. Therefore, when the general scheme of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation had been agreed to by the signatories in Washington, it became necessary to decide what adjustments were required to fit the existing Brussels Treaty defence organisation into the new scheme. After the Western Union Defence Committee had examined the problem, it issued a communique on 23rd November 1949, in which it made the following proposals to the North Atlantic Defence Committee. It suggested that the Western European Regional Planning Group of the Atlantic Treaty Organisation should consist of the Chiefs of Staff Committee of the Brussels Treaty Organisation together with its Permanent Military Committee, with the addition of representatives of Canada and the United States who should take part when necessary; the Defence Committee, the Commanders-in-Chief Committee and the Supply Board, all set up under the Brussels Treaty, should retain their former powers ...
powers and functions. Further, it was suggested that information on the Brussels Treaty organisation and details of the work carried out or planned by it should be given to the North Atlantic Standing Group, so that necessary information may be available to the later body when it places recommendations before the North Atlantic Military Committee.

This proposal received the approval of the North Atlantic Defence Committee in December 1949. Its effect is to leave the existing machinery of the Brussels Treaty untouched, at the same time giving to the Western Union Chiefs of Staff Committee and its Permanent Military Committee the additional task of acting also as the Western European Regional Planning Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

Moreover, when the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation came into full force and the Command structure took its form, the Western Union Commanders-in-Chief Committee had to hand over the responsibilities and functions to General Eisenhower when he took over command of the Defence of Western Europe. That was in effect the end of the Brussels Treaty defence system as a separate entity. Field Marshal Montgomery had to step down to become the Deputy Supreme Allied Commander in Europe to General Eisenhower. In actual effect, therefore, the Brussels Treaty has now become a subsidiary organ of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.
The development of military and political machinery of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

It is well-known that after its birth the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation has continuously maintained a steady process of growth both in its military as well as in the political sphere. As a result of the impetus which was given by the USA, the development of military organs was more marked in the beginning than the political ones.

The growth of military organs.

With the appointment of General Eisenhower in early 1951, the organisation of Supreme Headquarters was established at Paris with a cell of regular planners. This military HQ organisation consisted of the Chiefs of Staff as shown in the chart given below:

**Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIR DEPUTY</th>
<th>Supreme Allied Commander</th>
<th>Deputy Supreme Allied Commander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVM Saunders (U.K.)</td>
<td>General Matthew Ridgway (US)</td>
<td>Field Marshal Montgomery (UK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAVAL DEPUTY</th>
<th>Deputy Supreme Allied Commander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Admiral Lecornier (France)</td>
<td>Field Marshal Montgomery (UK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief of Staff</th>
<th>Deputy</th>
<th>National Military Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Grosathier (US)</td>
<td>C.G.S.</td>
<td>SHAPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>TATTIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G.S.</td>
<td>Plans &amp; Operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expansion ......
The expansion of the Headquarters organisation was followed by the creation of Commands. General Eisenhower was the main architect of the structure of Commands which were created under the North Atlantic Treaty. The following chart indicates the establishment of the various Commands under the direction of the Supreme Headquarters at Paris:

**Supreme Headquarters Allied Power Europe: Paris**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allied Forces</th>
<th>Flag Officer</th>
<th>Southern Forces</th>
<th>Central Forces</th>
<th>Northern Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Forces</td>
<td>Air Forces</td>
<td>Norway, Denmark</td>
<td>Oslo, Copenhagen</td>
<td>Lisbon, Naples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Greek and Turkish Naval Forces remain under their National Command as a provisional arrangement. Exact structure for Greek and Turkish Land and Air Forces is now in progress of development.

The land mass of Western Europe is a sort of a peninsula of the Central Asian mainland. It was accordingly divided into three separate Commands, Northern, Central and Southern.
The developments in the political structure.

Thus whereas the military organs had fully become operational with clear chains of command and with well-defined tasks, the political and economic organs had not been fully developed. The nation-states were probably still reluctant to surrender authority in the political sphere.

The result was an overgrowth of the military sphere without a corresponding increase in strength in the political sphere. As indicated before, in any democratic structure of control, the political sphere is of paramount importance since it controls, guides and directs the military sphere. The civilian set up had, therefore, to be correspondingly reorganised with the expansion of the military structure which had taken a regular shape. In May 1951, therefore, the reorganisation of the Council was announced. It was decided that the North Atlantic Defence Committee and the North Atlantic Financial and Economic Committees should be merged into the Atlantic Council of Foreign Ministers.

Thus the Foreign, Defence and Finance Ministers could also sit on the Atlantic Council whenever they chose in accordance with the agenda of the Council. The Defence and Finance Committees thus ceased to exist. Again, the powers of the Delegations who had been appointed in May 1950 were considerably enhanced. It will be recollected that in order to cope with the...
cope with the network of Committees which required supervision and direction, the Council had appointed twelve Deputies to meet continuously in London. It was their duty to see that policy decisions were properly implemented. A year later, in May 1951, it was found that since the Council had become too big a body to meet even frequently, let alone continuously, it was essential to give a definite place to the organization of the twelve Deputies. It was accordingly decided that they should become a 'continuously functioning authority at the centre', coordinating the work of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's permanent organs and dealing with the Standing Group on all political matters having military implications. Again, in the sphere of defence economics a new Financial and Economic Board was set up in Paris. This considerably strengthened the civilian set up in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, but owing to the towering personality of General Eisenhower, and there being no corresponding civil authority at that level in the political sphere, the latter mechanism was still considerably weaker than the expanded mechanism set up by the Supreme Commander. Thus, when the Council met in Ottawa in September 1951, it had to examine an ambitious programme prepared by its military advisers which their civilian advisers on Defence, Finance and Production could not accept. The Council had, therefore,....
therefore, to set up a temporary Committee of its own, known as the "Temporary Council Committee" (TCC), to examine the real capacities of member-countries in the light of the military plans presented. In other words, the Committee had to reconcile "the military and the civilian cases", and to reach a solution which may be accepted by the Council. The Temporary Council Committee was a temporary body but it was responsible for the creation of an important organ in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. Though the military set up had been considerably integrated and the planners could make their proposals free from national bias, the civilian organisation was still far from being denationalised and the financial and economic experts advised governments in accordance with their own national parochial viewpoint. Thus, it was in the interests of the military that the civilians too should have had their expert staff and expert groups denationalised. This is exactly what the Temporary Council Committee provided on a temporary basis. The inevitable result was that the civilian organisation was strengthened and it was made competent to handle all but the purely military problems which alone were assigned to Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe. The Supreme Commander was, therefore, free to concentrate on his job and his duties were specifically defined....
specifically defined as follows:

1) To organise and train the various units of armed forces allotted to NATO by member-countries so that they could be knit into one integrated force.

2) To prepare defence plans.

3) To make recommendations to the Standing Group about such matters as the adequacy and training of his forces, or any military questions affecting his ability to carry out his responsibilities in peace or war.

Once separation of functions between the Temporary Council Committee and SHAPE had taken place, the next step was to set up a permanent machinery on the civilian side since the TCC existed only on a temporary basis. The first Chairman of the Council of Deputies was an American, Mr Charles M Spofford, who pointedly drew the attention of the Atlantic Council that he along with his other Deputies still functioned as an expert national staff with a narrow parochial viewpoint. Thus the fourteen staffs of different nations had not been properly integrated as NATO Staff. They remained as it were "national delegations" and the Council of Deputies could be appropriately described as a "conference of ambassadors". However, despite the improvement in the position, disparity between the development of military and political organs continued to be great. By the end of 1951, the Supreme Commander had not only integrated the staff of S.H.A.P.E. but internationalised it more than ever.

*Any officer*...

1 "Atlantic Alliance" - Royal Institute of International Affairs.
Any officer presenting national views instead of the objective international approach could not survive under the Supreme Commander. Eisenhower even advocated the formation of an European Army. As against this, the Deputies had little opportunities to play a similar role. They had to sit and watch General Eisenhower assume leadership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in Europe. It, therefore, became evident to all concerned in 1952 that the central pivot of NATO must be a strong political organisation which would compare in prestige and authority to what was represented by SHAPE.

It was accordingly decided that NATO should have a Permanent Organisation and the first step taken in this connection was to convert the Deputies into a permanent body with the title of 'Permanent Representatives'. The members of this body were to act as representatives of national governments and they were to be regarded as "the Council itself in permanent session".

No organisation can be complete without a regular staff and hence a regular secretariat was created under a permanent Secretary-General who was also the Chairman of the Permanent Representatives. This clearly indicates.....

1 "Atlantic Alliance" - Royal Institute of International Affairs.
indicates the high position of the office of the Secretary General. It was clearly the intention that the Secretary-General should play the same role in the shaping of NATO's policies as General Ridgway had done by securing agreed operational plans from his Commanders. Thus after very careful considerations, the North Atlantic Treaty powers found in Lord Ismay the ideal person to fill this high appointment. Lord Ismay was, therefore, appointed to become the 'political Ridgway' of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. It is possible that the powers of Lord Ismay in due course of time may be even greater than those of the Supreme Commander though they would always be in a different sphere. The Military Committee and the Standing Group under the new set up are supposed to report to the Council through the Permanent Organisation of Lord Ismay. In order to appreciate the changes introduced by the establishment of the Permanent Organisation under Lord Ismay, a chart is given below of the organisation as it existed in May 1952. In contrast may be seen the chart at Appendix 'D' to this chapter which gives the position as it existed in February 1950.
As a result of the shape given to the political part of the organisation the pace of defence planning is being set not by the military but by the civil authorities. A publication of the Royal Institute of International Affairs records the fact that "SHAPE's own Chief of Staff has been heard to quote in public Clemenceau's dictum to the effect that war is too serious a matter to be left to Generals. ¹ There is rightly established the proper balance between political and military organs of the collective system of Defence in which the ultimate control rests with the true traditions of democracy. It is also felt that in the event of a war in Europe the organisation set up by the fourteen nations, both on the political...

¹ Atlantic Alliance - Royal Institute of International Affairs, p. 96.
political and the military side, would function exactly as the American organisation, including the Chiefs of Staff, functioned against Germany, Italy and Japan in World War II. Thus, collective defence, under a living and fast expanding political and military organisation created by the North Atlantic Treaty, is forging ahead at a pace which, in peace-time, is unprecedented. The supremacy of the political authority has throughout been maintained in accordance with the democratic traditions of the individual signatory State concerned. However, as the military planners of the several participating nations are involved, proper and adequate delegation of powers has been visualised once the military forces are employed in action. There is no doubt that the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation represents the most successful effort in collective organisation of defence including that visualised by the League of Nations and the U.N. Charter. The Military Staff Committee of the Security Council has not functioned even though collective military action was taken under the U.N. aegis in Korea. Thus, if N.A.T.O. represents the greatest organisation of collective defence yet devised by human effort, there is no doubt that it enshrines the two-fold functions of expert military planning and political policy-making and for their efficient discharge provides appropriate...
appropriate organisations both political and military. The Chiefs of Staff concept is therefore properly elaborated and wedded to the higher concept of political power to produce quick and harmonious results. This proves beyond doubt the central theme that wherever an organisation is improvised to deploy military forces there must be an expert planning cell both to advise the superior political body and to implement its decisions. This concept of the Chiefs of Staff is as much a political and military necessity for the efficient discharge of the functions of the national State as it is for the working of any collective organisation for defence.

Taking the N.A.T.O. as a model, several other attempts have been made to create regional pacts and organisations like the ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand and United States) pact, SEADO (South East Asian Defence Organisation) and the proposed MEDO (Middle Eastern Defence Organisation) which has not come into existence as yet. None of these organisations has as yet established its Headquarters and commands which is the feature of N.A.T.O. Again, extending the NATO principle to its logical conclusion, the European Defence Community (EDC) has been mooted. There is no doubt the E.D.C. organisation creates a federal defence structure aided by the appropriate political and military organs on the basis of the Cabinet...
the Cabinet and the Chiefs of Staff Committee in a national State. The organisation of the E.D.C. again establishes the necessity of the military planning and policy making cells and their working in fullest cooperation to achieve maximum results. There is no doubt, therefore, that the Chiefs of Staff concept lies at the root of all military action irrespective of whether it is undertaken by a tribe or an Emperor or a nation or a collective organisation like the E.D.C. or the NATO.