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The North Atlantic Treaty

Washington D.C., 4 April 1949*

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

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

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

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

They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty:

ARTICLE 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

ARTICLE 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

ARTICLE 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them,

* The Treaty came into force on 24 August, 1949, after the deposition of the ratifications of all signatory states.
the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

**ARTICLE 5**

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all, and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized 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.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

**ARTICLE 6**

For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack
- on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France**, on the territory of Turkey or on the islands under the jurisdiction of any of the Parties in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer;
- on the forces, vessels, or aircraft of any of the Parties, when in or over these territories or any area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the Parties were stationed on the date when the Treaty entered into force or the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

**ARTICLE 7**

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting, in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

*As amended by Article 2 of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey.

** On 16th January, 1963, the French Representative made a statement to the North Atlantic Council on the effects of the independence of Algeria on certain aspects of the North Atlantic Treaty. The Council noted that insofar as the former Algerian Departments of France were concerned the relevant clauses of this Treaty had become inapplicable as from 3rd July, 1962.
ARTICLE 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

ARTICLE 9

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The Council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defence committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

ARTICLE 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

ARTICLE 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other States on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.

ARTICLE 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.
ARTICLE 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

ARTICLE 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of the other signatories.
Analysis of the Treaty

The North Atlantic Treaty consists of a framework for broadly based co-operation between the signatory countries. It is not solely a military alliance designed to prevent aggression or to repel it should it occur; it permits continuous cooperation and consultation in political economic and other non-military fields.

The signatory countries undertake, in conformity with the terms of the United Nations Charter, to preserve peace and international security and to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They further undertake to eliminate possible conflict in their international economic policies and to encourage economic collaboration between their countries.

The Treaty has thus a double aspect; it affirms the importance of economic and social progress and, at the same time, the adoption of a policy of security, based on the inherent right of collective self-defence. The Treaty is an agreement between certain countries for their collective self-defence as provided for in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. It consists of a Preamble and fourteen Articles.

The Preamble outlines the main features of the Treaty: it is a Treaty of alliance within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, for the defence of a way of life, not only by means of essential military measures but also by cooperation in political, economic, social and cultural fields. Article 1 defines the basic principles to be followed by member countries in conducting their international relations in order to avoid endangering peace and world security. Article 2 defines the aims to be followed by member countries in their international relationships, and their resulting obligations.
Article 3 deals with the means of maintaining and increasing the individual and collective capacity of NATO member countries to resist an armed attack. Member countries of NATO are under an obligation to develop their individual capacities to resist and to act jointly through the medium of mutual assistance.

Article 4 envisages a threat to one of the member countries of NATO. Member countries will consult together if the territorial integrity or political independence of one of them is endangered. In practice, this consultation takes place within the framework of the North Atlantic Council meetings.

Article 5 is the most important Article of the Treaty. It states: "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all...".

This Article goes on to define the obligations of countries in the event of armed attack. These consist in taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties to the Treaty, such action, including the use of armed force, as is deemed necessary by each Party.

Each country is therefore free to take whatever action it considers appropriate.

Joint action is justified by the exercise of the natural right of self-defence, individual or collective, as provided for in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The exercise of this right in no way affects the primary competence of the Security Council in matters relating to the maintenance and restoration of peace. The final provisions of Article 5 stipulate that the measures so taken shall be reported to the Security Council and shall be terminated when that body has taken necessary measures.

Article 6 defines the area in which the provisions of Article 5 are applicable. This area covers the territories of all member countries in Europe and North America, the territory of
Turkey in Asia Minor, the islands under the jurisdiction of any member in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer and any Allied forces, vessels or aircraft in that area or in the Mediterranean.

The definition of the military area in which the Treaty is applicable in no way implies that political events occurring outside it cannot be the subject of consultations within the Council, for it is the overall international situation which is liable to affect the preservation of peace and security in the area in question, and it is to consideration of this situation that the Council must, and indeed does, devote its attention as a matter of course.

Article 9 provides for the creation of bodies to implement the provisions of the Treaty. It is these bodies which constitute the “Organization” as such within the strict meaning of the North Atlantic Treaty. It commits its Parties in particular to "establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented". This Council “shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time”. For the rest it is left to the Council to “set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary” and this is the basis on which the organization has gradually been built up.

Articles 12 and 13 deal with possibilities of revision and denunciation of the Treaty. After ten years the Parties may agree to review the Treaty (Article 12). After it has been in force for twenty years any Party may withdraw from the Alliance one year after it has given notice of denunciation. (Article 13). The Treaty itself is of indefinite duration.
III

An Alliance for Peace

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is, above all else, a defensive Alliance. It is an inter-governmental, not a supra-national organization, member states retaining to the full their sovereignty and independence. In peacetime, national forces receive orders only from national authorities, although they do hold exercises together.* The military task of NATO in peacetime is to draw up joint defence plans, to set up the necessary infrastructure, and to arrange for joint training. This military preparedness is aimed at preventing war. On the political side, the Alliance provides not only for the direction of the military, but for consultation on all political problems of relevance to its members or to the Alliance as a whole.

Since 1967, the Alliance has been taking positive steps, notably initiatives in the field of mutual and balanced force reductions, to ease tensions between East and West, and NATO's basic policy is based on the twin principles of defence and détente. The aim of all member countries is “to achieve a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe accompanied by appropriate security guarantees”.*

In 1969 the Alliance also began to promote solutions to some major environmental problems (see page 21).

Defence Policy

Under the Atlantic Treaty, the primary purpose of the Alliance is to deter aggression and if aggression were to occur

* Apart from the integrated staffs at the different NATO Headquarters, the only exceptions to this rule are certain air defence units on constant alert; the “Standing Naval Force Atlantic” (STANAVFORLANT), a force of destroyer type ships provided by different NATO nations, and the Standing Naval Force Channel (STANAVFORCHAN) which consists of a force of mine counter-measure ships also provided by different NATO countries.

to re-establish the territorial integrity of the North Atlantic area. To this end, the countries participating in the integrated NATO defence system maintain forces sufficient to preserve a stable balance between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The quantity and quality of forces judged adequate for deterrence are planned jointly on an annual basis and consist of three main elements: the strategic nuclear forces made available by those nations possessing and controlling them (the United States and the United Kingdom); the conventional forces predominantly deployed in or around Allied Command Europe where the threat is considered to be most critical; tactical nuclear weapons for the support, if need be, of the conventional forces. It is noteworthy that in recent years the Soviet Union has achieved nuclear parity with the West, while in the field of conventional forces the Warsaw Pact has superiority over NATO, Soviet Naval forces in particular having increased very markedly - yet there has been no corresponding increase in NATO forces.

In response to these developments which occurred gradually, NATO changed, in 1967, its strategy from one of “massive nuclear retaliation” to one of “flexibility in response.” NATO’s aim was to increase its options and to be able to counter aggression at any level by an appropriate choice of responses, leaving the enemy in doubt as to which response would be selected.

In a situation of nuclear parity the very credibility of the ultimate nuclear deterrent depends on having adequate conventional forces which could be used to contain a conventional attack and provide the aggressor with tangible evidence that any gain he may wish to achieve could only succeed at an unacceptable price including the risk of escalation to total nuclear war.

A major study of the defence problems facing the Alliance in the 1970’s was commissioned in late 1969 and the Report, which has come to be known as the “AD 70 Report”, was approved by Ministers in December of the following year. Ministers recognised and hoped that the decade of the “70’s”
might develop into an era of détente with successful negotiations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. But at the same time they stressed that the best foundation for genuine détente lay in a credible defence posture given that certain disturbing features in the international scene, such as the continuing build-up of Warsaw Pact forces, could not be ignored, and that the military strength of NATO should be based on the military capability of the Warsaw Pact rather than on its avowed intentions.

The AD 70 Report identified a number of critical areas in which NATO's conventional forces need to be progressively and systematically improved over the course of the present decade. Planning is now well advanced to launch the necessary action programmes. A message by President Nixon, addressed to the December 1970 Ministerial session of the North Atlantic Council, confirmed that the United States, given a similar approach by its Allies, would maintain and improve its forces in Europe,* and this affirmation was repeated by the United States in December of 1971, 1972, and 1973.

In parallel with the AD 70 Study, a group of ten NATO European countries,** which has come to be called the Eurogroup, decided upon certain major improvements in the defence field which they could begin to make at once and which could serve as a first major step in the direction indicated by the AD 70 Study. This European Defence Improvement Programme (EDIP) costing roughly a billion dollars over some five years, was adopted at the December 1970 Ministerial meeting.

When reviewing EDIP in December 1971, the Defence Ministers of the countries concerned announced a further planned increase in European defence spending for 1972 of over one billion dollars.

* For full text see page 77.
** Belgium, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, United Kingdom.
These measures, as well as United States plans to improve substantially their conventional forces in Europe, were welcomed by the Defence Planning Committee when it met in Ministerial Session in Brussels on 8th December, 1971, as was likewise the enhanced United States contribution to NATO's strategic deterrent which will result from the deployment of the Poseidon weapon system.

At the close of 1972 the Eurogroup Ministers stated that the momentum of EDIP would be maintained in 1973, with the planned defence budgets of member countries at least one and a half billion dollars higher than in 1972. At their meeting in December, 1973, the Eurogroup Ministers announced that the 1973 increase had, in fact, reached a level of $2.9 billion – an increase of between three and four per cent in real terms. It was proposed that in 1974 there should be a further increase of some $2 billion.

**Political Consultation**

Although political consultation had always taken place from the earliest days of the Alliance, it was given a new impetus when the Report of Three Foreign Ministers on Non-Military Co-operation within the Alliance was adopted in 1956. This report called for consultation on all matters of interest to the Alliance during the formative stage of government decision-making. Consultation has considerably developed over the years. The highest authority in the Alliance, which provides the forum for such consultation, is the North Atlantic Council, which meets twice a year at Ministerial level and at least once a week at the level of the Permanent Representatives. Consultation also takes place through the Political and other committees and in working groups. The Council and its Committees permit constant multilateral consultation (equivalent to 105 bilateral exchanges each time the Council meets). Although this type of machinery for consultation is no longer unique, NATO was the forerunner in this field. Extensive consultations have, in recent times, taken place.

[18]
on such subjects as mutual and balanced force reductions (MBFR), and on the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). In addition, the United States Government has, through the NATO Council, been consulting its Allies in detail on both rounds of the talks with the Soviet Union on Strategic Arms Limitation (SALT).

**Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR)**

The Alliance has maintained its initiative on mutual and balanced force reductions since the Harmel Report of 1967 which, inter alia, called on the Allies to intensify their studies on this subject,* and the Reykjavik Declaration the following year which invited the Soviet Union and other East European countries “to join in this search for progress towards peace”.** The Ministers repeated the invitation in December 1969, while a further Declaration*** following the Rome Ministerial Council Meeting in May 1970 urged “interested states to hold exploratory talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe, with special reference to the central region”. After the Rome Meeting, an approach was made through diplomatic channels to the USSR and other Warsaw Pact member countries. It was not, however, until the first part of 1971 that Soviet statesmen began to express interest in holding such discussions.

When the NATO Ministers met in Bonn in May 1972, they agreed on two points with a special bearing on MBFR: first, to enter multilateral conversations concerned with a Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and second, that exploratory talks on MBFR should begin as soon as practicable either before or in parallel with multilateral preparatory talks on CSCE.

By the autumn of that year, the USSR was responding fav-

---

* See page 63, paragraph 13.
** For text, see page 65.
*** See page 66.
ourably to the call for some degree of parallelism between the two sets of exploratory talks and this development enabled the Allied States concerned with MBFR* to propose in November to five Warsaw Pact countries that exploratory talks on the question of mutual and balanced force reductions in central Europe should begin in January 1973. Formal replies to the Allied proposal were made in mid-January and, after a further exchange of notes, the exploratory talks opened on 31st January in Vienna and concluded on 28th June. The negotiations proper began in Vienna on 30th October, 1973.

East-West Contacts and Negotiations

Meeting in Washington in April 1969 to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty, the NATO Allies had decided to explore with the USSR and its allies in Eastern Europe which issues might best lend themselves to fruitful negotiation and early resolution.

The period since then has seen a remarkable intensification of East/West contacts. The Federal Republic of Germany concluded a treaty to improve relations with the Soviet Union, another treaty with Poland and, most recently, initiated a treaty with Czechoslovakia and has undertaken negotiations for similar agreements with Hungary and Bulgaria; the Basic Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) was signed, and also the Four Power agreement on improved access to Berlin; in 1973 the Federal Republic and the GDR were both admitted to the United Nations. The US and USSR entered into the first agreement on strategic arms limitations (SALT), and the second round of SALT began in November 1972; President Nixon visited Moscow in 1972 and Mr Brezhnev made a return visit to Washington the following year.

* All Allies except France
In addition there were increasing bilateral exchanges at many other levels. In the area of multilateral diplomacy, the first stage of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) took place in Helsinki in July 1973. This followed more than six months of preparatory talks in which the NATO allies were able to satisfy themselves that their proposals would be examined fully at a conference and that there were reasonable hopes that the conference would produce satisfactory results. Since September 1973 the CSCE has been engaged in its main working stage in Geneva.

The Environment and Related Problems

Since its establishment by the NATO Council in late 1969, the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS) has undertaken a number of pilot studies on subjects of particular concern to member countries. Under its terms of reference, the Committee examines how to improve Allied co-operation in creating a better environment for their societies. While being careful to avoid undesirable duplication of work being done in other international organizations, CCMS has relied upon the "pilot country" concept to carry out studies financed and organized by individual member nations. Joining in on the work are interested Allied countries and often non-member countries and relevant international organizations. Two other features are noteworthy: (1) Pilot studies are not intended to involve long-term research for which other international organizations might be better suited, but rather to lead to fairly prompt Council adoption of resolutions and recommendations to catalyze national and international action. (2) All CCMS documentation is entirely open, as is participation at expert level in pilot studies. As of late 1973, studies had been completed in Ocean Oil Spills, Disaster Assistance, and Environment and Regional Planning. Of particular interest, the Council adopted a resolution in late 1970 calling for cessation of all intentional oil spills into the sea if possible by 1975, but in any case no later than
the end of the decade. Implementation of this resolution has helped encourage more urgent action to cope with ocean oil spills at national levels and through the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. It was anticipated that in 1974 pilot studies in Air Pollution, Road Safety, and Inland Water Pollution would be completed; work would continue in Advanced Health Care and Urban Transportation; and three new studies, launched in late 1973, would get under way, i.e., Disposal of Hazardous Substances, Solar Energy, and Geothermal Energy. As the practical value of the pilot country approach in tackling specific problem areas was clearly demonstrated, increasing interest was shown in the activities of CCMS not only by member governments, but also by non-member nations, international organizations, and private industry.
During the autumn of 1948, negotiations took place between five countries who had already signed a mutual defence pact in Europe – the Brussels Treaty between Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom – and Canada and the United States. Contemporaneously, action was undertaken in the United States to enable that country to associate itself constitutionally in peace-time "with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security..."*. In the spring of 1949 the above countries invited Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Norway and Portugal to join them in their discussion of a defence pact and on April 4 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington by those twelve states.**

At that time the memory of the coup d'état in Prague in the spring of 1948, which led to the establishment of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia, was fresh in men's minds and Berlin was still being blockaded by Soviet forces. One month after the Treaty was signed the blockade was lifted and since then the independence of the European member countries has been maintained and the peace and security of the NATO area preserved.

During the twenty five years of its existence, each successive stage of the Alliance has added a new aspect to its policies and activities. Immediately following the signing of the Treaty in April 1949, the most urgent task was to build up

* Senate Resolution 239 of June 11, 1948.
** Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom and United States. In 1952 Greece and Turkey acceded to the Treaty and the Federal Republic of Germany in 1955. Today the Alliance has fifteen members.
an adequate system of allied defence, and consultation between the Allies was concerned largely with defence matters or subjects with military implications. The steady improvement in collective defence measures brought a great increase in the political role of the Alliance, notably in the continuous expansion of consultation between member governments. Using the Council as a forum, the NATO allies today exchange views and consult together on the widest range of subjects.

Other landmarks in the progress of the Alliance include the evolution of its defence policy, Western-initiated moves towards detente, East-West contacts, the proposals for mutual and balanced force reductions and NATO's work on environmental problems, all of which are mentioned in Chapter III.

The following are among the main events in the history of the Alliance, in chronological order:

1949
4 April The North Atlantic Treaty is signed in Washington, DC.
24 August The Treaty comes into force on ratification.
1950
19 December The North Atlantic Council appoints General Eisenhower to be Supreme Allied Commander Europe.
1951
2 April Allied Command Europe becomes operational with Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe located at Rocquencourt near Paris.
19 June The member countries sign in London an Agreement on the Status of their Forces.
20 September The member countries sign in Ottawa an Agreement on the Status of NATO, National Representatives and International Staff.
20 September The Council sets up a Ministerial Committee to consider implementation of Article 2 of the Treaty.
9–11 October The Temporary Council Committee (tcc) holds its first session in Paris. (The tcc was set up by the Council to reconcile requirements of collective security with the political and economic capabilities of the member countries. It set the pattern for a continuing process of appraising defence programmes.)
19 November The NATO Defence College is inaugurated in Paris. (The
1952
30 January College was transferred to Rome in 1966 and re-opened there on 18 January, 1967.)
18 February The Council appoints Admiral Lynde D. McCormick (USN) to be Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic (SACLANT).
20-25 February Greece and Turkey accede to the North Atlantic Treaty.
21 February The Council meets in Lisbon. It re-organizes the structure of the Alliance with a permanent headquarters of NATO in Paris.
12 March The Council establishes a Channel Command.
10 April Lord Ismay (UK) is appointed to be first Secretary General of NATO.
16 April NATO opens its provisional Headquarters at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris.

1953
5 March Death of Stalin.
28 May The USSR recognizes the German Democratic Republic.
8 August The USSR announces its possession of the hydrogen bomb.

1954
18 June National pro-NATO voluntary associations meeting at The Hague establish the Atlantic Treaty Association.
29 August The French National Assembly rejects the European Defence Community treaty.
23 October The Paris Agreements are signed and the Federal Republic of Germany is invited to join NATO.

1955
5 May The Federal Republic of Germany accedes to the North Atlantic Treaty.
14 May Signature of the Warsaw Pact between the USSR and its European allies.
15-16 December The Council decides at a Ministerial Meeting in Paris to equip the forces of the Alliance with atomic weapons.

1956
4-5 May At a Ministerial Meeting, the Council instructs three of its members to submit recommendations on how to extend co-operation between NATO members in the non-military field and to develop greater unity among them.

1957
16 May M. Paul-Henri Spaak (Belgium) succeeds Lord Ismay as Secretary General.

1958
15-17 April The Defence Ministers meeting in Paris reaffirm the defensive character of NATO strategy.
5-7 May At a Ministerial Meeting in Copenhagen, the Council
declares that it favours negotiations with the Eastern bloc, provided that they are properly prepared and offered prospects of settling outstanding problems.

10 November
Mr. Krushchev announces that the USSR wishes to terminate the Four-Power agreement on the status of Berlin.

16–19 December
The Council in Ministerial Session associates itself with the views expressed by the French, UK and USA Governments on Berlin and the right of the Western Powers to remain there.

1959
2–4 April
Ministerial Meeting in Washington to coincide with the tenth anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty.

1961
21 April
Mr. Dirk U. Stikker (Netherlands) succeeds M. Paul-Henri Spaak as Secretary General of NATO.

13 August
Erection of the Berlin Wall.

6 September
The Council approves the concept of an Allied Command Europe Mobile Force.

1962
4–6 May
At a Ministerial Meeting in Athens, the Council reviews the circumstances in which NATO might be compelled to have recourse to nuclear weapons ("Athens guidelines").

1963
25 July
The USA, UK and USSR initial in Moscow an agreement banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water (Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty).

10 October
The Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty comes into force.

1964
1 August
Mr. Manlio Brosio (Italy) succeeds Mr. Dirk U. Stikker as Secretary General of NATO.

1965
31 May–1 June
Defence Ministers meeting in Paris decide to create a special committee of Defence Ministers to study nuclear problems.

1966
10 March
The French President (General de Gaulle) announces France's intention to withdraw from the military organization of NATO and the consequent removal from France of Allied military forces and headquarters.

8 June
The Council, in Ministerial Session in Brussels, decides to transfer NATO's European military headquarters and the Defense College from France. It also abolishes the Standing Group (USA, UK and France) and establishes an integrated International Military Staff responsible to the Military Committee.

21 June
The Belgian Chamber of Representatives approve the transfer of SHAPE to Belgium (Casteau, near Mons).

26 October
The Council decides to move NATO's political headquarters to Brussels.
10 November  The Defence Planning Committee (countries participating in the NATO integrated command system) decides to move the Military Committee from Washington to Brussels.

16 December  The Defence Planning Committee establishes two nuclear planning committees, the Nuclear Defence Affairs Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group.

1967  
16 October  Opening in Brussels of the new headquarters of the Council, Military Committee and International Staffs.

12–14 December  Ministerial Meeting in Brussels. The Council approves the Report on the Future Tasks of the Alliance (Harmel Report) which defines NATO's dual task of defence and détente. The Ministers (with the exception of France) adopt NATO's new strategic concept, based on a flexible and balanced range of appropriate responses, conventional and nuclear, to all levels of aggression or threats of aggression. They also approved the creation of an integrated NATO naval force for the Atlantic (STANAVFORLANT).

1968  
24–25 June  Ministerial Meeting in Reykjavik, Ministers issue a Declaration on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions.

20–21 August  Soviet, Polish, East German, Bulgarian and Hungarian troops invade Czechoslovakia.

15–16 November  Ministerial Council Meeting in Brussels. The Council denounces the Warsaw Pact's invasion of Czechoslovakia as contrary to the basic principles of the UN Charter and gives a warning to the USSR.

21 November  Activation of MARAIRMED at Naples to improve NATO surveillance of the Mediterranean.

1969  
24 February  President Nixon visits NATO and addresses the Council.

10–11 April  Spring Ministerial Meeting of the Council in Washington includes commemorative session to observe 20th Anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty. President Nixon proposes that NATO should study environmental questions.

Ministers offer to explore with the USSR and other East European countries which concrete issues best lend themselves to fruitful negotiations.

28 May  Defence Planning Committee Ministers approve establishment of naval on-call force for the Mediterranean.

6 November  Council approves establishment of a Committee on Challenges of Modern Society to consider problems of the human environment.

3–5 December  Ministerial Meeting in Brussels. The Council issues a Declaration on East-West relations.

1970  
5 March  Entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Arms.
20 March  First NATO Communications Satellite launched into orbit at Cape Kennedy.
16 April  Opening at Vienna of the USA-USSR negotiations on strategic arms limitations (SALT).
26–27 May  Ministerial Meeting in Rome, Ministers issue a Declaration on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions and request Italy to transmit it and the Final Communiqué to all interested governments.
11 June  Ministerial Meeting of the Defence Planning Committee in Brussels. The Ministers express concern at the increase of Soviet armed forces and Soviet penetration in the Mediterranean.
12 August  Signature in Moscow of a non-aggression Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and the USSR.
7 December  Signature in Warsaw of a Treaty on Normalization of Relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland.

1971
27 January  Second NATO Communications satellite launched from Cape Kennedy.
28 May  Defence Planning Committee Ministerial Meeting in Brussels. Ministers note progress of follow-up to report on Alliance Defence for the 1970s (AD/70).
20 August  Defence Planning Committee directs that NAVSOUTH be transferred from Malta to Naples.
3 September  Signing of first stage of Four-Power Agreement on Berlin.
1 October  Mr. Joseph Luns (Netherlands) succeeds Mr. Manlio Brosio as Secretary General of NATO.
5–6 October  High-level meeting of the Council attended by Deputy Foreign Ministers. Mr. Brosio appointed "explorer" for talks on mutual and balanced force reductions with Soviet and other interested Governments.
8–9–10 December  Ministerial Meetings of the Council and the Defence Planning Committee in Brussels. Ministers reaffirm readiness to begin multilateral exploration of European security and co-operation as soon as Berlin negotiations are successfully concluded.

1972
21 Feb.  President Nixon arrives in Peking.
22 May  Arrival of President Nixon in Moscow.
24 May  Defence Planning Committee Ministerial Meeting in Brussels. Ministers note increased Soviet nuclear and conventional capabilities and review progress of Euro-group members.
26 May  Signature in Moscow of interim agreement on strategic arms limitations (SALT).

30–31 May  Ministerial Meeting of the Council in Bonn. Ministers welcome favourable progress in East/West relations following signature of several bilateral agreements and agree to start multinational preparatory talks for a Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). The Fourteen propose multilateral explorations on mutual and balanced force reductions (MBFR).

3 June  Four-Power Agreement on Berlin signed by Foreign Ministers of France, UK, USA and USSR.

21 Nov.  Opening of SALT II in Geneva.

22 Nov.  Opening in Helsinki of multilateral preparatory talks on a CSCE.

7–8 Dec.  Ministerial meeting in Brussels. Ministers review Western objectives at Helsinki and express resolve to maintain Alliance defences in face of increased Warsaw Pact forces.

1973

31 Jan.  Multilateral exploratory talks on MBFR inaugurated in Vienna.

11 May  Inauguration of a permanent mine counter measures force within the Channel Command (STANAVFORCHAN).

14–15 June  Ministerial Council meeting in Copenhagen. Ministers consider outcome of CSCE preparatory talks and express willingness to enter first phase at Helsinki on July 3. The Fourteen reaffirm importance they attach to MBFR talks due to start in October in Vienna.

29 June  End of MBFR exploratory talks in Vienna.

3 July  First phase of CSCE opens in Helsinki.


30 Oct.  Conference on mutual reduction of forces and armaments (MBFR) opens in Vienna.


10–11 Dec.  Ministerial meeting in Brussels. Ministers review world developments and on-going negotiations and recognise a common Alliance effort is required to maintain US forces in Europe at present level.
The highest authority of the Alliance is the North Atlantic Council, composed of representatives of the fifteen member countries. The Council meets at the level of Ministers or Permanent Representatives (Ambassadors). Ministerial Meetings, attended by Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Defence, Finance or Economic Affairs according to the agenda, are held at least twice a year, at a member capital in the spring and at NATO’s Brussels Headquarters in the winter. In permanent session, at the level of the Ambassadors, the Council meets at least once a week – often more frequently – thus ensuring continuous Allied consultation. When necessary the Council can meet at very short notice.

The Secretary General of NATO is chairman of the Council at whatever level it may meet. Annually, the Foreign Minister of a member state is nominated honorary President of the Council, following the English alphabetical order of countries.

NATO being an organization of sovereign states equal in status, all decisions are expressions of the collective will of member governments, taken not by majority vote but by common consent. The Council is a forum for wide consultation and exchange of views between governments on major issues, including political, military, economic and many other subjects.

Military policy is discussed in the Defence Planning Committee (DPC), composed of the fourteen member countries taking part in NATO’s Integrated Defence System. France, having withdrawn from the integrated military organization
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The Defence Planning Committee (DPC) is composed of representatives of the 14 countries which take part in NATO's integrated defence.

**Committees

The main committees of the Council-DPC deal with the following subjects: Political Affairs; Nuclear Defence Affairs; Economic Affairs; Defence Review; Armaments; Science; Infrastructure; Senior Civil Emergency Planning; Information and Cultural Relations; Challenges of Modern Society; Civilian Budget; Military Budget; European Airspace Co-ordination; NATO Pipelines; etc.
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Standing Naval Force Atlantic.

****STANAVFORCHAN
Standing Naval Force Channel (Mine Counter Measures)
in 1966 does not attend these meetings. Whether at
Ministerial or Permanent Representative level, the DPC meets
under the chairmanship of the Secretary General.

The Permanent Representatives and Delegations

The fifteen Permanent Representatives of the member
countries are supported by national Delegations located at
NATO Headquarters. The Delegations are composed of off-
icials qualified to represent their countries on the various
committees. Before meetings of the Council notice is given
of the agenda and subjects to be discussed so that delegations
have time to seek the instructions of their governments.

The Council Committees

The Council is assisted by Committees, which study questions
submitted to them for assessment or recommendation. As in
the case of decisions of the Council, committee decisions
represent a collective view of the fifteen governments based
on the instructions those governments have sent to their
representatives on the committees. There are committees
dealing with: political affairs, economics, armaments, defence
review, nuclear defence, science, ecology, infrastructure,
communications, civil emergency planning, information and
cultural relations and civil and military budgets. Other
committees deal with specialised subjects, such as NATO
pipelines, European air space, etc.

Since 1966, the problems of nuclear defence policy have
been dealt with by the Nuclear Defence Affairs Committee
(NDAC) (composed of Defence Ministers of all NATO coun-
tries except France, Iceland and Luxembourg) and the
Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) (eight countries drawn from
the membership of the Nuclear Defence Affairs Committee).
The NPG, which meets regularly at Permanent Representatives’ level and twice a year at Defence Minister level, changes its composition periodically so that all interested countries have an opportunity to participate in its work.*

For Environmental problems the Council established in November, 1969, a Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society, chaired by the Secretary General of NATO or his representative, normally the Assistant Secretary General for Scientific Affairs.

The Secretary General and the International Secretariat

The Secretary General is Chairman of the North Atlantic Council, Defence Planning Committee, Nuclear Affairs Defence Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group. He is the head of the International Secretariat with a staff drawn from all member countries.

The Secretary General has the right to propose items for NATO consultation and he is generally responsible for promoting and directing the process of consultation. He has the authority to offer his good offices informally at any time in cases of disputes between member countries, and with their consent, to initiate or facilitate procedures of enquiry, mediation, conciliation or arbitration (for example with Greece and Turkey over Cyprus).

The Deputy Secretary General assists the Secretary General in his function and deputises for him in his absence. Under the Secretary General are four Assistant Secretaries General, each in charge of a division, as follows: Political Affairs, Defence Planning & Policy, Defence Support, and Scientific Affairs. Each Assistant Secretary General is normally chairman of the main committee dealing with his subject.

* On 1 January, 1974, the members of the Nuclear Planning Group were: Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States.

[35]
For fuller details of the structure of the International Staff and its work, see Annex 1 on Page 45.

The Military Committee

The Military Committee, the highest military authority in the Alliance, is responsible for making recommendations to the Council and Defence Planning Committee on military matters and for supplying guidance on military questions to Allied Commanders and subordinate military authorities. It is composed of the Chiefs-of-Staff of all member countries, except France and Iceland (which has no military forces). The Chiefs-of-Staff meet at least twice a year – and whenever else it may be found necessary. However, to enable the Military Committee to function in permanent session with effective powers of decision, each Chief-of-Staff appoints a Permanent Military Representative. Between meetings of the Chiefs-of-Staff, their Permanent Military Representatives deal with and settle questions which come within the province of the Military Committee, except those which, by their nature and scope, require the approval of the Chiefs-of-Staff. Liaison between the Military Committee and the French High Command is effected through the Chief of the French Military Mission to the Military Committee.

The Presidency of the Military Committee rotates annually in the alphabetical order of countries. The Chairmanship is held by a Permanent chairman, elected by the Committee for a period of two to three years. There is a Deputy Chairman who is also specifically responsible for the coordination of nuclear matters within the International Military Staff and for all questions pertaining to mutual and balanced force reductions.

The Military Committee is represented on the North At-
lantic Council by the Chairman and has a number of NATO military agencies under its authority.*

**The International Military Staff**

The Military Committee is assisted by an integrated International Military Staff (IMS) which is headed by a Director, selected from any of the member nations. The Director is assisted by six Assistant Directors of general officer rank, and the Secretary of the IMS. The Assistant Directors head the Divisions for Intelligence; Plans and Policy; Operations; Management and Logistics; Communications and Electronics; and Command, Control and Information Systems. As the executive agency of the Military Committee, the IMS is charged with ensuring that the policies and decisions of the Military Committee are implemented as directed. In addition, the IMS prepares plans, initiates studies and recommends policy on matters of a military nature.

**The NATO Commands**

The strategic area covered by the North Atlantic Treaty is divided, taking account of geographical and political factors, among three Commands: the Atlantic Ocean Command, the European Command and the Channel Command. (Defence plans for the North American area are developed by the Canada-us Regional Planning Group). The authority exercised by these Commands varies in form, being affected by the geographical and political factors and by the situation under peace or war conditions.

The forces of member countries remain under national command in peacetime; some of them may either be assigned or earmarked to NATO Commands.

*See Annex 3, page 53, for full list of Nato military agencies*
The NATO Commanders are responsible for the development of defence plans for their respective areas, for the determination of force requirements and for the deployment and exercise of the force under their Command.

The organization of these Commands is flexible enough and the liaison between them close enough to allow for mutual support in the event of war, and the rapid shifting of the necessary land, sea and air forces to meet any situation likely to confront the North Atlantic Community.

THE EUROPEAN COMMAND

Allied Command Europe (ACE) covers the area extending from the North Cape to the Mediterranean and from the Atlantic to the eastern border of Turkey, excluding the United Kingdom and Portugal, the defence of which does not fall under any one major NATO Command. ACE is subdivided into a number of subordinate Commands, details of which are given at Annex 2 page 51.

The European area is under the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), whose headquarters, near Mons in Belgium, are known as SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe).

The Supreme Commander has also under his orders the ACE Mobile Force. This force is composed of both land and air force units supplied by different member countries. It can be ready for action at very short notice in any threatened area and in particular on the northern and southern flanks of the European Command.

In peacetime SACEUR’s main functions are to prepare and finalize defence plans for the area under his command, and ensure the combat efficiency of forces assigned to him in the event of war. SACEUR also makes recommendations to the Military Committee on matters likely to improve the organization of his command.
He would, in time of war, control all land, sea and air operations in this area. Internal defence (including that of Sardinia and Sicily) and defence of coastal waters remain the responsibility of the national authorities concerned, but the Supreme Commander would have full authority to carry out such operations as he considered necessary for the defence of any part of the area under his Command.

Thirteen of the North Atlantic countries maintain a National Military Representative (NMR) at SHAPE, providing military liaison with the Allied Chiefs-of-Staff. France has a military liaison mission at SHAPE.

SACEUR and his Deputy Supreme Allied Commander are assisted by political and scientific advisers in addition to the usual military staff advisers.

THE ATLANTIC OCEAN COMMAND

This Command extends from the North Pole to the Tropic of Cancer and from the coastal waters of North America to those of Europe and Africa, except for the Channel and the British Isles. The Atlantic Ocean Command is subdivided into a number of subordinate Commands, details of which are given at Annex 2 page 51.

The Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic (SACLANT) also has under his orders the NATO Standing Naval Force Atlantic (STANAVFORLANT). This force is composed of an international squadron of ships from NATO countries normally operating in the Atlantic.

The Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, like the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, receives his directions from the Military Committee.

SACLANT's peacetime responsibilities consist of preparing and finalizing defence plans, conducting joint training exercises, laying down training standards and supplying the NATO authorities with information on his strategic requirements.

The primary task in wartime of the Allied Command At-
lantic is to ensure security in the whole Atlantic area by guarding the sea lanes and denying their use to an enemy. SACLANT has responsibility for islands in this area, such as Iceland and the Azores.

SACLANT’s responsibilities are almost entirely operational. STANAVFORLANT is permanently attached to his Command in peacetime. In addition, for training purposes and in the event of war, forces earmarked by the nations involved are assigned to his direction. Although these forces are predominantly naval, they also include ground forces and land-based air forces.

THE CHANNEL COMMAND AND THE CHANNEL COMMITTEE

The Channel Command covers the English Channel and the southern areas of the North Sea. Its mission is to control and protect merchant shipping in the area, co-operating with SACEUR in the air defence of the Channel. In emergency the forces earmarked to the Command are predominantly naval but include maritime air forces. The Allied Commander-in-Chief Channel (CINCHAN) has a Maritime Air Adviser who is also the Commander Allied Maritime Air Force Channel. For details of CINCHAN’s subordinate Commands see Annex 2, page 52. CINCHAN has also under his orders the NATO Standing Naval Force Channel (STANAVFORCHAN) which is a permanent force comprising mine counter measures vessels of Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

The Channel Committee consists of the Naval Chiefs-of-Staff of Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, and acts as an advisory body to the Allied Commander-in-Chief.
This Planning Group, which covers the North American area, develops and recommends to the Military Committee plans for the defence of the Canada-United States region. It meets alternately in Washington and Ottawa.
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The International Secretariat

The Office of the Secretary General is composed of the Private Office and of the Legal Adviser; it also includes:

The Office of the Executive Secretary, which provides the Secretariat of the Council/DPC and all its main committees and working groups; co-ordinates their tasks and ensures that Council/DPC decisions are followed up.

The Office of Security, which is responsible for the overall co-ordination of security within NATO and for providing advice and guidance on NATO security matters.

The International Secretariat is organised in four divisions plus the Office of Council Operations and Communications, the Office of Administration and the Financial Controller.

The Division of Political Affairs

The Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs is Chairman of the Political Committees and the Committee on Information and Cultural Relations.

The Political Division is composed of three separate Directorates – Political Affairs, Economic Affairs, Information – and a Press Service.

The Political Affairs Directorate has the following responsibilities:
a) Preparation of the political discussions of the Council and of the discussions of the Committee of Political Advisers;
b) Preparation of notes and reports on political subjects for the Secretary General and the Council;
c) Political liaison with the Delegations of member countries;
d) Liaison with other international organizations, both governmental and non-governmental.

The Economic Directorate carries out similar functions with regard to all economic questions having political or defence implications of concern to NATO and maintains contacts with
international economic organizations. The Director presides over the Economic Committee.

The Information Directorate has the task of informing public opinion about the aims and achievements of the Atlantic Alliance. It assists member governments to widen public understanding of NATO activities through the medium of periodicals, films, radio and TV programmes, publications and exhibitions. It also arranges for group visits to NATO Headquarters for briefings and participates in the organization of special courses and seminars on NATO matters for young people. The Directorate operates the Headquarters Library.

The Press Service
The Head of the Press Service is the official spokesman for NATO. His office provides a daily press review and a press cutting service.

The Division of Defence Planning and Policy
The Assistant Secretary General for Defence Planning and Policy is Chairman of the Defence Review Committee* and heads the Defence Planning and Policy Division of the International Staff. This Division is organized in three separate Directorates: Force Planning, Nuclear Planning, and Civil Emergency Planning. Within these three fields, the Division is responsible for:
(a) Preparation of the discussions of the Council, Defence Planning Committee, Nuclear Defence Affairs Committee, and Nuclear Planning Group;
(b) Preparation of the work of the Defence Review Committee, Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee, NPG Staff Group;
(c) Development of draft proposals for political directives to

* All member countries are represented on the Defence Review Committee (although France does not at present take its seat) together with representatives of the Military Committee and the Major NATO Commanders.
the NATO Military Authorities or for guidance to national authorities;
(d) Study of the non-military aspects of relevant problems arising from the application of such political directives or guidance as approved by the Council or Defence Planning Committee;
(e) Study of the overall financial and economic aspects of defence by country, within the framework of the plans proposed by the NATO Military Authorities, and the national defence budgets; analysis and costing by Services of the countries’ defence programmes;
(f) Provision of advice for the Secretary General;
(g) Liaison with the delegations of member countries and with the International Military Staff;
(h) Liaison with other international organizations as necessary.

The Division of Defence Support
The Assistant Secretary General heading the Defence Support Division has, through three different Directorates, the following responsibilities:

a) The promotion of the most efficient use of the resources of the Alliance for the equipment and support of its forces. This task especially involves:
   – The encouragement of co-operation between nations in research, development and production and standardization of weapons and equipment and their supply and maintenance within the framework of the defence plans of the Alliance.
   – The organization of exchanges of information which may lead to such equipment.
   – The study of logistic problems including the operation of the NATO Pipeline System, the NATO Maintenance and Supply Organization, etc.

b) To assure technical and financial supervision of the NATO Infrastructure programme.

c) Participation in the process of Defence Reviews on mat-
ters within the responsibility and competence of the Division.

The Scientific Affairs Division
The Assistant Secretary General for Scientific and Environmental Affairs has the following responsibilities:

a) to advise the Secretary General on scientific matters of interest to NATO;

b) to chair the NATO Science Committee, to direct the activities of the working groups created by it, and in general to implement the decisions of the Committee and its working groups;

c) to serve as Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (ccms), to provide secretariat services for that Committee, and liaison between the International Staff and the pilot projects;

d) to ensure liaison in the scientific field with the military and civil authorities of NATO, with agencies in the member countries responsible for implementation of science policies and with international organizations having scientific and environmental programmes.

Office of Council Operations and Communications
Under its Director, the Office of Council Operations and Communications is organised into two Directorates with the following responsibilities:

a) The Council Operations Directorate, concerned with the co-ordination of the operational aspects of the Council’s activities, crisis management plans and arrangements, and the preparation and conduct of high-level exercises. It also, on behalf of the Council/Defence Planning Committee and the Secretary General, exercises overall supervision of the NATO Situation Centre and the NATO Communications Centre.

b) The Communications and Electronics Directorate, charged with the development of the necessary communications between the NATO Council, national capitals and
Major NATO Commanders, with the co-ordination of the overall policy aspects of NATO's civil and military communications, and with support to the Management Agency responsible for the establishment of the NATO Integrated Communications System (NICSMA) and to the NATO Joint Communications-Electronics Committee (acting also as the NICSO Policy Committee).

In addition, the Office includes a section responsible for the co-ordination of civil and military use of the airspace and air traffic control systems in NATO Europe.

Office of Administration
The Director of Administration is responsible for the general administration of the International Staff and for the preparation and presentation of the annual budget. He heads the Personnel Services and provides co-ordinating personnel management and policy guidance for the civilian staffs throughout NATO. The Office of Administration provides the Conference and Linguistic Services and is responsible for the security and maintenance of the Headquarters.

The Statistic Service comes under the supervision of the Director of Administration and is responsible for all statistical studies and in particular those required to assess the NATO defence effort.

The Office of the Financial Controller
This independent office is headed by the Financial Controller, who is appointed by the Council and is responsible for the control of expenditures within the framework of the budgets.
ANNEX 2

NATO COMMANDS

ACE: Allied Command Europe, Headquarters (SHAPE): Mons (Belgium)

Commands subordinate to the Supreme Allied Commander Europe:

a) The Northern Europe Command: Kolsaas, Norway.
   This Command comprises – Allied Task Forces North Norway; Allied Land Forces Norway; Allied Naval Forces Scandinavian Approaches; Allied Tactical Air Forces Southern Norway; and Allied Forces Baltic Approaches.

b) The Central Command: Brunssum, Netherlands.
   This Command comprises – Northern Army Group; Central Army Group; 2nd Allied Tactical Air Force; and 4th Allied Tactical Air Force.

c) The Southern Europe Command: Naples, Italy.
   This Command comprises – Naval Striking and Support Forces Southern Europe; two Allied Land Forces; one for Southern Europe and one for South-Eastern Europe; Allied Air Forces Southern Europe; and Allied Naval Forces Southern Europe.

d) The UK Air Defence Region Command: High Wycombe, UK.

e) The Allied Command Europe Mobile Force: Seckenheim, Germany.

ACLANT: Allied Command Atlantic, Headquarters: Norfolk, Virginia (u.s.)

Commands subordinate to the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic:

a) The Western Atlantic Command.
   This Command comprises – a Submarine Force Western Atlantic Area; an Ocean Sub-Area; a Canadian Atlantic Sub-Area; and the Bermuda, Azores and Greenland Island Commands.

b) The Eastern Atlantic Command.
   This Command comprises – Maritime Air Eastern Atlantic Area; Northern Sub-Area; Maritime Air Northern Sub-Area; Central Sub-Area; Maritime Air Central Sub-Area; Submarine Force Eastern Atlantic Area; and the Island Commanders of Iceland and the Faeroes.

c) The Striking Fleet Atlantic Command.
   This Command comprises – a Carrier Striking Force, and the Carrier Striking Groups One and Two.

d) The Submarines Allied Command Atlantic.
e) The Iberian Atlantic Command.
   This includes the Island Command of Madeira.


ACCHAN: Allied Command Channel, Headquarters: Northwood (U.K.)
Commands subordinate to the Allied Commander-in-Chief, Channel Command:

a) The Nore Channel Command
b) The Plymouth Channel Command
c) The Benelux Channel Command
d) The Commander Maritime Air Channel Command
e) The Standing Naval Force Channel (Mine Counter Measures) – afloat.
ANNEX 3

NATO AGENCIES

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

Central Europe Pipeline System (CEPS)
Established in 1957 for the multi-national control of the operation and maintenance of the integrated military pipeline network in Central Europe, this Organization has eight member nations. Is responsible to the Council. Located at Versailles, France.

NATO Air Defence Ground Environment Organization (NADGE)
Established in 1965, this Organization completed in August 1973 the implementation of the NADGE Improvement Plan. The system provides for NATO Europe a single integrated semi-automatic Air Defence System, stretching from Northern Norway to Eastern Turkey, capable of providing continuous early warning and tracking of hostile aircraft and missiles, and enabling retaliatory action to be taken through computerized air defence centres.

Is responsible to the Council. Located in Brussels. Responsibility for maintaining the NADGE System has been transferred to the NATO Air Defence Electronic Environment Committee (NADEEC); a newly established body directly responsible to the Council and also located in Brussels.

NATO Hawk Production and Logistics Organization (NHPLO)
Established in 1959 to supervise the multi-national production of the HAWK surface-to-air missile system in Europe, this Organization now undertakes the logistic support of HAWK units in Europe and has started on a European Limited Improvement Programme. Seven nations participate. Is responsible to the Council. Located at Rueil-Malmaison, France.
NATO Maintenance and Supply Organization (NAMSO)
Established in 1958, this Organization supplies spare parts and logistic support for a number of jointly-used weapon systems or equipments, especially missiles and electronic systems. All nations except Canada and Iceland are members. Is responsible to the Council. Located in Luxembourg.

NATO Multi-Role Combat Aircraft Development and Production Management Organization (NAMMO)
Established in 1969 by the NATO Council to supervise the development and production of the MRCA project. NAMMO is an inter-governmental body supported by Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, and is located in Munich, Federal Republic of Germany.

NATO Integrated Communications System Organization (NICSO)
Established in 1971 to supervise the planning and management of the NATO Integrated Communications System (NICS). This system will comprise the majority of NATO’s existing communications (including the NATO Satellite Communications System) and will involve the creation of new and improved networks for common use by all elements of the Alliance. Is responsible to the Council. Located in Brussels.

MILITARY AGENCIES

Allied Communications Security Agency (ACSA)
Advises on all matters relating to communications security. Located in Brussels.

Allied Long Lines Agency (ALLA)
Created in 1951, this Agency provides the focal point within NATO for the formulation of policies and plans to meet the long lines requirements of NATO. Is responsible to the Military Committee. Located in Brussels.
Allied Naval Communications Agency (ANCA)
Established in 1951 to meet requirements of the Major NATO Commanders for adequate and reliable communications for maritime operations. Located in London.

Allied Radio Frequency Agency (ARFA)
Formed in 1951 for the establishment of policies concerned with the management of the military use of the radio frequency spectrum. The Agency also provides engineering assistance to all nations and NATO Commands in the selection of suitable radio frequencies. Located in Brussels.

Advisory Group for Aerospace Research and Development (AGARD)
Created in 1952. Brings together aerospace scientists from NATO nations for exchange of technical information and cooperation in research and development. Provides scientific and technical advice to the Military Committee, other NATO bodies and to member nations in the aerospace field. Is responsible to the Military Committee. Located in Neuilly-sur-Seine, France.

Military Agency for Standardization (MAS)
Set up in 1951 to foster military standardization with the aim of enabling NATO forces to operate together in the most effective manner. Consists of representatives of all participating nations and is served by an international staff. Chairman, MAS, is the sole promulgating authority for all standardization agreements and is responsible directly to the Military Committee. Located in Brussels.

NATO Defence College (NDC)
Founded in 1951 for the training of officials, civilian or military, who will serve in key posts in NATO organizations, or in national ministries. Is responsible to the Military Committee. Located in Rome.
SACLANT Anti-submarine Warfare Research Centre (SACLANTCEN)
Created in 1962 for research into submarine detection and oceanographic problems. Is responsible to SACLANT. Located in La Spezia, Italy.

SHAPE Technical Centre (STC)
Created in 1960, this Centre provides scientific and technical advice to the Supreme Allied Commander Europe. Is responsible to SHAPE. Located in The Hague.
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SENIOR CIVIL AND MILITARY OFFICIALS OF NATO

International Secretariat

Secretary General:
  Mr. Joseph Luns (Netherlands)

Directeur du Cabinet:
  Mr. S. I. P. van Campen (Netherlands)

Deputy Secretary General:
  Mr. P. Pansa Cedronio (Italy)

Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs:
  Mr. Jörg Kastl (Federal Republic of Germany)

Assistant Secretary General for Defence Planning and Policy:
  Mr. D. C. Humphreys (United Kingdom)

Assistant Secretary General for Defence Support:
  Dr. Gardiner L. Tucker (US)

Assistant Secretary General for Scientific Affairs:
  Professor Nimet Özdas (Turkey)

Director of Council Operations and Communications:
  Air Marshal (ret.) W. R. MacBrien (Canada)

Executive Secretary:
  Mr. George E. Sekeris (Greece)

Director of Civil Emergency Planning:
  M. Marino Deveglia (Italy)

Director of Administration and Personnel:
  Mr. L. A. Kunzig (United States)

Financial Controller:
  M. J. Ceulemans (Belgium)

Director of Security:
  Mr. John V. Abidian (United States)

Director of Information:
  Mr. Claus G. M. Koren (Norway)

Head of the Press Service:
  Mr. Arie de Vries (Netherlands)

International Military Staff:

Director: Lieutenant General Sir John Read, United Kingdom Army

Assistant Director, Intelligence: Major General Erik Fournais, Danish Army
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FUTURE TASKS OF THE ALLIANCE
REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

(THE "HARMEL REPORT" – DECEMBER 1967)

A year ago, on the initiative of the Foreign Minister of Belgium, the governments of the fifteen nations of the Alliance resolved to "study the future tasks which face the Alliance, and its procedures for fulfilling them in order to strengthen the Alliance as a factor for durable peace". The present report sets forth the general tenor and main principles emerging from this examination of the future tasks of the Alliance.

2. Studies were undertaken by Messrs. Schütz, Watson, Spaak, Kohler and Patijn. The Council wishes to express its appreciation and thanks to these eminent personalities for their efforts and for the analyses they produced.

3. The exercise has shown that the Alliance is a dynamic and vigorous organization which is constantly adapting itself to changing conditions. It also has shown that its future tasks can be handled within the terms of the Treaty by building on the methods and procedures which have proved their value over many years.

4. Since the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in 1949 the international situation has changed significantly and the political tasks of the Alliance have assumed a new dimension. Amongst other developments, the Alliance has played a major part in stopping Communist expansion in Europe; the USSR has become one of the two world super powers but the Communist world is no longer monolithic; the Soviet doctrine of "peaceful co-existence" has changed the nature of the confrontation with the West but not the basic problems. Although the disparity between the power of the United States and that of the European states remains, Europe has recovered and is on its way towards unity. The process of decolonisation has transformed European relations with the rest of the world; at the same time, major problems have arisen in the relations between developed and developing countries.

5. The Atlantic Alliance has two main functions. Its first function is to maintain adequate military strength and political solidarity to deter aggression and other forms of pressure and to defend the territory of member countries if aggression should occur. Since its inception, the Alliance has successfully fulfilled this task. But the possibility of a crisis cannot be excluded as long as the central political issues in Europe, first and foremost the German Question, remain unsolved. Moreover, the situation of instability and uncertainty still precludes a balanced reduction of military forces. Under these conditions, the Allies will maintain as necessary, a suitable military capability to assure the balance of forces, thereby creating a climate of stability, security and confidence.

In this climate the Alliance can carry out its second function, to pursue the search for progress towards a more stable relationship in which the
underlying political issues can be solved. Military security and a policy of détente are not contradictory but complementary. Collective defence is a stabilising factor in world politics. It is the necessary condition for effective policies directed towards a greater relaxation of tensions. The way to peace and stability in Europe rests in particular on the use of the Alliance constructively in the interest of détente. The participation of the USSR and the USA will be necessary to achieve a settlement of the political problems in Europe.

6. From the beginning the Atlantic Alliance has been a co-operative grouping of states sharing the same ideals and with a high degree of common interest. Their cohesion and solidarity provide an element of stability within the Atlantic area.

7. As sovereign states the Allies are not obliged to subordinate their policies to collective decision. The Alliance affords an effective forum and clearing house for the exchange of information and views; thus, each of the Allies can decide his policy in the light of close knowledge of each others' problems and objectives. To this end the practice of frank and timely consultations needs to be deepened and improved. Each Ally should play its full part in promoting an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe, bearing in mind that the pursuit of détente must not be allowed to split the Alliance. The chances of success will clearly be greatest if the Allies remain on parallel courses, especially in matters of close concern to them all; their actions will thus be all the more effective.

8. No peaceful order in Europe is possible without a major effort by all concerned. The evolution of Soviet and East European policies gives ground for hope that those governments may eventually come to recognise the advantages to them of collaborating in working towards a peaceful settlement. But no final and stable settlement in Europe is possible without a solution of the German question which lies at the heart of present tensions in Europe. Any such settlement must end the unnatural barriers between Eastern and Western Europe, which are most clearly and cruelly manifested in the division of Germany.

9. Accordingly the Allies are resolved to direct their energies to this purpose by realistic measures designed to further a détente in East-West relations. The relaxation of tensions is not the final goal but is part of a long-term process to promote better relations and to foster a European settlement. The ultimate political purpose of the Alliance is to achieve a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe accompanied by appropriate security guarantees.

10. Currently, the development of contacts between the countries of Western and Eastern Europe is now mainly on a bilateral basis. Certain subjects, of course, require by their very nature a multilateral solution.

11. The problem of German reunification and its relationship to a European settlement has normally been dealt with in exchanges between the Soviet Union and the three Western powers having special responsibilities.
in this field. In the preparation of such exchanges the Federal Republic of
Germany has regularly joined the three Western powers in order to reach
a common position. The other Allies will continue to have their views
considered in timely discussions among the Allies about Western policy on
this subject, without in any way impairing the special responsibilities in
question.

12. The Allies will examine and review suitable policies designed to achieve
a just and stable order in Europe, to overcome the division of Germany
and to foster European security. This will be part of a process of active
and constant preparation for the time when fruitful discussions of these
complex questions may be possible bilaterally or multilaterally between
Eastern and Western nations.

13. The Allies are studying disarmament and practical arms control
measures, including the possibility of balanced force reductions. These
studies will be intensified. Their active pursuit reflects the will of the Allies
to work for an effective détente with the East.

14. The Allies will examine with particular attention the defence problems
of the exposed areas e.g. the South-Eastern flank. In this respect the
current situation in the Mediterranean presents special problems, bearing in
mind that the current crisis in the Middle East falls within the responsi­
bilities of the United Nations.

15. The North Atlantic Treaty area cannot be treated in isolation from the
rest of the world. Crises and conflicts arising outside the area may impair
its security either directly or by affecting the global balance. Allied coun­
tries contribute individually within the United Nations and other inter­
national organisations to the maintenance of international peace and
security and to the solution of important international problems. In accor­
dance with established usage the Allies or such of them as wish to do so
will also continue to consult on such problems without commitment and
as the case may demand.

16. In the light of these findings, the Ministers directed the Council in per­
manent session to carry out, in the years ahead, the detailed follow-up
resulting from this study. This will be done either by intensifying work al­
ready in hand or by activating highly specialized studies by more system­
atic use of experts and officials sent from capitals.

17. Ministers found that the study by the Special Group confirmed the
importance of the role which the Alliance is called upon to play during the
coming years in the promotion of détente and the strengthening of peace.
Since significant problems have not yet been examined in all their aspects,
and other problems of no less significance which have arisen from the
latest political and strategic developments have still to be examined, the
Ministers have directed the Permanent Representatives to put in hand the
study of these problems without delay, following such procedures as shall
be deemed most appropriate by the Council in permanent session in order
to enable further reports to be subsequently submitted to the Council in
Ministerial Session.
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II

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

(a) Annex to Final Communiqué, Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council – June 1968

DECLARATION ADOPTED BY FOREIGN MINISTERS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE NATO DEFENCE PROGRAMME

1. Meeting at Reykjavik on 24th and 25th June, 1968, the Ministers recalled the frequently expressed and strong desire of their countries to make progress in the field of disarmament and arms control.

2. Ministers recognised that the unresolved issues which still divide the European Continent must be settled by peaceful means, and are convinced that the ultimate goal of a lasting, peaceful order in Europe requires an atmosphere of trust and confidence and can only be reached by a step-by-step process. Mindful of the obvious and considerable interest of all European States in this goal, Ministers expressed their belief that measures in this field including balanced and mutual force reductions can contribute significantly to the lessening of tension and to further reducing the danger of war.

3. Ministers noted the important work undertaken within the North Atlantic Council by member governments in examining possible proposals for such reductions pursuant to paragraph 13 of the “Report on the Future Tasks of the Alliance”, approved by the Ministers in December 1967. In particular, they have taken note of the work being done in the Committee of Political Advisers to establish bases of comparison and to analyse alternative ways of achieving a balanced reduction of forces, particularly in the Central part of Europe.

4. Ministers affirmed the need for the Alliance to maintain an effective military capability and to assure a balance of forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Since the security of the NATO countries and the prospects for mutual force reductions would be weakened by NATO reductions alone, Ministers affirmed the proposition that the overall military capability of NATO should not be reduced except as part of a pattern of mutual force reductions balanced in scope and timing.

5. Accordingly, Ministers directed Permanent Representatives to continue and intensify their work in accordance with the following agreed principles:

(a) Mutual force reductions should be reciprocal and balanced in scope and timing.
(b) Mutual reductions should represent a substantial and significant step, which will serve to maintain the present degree of security at reduced cost, but should not be such as to risk de-stabilizing the situation in Europe.
(c) Mutual reductions should be consonant with the aim of creating confidence in Europe generally and in the case of each party concerned.
(d) To this end, any new arrangement regarding forces should be consistent with the vital security interests of all parties and capable of being carried out effectively.

6. Ministers affirmed the readiness of the governments to explore with other interested states specific and practical steps in the arms control field.

7. In particular, Ministers agreed that it was desirable that a process leading to mutual force reductions should be initiated. To that end they decided to make all necessary preparations for discussions on this subject with the Soviet Union and other countries of Eastern Europe and they call on them to join in this search for progress towards peace.

8. Ministers directed their Permanent Representatives to follow up on this declaration.

(b) Annex to Final Communiqué, Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council – May 1970

DECLARATION ADOPTED BY FOREIGN MINISTERS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE NATO DEFENCE PROGRAMME

1. Meeting at Rome on 26th and 27th May, 1970, the Ministers representing countries participating in NATO's Integrated Defence Programme recall and reaffirm the commitment of their nations to pursue effective policies directed towards a greater relaxation of tensions in their continuing search for a just and durable peace. They recall, in particular, the invitations they have previously addressed to the Soviet Union and other countries of Eastern Europe to join them in discussing the possibility of mutual and balanced force reductions.

2. The objective of the work on which their representatives have been engaged has been to prepare a realistic basis for active explorations between the interested parties at an early date and thereby to establish whether it could serve as a starting point for fruitful negotiation. Such exploratory talks would assist those concerned in developing in detail criteria and objectives for substantive negotiations to follow at the appropriate stage in a forum to be determined. They would also provide tangible evidence of the readiness to build confidence between East and West.

3. Ministers invite interested states to hold exploratory talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe, with special reference to the Central Region. They agree that in such talks the Allies would put forward the following considerations:
(a) Mutual force reductions should be compatible with the vital security interests of the Alliance and should not operate to the military disadvantage of either side having regard for the differences arising from geographical and other considerations.
(b) Reductions should be on a basis of reciprocity, and phased and balanced as to their scope and timing.
(c) Reductions should include stationed and indigenous forces and their weapons systems in the area concerned.
(d) There must be adequate verification and controls to ensure the observance of agreements on mutual and balanced force reductions.

4. As a first step Ministers requested the Foreign Minister of Italy to transmit this Declaration on their behalf through diplomatic channels to all other interested parties, including neutral and non-aligned governments. They further agreed that in the course of their normal bilateral and other contacts member governments would seek to obtain the responses and reactions of other governments. Members of the Alliance will consult further regarding the outcome of their soundings with a view to enabling the Alliance to determine what further individual or joint exploration might be useful.
1. Meeting at Brussels on 4th and 5th December, 1969, the Ministers of the North Atlantic Alliance reaffirmed the commitment of their nations to pursue effective policies directed towards a greater relaxation of tensions in their continuing search for a just and durable peace.

2. Peace and security in Europe must rest upon universal respect for the principles of sovereign equality, political independence and the territorial integrity of each European state; the right of its peoples to shape their own destinies; the peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention in the internal affairs of any state by any other state, whatever their political or social system; and the renunciation of the use or the threat of force against any state. Past experience has shown that there is, as yet, no common interpretation of these principles. The fundamental problems in Europe can be solved only on the basis of these principles and any real and lasting improvement of East-West relations presupposes respect for them without any conditions or reservations.

3. At their meeting in Washington in April 1969, Ministers had expressed the intention of their governments to explore with the Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe which concrete issues best lend themselves to fruitful negotiation and an early resolution. To this end, the Council has been engaged in a detailed study of various issues for exploration and possible negotiation. Ministers recognized that procedure merited closer examination and, accordingly, requested the Council in Permanent Session to report to the next Ministerial Meeting.

4. Ministers considered that, in an era of negotiation, it should be possible, by means of discussion of specific and well-defined subjects, progressively to reduce tensions. This would in itself facilitate discussion of the more fundamental questions.

Arms Control and Disarmament
5. Ministers again expressed the interest of the Alliance in arms control and disarmament and recalled the Declaration on mutual and balanced force reductions adopted at Reykjavik in 1968 and reaffirmed in Washington in 1969. The Members of the Alliance have noted that up to now this suggestion has led to no result. The Allies, nevertheless, have continued, and will continue, their studies in order to prepare a realistic basis for active exploration at an early date and thereby establish whether it could serve as a starting point for fruitful negotiations. They requested that a report of the Council in Permanent Session on the preparation of models for mutual and balanced force reductions be submitted as soon as possible.
6. Ministers of countries participating in NATO's integrated defence programme consider that the studies on mutual and balanced force reductions have progressed sufficiently to permit the establishment of certain criteria which, in their view, such reductions should meet. Significant reductions under adequate verification and control would be envisaged under any agreement on mutual and balanced force reductions, which should also be consistent with the vital security interests of all parties. This would be another concrete step in advancing "along the road of ending the arms race and of general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament".

7. These Ministers directed that further studies should be given to measures which could accompany or follow agreement on mutual and balanced force reductions. Such measures could include advance notification of military movements and manoeuvres, exchange of observers at military manoeuvres and possibly the establishment of observation posts. Examination of the techniques and methods of inspection should also be further developed.

Germany and Berlin
8. The Ministers welcome the efforts of the governments of the United States, Great Britain, and France, in the framework of their special responsibility for Berlin and Germany as a whole, to gain the co-operation of the Soviet Union in improving the situation with respect to Berlin and free access to the city. The elimination of difficulties created in the past with respect to Berlin, especially with regard to access, would increase the prospects for serious discussions on the other concrete issues which continue to divide East and West. Furthermore, Berlin could play a constructive rôle in the expansion of East-West economic relations if the city's trade with the East could be facilitated.

9. A just and lasting peace settlement for Germany must be based on the free decision of the German people and on the interests of European security. The Ministers are convinced that, pending such a settlement, the proposals of the Federal Republic for a modus vivendi between the two parts of Germany and for a bilateral exchange of declarations on the non-use of force or the threat of force would, if they receive a positive response, substantially facilitate co-operation between East and West on other problems. They consider that these efforts by the Federal Republic represent constructive steps toward relaxation of tension in Europe and express the hope that the governments will therefore take them into account in forming their own attitude toward the German question.

10. The Ministers would regard concrete progress in both these fields as an important contribution to peace in Europe. They are bound to attach great weight to the responses to these proposals in evaluating the prospects for negotiations looking toward improved relations and co-operation in Europe.

Economic, technical and cultural exchanges
11. Allied governments consider that not only economic and technical but also cultural exchanges between interested countries can bring mutual benefit and understanding. In these fields more could be achieved by freer
movement of people, ideas and information between the countries of East and West.

12. The benefit of the Alliance’s work in the field of human environment would be enhanced if it were to become the basis of broader co-operation. This could, and should, be an early objective, being one in which the Warsaw Pact governments have indicated an interest. Further co-operation could also be undertaken, for example, in the more specialised field of oceanography. More intensive efforts in such fields should be pursued either bilaterally, multilaterally or in the framework of existing international bodies comprising interested countries.

**Perspectives for negotiations**

13. The Ministers considered that the concrete issues concerning European security and co-operation mentioned in this Declaration are subjects lending themselves to possible discussions or negotiations with the Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe. The Allied governments will continue and intensify their contacts, discussions or negotiations through all appropriate channels, bilateral or multilateral, believing that progress is most likely to be achieved by choosing in each instance the means most suitable for the subject. Ministers therefore expressed their support for bilateral initiatives undertaken by the German Federal Government with the Soviet Union and other countries of Eastern Europe, looking toward agreements on the renunciation of force and the threat of force. Ministers expressed the hope that existing contacts will be developed so as to enable all countries concerned to participate in discussions and negotiations on substantial problems of co-operation and security in Europe with real prospects of success.

14. The Members of the Alliance remain receptive to signs of willingness on the part of the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries to discuss measures to reduce tension and promote co-operation in Europe and to take constructive actions to this end. They have noted in this connection references made by these countries to the possibility of holding an early conference on European security. Ministers agreed that careful advance preparation and prospects of concrete results would in any case be essential. Ministers consider that, as part of a comprehensive approach, progress in the bilateral and multilateral discussions and negotiations which have already begun, or could begin shortly, and which relate to fundamental problems of European security, would make a major contribution to improving the political atmosphere in Europe. Progress in these discussions and negotiations would help to ensure the success of any eventual conference in which, of course, the North American members of the Alliance would participate, to discuss and negotiate substantial problems of co-operation and security in Europe.

15. The Ministers affirmed that, in considering all constructive possibilities, including a general conference or conferences, they will wish to assure that any such meeting should not serve to ratify the present division of Europe and should be the result of a common effort among all interested countries to tackle the problems which separate them.
IV

ALLIANCE DEFENCE FOR THE SEVENTIES

Annex to Final Communiqué, Ministerial Meeting of the
North Atlantic Council – December 1970

The Allied countries participating in the integrated defence efforts decided at a meeting of the Defence Planning Committee in Permanent Session in May of this year to examine in depth NATO defence problems for the next decade.

2. The North Atlantic Alliance has made a practice over the years of periodically conducting major reviews and adapting its policies to accord with the changing circumstances of the times. A notable recent example was the study undertaken in 1967 which resulted in the Report on the Future Tasks of the Alliance establishing defence and détente as complementary pillars of its activities. That Report stated that “collective defence is a stabilising factor in world politics. It is the necessary condition for effective policies directed towards a greater relaxation of tensions”. Against this background, governments earlier this year recognised the particular timeliness of a full and candid exchange of views among the Allies on their common defence over the next ten years. This examination of NATO's defence capability in the light of current and prospective military and political developments has now been completed.

3. NATO's approach to security in the 1970s will continue to be based on the twin concepts of defence and détente. Defence problems cannot be seen in isolation but must be viewed in the broader context of the Alliance's basic purpose of ensuring the security of its members. There is a close interrelationship between the maintenance of adequate defensive strength and the negotiation of settlements affecting the security of the member states.

4. The 1970s could develop into an era of successful negotiations between members of the North Atlantic Alliance and those of the Warsaw Pact. On Western initiative, there are now negotiations under way between East and West which could lead to a real relaxation of tensions. It is hoped that there will be satisfactory progress in on-going talks on a limitation of strategic nuclear weapons and on an improvement of the situation in and around Berlin, and in other current negotiations between individual members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The Alliance will continue to seek improved East-West relations, and in the framework of this effort, one of its principal aims will be to engage the Soviet Union and its allies in meaningful talks on mutual and balanced force reductions and other disarmament measures. Progress in this field would facilitate dealing with the defence problems of the next decade. This period might also see convened one or more conferences on European security and co-operation.

5. On the other hand, the Allies cannot ignore certain disturbing features in the international situation. The evidence thus far suggests that the USSR,
intent on extending and strengthening its political power, conducts its international relations on the basis of concepts some of which are not conducive to détente. In particular, its concept of sovereignty is clearly inconsistent with United Nations' principles. At the same time, Soviet military capabilities, besides guaranteeing the USSR's security, continue to increase and provide formidable backing for the wide-ranging assertion of Soviet influence and presence, persistently raising questions regarding their intentions. In real terms, there has been a continuous rise in Soviet defence and defence-related expenditures between 1965 and 1969 of about 5% to 6% per year on average and the evidence is that the USSR is continuing to strengthen its military establishments still further. The contrast between these figures and the corresponding information relating to the Alliance may be seen from paragraph 10 below. Whether East-West relations can in these circumstances be significantly improved will depend mainly on the actions of the USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies, and on the attitudes they bring to negotiations now in progress or in prospect.

6. The position of the Alliance and its member countries during this period of exploration and negotiation, with special reference to European security and mutual force reductions, would be weakened if NATO were to reduce its forces unilaterally, especially those in the European area, and in particular at a time when it is confronted with a steady growth in Soviet military power, which manifests itself above all in the strategic nuclear and maritime fields. NATO member states must, therefore, maintain a sufficient level of conventional and nuclear strength for defence as well as for deterrence, thus furnishing a sound basis from which to negotiate and underlining that negotiation is the only sensible road open. Progress towards a meaningful détente in an era of negotiation will, therefore, require the maintenance of a strong collective defence posture.

7. The present NATO defence strategy of deterrence and defence, with its constituent concepts of flexibility in response and forward defence, will remain valid. It will continue to require an appropriate mix of nuclear and conventional forces.

8. It is to be hoped that success in strategic arms limitation talks will be achieved. Allied strategic nuclear capability will in any event remain a key element in the security of the West during the 1970s. At the present time, adequate nuclear forces exist and it will be essential to ensure that this capability, which includes the continued commitment of theatre nuclear forces, is maintained.

9. The situation in the field of conventional forces is less satisfactory in view of certain imbalances between NATO and Warsaw Pact capabilities. Careful attention needs to be paid to priorities in improving NATO's conventional strength in the 1970s. In the allocation of resources, priority will be given to measures most critical to a balanced Alliance defence posture in terms of deterrent effect, ability to resist external political pressure, and the prompt availability or rapid enhancement of the forward defensive capability in a developing crisis. In addition to a capability to deter and counter major deliberate aggression, Allied forces should be so structured
and organized as to be capable of dealing also with aggressions and incursions with more limited objectives associated with intimidation or the creation of faits accomplis, or with those aggressions which might be the result of accident or miscalculation. In short, Allied forces should be so structured and organized as to deter and counter any kind of aggression. Important areas in NATO’s conventional defence posture to which attention should be paid in the next decade include: armoured/anti-armoured potential; the air situation including aircraft protection; overall maritime capabilities, with special reference to anti-submarine forces; the situation on NATO’s flanks; the peacetime deployment of ground forces; further improvements in Allied mobilization and reinforcement capabilities as well as in NATO communications, for crisis management purposes.

10. The Alliance possesses the basic resources for adequate conventional strength. However, member countries are confronted with diverging trends in the pattern of expenditures and costs. On the other hand the cost of personnel and equipment continues to mount and most NATO countries are faced with major re-equipment programmes; on the other, in many member countries the share of GDP devoted to defence has declined and, even if outlays in money terms have risen, outlays in real terms have diminished owing to inflation. In marked contrast with the trend in Warsaw Pact countries’ military expenditure, defence expenditures of the NATO European countries taken as a whole and calculated in real terms went down by 4% from 1964 to 1969.

11. It is of paramount importance that there be close collaboration among all member states to ensure the most effective collective defence posture. It is equally important that the burden of maintaining the necessary military strength should be borne co-operatively with each member taking an appropriate contribution.

12. The commitment of substantial North American forces deployed in Europe is essential both politically and military for effective deterrence and defence and to demonstrate the solidarity of NATO. Their replacement by European forces would be no substitute. At the same time their significance is closely related to an effective and improved European defence effort. Ten of the European countries have therefore consulted among themselves to determine how it would be possible for them individually and collectively to make a more substantial contribution to the overall defence of the Treaty area.

13. As a result the ten countries have decided to adopt a special European Defence Improvement Programme going well beyond previously existing plans and designed to improve Alliance capability in specific fields identified as of particular importance in the current study. This Programme will comprise:

(a) an additional collective contribution, in the order of $420 million over five years, to NATO common infrastructure to accelerate work on the NATO integrated communications system and on aircraft survival measures;
(b) numerous important additions and improvements to national forces, costing at least $450-500 million over the next five years plus very substantial further amounts thereafter; the forces concerned will all be committed to NATO;

(c) other significant financial measures to improve collective defence capability, costing $79 million over the next two years.

The United States and Canada have welcomed this Programme, and have reaffirmed their intention to maintain their forces in Europe at substantially their current levels.

14. After careful review of the proposals emerging from the examination of defence problems in the Seventies, the Defence Planning Committee in Ministerial Session on 2nd December, 1970, adopted concrete proposals aimed at improving NATO's defence capabilities.
V

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE TO THE COUNCIL

(BRUSSELS – DECEMBER 3, 1970)

The meeting of the North Atlantic Alliance will be one of the most important conferences in the history of the Alliance. This past year has witnessed the completion of a comprehensive review of Alliance defence that can serve as the basis for a common effort throughout this decade. This review testifies to the continuing value of candid consultations based on mutual respect and to the common recognition that the prospects for peace rest primarily on our ability and willingness to maintain an Alliance sufficiently strong to deter those who might threaten war.

After the most searching consultations, together we have arrived at several fundamental conclusions which will help us maintain NATO’s strength while the Alliance seeks to translate the promise of detente into the reality of a just and lasting peace.

- We have reaffirmed flexibility of response as the proper strategy for a defensive Alliance confronted by a formidable mix of a potentially hostile force, which is constantly improving.

- We have agreed that NATO’s conventional forces must not only be maintained, but in certain key areas, strengthened. Given a similar approach by our allies, the United States will maintain and improve its own forces in Europe and will not reduce them unless there is reciprocal action from our adversaries. We will continue to talk with our NATO allies with regard to how we can meet our responsibilities together.

- The allies have agreed to move to transform the recommendations of the study into fact. This should provide NATO with an enhanced capability sufficient to make the strategy of flexible response a more credible factor in the equation of deterrence.

In the process of this review we were heartened by the efforts of several of the Alliance’s members to create a new and more equitable sharing of the burdens of the Alliance through a greater effort by our allies to meet the challenges of NATO defence in the decade of the seventies. This European initiative gives concrete testimony to the vitality and spirit of the European allies. NATO has strong support among the American people. Successful efforts to improve European forces and absorb a greater share of the burden will insure continued support.

I welcome the achievements of the Alliance. I am certain we can move from agreed goals to practical action with the same seriousness of purpose.
VI
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