



CANADA-EUROPE TRANSATLANTIC DIALOGUE:  
SEEKING TRANSNATIONAL SOLUTIONS TO 21ST CENTURY PROBLEMS<sup>1</sup>

[labs.carleton.ca/canadaeurope](http://labs.carleton.ca/canadaeurope)

April 2015  
Policy Paper

## **The Canadian Politics of Fair-Share during NATO's Formative Years**

### Working Policy Paper

**Dominika Kunertova**

PhD Candidate, Université de Montréal

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) connects the two sides of the Atlantic Ocean by providing Canada, the United States (US) and Europe with a common defence framework. In the field of defence and security the burden-sharing problem of distributing the cost of collective defence – and what a fair share among member states should look like – can become a complex issue.<sup>2</sup> NATO is not an exception from equity controversies. The central goal of this paper is to understand a rather specific part of the transatlantic burden-sharing story: Canada's decision to contribute to NATO and its position during the first debates on burden-sharing in the alliance. I argue that Canadian contribution strategies can be best understood by looking at the geopolitics of the middle power on the one hand and the concepts of fair-share and burden on the other. In this paper I show that burden-sharing is not only a mere technicality but instead it is filled with interpretative gaps. By looking at the normative level the paper explores why burden-sharing became an issue in the first place and elaborates on the *politics* of burden-sharing from the Canadian point of view.

The question of burden-sharing is as old as collective action. The dominant approach to the problem, collective action theory, defines burden as a "good" in terms of public-private dichotomy. When it comes to the sharing of burden, middle and small powers suffer from the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Canada-Europe Transatlantic Dialogue receives support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

<sup>2</sup> Keith Hartley and Todd Sandler, "NATO Burden-Sharing: Past and Future," *Journal of Peace Research* 36, no. 6 (1999), 668; Stephen J. Cimbala and Peter K. Forster, *Multinational Military Intervention: NATO Policy, Strategy and Burden Sharing* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2010), 1.

free-riding stigma<sup>3</sup> since this mainstream economic reasoning suggests that large states bear disproportionately higher shares of the burden while other (smaller) nations act in a rational self-interest and tend to retain security assurances without bearing hardly any costs. However, the questions of what burden is and how to assess and compare individual states' contributions have been much complicated.

The ambiguity of burden and its sharing can be illustrated by the conceptual fluidum as to how scholars use different labels to describe the dynamics of contributions and sharing. They pass from burden-sharing to burden-shedding,<sup>4</sup> burden-shifting,<sup>5</sup> or responsibility-sharing,<sup>6</sup> in addition to the less straightforward application of the public good concept in the case of NATO.<sup>7</sup>

The next crucial point is the questions of how to measure individual shares of the burden. There is no consensus among scholars on any global and standardizable criteria which would convincingly define the individual shares of the burden. The measurement problem is also marked by the Cold-War double bias: the overwhelming focus on the military domain measured almost uniquely by defence spending indicators.<sup>8</sup> Since the cost distribution can be multidimensional,<sup>9</sup> any quantification of a potential burden-sharing gap between members' costs and benefits very often ends in some statistical jugglery with comparison criteria and multiplication of variables in the burden-sharing equation.<sup>10</sup> Not without importance is the fact that the debate on burden-sharing in NATO is conducted basically between two camps of scholars biased one way or another: one group tries to prove that "Europe" is contributing enough and the other one that US contributes too much and "Europe" is free-riding. In narrowing the problem into the *economics* of alliances,<sup>11</sup> the existing literature on burden-sharing in NATO does not put enough emphasis on the *politics* of burden-sharing and normative structures.

In order to correct this research gap, in the present paper I focus on the other North-American ally: Canada, a particular case of a middle power. I intend to unpack the assumption of classic collective action theory put forward by Olson and Zeckhauser in 1966 according to which states are rational, unitary, and share the same preferences and perception on the purpose and functioning of the alliance. This allows me, among other things, to invalidate the oversimplification of the free riding accusations and the exploitation hypothesis often based on mere defence spending.

---

<sup>3</sup> Mancur Olson and Richard Zeckhauser, "An economic theory of alliances," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 48, no. 3 (1966): 266–79.

<sup>4</sup> Simon Duke, *The Burdensharing Debate: A Reassessment* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1993).

<sup>5</sup> Wallace J. Thies, *Friendly rivals* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2003).

<sup>6</sup> Cimbala and Forster, *Multinational Military Intervention*. 206.

<sup>7</sup> Todd Sandler and Hirofumi Shimizu, "NATO Burden Sharing 1999-2010: An Altered Alliance," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 10, no. 1 (2014): 43-60.

<sup>8</sup> Charles A. Cooper and Benjamin Zycher, *Perceptions of NATO Burden-Sharing* (RAND, 1989). Stephen J. Coonen, "The widening military capabilities gap between the United States and Europe: does it matter?" *Parameters* 36, no. 3 (2006):67–84.

<sup>9</sup> Malcolm Chalmers, "The Atlantic burden-sharing debate – Widening or Fragmenting?" *International Affairs* 77, no. 3 (2001): 569-585. Keith A. Cameron. *Risk, Cost and Control in NATO burdensharing: Apportioning Atlas' Load* (A Master Research Paper, London, Canada: University of Western Ontario, 2008).

<sup>10</sup> Burden-sharing debates are affected by the choice of indicator, which usually chosen from military-civilian and qualitative-quantitative spectrum of criteria. Hartley and Sandler, *NATO Burden-Sharing*, 668, 673.

<sup>11</sup> Todd Sandler and Keith Hartley, "Economics of Alliances: The Lessons for Collective Action," *Journal of Economic Literature* 39, no. 3 (2001): 869-896.

My research question *why and how did Canada contribute to NATO?* addresses two sides of one contribution-strategy coin: why contribute to NATO and how to make it work. In other words, this paper is interested in exploring the Canadian contribution strategies on both functional and operational levels. The former designates what NATO actually meant for Canada and how Canadian political elites projected the role for Canada in the Atlantic alliance (the purpose of NATO). The latter denominates the relational intra-alliance context of burden-sharing and the implementation of those general objectives by some collective action (the burden and sharing in NATO). The combination of these two levels will in turn tell more about how Canadian contribution strategies in NATO were shaped by the politicians' understanding of burden and fair-share.

Consequently, since this analysis is situated in interpretive epistemology, I need to employ a method of discourse analysis called *interpretive policy analysis*<sup>12</sup> to address the process of sense-making by looking at categories, metaphors and arguments in the Canadian private and public documents on burden-sharing. The analysis of category and metaphor is necessary to set the basic structure of discourse. First, category analysis allows me to reconstruct the logic of naming in order to decipher the meanings that "*political actors have vested in the categories, rather than the meanings they hold for the researcher-analyst.*"<sup>13</sup> This analytical approach is useful in situations when the actors have to make sense of ambiguous concepts, e.g. how political elites interpret NATO's burden and how the issue of burden-sharing is framed in the discourse. Second, metaphor analysis clarifies meanings by pointing to the local knowledge of those who introduced the metaphoric language. This analysis also generates concepts and categories from metaphor language which in turn reinforce the argument architecture. The third analytical technique, argument analysis, looks at the architecture and the content of arguments which in turn enables me to look at the justifications of contributions mobilized by Canadian politicians in their discourse. Put shortly, I let the Canadian political elites speak about the burden-sharing problem.

The primary sources consist of both public speeches and statements made by the members of Government and private Cabinet communiqués, memoranda, and diplomatic telegrams found in Library and Archives Canada (LAC) in Ottawa. The public documents are listed at the end of this paper and are referenced in the text by a parenthesised number. The private documents are cited directly in the footnotes. Due to the space limitation I cited only some of the private and public material, though the most representative quotations were chosen. To add one conceptual note, I will use a modified pluralist concept of foreign policy executive (FPE)<sup>14</sup> every time I need to mention the central actors of this analysis all at once.

---

<sup>12</sup> Dvora Yanow, *Conducting interpretive policy analysis* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE, 2000); Clare Ginger, "Interpretive content analysis. Stories and Arguments in Analytical Documents," In: Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds.), *Interpretation and Method. Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2006), 331-348.

<sup>13</sup> Yanow, *Conducting interpretive policy analysis*, 55.

<sup>14</sup> This concept was developed by Kitchen who defines foreign policy executive basically as high-ranking bureaucrats and elected executive officials responsible for the overall conduct of foreign affairs. In addition, he recognises that processes within states are influenced not only by exogenous systemic factors and considerations of power and security, but also by cultural and ideological bias, domestic political considerations and prevailing ideas. Nicolas Kitchen, "Systemic pressures and domestic ideas: a neoclassical realist model of grand strategy formation," *Review of International Studies*, 36 no. 1 (2010), 133.

The paper is divided into three parts. The first part briefly reconstructs the formation of NATO by looking at Canada's alternative policy options in 1948 and thus indirectly informs on the purpose of NATO. The second directly focuses on distilling various categories Canadian political elites used when they talked about and characterised the Atlantic Alliance. The third part tries to understand how the Canadian political elites made sense of the collective action in NATO and their part in it, i.e. how they interpret sharing the burden with their Atlantic partners. This third analytical part dismantles the concept of burden-sharing into its basic categories – burden, contribution, and comparison criteria – to show how Canadians justified their contributions at the time of designing the Canadian Mutual Aid Programme and on what basis they were defending their approach to the first burden-sharing exercise in NATO. Once the paper shows what costs and benefits of the active Canadian participation in NATO were, it concludes on why Canada contributed to NATO on both functional and operational level and comments on the Canadian politics of burden-sharing.

#### (I) WHY NATO?

*"... it was the threat to the peace that brought NATO into being."  
Pearson (82)*

The rising Soviet aggressiveness in the post-Second World War context created anxieties on the west side of the Iron Curtain. Ultimately, the coup d'état in Czechoslovakia in February 1948 triggered the formation of collective defence system in Western Europe under the leadership of the British Government and led to the conclusion of the Treaty of Brussels on March 17, 1948 between Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (UK). In a telegram from March 11, 1948 the British Prime Minister Attlee proposed to Canada and the US to establish together a regional security organization under Article 51 of the UN Charter. Not more than two weeks later the informal tripartite talks between the UK, the US, and Canada began in Washington and spread over 12 months from March 22, 1948 to March 15, 1949. The five Brussels Powers joined the discussions in June 1948, and Norway, Italy, Iceland, Denmark and Iceland came aboard in March 1949. The North Atlantic Treaty (NAT) was signed on April 4, 1949 in Washington within less than fourteen months after the fall of Czechoslovakia. But why did Canada become a party to a peacetime security alliance in the first place?

#### *Options and alternatives*

In the aftermath of the WWII Canada experienced a revolutionary shift towards liberal internationalism due to a new generation of political leaders and public servants: Louis S. St. Laurent and Lester B. Pearson, Escott Reid and A. D. P. Heeney in the Department of External Affairs (DEA), together with Hume Wrong (Ambassador in Washington), Dana Wilgress (Ambassador in Moscow, and later as a head of Canadian delegation to NATO), and Norman Robertson (High Commissioner in London), who all contributed to the growing sense of *Canadianism* (79). The appointment of St. Laurent as the first independent Secretary of State for External Affairs (SSEA) in Canada in September 1946<sup>15</sup> marked the definite

---

<sup>15</sup> Until then it was the Prime Minister who held the post of SSEA.

departure from the Mackenzie King's isolationism and "no commitments."<sup>16</sup> His Grey Lecture in 1947 provided the most comprehensive outline of this new Canadian foreign policy doctrine (4). Canada was supposed to pursue abroad the essential goals of peace protection and war prevention, assume international responsibilities, and take part in building an international order through multilateral institutions. It was the time when the concept of middle power was born in Canada.<sup>17</sup>

The new menace to the international peace created among Canada's FPE tangible fear of a looming war much like in the late 1930s.<sup>18</sup> War, though not inevitable, was not impossible to imagine for anyone with "*the most elementary realism*" (11). How could Canada address the Uncle Joe's aggressiveness and assure her national security? What alternatives Canada had in the early days of the Cold War? First of all, "*isolationism is no guarantee of security*" (11). Isolation from international development as a strategy had been abandoned for a quite some time in Canada due to the recognition of existing economic and strategic interdependences. Furthermore, Pearson as the SSEA pointed to the key problem of "*the inescapable fact that no country in the world has less chance of isolating itself from the effect of American policies and decisions than Canada*" (52). The US influence was one of the crucial and often repeated arguments in Ottawa. Similarly, "*neutrality or nonalignment*" was unthinkable for Ottawa (89). As the last war proved, small states could maintain their neutrality and live in freedom only because of the Allied victory (11). Moreover, since Canada was situated between two great powers, a next war would mean automatic involvement for Canada. Equally important for preserving national autonomy was the realization that this neutrality option would practically mean the de facto dependence on the US.<sup>19</sup>

*Do nothing.* This delusionary option would imply relying on the UN. However, the UN fell into "*a paralysis*" (32) since "*the unity of the great powers... was soon eaten away by the acids of post-war controversy*" (14). The imperilled ability of the UN to build an effective system of collective security pushed Canada to seek some more limited regional arrangements under the UN Charter. Canada's FPE though never stopped believing in the UN and supported it as a forum for promoting the dialogue between West and East (63).

*Transform the Commonwealth into a defence pact* turned out impracticable. St. Laurent acknowledged at the very beginning that the British Commonwealth by itself did not

---

<sup>16</sup> John W Holmes, *The Shaping of Peace: Canada and the Search for World Order, 1943-1957, Volume 1* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979): 139, 176.

<sup>17</sup> The concept of middle power, in order to distinguish certain countries from small powers, refers to a state that does not seek a great power status but nevertheless can be considered as a great power in the domains where it has acquired expertise and in which it has interests. This concept constitutes one of three core elements of international liberalism. On the concept of middle power and the discussion of three images of Canadian foreign policy see Bratt and Kukucha, *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy* (Classic Debates & New Ideas. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>18</sup> LSL/224/E4-26 – From E. Reid to Mr. Pickersgill, October 28, 1948. Reid worried that "*the Western world may be entering the same sort of period as it entered in 1936 or in September 1938 – a period during which our foreign policy was based on the mistaken belief that time was on our side.*"

<sup>19</sup> "... nous consentirions à nous en remettre entièrement aux États-Unis pour notre défense, ce qui n'est quère compatible avec la politique d'indépendance que les nationalités eux-mêmes sont les premiers à nous recommander... Une politique de neutralité, c.-à-d. une politique d'isolement, serait pour nous une politique de suicide." The public reply of Cadieux to the population of Québec as to why neutrality was not an optimal alternative. LSL/224/E4-26 – "Projet d'un discours pour la participation du Canada au Pacte de l'Atlantique," Cadieux, (approx. 1948), p. 8, 31-32.

constitute a system of collective security (11), as it was neither a political unit nor an alliance and as such had no common policy (37). The Canadian FPE did not want to upgrade the Commonwealth into a security alliance because of the echo of the colonial past and the possible alienation of Canada's relationship with the US (36). However, creating any *bilateral defence agreement with the United States* would have had almost the same practical effects as neutrality since it would result in Canada being dependent on the US. Despite the cooperative tradition established during the WWII,<sup>20</sup> the mutual responsibility for the defence of the whole continent had to find expression in a different, and most of all a multilateral, cooperative security arrangement (19).

*Getting a seat in the Brussels Pact* was a no-go. Taking this step would imply a creation of two unequal pillars of common defence: the Brussels Pact group and North America. Besides, the Brussels Pact itself was not yet ready for enlargement<sup>21</sup> and the question of admitting other strategically important countries (e.g. Iceland or Scandinavian countries) remained open as well. It must be noted, however, that the institutional design of the Brussels Pact largely inspired Canada in the future negotiation on NAT.<sup>22</sup>

Taken together, Canada faced a double security dilemma: first, to create a balancing coalition against the Soviet menace and second, to counter the possible invasive influence of the US.<sup>23</sup> Since the creation of the former was already in motion, the major concern of Canada narrowed into the focus on its southern neighbour. The solution was found in the creation of a new multilateral<sup>24</sup> and truly transatlantic body. The seizure of Czechoslovakia in February 1948 and the alleged suicide of its non-communist Minister of Foreign Affairs Jan Masaryk finally convinced Mackenzie King, one of the last advocates of the cautious isolation in Ottawa, to the idea of a collective defence alliance<sup>25</sup> as this act of aggressiveness "*revealed Soviet imperialism in all its nakedness*" (71). After receiving the British invitation to the tripartite talks, Canadians took an active role in the formation of NATO. Some days before the beginning of the second phase of the Washington talks, St. Laurent in the House of Commons declared that Canada was conducting a "*crusade*" (95) for a North Atlantic pact, the first unambiguous public statement of Canadian willingness to enter a North Atlantic Alliance.

In the efforts of diluting the US influence in the multilateral setting, the Canadian delegation pushed for a strong pledge by the US in a form of treaty, which would have to be approved by the Congress and therefore commit the US more firmly to the case together with bringing about an element of mutual assistance and reciprocity. Any unilateral declaration of

---

<sup>20</sup> The creation of the bilateral Permanent Joint Board on Defence (PJBD) by the Ogdensburg Agreement in August 1940 and the Hyde Park Agreement of 1941.

<sup>21</sup> DEA/5803/283-1(s)/1, *passim*.

<sup>22</sup> Under the Brussels Treaty, members were committed in the event of an attack on any one of them to go to its assistance with all the military and other means in their power. The treaty also provided for standing institutions, such as a consultative council of Foreign Ministers and a military committee, to facilitate co-operation and speedy military and economic aid in the event of emergency. Moreover, a joint military organization under Field Marshal Montgomery was set up near Paris. Escott Reid. *Forming the North Atlantic Alliance, 1949*. In: Don Munton and John Kirton (eds.). *Canadian Foreign Policy. Selected Cases* (Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1992), 33.

<sup>23</sup> DEA/5803/283(s) – From Ambassador in United States to USSEA, Washington, April 7, 1948.

<sup>24</sup> According to Keating, multilateralism was the most effective strategy for pursuing Canadian national policy objectives. Keating, *Canada and World Order*, 5.

<sup>25</sup> Reid, *Forming the North Atlantic Alliance, 1949*, 27.

military aid by the US would according to Reid sound like charity Europe and would only emphasize the dependence and the satellite character of the Western Europe.<sup>26</sup> At the same time, any alliance without the US power and resources would not live a long time. Therefore, most of the concessions Canada made during the treaty negotiations<sup>27</sup> were subordinated to the urgent need to get this treaty passed in the US Congress as soon as possible. However, the Canadian FPE stayed cautious. Since NATO was Canada's first peacetime alliance, they preferred somewhat shorter treaty duration of 20 years (the Brussels Pact was signed for 50 years).

It is interesting to notice that the Canadian FPE did not show any of these apprehensions with regard to the US in public. St. Laurent presented Canada's relation to the US as more than a mere "*empirical neighbourliness*" (4). Ottawa considered the Canada-US friendship as an important asset for the Atlantic Alliance. By comparing it with the Soviet block and relations between Moscow and its satellites,<sup>28</sup> the US-Canada relationship was meant to be a proof that friendship between asymmetric powers could exist (77).

Despite some failures of Canadian diplomacy during the negotiations, NATO managed to reply to the Canadians basic needs of that time: deter the Soviets; keep an eye on the Americans; promote cooperation, consultation and reciprocity between the free democratic Western European and North American states, connect institutionally Canada with Europe, and enhanced Canadian status as a middle power and independent North American nation.<sup>29</sup> NATO also solved another Canadian geopolitical dilemma for on the one hand it reconciled the dual orientation of Canadian foreign policy (71) by preserving the Atlantic triangle of US-UK-Canada in the Alliance (63), and on the other it maintained Canada's interest in the special relationships with its two mother countries, the UK and France (72). As the SSEA Pearson noted, "*no country has a greater stake in the success or failure of this great movement than Canada for we are both North American and European*" (51). The Canadian Parliament approved the Treaty on March 28, 1949. The NAT passed with only two opposing votes<sup>30</sup>, which confirmed that "*Canada's adherence to and support of the North Atlantic Alliance has never been a matter of party controversy*" (42). Canada was the first of its allies to ratify NAT, which came into force on August 24, 1949.

## (II) NATO IN CATEGORIES AND METAPHORS

The following analysis is based mostly on public speeches and statements<sup>31</sup> dated from 1948 till 1955, covering the period of the treaty negotiations and the five-year aftermath. The analysis attempts to explore how the Canadian FPE understood the purpose of the Atlantic

---

<sup>26</sup> WLMK/J4/309 – "North Atlantic Collective Defence Agreement," Memorandum from USSEA to Prime Minister, Ottawa, April 12, 1948.

<sup>27</sup> The most important ones: the admission of Portugal and Italy, final text of Article 2 weaker than Canada wished for, no reference to the International Court of Justice, or omission of the word 'aggression'.

<sup>28</sup> The example of Czechoslovakia was used very often as a country who was invaded by great powers twice within a period of 10 years (19).

<sup>29</sup> As a contrast to the peace talks at the end of the WWII when Canada felt marginalized and treated as a second-rank power. Létourneau et al., *Le Canada et la sécurité européenne (1943-1952)*, 23.

<sup>30</sup> The vote was 149 to 2, dissenters being Raymond and Hamel from Bloc Populaire members (94).

<sup>31</sup> The private dimension of Cabinet documents is mentioned only when the position diverged from the public discourse.

Alliance in their discourse by looking at the expressions directly associated with NATO, its relationship with the UN, and the distinction between alliance and community.

The NAT for Canada's FPE signified in the first place a purely defensive alliance against a military threat (62). The notion of war makes all the difference for NATO was created "*not for the purpose of waging war, but for the purpose of preventing war*" due to strong reminiscence of the World War II tragedy (11). The only aggressive element of NATO according to Pearson was located in the intellectual sphere since the Atlantic nations could challenge the communism with "*far more powerful intellectual force – the international of the free scholars*" (16).

The creation of this Alliance was meant to make the cost of attack high enough to "*deter any act of aggression*" (12) and at the same time to "*reduce fear and tension in the face of threats and provocation*" (67). However, the term "*organization of resistance to aggression*" (61) leads to a more nuanced meaning since aggression can manifest itself in a direct and indirect way. For Pearson and St. Laurent, if the Atlantic nations wanted to resist the Soviet aggression, they needed not only military, but also "*economic and moral strength*" (11) to "*promote stability and well-being, in addition to uniting for collective defence for peace and security preservation*" (54, 82).

The Canadian FPE maintained a unison position throughout the whole period that the North Atlantic Pact should aspire to be more than "*a mere military alliance*" (52), more than only "*defensive,*" "*negative*" and "*against something*" (23). In order to describe the North Atlantic Pact and its main purpose of peace preservation,<sup>32</sup> the Canadian elites very often used the term "*instrument of peace*" or "*instrument of preventing wars*" destined to "*remove the economic and political causes of war and increase security of the North Atlantic nations*" (14). The Treaty was to be conceived as a positive move forward "*from dark ages of war, from wasteland to green lands*" (52).

In projecting "*positive and constructive consequences*" (14) of the Treaty, the dual purpose of NATO crystallized very quickly in Ottawa. Apart from Article 5, NATO's positive objective consisted in the promotion of democracy, stability, and consultation, which was assured by implanting Article 2 and 4 in the NAT. The aim of Article 4 was to prevent the erosion of unity, solidarity, confidence, and mutual trust in NATO – the political stability – much needed for combating "*the Soviet subversive menace*" (20). Article 2 – a pledge for co-operation in social and economic policies – was meant to give NATO a purpose beyond the imminent Soviet threat and to avoid the risk of the Atlantic coalition diminishing into a "*by-product of a cold war*" (73).

Article 2 brought NATO commitments closer to the UN since NATO was regarded as a tool for building the system of collective security in a particular region. The legal relation between NATO and the UN was established in Article 51 of the UN Charter.<sup>33</sup> NATO did not intend to undercut or side-track the UN. St. Laurent made it clear that NATO was created "*to*

---

<sup>32</sup> DEA/5803/283(s) – From SSEA to Ambassador in United States, Ottawa, February 17, 1949.

<sup>33</sup> The choice of Article 51 of the UN Charter reflected the need of Atlantic nations for an *effective* alliance. It is important to notice that self-defence under the UN Charter does not require a prior authorisation of the Security Council, while Article 53 of Chapter VIII (also considered during Washington talks) permits enforcement actions by regional agencies only with the Security Council's approval. Hastings Lionel Ismay, *NATO: The First Five Years (1949-1954)* (Paris: North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 1954 [Online: <http://www.nato.int/archives/1st5years/>]), Chapter Two.



*fill the security gap in the North Atlantic area*" (34) precisely because of the inability of the UN to provide for collective security. Ergo, until the UN could function more effectively, NATO was believed to be *"the most important international instrument"* (57) and *"the most effective agency"* (61) for *"the defence of the free world and the preservation of international peace"* (57). This contextualization of NATO's existence increased its value to Canadians since by *"promoting progress and preserving peace"* (14), NATO contributed *"to the growth of freedom and order everywhere"* (94). As Reid observed in a private memorandum, the NAT was considered by the Government as *"a great power alliance against the Soviet Union which has been given the cover of an agreement between countries in a certain geographical area."*<sup>34</sup>

In the private Cabinet discussions two other reasons pressed for Article 2. First, according to Reid Canada had direct interest in creating the unity among the Atlantic nations due to the vulnerability of Canadian economy.<sup>35</sup> The Government saw in NATO an opportunity to liberalize trade relations between Western Europe, the UK and Canada and even to achieve some bilateral arrangements for free trade between Canada and the US (and eventually with the UK too).<sup>36</sup> In addition, by developing the constitutional structure of the Atlantic community the power of the US would become restrained by its allies and ultimately NATO would provide for Canada a more robust countervailing force against the US.<sup>37</sup> The second private reason was a domestic one. Since the creation of the Atlantic Alliance was about to constitute a revolution in the Canadian foreign policy,<sup>38</sup> the full acceptance of the Treaty by the whole Canadian population, including the Province of Québec as the loudest opponent calling for the neutrality, would underline the Treaty's great political value for the Canadian FPE.<sup>39 40</sup>

Given a far-reaching vocation of this Canadian article, was there any end-point of this broad project? At the beginning of the treaty negotiations in 1948 the Canadian FPE projected a political and economic unification of the North Atlantic countries.<sup>41</sup> Pearson in 1949 even talked about a *"road towards world organization"* (16). However, given the militarization of the Alliance due to the outbreak of the Korean War and the advancing economic integration in Europe, Pearson started to lean towards a more functional approach *"on a step-by-step basis"* with *"more efficient co-operative working arrangements and practices"* (54), rather than a radical creation of some North Atlantic federation. In 1954, Canada narrowed the scope of NATO project only to closer cooperation *"within the larger framework of the North Atlantic community"* (82).

The terms alliance and community caused confusion to some extent due to the vagueness and imprecision of the latter. St. Laurent kept stressing that NATO was *"far more than an old-fashioned military alliance"* (13). Pearson similarly pointed to the strong cohesive

---

<sup>34</sup> DEA/4484/50030-40 - "Defence Organs under the North Atlantic Treaty," Memorandum from Deputy USSEA to USSEA, Ottawa, July 22, 1949.

<sup>35</sup> DEA/5796/264-C (s) – Memorandum by Acting USSEA, Ottawa, September 24, 1948.

<sup>36</sup> DEA/5804/288(s) – SSEA to Ambassador in United States, Ottawa, March 31, 1948, Telegram EX-846.

<sup>37</sup> Reid, *Forming the North Atlantic Alliance*, 1949, 38.

<sup>38</sup> LSL/224/E4-26 – From Reid to Robertson, Ottawa, November 11, 1948.

<sup>39</sup> DEA/5803/283(s) - Memorandum by Ambassador in United States, Washington, February 12, 1949.

<sup>40</sup> DEA/5803/283(s) - Ambassador in United States to SSEA, Washington, February 21, 1949.

<sup>41</sup> DEA/5796/264-C(s) - Memorandum by Acting USSEA, Ottawa, September 24, 1948.

qualities of NAT since the association of North Atlantic countries was "*a natural one*" geographically and socially (12, 16). Several other members of Cabinet expanded on this idea. Although for Taylor from the Department of Finance a community in the North Atlantic area had "*existed for a very long time,*" he admitted that the precise articulations were induced by an external threat which made the Atlantic nations aware of their common heritage and interest (58). Similarly, Pearson noted that "*historically the needs of defence have always been a profound influence in the development of political communities*" (59).

Since a common fear is "*only an ephemeral bond of unity*" (68), Canada tried to shape NATO into a more-than-a-military association.<sup>42</sup> Heeney, the Permanent Representative of Canada to NATO, explained very clearly that "*NATO is not the North Atlantic community, neither is the North Atlantic community NATO*" since "*there is nothing in our Treaty to suggest that NATO is the only means by which we are to build our community*" (62). Taylor likewise stated that "*NATO represents the beginnings of an attempt at the conscious organization of the North Atlantic community, but it is not it*" (58). On another occasion Pearson clarified that the Treaty was "*the formal expression of the reality of the North Atlantic community*" (65).

Taken together, denominations and metaphors found in the FPE discourse pointed to the Alliance's double purpose: prevention of war and active promotion of peace. These two broad and very general purposes can be split into more specific and momentous goals of resisting the Soviet aggression and building the Atlantic community. The objective of community building was a result of the strategic mobilization of the Atlantic identity and the concept of the Atlantic community by the Canadian FPE. Canada valued NATO as "*the most important international instrument for the defence of the free world and the preservation of international peace*" (57). NATO eventually became "*the cornerstone in the structure of general collective security*" (20), a "*vehicle of Anglo-American-Canadian cooperation*" and "*a bulwark of peace*" (83).

### (III) NATO'S BURDEN AND ITS SHARE IN CATEGORIES AND METAPHORS

Having established the purpose of NATO, this part focuses on the relational context of burden-sharing and treats the problem of "why contribute" on the operational level. It intends to step back and look first at what burden and contribution meant for Canada and second, how the Canadian FPE was making sense of burden-sharing in terms of the comparison criteria and fair-share. It elaborates in more details on what constituted a contribution to NATO and, more importantly, how the Canadian FPE justified these contributions. This optics allows me to look at the problem of contribution when it is contextualized in concrete implementation measures. Only after these steps I reconstruct the basic argumentative structure of the burden-sharing discourse in Canada in order to shed more lights on the Canadian contribution strategies.

#### **Burden**

---

<sup>42</sup> Or, as Létourneau pointed out, Canada and Western Europe had to "*se solidariser,*" in order to avoid decline of their civilization. Paul Létourneau, *Les Motivations Originales du Canada lors de la création de l'OTAN (1948-1950)*, 49.

The notion of burden depicts considerations regarding how to implement the purpose of an alliance. As seen in the analytical part above, the Canadian FPE hoped NATO would not only prevent war but also create such conditions for life in the North Atlantic area which would not be characterized as mere absence of war, i.e. the active promotion of peace. The term "burden" was used only rarely in public speeches and most of the time without any predicates. However, on those rare occasions, the Canadian politicians referred to the "burden of collective defence," "defence burden," "common burden of defence," or "burden of providing security."

When it comes to the implementation of these goals or objectives, the interpretation of the Soviet aggression was instrumental for understanding NATO's burden. Pearson warned repeatedly that Russian Communist aggression was "*more than military*" (55) and thus Canada needed NATO to increase the security of the free world in the face of both military and ideological aggression. As St. Laurent pointed out, "*security is a commodity produced as such, indeed, possibly more, by economic well-being as by military preparedness*" (14).

This more complex understanding of NATO's purpose therefore implied that its burden had to be conceived in broader terms as well. The burden Canada's FPE talked about was not only military: Pearson urged to develop "*our defence - military, economic and moral*" (68). NATO's "*burden of collective defence*" (60) or "*burden of providing security*" (21) therefore consisted of building the overwhelming preponderance of forces which had to be economic and moral as well as military<sup>43</sup> so that NATO would be able to resist any direct and indirect aggression. For the DEA the non-military defence consisted in "*making our own democracy work*" (73) and "*by showing that democracy can contribute more to the dignity and well-being of the citizen than communism can ever hope to do*" (16). This comprehension of burden therefore led the Government to put equal emphasis on the military expenditures and deepened economic and social cooperation. And although being aware of the imminent military threat, the SSEA stressed the importance of both the short-term and long-term goals (51). On the one hand, the Atlantic nations had to strengthen their military deterrent effect vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the whole Government was convinced that in the long-term, NATO countries had to promote economic and social stability, prosperity and well-being of the Atlantic nations and protect their democratic institutions and values.

#### *Where did the economic burden go?*

The non-military burden and the goal of strengthening cooperation and developing consciousness of the unity of the Atlantic nations was embodied in Article 2. Although this long-term objective "*has to be subordinated at present to the exigencies of the immediate situation*" (47), Pearson and Wilgress constantly pressed for closer economic cooperation among the allies. Apart from minor projects on NATO awareness and on migration of labour amongst the Atlantic nations<sup>44</sup> there was no significant progress in economic and social co-

---

<sup>43</sup> DEA/5796/264-C(s) - Memorandum by Acting USSEA, Ottawa, September 24, 1948.

<sup>44</sup> Other programmes included exchange programs for professors and students, new lectures in the school curricula, tours of journalists, cultural projects (e.g. the National film board of Canada produced several films on NATO such as "The Atlantic Community - Know your allies"), other proposals contained a suggestion for the Atlantic postal union etc.

operation measures, which made this Canadian sub-crusade for Article 2 disappointing at best.<sup>45</sup>

Although the Canadian Government did not want "*some grandiose*" structure for non-military cooperation in NATO or to duplicate already existing machineries, Pearson did not suggest that it was "*a guidepost for purely academic matters*" (56) either. Since Canada wanted to ensure that these developments in economic cooperation were on the North Atlantic basis and not on the European one, the FPE got frustrated by the fact that in Western Europe there already existed several multilateral bodies dedicated to economic problems. Ultimately, Canada and the US entered into an informal relationship with the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC)<sup>46</sup> as observers in May 1950. This step facilitated the transfer of NATO's economic matters to the OEEC through the establishment of the Financial and Economic Board in Paris in 1951, a NATO agency made up of the OEEC personnel from NATO member countries. This personal linkage turned out to be very helpful since the OEEC examinations of national economies provided the basis for the NATO annual review exercise between 1952 and 1962. Finally, Wilgress together with Pearson in 1953 admitted that even though NATO should direct attention to the problems of lifting economic barriers and promoting the collective approach to economic development, "*action to bring about a collective approach must be left to other agencies because it has to be on a broader basis than that of NATO*" (71).

#### *Military burden: Mutual aid programmes*

After signing the NAT, the allies began setting up a defence organizational structure (both civilian and military) such as Defence and Military Committee, Defence Financial and Economic Committee, and Military Planning and Supply Board. The central objective of these committees was, in addition to the building of a common infrastructure,<sup>47</sup> to develop military plans and identify deficiencies in NATO countries' national defences so that allies would be able to build together collective balanced forces (later in 1950 called the "integrated forces"). The defence burden of military expenditures had a clear end-point or "*the plateau*" (82): to make NATO strong enough to be able to deter and defend itself against the USSR. Article 3 – self-help and mutual aid – was the way to strengthen this collective defence, since it was designed to "*maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity.*"<sup>48</sup> There were only two countries who launched a program of mutual aid: the United States and Canada. The Canadian Government considered the rearmament of NATO countries the most pressing issue and decided to embark on a mutual aid programme in 1950.

---

<sup>45</sup> It must be noted that Canada was not the only country interested in the implementation of Article 2. In addition, the position of the Canadian government on several occasions hindered the progress and some initiatives were put forwards with little Canadian help. For details see John Milloy, *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 1948 – 1957: Community or Alliance?* (Montréal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006).

<sup>46</sup> In 1961 the OEEC became an important agency for social and economic co-operation between the states of Europe and North America – the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – and today includes as much as 34 countries.

<sup>47</sup> The infrastructure problem or "*collective facilities*" (55) designates the repartition of the costs for financing the establishment of NATO headquarters, salaries of the international staff, the NATO command structure, NATO-wide air defence, command and control systems or Alliance-wide communications systems, which are not the responsibility of any single member. The infrastructure debates are not covered in this paper.

<sup>48</sup> North Atlantic Treaty, April 4, 1949.

### ***Contribution***

Until the beginning of 1950 the Canadian FPE was convinced that one of the most effective contributions Canada could make was the development of its own natural and strategic resources together with building a strong and balanced economy. During the next five years Canada made substantial contributions to NATO in several forms: one infantry brigade and one air division in Europe; one infantry brigade in Korea; tens of ships of the Canadian Navy patrolling the Atlantic coast; and the significant contribution through the mutual aid which included budgetary expenditures for the transfers of equipment and raw materials and provision of training facilities to other NATO partners. This section elaborates on the six kinds of justifications of these contributions and draws a clear distinction between public and private dimensions.

First, for several Canadian politicians making a contribution to the Atlantic alliance was like paying an insurance premium. When St. Laurent announced to the Canadian people the Government's final decision to create NATO, he made this very same pledge: "*When I ask you to support a North Atlantic Treaty, I am simply asking you to pay an insurance premium*" (11). At the end of 1948 the Canadian Government was facing two important questions framed in the logic of this insurance premium metaphor: (a) how big an insurance premium NATO should pay each year; and (b) how big Canada's share should be of that annual collective insurance premium.<sup>49</sup> For Reid, the acting Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs (USSEA), the immediate objective was two-fold: not only to strengthen the national defence of each ally, but secondly and most importantly, to create "*an overwhelming preponderance of force on the side of the Western world*"<sup>50</sup> to prevent the war from breaking out. Later in the context of the Korean war, the increase of Canadian defence expenditures was justified as "*the increased premium to ensure peace*" (39). This premium insurance cost Canada \$5 billion in the military programme for 1950-53.

The second Canadian justification as to why contribute was linked to the US. Canada acknowledged the essential priority of the active US implication in the Alliance. Consequently, Reid was convinced that the importance of Canadian contributions resided in creating a peer pressure mainly on the US as "*an increase in Canadian defence expenditures might be of some considerable assistance in hastening the creation of an overwhelming preponderance of force [which only the US was capable of]*".<sup>51</sup> In other words, he proposed that Canada should contribute to NATO in order to show the US Administration that there was another country in the Alliance who was a net contributor.

The third group of justifications was related to the public announcement of Canadian contributions. During the negotiations of NAT neither the Canadian FPE nor military authorities envisaged any increase in military expenditures since members were supposed to optimize their defence expenditures by pooling their resources. The Government in the summer of 1949 chose to wait with regard to the decision on the matters of "*the extent and*

---

<sup>49</sup> LSL/224/E4-26 – "The North Atlantic Treaty and the Canadian Armed Forces Programmes," From Reid to SSEA, October 26, 1948.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> LSL/224/E4-26 – "The North Atlantic Treaty and the Canadian Armed Forces Programmes," From Reid to SSEA, October 26, 1948.

*nature of the 'mutual aid' which Canada might provide.*"<sup>52</sup> Publicly and privately, the Canadian FPE maintained that it would be "*quite impossible to forecast*"<sup>53</sup> Canada's contribution until the collective military goals of NATO and deficiencies in the national defences "*are worked out and problems of co-ordination investigated*" (20) by the respective NATO committees.<sup>54</sup> Canada, planning on to participate in the most effective way, continued publicly with this wait-and-see strategy at least till March 1950 when Pearson warned the House of Commons about premature decisions and "*the race for security*" (22).

However, in fall 1949 tables turned and the Canadian Government started to contemplate the potential political benefits the contributions and the mutual aid programme could bring for Canada. To this end, the interdepartmental Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions ("Panel") was formed at the beginning of 1950.<sup>55</sup> Ottawa needed to answer three essential questions: whether to announce the Canadian Mutual aid programme any time soon (i.e. before the NATO defence plans and allies' deficiencies were disclosed); in what form Canada should announce its mutual aid (an ad hoc basis or some definite amount); and whether to require any counter benefits for its aid.<sup>56</sup> In November 1949 the Minister of Trade and Commerce Pierce observed that "*there is nothing to be gained by waiting until we are asked and much to be gained by announcing our position on own initiative.*"<sup>57</sup> In December 1949, Ottawa assumed that it would be desirable to start contributing as soon as possible to avoid political and commercial disadvantages and any disturbing effects on Canadian economy.

The considerations regarding the form of the Canadian mutual aid programme fell into three sub-groups: actual cost of the program, reputation and esteem in relation with the NATO allies, and the bargaining power with respect to the US. When it comes to the cost, although Pierce suggested contributions on an ad hoc basis, the Canadian delegates in London together with the Defence Minister<sup>58</sup> and Canadian Ambassador in the US<sup>59</sup> advised the USSEA that an early announcement of a definite sum of the Canadian aid for 1950 was "*the most effective Canadian participation in the North Atlantic Treaty.*"<sup>60</sup> As to the reputational concerns, Wilgress in London was persuaded that the announcement of an ad hoc policy

---

<sup>52</sup> DEA/4484/50030-40/2 – From Ambassador in US to SSEA, Washington, June 1, 1949.

<sup>53</sup> DEA/4501/50030-L-40/2 – From SSEA to Ambassador in US, Ottawa, July 15, 1949.

<sup>54</sup> On October 5, 1949 the Military Production and Supply Board established by the NAT Defense Committee, dedicates to work for the fulfilment of the objectives of Article 3. In April 1950 a Medium Term Defence Plan was approved by the Defence Committee as a first approximation of the 1954 force requirements and as an expression of the necessity to build up these forces as quickly as possible.

<sup>55</sup> The Privy Council Office on December 29, 1949 convened a meeting of representatives of interested departments to discuss the possible establishment of a committee to provide machinery for interdepartmental consultation on economic questions arising from the NAT related to Canadian defence programmes. The invitations were sent to Drury (Deputy Minister of National Defence), Pierce (Associate Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce), Clark (Deputy Minister of Finance) and Heaney (Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs). Lieutenant General Foulkes (Chiefs of Staff Committee), Robertson (Secretary to the Cabinet), and MacKay (DEA) were invited eventually. The first meeting was held in the Privy Council committee on January 6, 1950. DND/20707/2-2-30 VI/1, *passim*.

<sup>56</sup> DND/20707/2-2-30 VI/1 – "North Atlantic Treaty," From Pierce to Howe, Ottawa, November 23, 1949.

<sup>57</sup> DEA/4501/50030-L-40/1 – Extract from Minutes of Meeting of Cabinet Defence Committee, Ottawa, November 23, 1949.

<sup>58</sup> LSL/224/E4-26 - Extracts from Report of Minister of National Defence, Ottawa, December 1949.

<sup>59</sup> DEA/4501/50030-L-40/1 – From Wrong to Heaney, Washington, December 30, 1949.

<sup>60</sup> DND/20707/2-2-30 VI/1 – From Wilgress to Heaney, London, December 12, 1949.

would not have the same timely effect both on the morale of the European countries and on the status of Canada in the various political, military and supply agencies of the NATO.<sup>61</sup>

Moreover, Wilgress warned that Canada should be aware of the effect any Canadian action could have on the willingness of the US to contribute to the strengthening of the common defence in Western Europe.<sup>62</sup> At that time the US Congress was about to start the approval process for the defence appropriations (including the US mutual aid for NATO). For Wilgress, an ad hoc form of Canadian contributions would not provide a satisfactory basis for bargaining with the US. Ottawa was anxious to build its image as an active contributor to NATO in order to escape the US pressures and to show that the US could not treat Canada in the same way like the recipients of the American military programme in Western Europe. In addition, Wilgress, and later Wrong,<sup>63</sup> proposed that if Canada showed its willingness to make a direct contribution to the strengthening of Western Europe, the US could grant it either exemptions from the Buy America Act or amendment of the US mutual aid program, which could rectify Canada's balance-of-payment problem.

As to the final question, the Panel agreed that if counter benefits were to be sought, Canada's contribution would have to be substantially larger in order to get the same political results. Ottawa therefore concluded that Canada would offer to make a certain contributions free of charge provided that this contribution might be increased during the year by an amount corresponding to the value of any supplies which the European countries themselves could produce.<sup>64</sup>

Consequently, the fourth justification reveals that the Canadian FPE did not think only in terms of expenditures on Canadian own national armed forces and defence facilities but also in terms of assistance in the re-equipment of the armed forces of Western Europe in order to address their defence weaknesses. In public, St. Laurent presented this concern in terms of "*the defence of Europe is our own defence*" (65) and Heeney as "*close historical ties*" and "*the solemn obligations*" (79) which was often exemplified by the presence of Canadian soldiers in Europe. Similarly, the Minister of Defence Production Howe proclaimed that "*the vital area of global defence is in Western Europe*" (45). In short, Western Europe was made a frontline of the Canadian defence.

It should be noted here that when it comes to the form of contribution other than the military equipment, until the Korean War Ottawa did not consider sending soldiers out of the Canadian territory since the aid was destined to recover deficiencies in equipment, not manpower.<sup>65</sup> The Canadian soldiers were brought into consideration by General Foulkes only at the end of July 1950 when transfers of Canada's military equipment to Western Europe started to be insufficient. In October 1950 the Cabinet began to be aware that Western European allies expected the Canadian forces to participate on their defence. Since "*the*

---

<sup>61</sup> DEA/4501/50030-L-40/1 – From Wilgress to Heeney, London, December 12, 1949.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> DEA/4501/50030-L-40/1 – From Wrong to Heeney, Washington, December 30, 1949.

<sup>64</sup> DEA/4501/50030-L-40/1 – From High Commissioner in United Kingdom Wilgress to USSEA Heeney, London, December 12, 1949.

<sup>65</sup> DND/20707/2-2-30 VI/1 – "The Eight meeting of the Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions," April 19, 1950.

*stationing of more troops in Western Europe was the only effective deterrent,*"<sup>66</sup> in February 1951 the Canadian Defence Minister Claxton announced in the House of Commons the Cabinet's plan to send the 25<sup>th</sup> Infantry Brigade group to Korea to and the 27<sup>th</sup> to Europe as the "*participation by the Canadian army will show more emphatically than any amount of equipment*" (39).

The fifth justification linked Canadian contributions to NATO with its commitments to the UN since "*by contributing to the stability and economic recovery of our part of the world, the members of this group of states strengthen the United Nations*" (12). This meta-justification of Canadian contributions was particularly present in the Canadian discourse on manpower contribution both in the Korean War and under the NATO integrated command in West Germany (60, 69, 82).

The sixth justification touched upon the standing of Canada in the international system and the functional principle in the Canadian foreign policy which, according to Pearson, aimed to "*reconcile legal equality in theory with the actual inequality in power and resources*" (68).<sup>67</sup> Although the great importance was attached to Article 9, according to which all members were equally represented in the North Atlantic Council, "*the equality appropriate to status need not, and in many circumstances should not, extend to function*" (57). Contributions here translate as commitments and responsibilities Canada had taken upon as a middle power, such as the declared "*responsibility of defending the free world*" (52). Canada's financial commitments to NATO (and to the UN) were a quantitative expression of the transformation in Canadian foreign policy, which contrasted with the "*reluctant and parochial point of view of the twenties and of the early thirties*" (92). According to the Canadian FPE, contributions were to be commensurable with state's responsibilities, i.e. they should be adequate to a middle power status. At the same time Pearson acknowledged that "*it is only by working with others that smaller countries can exercise any influence on the big decisions by the big powers which determine their own fate*" (57).

This functional principle of Canadian diplomacy can be illustrated in the negotiations that led to the creation of a Steering, or later known as a Standing, group in NATO in the fall 1949.<sup>68</sup> In May 1949 the Chiefs of Staff Committee and the Cabinet Defence Committee decided not to actively seek a seat in this high profile military planning group despite the fact that in the informal couloirs discussions the US, the UK, and France were positive about inviting Canada in.<sup>69</sup> One of the reasons for not lobbying for the membership was that it "*might prove embarrassing to the Government,*"<sup>70</sup> since contributions of countries in such a senior body should be adequate to its high profile and Canada could not afford any permanent increase in its contribution. At last the US decided to keep the body as small as possible to

---

<sup>66</sup> DND/20707/2-2-30 VI/1 – "The Thirteenth meeting of the Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions, " October 2 and 3, 1950; DEA/4499/50030-K-40/ 2, passim.

<sup>67</sup> On differences between functionalism and the functional principle see Miller, "The Functional Principle in Canada's External Relations," *International Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 2, (Spring, 1980): 309-328.

<sup>68</sup> Subordinated to the Military Committee, the Standing Group coordinated the Regional Planning Groups and the other military bodies for the purposes of a unified defence of the North Atlantic area. The Standing Group made recommendations to the Military Committee and advised also on other strategic questions.

<sup>69</sup> DEA/4483/50030-40/1 – Extract from minutes of Meeting of Cabinet Defence Committee, Ottawa, May 18, 1949.

<sup>70</sup> DND/20707/2-2-30 VI/1 – Memorandum for Chiefs of Staff Committee, Ottawa, May 11.



assure its efficiency.<sup>71</sup> Few months later St. Laurent as the Prime Minister of Canada explicitly acknowledged that Canada was not part of the "Big Four" since there is only the "Big Three": US, UK, and France.<sup>72</sup> The FPE presented Canada as a middle power with no great power aspirations. This general attitude of "contribute, but not too much" leads to the final part of the analysis: the comparison of contributions and the burden-sharing exercise.

### ***Burden-sharing***

*"I do not suggest that in these discussions anyone would be so naive as to propose that the members of the alliance should each devote exactly the same proportion of their national income to defence purposes. This would be as absurd as proposing that the citizens of Nova Scotia should contribute the same proportion of their total income to the federal budget of Canada as the citizens of Ontario, in which the per capita income is much higher."*  
Escott Reid<sup>73</sup>

Believing in the functional principle that the contributions should commensurate with power and resources, Canada's FPE equated the US leadership with having special responsibilities in the Atlantic alliance. The US status implied both a privilege of having more influence in determining the common strategy of NATO and the necessity of carrying the greatest share of the burden (43, 60, 66, 73). In other words, the disproportionate cost distribution of the collective defence at the US expenses was merely a declaration of the accepted international responsibilities which matched the US power and resources. Or, as Pearson said, it was "*a penalty of leadership to feel overburdened*" (60, 66).

In general, the Canadian Government did not like being compared to the US since this comparison used to diminish the Canadian contribution efforts. The Canadian FPE in their public speeches repeatedly tried to rectify the perspective from which the other allies should look at the Canadian contributions. One of the practices was to convert the Canadian statistical numbers proportionally to the US ones.<sup>74</sup> The other Canadian tactic was to underline the vast Canadian territory (the colder climate and sparse population, only one-eleventh of the US population in that time) and the fact that the Canadian federal government's room for manoeuvre was narrower than in the case of the US Administration. As St. Laurent pointed out, the Cabinet had to take into consideration the system of fiscal transfers to the Canadian provinces (70), which resulted in Canada spending a larger share of federal resources on the "uncontrollable items"<sup>75</sup> and, consequently, limiting the amount of federal budget available for defence. Ultimately, Reid pointed to the fact that even though Canada was spending less on defence in terms of national income or national income per capita, the US had higher average standard of living (43). All these excerpts illustrate how the choice of indicator influenced country's perception of fairness when being compared to the most powerful state in the Alliance. But when the contributions of other Atlantic allies are

---

<sup>71</sup> DEA/4483/50030-40/2 – "North Atlantic Defence Organization – Summary of Progress," From Reid to SSEA, Ottawa, August 4, 1949.

<sup>72</sup> DEA/4486/50030-A-40/2 - From SSEA to Canadian High Commissioner, London, May 17, 1950.

<sup>73</sup> LSL/224/E4-26 – "The North Atlantic Treaty and the Canadian Armed Forces Programmes," From Reid to SSEA, October 26, 1948.

<sup>74</sup> "This year we are spending more than two billion dollars - or in terms of the total national income of the United States - the equivalent of about 38 billion dollars" (69).

<sup>75</sup> Such as maintenance of communication and the provision of essential services to the population. DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom, Ottawa, January 7, 1950.

taken into consideration, how did these perceptions and strategies change the terms of comparison and the fair distribution of the cost of the common defence burden?

The problem of equitable distribution of burden emerged in full force at the beginning of the fall 1949, when the Atlantic countries were about to decide on terms of reference and agenda for a Permanent Working Staff (PWS) of the newly established North Atlantic Defence Financial and Economic Committee (DFEC). The DEA got disturbed by the initiative issued by both the US and the UK since their proposals were based on their past experience with finding a cost-sharing formula in the Brussels Pact.<sup>76</sup> Suffice it to say that a year-long discussion in the Western Union did not produce any automatic formula for the distribution of defence costs.

In a nutshell, the US proposed a study<sup>77</sup> which would assess and estimate the fiscal resources for defence purposes of all parties to the NAT. Moreover, this study was supposed to propose a formula and design criteria to indicate the individual burdens in relation to the budgetary and economic capacity of each NAT country.<sup>78</sup> Thus, the suggested examination of the fiscal capacity of each country was meant to compare their performance in bearing the cost of defence and establish some measure of their relative capacity to share the financial burden in the future.<sup>79</sup>

The interdepartmental Panel in Ottawa opposed altogether the US proposal for several reasons. First, the study was politically objectionable.<sup>80</sup> If some formula for the distribution of defence costs was to be adopted, it would result in an increased pressure on Canada to contribute more and would commit Canada in advance to some (undesirable) budgetary expenditure. Second, under this study Canada would run a risk of having its problem of being a cash customer of the US exposed.<sup>81</sup> Third, Ottawa was convinced that this US initiative was largely linked to its military assistance programmes in Western Europe and was led above all by domestic purposes since the study would be useful for the US Administration in demanding additional military assistance appropriations<sup>82</sup> and in convincing the Congress that the USA was not carrying virtually the whole NATO defence burden itself.<sup>83</sup> From the point of view of the DEA, the study would be less objectionable had it either covered European members only (which could also be done under the terms of the Mutual Defence Assistance Act or in form of bilateral agreements) or to make its terms of reference as general as possible.<sup>84</sup>

The PWS meeting of the DFEC in Paris on December 20, 1949 exposed the different allies' interpretations of an equitable distribution of defence burden. According to Canada's High Commissioner in London, this study proposal could examine several possible aspects:

---

<sup>76</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – Memorandum by Defence Liaison Division, Ottawa, October 18, 1949.

<sup>77</sup> The UK proposal was less ambitious. The British wanted to conduct statistical studies which should determine the distribution of defence costs by ratios between expenditures on the one hand, and population, total national budget, and national income on the other.

<sup>78</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From High Commissioner in UK to SSEA, London, December 8, 1949.

<sup>79</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom, Ottawa, January 7, 1950.

<sup>80</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From SSEA to High Commissioner in UK, Ottawa, December 7, 1949.

<sup>81</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From SSEA to Ambassador in France, Ottawa, December 15, 1949.

<sup>82</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – Memorandum by Defence Liaison Division, Ottawa, October 18, 1949.

<sup>83</sup> PCO/204/U-40-4(p) – "Burden-Sharing in NATO," Ottawa, November 20, 1950. In: "N.A.T.O. Countries; Proposed Studies of Economic Resources," From SSEA to Cabinet, Ottawa, November 21, 1950.

<sup>84</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – Memorandum by Defence Liaison Division, Ottawa, October 18, 1949.

countries' *intentions* (national defence estimates tabled by each country), *capabilities* (examination of all budgetary items which could possibly be devoted to defence purposes), or *defence needs* (based on the military plans and supply programmes of NATO).<sup>85</sup> There was a clash between the US Delegation, who was thinking in terms of capabilities, and the Canadian Delegation, preferring intentions and needs.<sup>86</sup> In addition, the proposals issued a statement on the *philosophy* of sharing of the burden. The US talked about an "equality of sacrifice" or "share of the sacrifices."<sup>87</sup> The French proposed a conception of "pooling of resources" and the British talked of "sharing the wealth" which went "*beyond anything acceptable to the Canadian Government.*"<sup>88</sup> In general, the Canadian Cabinet did not hide apprehension about the wisdom or value of these studies.<sup>89</sup>

The SSEA Pearson considered the US "capacity approach" as "*academic and impracticable*" and thus necessarily producing time-wasting discussions on "*hypothetical ways of sharing a presumably large, but yet unspecified, defence burden.*"<sup>90</sup> This search for one-fit-it-all formula was regarded by Ottawa both publicly and privately as arbitrary, unrealistic, and politically objectionable,<sup>91</sup> mischievous (27), harmful (45), an exercise only for statisticians (45), invidious,<sup>92</sup> unfair and misleading.<sup>93</sup> Any statistical figures comparing defence expenditure<sup>94</sup> were met by a unison rejection in Ottawa since "*any comparison would be materially altered*"<sup>95</sup> depending on the items included in the defence expenditures.<sup>96</sup> Moreover, the Minister of Defence Production Howe pointed out that "*there are elements in the defensive strength of any country that cannot be reckoned in the simple arithmetic of government expenditures*" (45). The general reluctance of the FPE towards statistical comparison stemmed from the perceived danger of equating incomparable contributions; as put by Pearson, "*no one wishes to make the comparison [...] between blood and iron*" (27). In the end, the only formula the FPE was searching for was "*a satisfactory formula for lasting peace*" (71). The Canadian representative was therefore instructed to issue objection of principle since "*the criteria which apply to a national economy of one type do not necessarily apply with equal fairness to other.*"<sup>97</sup> The Canadian representative suggested to other allies a

---

<sup>85</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From High Commissioner in UK to SSEA, London, December 22, 1949.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>87</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – Memorandum by Defence Liaison Division, Ottawa, October 18, 1949.

<sup>88</sup> This extreme British view was later replaced by a more moderate 'sharing the burden.' PCO/204/U-40-4(p) – "Burden-Sharing in NATO," Ottawa, November 20, 1950. In: "N.A.T.O. Countries; Proposed Studies of Economic Resources," From SSEA to Cabinet, Ottawa, November 21, 1950.

<sup>89</sup> DEA/4735/50069-40/1 - From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom, Ottawa, November 23, 1950.

<sup>90</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom, Ottawa, January 7, 1950.

<sup>91</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1- From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom; Ottawa, January 29, 1950.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>93</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1- From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom; Ottawa, January 7, 1950.

<sup>94</sup> They were most commonly presented on three different basis: defence spending per capita, as a percentage of national income, as a percentage of total government expenditures

<sup>95</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom, Ottawa, January 7, 1950.

<sup>96</sup> The problem of what categories to include in the expenditures on defence should be solved according to "the degree of directness in their bearing on defence." DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From SSEA to High Commissioner in UK, Ottawa, March 13, 1950.

<sup>97</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From SSEA to High Commissioner in UK; Ottawa, January 29, 1950.

more practical approach based on defence needs (which were yet to be determined by the NATO Defence Committee).<sup>98</sup>

The question as to whether Canada should even participate on such a study was still hanging in the air at the end of 1950. Given the fact that the Canadian Delegation to NATO was not able to gain support from anybody except Belgium, the NAT countries were prepared to go ahead with this statistical survey.<sup>99</sup> The DEA identified several dangers which could make the case against the Canadian participation, such as the possible exposure to the US pressures (as if Canada was receiving the military aid from the US) and the loss of credit for the Canadian mutual aid programme (which might get merged with the US aid).<sup>100</sup> At last, the interdepartmental Panel concluded that the advantages of participation were greater than disadvantages of abstention.<sup>101</sup> First, in case Canada did not join the study, the report might set targets for the Canadian defence and mutual aid too high. Second, the other NATO allies agreed on this study since they all had already had some experience in the OEEC; Canada had none. And if the proposed study turned out less important or impractical, Canada would have only made "*a mountain out of a mole-hill*."<sup>102</sup> There were also other reasons in favour of participation on this burden-sharing study: the Canadian non-participation would jeopardize (i) gratitude and esteem of the European allies,<sup>103</sup> (ii) the Atlantic unity (individual countries should accept majority decisions),<sup>104</sup> and (iii) Canada's reputation as a cooperative country.<sup>105</sup> Wilgress in London feared that Canada's negative attitude to this kind of study would only be misunderstood and misinterpreted and Canada would end up embarrassed<sup>106</sup> and lose "*the respect and confidence of other countries and [...] influence and prestige among them*."<sup>107</sup> As to the positive motivations, Pearson explained to the Cabinet that the proposed burden-sharing exercise might be useful for exchanging information and have some connection with future political negotiations with respect to defence plans in NATO.<sup>108</sup> Finally, Pearson proposed that Canada could influence the conduct of exercise and impose an alternative course of study to tackle "*more immediate and practical problems*."<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From Acting Secretary of Cabinet to Panel on the Economic aspects of defence, Ottawa, January 18, 1950

<sup>99</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1 – From Acting Secretary of Cabinet to Panel on the Economic aspects of defence, Ottawa, January 18, 1950

<sup>100</sup> PCO/204/U-40-4(p) – "Burden-Sharing in NATO," Ottawa, November 20, 1950. In: "N.A.T.O. Countries; Proposed Studies of Economic Resources," From SSEA to Cabinet, Ottawa, November 21, 1950.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>102</sup> PCO/204/U-40-4(p) – "N.A.T.O. Countries; Proposed Studies of Economic Resources," From SSEA to Cabinet, Ottawa, November 21, 1950.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>104</sup> PCO/204/U-40-4(p) – "Burden-Sharing in NATO," Ottawa, November 20, 1950. In: "N.A.T.O. Countries; Proposed Studies of Economic Resources," From SSEA to Cabinet, Ottawa, November 21, 1950.

<sup>105</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1- From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom; Ottawa, January 29, 1950.

<sup>106</sup> Canada could have been suspected of willingness to play the game only as long as it did not cost too much. DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1- From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom; Ottawa, January 29, 1950.

<sup>107</sup> PCO/204/U-40-4(p) – "Burden-Sharing in NATO," Ottawa, November 20, 1950. In: "N.A.T.O. Countries; Proposed Studies of Economic Resources," From SSEA to Cabinet, Ottawa, November 21, 1950.

<sup>108</sup> PCO/204/U-40-4(p) – "N.A.T.O. Countries; Proposed Studies of Economic Resources," From SSEA to Cabinet, Ottawa, November 21, 1950.

<sup>109</sup> Such as removing financial barriers for the military equipment among the European members. DEA/4491/50030-C-40/1- From SSEA to High Commissioner in United Kingdom; Ottawa, January 29, 1950.

In November 1950 the Cabinet approved<sup>110</sup> the Canadian participation in the proposed study of economic resources, which Pearson later described as "*an inquisitorial examination into the defence programmes and economic and financial resources of the member countries*" (57). In the end, it was the Temporary Council Committee (TCC) of the Financial and Defence Board who in 1951-52 conducted the examination of national capabilities in order to propose national defence programmes that would be feasible politically and economically.<sup>111</sup> This comprehensive study became a standard annual practice under the title "NATO Annual Review."<sup>112</sup> By reporting on the economic and political factors that could impede national defence programmes, these NATO annual reviews served as "*a safeguard*" (96) that military programmes would not harm collective economic capacities. Finally, the statistics in both TCC and annual reviews compared only one country's capabilities in time, rather than countries among one another.<sup>113</sup>

#### CONCLUSION: CANADIAN CONTRIBUTION STRATEGIES AND THE POLITICS OF BURDEN-SHARING

*" /... / our peoples [the US and Canada] are in the same lifeboat together, confronting the same dangers, sharing the same hopes and fears... One possible source of difficulty arises out of the fact that the captain of the lifeboat, the Government of the United States, is elected only by the Americans in the boat /... / Escott Reid (43)*

In this paper I argued that Canadian contribution strategies can be best understood by looking at the geopolitics of the middle power on the one hand and the interpretations of fair-share and burden by the Canadian political elites on the other. Furthermore, this paper showed that burden-sharing, rather than being a mere technicality in a form of some automatic contribution formula, is filled with interpretative gaps with respect to the conceptions of a common burden and principles of fairness. By looking at the normative level I explored the links between the conceptualisations of the purpose, burden, contribution, and comparison from the Canadian point of view in order to show how Canada's FPE made sense of its contributions to NATO and to clarify Canadian contribution strategies. To this end I used the analytical tools of category, metaphor, and argument to reconstruct the role of NATO according to the Canadian political elites and their discourse on burden-sharing during the launch of the Canadian mutual aid programme and the first discussion on burden-sharing exercise in NATO. Therefore the question *why and how Canada contributed to NATO* can be fully answered through the combination of two levels – functional (purpose) and operational (burden-sharing).

The analysis showed that for the Canadian FPE the creation of NATO was not a mere political pledge or some paper commitment. A closer look at the geopolitics of middle power provides several hints as to why Canada contributed to NATO. First of all, Ottawa needed to assure its national security in the face of the Soviet threat. Since Canada's capabilities alone

---

<sup>110</sup> DEA/4735/50069-40/1 - From SSEA to High Commissioner in UK, Ottawa, November 23, 1950.

<sup>111</sup> Temporary Council Committee. Draft Plan of Work. Proposal by the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman. TCC I (51) 2, October 10, 1951, Financial and Economic Board, Paris.

<sup>112</sup> The reviews looked at five categories: military considerations, defence expenditure, economic capabilities, equipment and production, and infrastructure. They were conducted under the auspices of the International Secretariat with the participation of all national delegations and West Germany.

<sup>113</sup> DEA/4491/50030-C-40/2 – From High Commissioner in UK to SSEA, London, March 18, 1950.

would not constitute a sufficient deterrent effect, an alliance of several states then served to create a necessary balance to the Soviet bloc and increase the cost for the Soviet aggression.

Second, the Canadian FPE devoted a great deal of consideration to the US due to the dangerous combination of its proximity and tremendous capabilities. Ottawa's fear of the American invasive influence pushed the FPE to design institutional constraints in order to counterbalance the US. NATO was therefore seen as a means to keep an eye on the US and at the same time to create incentives for the US to direct its help to Western Europe. Consequently, the FPE then justified the Canadian mutual aid programme as a way to encourage the US to participate actively in the collective defence and collective security setting. Lastly, the FPE used the contribution argument as leverage in negotiations on the economic matters with the US.

Third, the new doctrine of Canadian foreign policy (liberal internationalism), which reflected the mindset of the new generation in the DEA, opened the door for Canada's active participation in international relations. Instead of neutrality, the Canadian FPE wanted to exercise influence and make Canada's voice heard in the international sphere, especially in the relationship with Washington and London. Given its middle power status, this could be done only through multilateral institutions that included the North Atlantic triangle. The influence was one of the main Canadian justifications of contributions for they were seen as an expression of Canada's standing and its international responsibilities in the international system. The contributions were part of the Canadian image-building: the image of an independent North American Country (so that the US would not treat Canada in the same way like the Western Europe who was receiving the American aid) and the image of a cooperative country (to gain esteem and respect of allies which would in turn allow Canada to influence the conduct of NATO defence studies). However, the FPE did not want to create an impression of Canada being a great power. Fourth, Canada was eagerly trying to assure its presence in Europe. Given the vulnerability of the Canadian economy and withdrawal of Canadian soldiers from Europe, NATO was supposed to provide the necessary institutional channels to grant Canada access to the European affairs. Whence the FPE justifications for developing the measures for closer economic cooperation and making Western Europe the frontline of Canadian defence.

The discursive analysis of what NATO actually meant to Canada's FPE pointed to other group of factors that influenced Canada's decision to contribute to NATO. The Atlantic Alliance was conceived as more than an old-fashioned military alliance since it was supposed not only to prevent war but also build peace. The general assumption that international institutions can prevent war and assure international order prompted Ottawa to insist on the incorporation of NATO into the UN system of collective security as its most effective instrument of peace, an instrument to eradicate the military and economic causes of war. Canada therefore contributed to NATO to decrease the insecurity in the same way individuals pay insurance premiums.

If the Soviet threat was interpreted in ideological terms as an indirect aggression, as a threat to common heritage, democratic values and western civilization, the FPE in Canada needed NATO to build not only military strength of the Atlantic nations, but also economic and moral one. The nature of Soviet threat required NATO to carry a broader defence burden of economic cooperation, identity building, and projecting the principles of democracy to the

international level. Although the concept of the Atlantic community was strategically mobilized by the Canadian elites to facilitate the cooperation between countries threatened by the same communist menace, the FPE equally grasped an opportunity to give this defence alliance a long-term and positive goal of prosperity and well-being as well. Since the military strength was inseparable from the economic one, this strategy would be also profitable for the Canadian economy and political stability in the region. Canada embarked on the Atlantic community-building project in order to strengthen and maintain firm democratic and economic foundations of NATO in the face of the Soviet ideological threat. Similarly, Ottawa helped to improve Western European military and economic capacities because of her historical ties with this region.

When it comes to the burden-sharing exercise, this paper identified two basic opposing discourses in the early NATO debates on the cost distribution: the Canadian practical needs-and-intentions approach in contrast to a one-fit-it-all formula pushed by the US and favoured by the rest of the allies. The US approach was objectionable according to the Canadian FPE not only because it would arbitrarily set contribution targets for allies who each had different structure of economy, but also its implementation would harm the Atlantic unity and solidarity since any formula would be always *unfair* to somebody. The objective of sharing a burden was neither situated in vacuum, nor was it a question of a mere technicality; it touched the very principles of fairness. However, despite this interpretive gap with regard to what actually fair share was, the Canadian FPE on several occasions used the term "fair contribution," "fair-share," or "just part" to build the reputation of a good and responsible contributor, albeit without any specification.

The detailed discursive analysis revealed that the Canadian philosophy was based on the principle of reconciling economic capabilities with defence commitments. Put differently, a fair contribution was a contribution which (i) was adequate to the country's standing in the international system; (ii) did not jeopardize the economy; and (iii) addressed the needs of NATO which were identified in the NATO agencies (where all member states were represented). Consequently, a good burden-sharer was a country that fulfilled these collectively decided commitments. This was also Canada's comprehension of an effective contribution. In practice the FPE's understanding of the purpose and burden of NATO, i.e. the collective defence against direct and indirect aggression, shaped the Canadian contribution strategies since they merged Article 2 and 3 of the NAT, i.e. the promotion of conditions of stability and well-being with self-help and mutual aid.

The interaction of functional and operational level shows that Canada's decision to contribute was not only a matter of cost-benefit calculations, but also an expression of some sense of responsibility towards its commitments and driven by the norm of solidarity. Ottawa recognized that in order to successfully carry NATO's moral burden, the high degree of unity was needed among the Atlantic allies. This is why the notion of fair-share was so central in the burden-sharing exercise. For this reason the approach for solving the burden-sharing problem had to be based on the recognition of all three dimensions of the burden: military, economic, and moral. To some extent, the actual burden of NATO was a problem of finding a way to reconcile demands for collective defence with the economic conditions in order to avoid the dangers of unnecessary high military expenditures feeding the domestic discontent. To this end Ottawa preferred frequent consultations of special problems between allies, rather

than statistical inquisitions and race for security. This kind of practice would in turn contribute to democracy enhancement and strengthen the solidarity in the Alliance.

Finally, the interpretive analysis points to the roots of the *politics* of burden-sharing. According to the Canadian Government, no country could contribute to an alliance by simply following an arbitrary formula since the economic capacity is far from being the main obstacle to defence spending. To contribute is a problem of "*great administrative complexity and of even greater political delicacy*" (42) and therefore the government must always have the final word to keep the discretionary power over the allocation of expenditures.

Consequently, to share a burden is above all a politically difficult decision of a national government who usually faces several dilemmas. First, the government has to persuade the population about the necessity of military expenditures in the peacetime. Second, the decision to contribute must be a political one because each chief of staff has tendency to favour increase in one particular branch of the armed forces, which would very probably compromise the desirable effectiveness of balanced contributions. Third, even though countries contribute to the common cause, they can still negotiate some individual benefits in return for their contributions. Fourth, even if countries were in favour of some distributive formula, they would not be able to agree on any concrete criteria since the notion of fairness differs from one country to another. However, in the end this grumping about some invidious comparisons was a sign that the Atlantic countries had "*the privilege of free peoples*" in contrast to "*unhappy people of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of Hungary and of Russia, are not permitted even to grumble out loud about having to bear a heavy share of the upkeep of the iron curtain*" (21).

The reminiscence of the St. Laurent's liberal government can be traced even today. Few days before the NATO summit in Wales in September 2014 Canada's conservative Prime Minister Harper rejected any increase of defence spending to two per cent of GDP with a justification that "*we have the same philosophy on defence budgeting that we do on any other budgeting, which is, we don't go out and just specify a dollar figure, and then figure out how to spend it, we go out and figure out what it is we need to do.*"<sup>114</sup> Shortly, Canada would increase its military spending only to address some collectively identified needs, rather than to achieve some arbitrary target, especially when it is expressed in such a simplifying way as defence spending.

---

<sup>114</sup> Gwiazda, *Canada, Germany reject NATO bid to raise military spending to 2% of GDP.*



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Archival Sources

#### *Library and Archives Canada*

MG 26 J – Fonds William Lyon Mackenzie King (WLMK)

MG 26 L – Fonds Louis St. Laurent (LSL)

RG 2 – Privy Council Office Fonds (PCO), Series A-5-a, A-5-c

RG 24 – Department of National Defence Fonds (DND), Series B-1-a

RG 25 – Department of External Affairs Fonds (DEA), Series A-3-b

#### *Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada Digital Library*

- (1) Statement by the Prime Minister, Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King (CHCD, August 4, 1944, pp. 5909-10). In: Mackay, Robert Alexander. 1971. *Canadian Foreign Policy 1945 – 1954. Selected Speeches and Documents*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- (2) Statement by the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent, at the General Assembly, January 18, 1946. In: DEA, Conference series, 1946, No. 1, Report on the First Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, pp. 59-61.
- (3) The Minister of National Defence, Mr. Brooke Claxton. 1947. In *Canada's Defence: Information on Canada's Defence Achievements and Organization*, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1947.
- (4) "The Foundation of Canadian Policy in World Affairs." An address by Right Hon. Louis S. St. Laurent, Secretary of State for External Affairs, Inaugurating the Gray Foundation Lecturship at Toronto University, January 13, 1947. *Statements and Speeches* no. 47/2, Information division, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa – Canada (S&S).
- (5) Statement by the SSEA, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent. CHCD, March 3, 1947, p. 975.
- (6) Statement by the Prime Minister, Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King. CHCD, March 10, 1947, pp. 1197-8.
- (7) Statement of the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent in the General Assembly, September 18, 1947. DEA, Conference Series, No. 1, Canada and the United Nations, 1947, pp. 178-180.
- (8) Statement by the SSEA, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent. CHCD, April 28/29, 1948, pp. 3448-9.
- (9) "A middle power in the United Nations." Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent. CHCD, April 29, 1948, pp. 3443-5.
- (10) Address by SSEA, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent at the Canadian International Trade Fair, Toronto, June 11, 1948. *External Affairs Bulletin*, July 1948, p. 7.
- (11) "Canada and World Affairs." A broadcast delivered by Mr. L. S. St. Laurent, at Ottawa, on the occasion of Remembrance Day, November 11, 1948. In: S&S no. 48/59.
- (12) "The North Atlantic Treaty." Text of, a broadcast on the North Atlantic Treaty delivered by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, over the Trans-Canada Network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at 8.45 P.M. on March 18, 1949. In: S&S no 49/10.

- (13) Statement by the Prime Minister, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent. CHCD, March 28, 1949, p. 2063. In: S&S 49/12)
- (14) "North Atlantic Treaty II." Text of a statement delivered in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, on March 28, 1949. In: S&S no. 49/13.
- (15) "North Atlantic Treaty – III." Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Ms. Pearson, at the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington, D. C., on April 4, 1949. In: S&S no 49/14.
- (16) "Canada and the North Atlantic Treaty." Text of an address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, delivered at the Spring Meeting (Third Session, Dinner Meeting) of the Academy of Political Science, Hotel Astor, New York City, Thursday, April 7, 1949. In: S&S no. 49/15.
- (17) "International Cooperation in a Divided World." Commencement Day Address by Mr . L .B . Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, at Syracuse University, Syracuse, N .Y., on June 6, 1949. In: S&S no. 49/23.
- (18) "International Economic Relations and the Prospects of Peace." An address by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, delivered to the Boston Conference on Distribution, in Boston, Massachusetts, on October 11, 1949. In: S&S, no. 49/33.
- (19) Address by Mr. L. S. St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada, in Acknowledgement of the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws, at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N .Y., on October 14, 1949. In: S&S no. 49/34.
- (20) "Canada and World Affairs." Statement by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the House of Commons on November 16 and 17, 1949. In: S&S, no. 49/43.
- (21) "Security through co-operation." An address by Mr . L .S . St . Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada, to the Canadian Society of New York, in New York, on February 10, 1950. In: S&S no. 50/3.
- (22) Statement on External Relations by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the House of Commons, on March 3 and 7, 1950 . In: S&S no. 50/7.
- (23) "Consequences of the Cold War for Canada." Speech by Mr. Louis Stephen St. Laurent to the Canadian Club in Toronto, March 27, 1950. In: Library and Archives Canada, archived web page of the Government of Canada. Translation of: St-Laurent, Louis. *Les conséquences de la Guerre froide pour le Canada*. Ottawa : Division de l'information, Ministère des affaires extérieures, 1950. 8 p.
- (24) "Canada's Armed Services and North Atlantic Defence." An address by Mr. Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defence, at the Annual Meeting of the Quebec Command of the Canadian Legion, B. E. S.L., in Sherbrooke, Quebec, on April 19, 1950. In: S&S no 50/13.
- (25) "Canada's World Trade." An address by Mr. L. B . Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, before the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce, on April 24, 1950. In: S&S no. 50/15.
- (26) "Canada and the Atlantic Community." An address by Mr. A .D .P. Heeney, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, delivered to the Canadian Club of Montreal, on March 19, 1951. In: S&S 51/11.
- (27) Statement by Mr. L. B. Pearson. Press Release no. 31, read to the Canadian Peace Congress in Toronto at 9 P.M. E.D.T. Sunday, May 7, 1950.
- (28) "Canada, the Pound and the Dollar." An address by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, before the Canada Club, London, England, on May 16, 1950. In: S&S no. 50/20.
- (29) "North American Security." An address by General A .G. L. McNaughton, delivered to the Canadian Manufacturers Association, in Toronto, on May 25, 1950. In: S&S no 50/21.
- (30) "The North Atlantic Council Meeting." Statement by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, made in the House of Commons on June 5, 1950. In: S&S no. 50/22.

- (31) Acting Permanent Delegate of Canada to the United Nations to the Secretary-General of the United Nations July 12, 1950. DEA, Canada and the Korean Crisis, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1950.
- (32) Broadcast over the CBC by the Prime Minister, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent, August 7, 1950. DEA, Canada and the Korean Crisis, Ottawa: King's Printer 1950.
- (33) "Canada and the Far East." An address by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, before the Canadian Club, in Victoria, on August 21, 1950. In: S&S, no. 50/31.
- (34) An address delivered by Mr. L. S. St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada, on the occasion of the Annual Meeting of the Royal Military College Club, at Kingston, Ontario, on September 30, 1950. In: S&S no. 50/35.
- (35) "Canada speeds plans for defence." An address by Mr. C .D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, to the Vancouver Board of Trade, on October 6, 1950. In: S&S, no. 50/39.
- (36) "The Commonwealth and the World Today." An address by Mr. L. S. St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada, delivered to the Canada Club in London, England, on January 8, 1951. In: S&S no 51/1.
- (37) Text of broadcast from London by the Prime Minister, L.S. St. Laurent, on January 10, 1951. DEA, S&S, January 10, 1951.
- (38) "Review of the International Situation." Statement, by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, made in the House of Commons on February 2, 1951. In: S&S, no. 51/4.
- (39) "Canada's Defence Programme." A speech made in the House of Commons on February 5, 1951, by the Minister of National Defence, Mr . Brooke Claxton. In: S&S no. 51/5.
- (40) "Canada's Role in the Defence of the Free World." An address by Mr. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, delivered to the Commercial Club of Chicago on February 27, 1951. In: S&S, no. 51/7.
- (41) "The Universities and International Understanding in the Free World." An address by the Prime Minister, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent, at a special Convocation at the University of Western Ontario, London, on March 7, 1951. In: S&S no. 51/10.
- (42) "Canada and the Atlantic Community." An address by Mr. A .D .P. Heeney, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, delivered to the Canadian Club of Montreal, on March 19, 1951. In: S&S 51/11.
- (43) "Canada and the United States: Neighbours and Allies." An address by the Deputy Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Escott Reid, delivered to the Opening Meeting of the Conference on Canadian-American Affairs, at the University of Maine, on April 19, 1951. In: Statements and Speeches no. 51/16.
- (44) "A Statement on Canadian External Policy." A statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made in the House of Commons on May 7, 1951. In: S&S, no 51/20.
- (45) "Canada's Contribution to the Strength of the Free World." An address by the Minister of Defence Production, Mr. C. D . Howe delivered to the Semi-Annual National Meeting of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, at Toronto on June 13, 1951. In: S&S, no. 51/27.
- (46) "The Organization ad Work of the Department of Defence Production." A statement by the Minister of Defence Production Mr. C. D. Howe, made in the House of Commons on June 14, 1951. In: S&S, no 51/28.
- (47) "North Atlantic Treaty Organization." An address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, delivered to a meeting of the Council Deputies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in London on June 25, 1951. In: S&S, no. 51/30.
- (48) "National Defence Planning." An address by the Minister of National Defence, Mr. Brooke Claxton, delivered before the Kiwanis Club of Ottawa, on June 26, 1951. In: S&S no. 51/29.

- (49) Statement by the Minister of National Defence, Mr. Brooke Claxton and Order-in-Council P.C. 5598 – Participation in Integrated Force. CHCD, October 18, 1951, p. 151; October 22, 1951, pp. 280-1.
- (50) "Canada's Defence Production Programme." A statement by the Minister of Defence Production, Mr. C. D. Howe, made in the House of Commons, October 19, 1951. In: S&S, no. 51/40.
- (51) "Review of the International Situation." Statement by the SSEA, Mr. L. B. Pearson. In: S&S 51/42
- (52) Article by the SSEA, Mr. L. B. Pearson. DEA, External Affairs, November, 1951, pp. 377-9.
- (53) "Disarmament Proposals before the United Nations." Text of a statement by the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation to the Sixth Session of the United Nations General Assembly, and Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, on disarmament proposals, made in the First Committee of the General Assembly in Paris, on November 21, 1951. In: S&S, no. 51/47.
- (54) "The North Atlantic Community." Text of an address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, delivered at a meeting of the Commercial Club at Halifax, Nova Scotia, on January 26, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/6.
- (55) "Review of the International Situation (Part 1)." Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made in the House of Commons on March 21, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/15.
- (56) Statement by the SSEA, Mr. L. B. Pearson. CHCD, April 1, 1952, pp. 1013-14.
- (57) "National Sovereignty and International Organization." A speech by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, delivered at Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., on April 15, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/17.
- (58) "Canada and the North Atlantic Community: An Economic View." A paper presented by the Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Finance, Mr. K. W. Taylor, to the Royal Society of Canada-Section II - at the Quebec Meetings, June 3, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/28.
- (59) "Canada and Western Security." An address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, to the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, at Quebec City, June 8, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/24.
- (60) An address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made at the Conference of State Governors, Houston, Texas, June 30, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/26.
- (61) "How is NATO Doing." An address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, delivered at the Directors' Luncheon on International and Health Day, Canadian National Exhibition, Toronto, September 2, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/30.
- (62) "The Nature of the North Atlantic Community." An address delivered by the Permanent Representative of Canada to the North Atlantic Council, Mr. A. D. P. Heeney, at the Atlantic Community Conference, Oxford, September 10, 1952. In: S&S no. 52/37.
- (63) "Canada and External Affairs." Text of an address by the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. D. Wilgress, delivered to the Canadian Club of Toronto, October 27, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/45.
- (64) "Report to Parliament." Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made in the House of Commons during the debate on the Speech from the throne. December 8, 1952. In: S&S, no. 52/54.
- (65) "Review of International Development." Statements by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made in the House of Commons, February 5, 11, and 12, 1953. In: S&S, no. 53/7.
- (66) "The United Nations and What It Stands For." An address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and President of the Seventh Session of the United Nations General Assembly,

- Mr. L. B. Pearson, made at Founders Week Convocation, Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida, February 23, 1953. In: S&S, no. 53/10.
- (67) "Canada's International Situation and Point of View." Text of an address by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, opening the Town Hall Forum "Canada - Nation on the March", on March 3, 1953, in New York City. In: S&S, no. 53/11.
- (68) "National Freedom and International Co-operation." Text of the Jonathan Peterson Lecture, by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, delivered at Town Hall, New York, April 15, 1953. In: S&S, no. 53/17.
- (69) "The North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Report of the Paris Meeting. April 23-26." Text of the radio broadcast by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, over the CBC, May 3, 1953. In: S&S, no. 53/20.
- (70) "Canadian-United States Partnership in World Affairs." An address by the Prime Minister, Mr. L. S. St. Laurent, made at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., May 8, 1953. In: S&S, no. 53/21.
- (71) "Canada and NATO." Text of an address by the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. D. Wilgress, prepared for delivery to the Vancouver Board of Trade, May 20, 1953, at Vancouver, B.C. In: S&S 53/24.
- (72) "The New Commonwealth Bridge Between East and West." Text of an address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, on May 25, 1953. In: S&S 53/26.
- (73) Text of Commencement Address at Dartmouth College delivered by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, at Hanover, N.H., Sunday, June 14, 1953. In: S&S, no. 53/31.
- (74) "An Assessment of the United Nations." An address by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Paul Martin, to the Toronto Branch-of the United Nations Association in Canada, Toronto, October 23, 1953. In: S&S, no. 53/40.
- (75) Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson broadcast on January 1 over the International Service of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. In: S&S, no. 54/1.
- (76) An address by the Prime Minister, Mr. St. Laurent, at a dinner given the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, at Bonn, Germany, February 10, 1954. In: S&S, no. 54/8.
- (77) "The North American Pattern for Peaceful Progress." An address by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Paul Martin, to the Economic Club of New York, March 9, 1954. In: S&S, no. 54/13.
- (78) Speech by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L.B. Pearson, to the National Press Club, Washington D.C., March 15, 1954. In: S&S 54/16.
- (79) "Canada: A Growing Power in a Shrinking World." Speech by the Canadian Ambassador to the United States, Mr. A. D. P. Heeney, to the Commonwealth Club of California, at San Francisco, March 19, 1954. In: S&S, no. 54/20.
- (80) "Recognition of China." Statement by the Prime Minister in the debate on External Affairs in the House of Commons, March 25, 1954. In: S&S, no. 54/19.
- (81) "Survey of International Affairs." Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made in the House of Commons, March 25, 1954. In: S&S, no. 54/18.
- (82) "The Firth Anniversary of NATO." Statements issued on April 4, 1954, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, by the Prime Minister, Mr. St. Laurent; the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson; the Minister of National Defence, Mr. Brooke Claxton; and the Canadian Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council, Mr. L. D. Wilgress. In: S&S, no. 54/22.

- (83) "Some Thoughts on Canadian External Relations." Text of an address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, before the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Friday, June 4, 1954. In: S&S, no. 54/31.
- (84) "Canada and the United States – Our Area of Economic Co-operation." An address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made at the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y., September 2, 1954. In: S&S, no. 54/40.
- (85) "Canada and the United Nations." Speech by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Paul Martin, made at the Annual Convention of the United Steel Workers of America, at Atlantic City, September 22, 1954. In: S&S, no. 54/42.
- (86) Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson. CHCD, January 20, 1955, pp. 369-71.
- (87) "North Atlantic Treaty. Approval of Protocol on Accession of Federal Republic of Germany." Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made in the House of Commons January 20, 1955. In: S&S, no. 55/1.
- (88) Opposition Leaders and Private Members. CHCD, January 20 and 24, 1955.
- (89) Speech by the SSEA, Mr. L. B. Pearson, to the Canadian Club, Toronto, March 14, 1955. In: S&S 55/8..
- (90) "The Far Eastern Situation." Statement by the Secretary of State for External affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, introducing the debate on external affairs, made in the House of Commons, March 24, 1955. In: S&S (unknown).
- (91) "Debate on External Affairs." Statement made in the House of Commons on April 21, 1955, by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, closing the debate on External Affairs (see Statements and Speeches No. 55/10 which opened the debate) .
- (92) "Canadian Foreign Policy." An Address by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Paul Martin, at the closing dinner of the Canada-United States Conference, University of Rochester, N.Y., September 1, 1955. In: S&S, no. 55/29.
- (93) "Impressions of the Russians and Their Leaders." Address given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, at Women's Canadian Club, Chateau Laurier, Ottawa, December 8, 1955. In: S&S, no. 55/44.
- (94) Canadian Weekly Bulletin Vol. 4 No. 21, April 1, 1949. Information Division Department of External Affairs, Ottawa – Canada, pp. 10.
- (95) Affairs Extérieures Vol 1, No A (Novembre 1948). Ministère des Affaires extérieures Ottawa, Canada, pp. 44.
- (96) External Affairs. 1953. Volume 5 No. 1. Department of External Affairs, pp. 1-40.

### Other Sources

Bratt, Duane & Christopher J. Kukucha (eds.). 2007. *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy. Classic Debates & New Ideas*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Cameron, Keith A. 2008. *Risk, Cost and Control in NATO burdensharing: Apportioning Atlas' Load*. A Master Research Paper submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the University of Western Ontario for the degree of Master of Arts. London, Canada: University of Western Ontario.

Cimbala, Stephen J. and Peter K. Forster. 2010. *Multinational Military Intervention: NATO Policy, Strategy and Burden Sharing*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Chalmers, Malcolm. 2001. "The Atlantic burden-sharing debate – Widening or Fragmenting?" *International Affairs* 77 (3):569-585.

- Coonen, Stephen J. 2006. "The widening military capabilities gap between the United States and Europe: does it matter?" *Parameters* 36 (3):67–84.
- Cooper, Charles A. and Benjamin Zycher. 1989. *Perceptions of NATO Burden-Sharing*. RAND Corporation.
- Duke, Simon. 1993. *The Burdensharing Debate: A Reassessment*. New York: St Martin's Press
- Ginger, Clare. 2006. "Interpretive content analysis. Stories and Arguments in Analytical Documents." In: Yanow, Dvora and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds.), *Interpretation and Method. Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharpe. pp. 331-348.
- Gwiazda, Wojtek. 2014. "Canada, Germany reject NATO bid to raise military spending to 2% of GDP." *Radio Canada International*, 3 September, 2014. Online: <http://www.rcinet.ca/en/2014/09/03/canada-germany-reject-nato-bid-to-raise-military-spending-to-2-of-gdp/> [Accessed: January 14, 2015]
- Hartley, Keith and Todd Sandler. "NATO Burden-Sharing: Past and Future," *Journal of Peace Research* 36, no. 6 (1999),
- Holmes, John W. 1979. *The Shaping of Peace: Canada and the Search for World Order, 1943-1957, Volume 1*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ismay, Hastings Lionel. 1954. *NATO: The First Five Years (1949-1954)*. Paris: North Atlantic Treaty Organization [Online: <http://www.nato.int/archives/1st5years/>].
- Keating, Tom. 2002. *Canada and World Order. The Multilateralist Tradition in Canadian Foreign Policy. 2nd edition*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Kitchen, Nicholas. 2010. "Systemic pressures and domestic ideas: a neoclassical realist model of grand strategy formation." *Review of International Studies*, 36 (1): 117-143.
- Létourneau, Paul. 1992. "Les Motivations Originales du Canada lors de la création de l'OTAN (1948-1950)." In: Paul Létourneau (ed.). 1992. *Le Canada et l'OTAN Après 40 Ans 1949-1989*. Québec: Centre québécois de relations internationales, Université Laval, pp. 49 – 68.
- Létourneau, Paul, Roch Legault, et Stéphane Roussel. 1994. "Le Canada et la sécurité européenne (1943-1952): À la recherche de l'équilibre des puissances." *Revue canadienne de défense* 23 (4): 23-27.
- Miller, A. J. 1980. "The Functional Principle in Canada's External Relations." *International Journal* 35 (2): 309-328.
- Milloy, John. 2006. *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 1948 – 1957: Community or Alliance?* Montréal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- NATO. 1949. *The North Atlantic Treaty*. [Online] 4th April. Available at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official\\_texts\\_17120.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm) [Accessed: 18 January 2015].
- Nossal, Kim Richard, Stéphane Roussel, and Stéphane Paquin. 2007. *Politique internationale et défense au Canada et au Québec*. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Olson, Mancur and Richard Zeckhauser. 1966. "An economic theory of alliances." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 48 (3):266–79.
- Reid, Escott. 1992. "Forming the North Atlantic Alliance, 1949." In: Don Munton and John Kirton (eds.). 1992. *Canadian Foreign Policy. Selected Cases*. Toronto: Prentice Hall, pp.27-42.
- Sandler, Todd and Keith Hartley. 2001. "Economics of Alliances: The Lessons for Collective Action." *Journal of Economic Literature* 39(3):869-896.
- Sandler, Todd and Hirofumi Shimizu. 2014. "NATO Burden Sharing 1999-2010: An Altered Alliance." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 10 (1):43-60.
- Temporary Council Committee. 1951. *Draft Plan of Work. Proposal by the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman*. TCC I (51) 2 10 October 1951. Paris: Financial and Economic Board.
- Thies, Wallace J. 2003. *Friendly rivals*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2000. *Conducting interpretive policy analysis*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.