

20th Annual CDAI Seminar/CDA Annual General Meeting

26-27 February 2004

Colonel Howie Marsh (Retd),

Senior Defence Analyst,

CDA Institute

Introduction

The CDA Institute ably supported by Queen's University and the Institute for Public Affairs of Montreal conducted a one-day seminar, *The Way Ahead for Canadian Foreign & Defence Policy* prior to the CDA Annual General Meeting. The large meeting rooms in the Fairmont Château Laurier Hotel, Ottawa provided a marvelous venue for discussions.

Keynote Speaker

The Honourable David Pratt, Minister of National Defence spoke of his continuing support to the Canadian Forces. He underscored that in his transition from Chairman Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs (SCONDVA) to Minister National Defence (MND) his heart attitude toward defence has not changed, but his power to affect change has greatly increased.

Looking forward to a foreign and defence policy review Minister Pratt outlined his four criteria: capability; deployability; sustainability (but not at soldier's expense), and "use-ability" (a capability that has not been used in the last ten years is likely to be discarded). He went on to explain that a defence policy review would be set in the context of a new national security policy, that spending would reflect Canada's priorities and that any review would provide Canadians the opportunity to participate.

He emphasized that somethings do not need to wait the outcome of a defence policy review. He endorsed force reductions in Bosnia, the need to rest elements of the Canadian Forces, the need to transform to a 21st century fighting force, and the necessity of NATO.

His speech then shifted to a summary of military achievements and the need for Canada to stay internationally engaged. Continentally that engagement would include participation in National Missile Defence (NMD), and on other continents Canada should be prepared for meaningful contributions to global peace and stability.

In response to questions Minister Pratt acknowledged the need to revive skills and equipment, and further acknowledged that “getting it right” in the short-term is problematic. He hinted that incremental spending increases and internal allocations over the next three years would mark the transition to a stable force. However, without the interest of Canadians, defence’s future is not certain. He challenged CDA to keep the Canadian populace interested in defence. CDA has a responsibility to explain and bring substance to the defence debate.

Theme Speaker

General Klaus Naumann, former Chairman NATO Military Committee chose the theme, *The Responsibility to Protect –Humanitarian Intervention and the Military*, to address the seminar.

Starting with a review of global human suffering and a historical summary of humanitarian intervention, General Naumann led us to the challenging question of when, how and upon what authority is humanitarian intervention permitted, and if permitted, what is the nature of that intervention. He then went on to explain through illustration other layers of complexity by describing intervention criteria:

- Large scale loss of life
- The right intent to intervene
- The principle of last resort
- Protection of people
- An exit strategy before intervention
- Preparation for long engagement
- Agreed objectives prior to intervention
- Clear and unambiguous mandate
- Resources required from outset

Having outlined humanitarian intervention from the political perspective, General Naumann then presented the military perspective In this discourse he covered the challenges of:

- Political guidance to civilian-military relations
- Command and control
- Rules of engagement

- Proportionately of force
- Transition from military to civilian authority
- Military coalitions

General Naumann then concluded with comments on the current world situation. While acknowledging the multilateral framework and authority of the United Nations, concern was expressed that regional and national interests often defer multilateral action. It was offered that NATO is still the best multi-nation coalition even though it is in “bad shape”. NATO needs the resources to match its aspirations. The General perceives that the USA views NATO as a “tool box” from which assets can be borrowed to fix global problems.

During the question period General Naumann provided further insight into the function and likely reluctance of the Security Council to shift to human rights jurisprudence as the legal foundation of armed intervention. He also expressed concern that political-level, decision-making in coalitions is not yet adequate for the tempo of modern military operations.

General Naumann’s thesis revolved around the legal and moral conundrum of military force and human rights. Military force draws legal authority to intervene from their nation states and the law of armed conflict. The sovereignty of states is a prerequisite to armed intervention. Human rights law transcends boundaries. Violations of human rights, often in “failed states”, lead to humanitarian intervention. It would be of value to obtain a transcript of the General’s speech and to study its substance.

Indirectly the General alerted me to another present day reality. A foreign and defence policy review would not be complete without clarifying the jurisprudence foundation for Canadian armed intervention in humanitarian crisis, and transnational counter-terrorism.

Panel One

The moderator, General (Retd) de Chastelain and three panelist: Dr. Nossal of Queen’s University, Mr. Thorne of Canadian Press, and Col (Retd) Howie Marsh of CDA Institute spoke on *Policy and Practice – The Capabilities of the Canadian Forces*.

Dr. Nossal brought to everyone’s attention that Canada’s defence-capabilities history is marked by two national traits: the Canadian tendency to “tight-fistedness” when it comes to international affairs and the unwillingness of national leadership to make strategic decisions. This pattern of national behaviour permits avoidance of issues and muddling through. Dr. Nossal warned us not to anticipate generosity or to expect decisive leadership. “The entrenched attitudes will resound into the future.”

Mr. Thorne shared experiences and observations related to what Canadian’s think soldiers are doing and what soldiers are actually doing. The illusion that Canada’s soldiers are predominantly peacekeepers, maintaining law and order while helping to rebuild ravaged societies is well engrained in the national psyche. The reality for soldiers—they are in war

zones—is stifled. Canadian soldiers die for doing it the Canadian way. The Canadian “up close and personal” way of patrolling while instrumental in developing local rapport makes soldiers vulnerable. Mr. Thorne expressed concern that the Canadian soldier’s “common touch” and wisdom needs tangible Canadian support as soldiers face more combat scenarios.

Col. (Retd) Howie Marsh described the depleted state of the Canadian Forces personnel, equipment and operations and maintenance accounts. Given the time and resources required to replenish skills and equipment he deduced that Canada’s military is entering a long season of dormancy. Future capability is highly dependent on the resolve and decisions taken by this government. Inaction could lead to the demise of the air force circa 2008 and either the army or navy by 2013. In order to avoid that demise major capital equipment and human resource development must start now.

Assuming a pro-defence stance in the next government and reconstitution of the Canadian Forces, Col. Marsh went on to describe the defence capabilities that would be required in the future:

- national command and intelligence
- national surveillance and defence
- multi-faceted, operational maritime
- a unified, sustainable “expeditionary” force

Col. Marsh expressed concern that many warnings of the military’s “bankruptcy” have gone unheeded, as a consequence, Canada could be forced to revisit the principal foundation of nation-states—arms and laws.

Luncheon Speaker

Admiral Giambastani, US Navy, Commander US Joint Forces and NATO Supreme Allied Commander-Transformation chose the topic, *The Way Ahead – The Armed Forces of the 21st Century* as a way to introduce the work of his Command. The admiral’s account of his Command’s experience underscored how far behind the Canadian Forces is on the path of transformation.

Starting with “sound services” the Admiral described four discrete steps that lead to coherent, joint capabilities-based force:

- services deconflicting (doctrines of employment that reduce conflicts between forces)
- services coordinating (doctrines that coordinate the application of military force from two or more services)

- services/SOCOM integrating(the integration of services and special operations)
- collaborative and network centric (an effects-based, coherently joint force)

The concept of Transformation being a continuum was introduced. From a listeners perspective this continuum is marked by increased integration as service command and control becomes subordinate to joint command and control. The theme of the supremacy of joint was evident in joint training centres, joint lesson-learned feedback, and multi-dimensional joint fire coordination. The USA has learned that joint forces provide more power than the sum of the parts and that joint deployments vice service deployments are the new norm. The breath of integration, referred to as the horizontal dimension of C2ISR, was illustrated by a national exercise that integrated 70 federal, state and other agencies with armed forces. The speed of decision-making in a complex environment makes forces highly effective.

The admiral's speech made me realize that Canada has barely started joint operations, operational integration, situational awareness, and transformation writ large. Yet, should Canada desire a national security architecture that requires "horizontal" integration, then Allied Command Transformation (ACT) is the place to start. Canadian officers who currently serve at ACT provide Canada the capital intellect to integrate the elements of national security.

Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS)

In the afternoon General Henault described the administrative measures taken to sustain the Canadian Forces. He spoke of "flexible employment", distributed learning, health clinics and quality of life measures that enhance the "operational quality of life". He then complimented service personnel on operations before introducing the major theme of his address—Transformation.

In contrast to Admiral Giambastiani who described what has been done to achieve Transformation, the CDS launched into a summary of observations and studies. The audience heard that the future security environment is more complex, that a new level of coherency, integration and joint operations are required, that forces must adapt quickly, that doctrine needs to be changed, that the CF should strive to "end-state results, and that new concepts require resources.

The CDS shifted to ISAF Kabul (Canada's 2,000 person stability force in Afghanistan) and, by illustration, demonstrated that this operation is indicative of the military future. Satellite Communications permit real-time sharing of information, Ottawa to Kabul. Uninhabited Aerial Vehicles (UAV) and state-of-the-art Coyote reconnaissance vehicles provide greatly enhanced situational awareness to commanders and soldiers. Other Government Departments (OGD) provide the full dimensions of modern conflict resolution—defence, diplomacy, and development.

Returning to Canada and the homeland defence theme, the CDS spoke of the need to reinforce support to government's national emergency response capabilities. He then outlined a number of CF initiatives that would enhance national security:

- Joint Task Force 2 expansion
- Anti-terrorist research centre
- Chemical, biological live-agent training
- Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear Response Team (CFB Trenton)
- Primary Reserve roles (CBRN responders)

The CDS offered his perspective on the “new way” of conducting operations:

- The secondment of military persons to Other Government Departments (OGD) facilitates a higher level of integration and enhances the success of operations in all environments.
- The integration of skills and capabilities, principally from three departments: DND, DFAIT, and CIDA, provide a coherent response to international affairs. The “3Ds” of Defence, Diplomacy, and Development better articulate Foreign and Defence policy.
- The concept of “forward presence” requires that the CF be “out and about” on the international scene. Forward presence provides early warning of and possibly deterrence of national security threats.
- Greater familiarity with allies through individual training, collective exercises, and participation leads to positive interoperability benefits.
- The Canadian Forces is becoming a knowledge-based institution that is increasing education opportunities for all service members, both academically and through improved professional development.
- The recent CF publication, “The Profession of Arms” provides a foundation to the application of collective lethal force in the 21st century.

In concluding the CDS returned to military operations in Afghanistan and emphasized that current operations testify to the Transformation that is already underway. All Canadian services including Special Forces operate in a unified command with OGD alongside 32 other nations with a much-enhanced situational awareness.

The CDS acknowledged the need for an “operational pause”. A “breather” is necessary to put the CF on a more sure footing for the years to come. However an operational pause will need to be balanced with the imperative of operational demand. He recognized that financial constraints still persist and that investment in the future force needs to be better balanced with the cost of sustaining today’s force structure and operations. He closed with the warning; “If we [CF] don’t transform we will lose the ability to do what we do so well around the world.”

During the question period the CDS responded to Canada's continuing presence in Afghanistan. Without addressing specifics the CDS emphasized that ISAF must not fail, that stability in Kabul is essential and spoke of NATO Provincial Response Teams. Responding to a question on the CF ability to act on credible intelligence, the CDS spoke of the enhanced role of the military attaché in intelligence gathering.

Panel Two

The moderator, LGen Romeó Dallaire and three panelists: Dr. David Malone, President International Peace Academy, Dr. Ann Fitz-Gerald, Cranfield/RMCS (UK), and Dr. Sean Maloney, Queen's/RMC, examined *Multilateralism and the CF – UN and Coalitions Roles and Responsibilities*.

After strong admonitions from the moderator that a strategic focus is essential to future multilateralism the first panelist spoke of future expectations by extracting lessons from the past 20 years. He brought to everyone's attention that the Permanent members of the UN Security Council tend to agree with one another and rarely disagree on global security issues. He cited three cases of disagreement against a backdrop of dozens of agreements.

An examination of UN missions lead to the observation that conflict is shifting from state-against-state to internal strife. Internal conflict is harder to resolve as predatory governments have no incentive to resolve internal issues and those aggrieved have little recourse other than lethal violence. This emerging conflict scenario renders tradition peacekeeping futile.

Dr Malone concluded that new instruments of conflict resolution are required. Extra capabilities, especially civilian expertise needs to be augmented to the military capability. He then went on to offer a number of issues that need resolution:

- Civilian oversight of UN mandates tend to be good, bad, or indifferent.
- There are too many "trouble spots". There is too much work, too many crises and too many humans suffering for the United Nations to placate. Regional organizations (OAS, OSCE, NATO, etc) need to provide robust assistance.
- The notion that the USA is a replica of the Roman Empire is false. The Roman Empire provided benefits and security in exchange for subjection and taxation. The USA provides neither; the American taxpayer is left with the bill. Relying on one country to spend the majority of blood and money to maintain global order is not realistic or sustainable.
- The future offers more failing states and more terrorism. Restoration of failed states takes a long-term commitment. Is the West prepared for many, multi-year peace and stability operations? Democratization is a slow, painful process. Elections don't bring democracy.
- Canada has not done a good job of alerting its population to present realities and the relationship of Canada's well being to international peace and order. Canada will need to

support existing multilateral organizations, principally NATO and UN with meaningful resources. Canada should not be turning down opportunities of command and support.

- There is a dearth of good policy outside the defence department.

Dr Malone challenged CDA to cease calling for more resources for defence, but to focus on showing Canadians the link between international order, defence and national well being. CDA members should be generating an article a week.

Dr. Ann Fitz-Gerald spoke on security sector reform by outlining the transition from peacekeeping models to peace enforcement models to peace support operations. The model examination lead to a number of observations:

- There is a critical link between security and development. Both the military (armed intervention) and the civilian (humanitarian assistance) components of peace support operations acknowledge the need of each other.
- The investigative media needs to increase; the sensational media needs to decrease.
- Peace support operations need to be more comprehensive and sequential. There is little point investing millions in police forces (Haiti) when the judicial system remains corrupt. Sequencing criminal suppression with military liberation (Iraq) is another sequencing challenge.
- The reintegration of previously rogue elements into main stream society is often overlooked. When a guerilla fighter emerges from the jungle looking to surrender his weapon in exchange for a livelihood the new authority cannot simply say that there is no program. The guerilla fighter slips back into the jungle and uses his criminal skills to sustain himself.
- National ministries from the outset can have conflicting mandates that deny coordinated solutions for peace support operations.

Dr Fitz-Gerald impressed upon us that security sector reform is an all encompassing endeavour that requires internal security, external security, economic security, resource(food) security, energy security etc.

Dr. Sean Maloney spoke to the subject, “Whither So-Called Peacekeeping” His talk described the failure of peacekeeping missions as the United Nations made the transition from the Cold War intervention mode to the New World Order. Ten years after the end of the Cold War and after repeated failures of UN mandated peacekeeping NATO demonstrated the new way of intervention with IFOR, a robust joint military force with electronic warfare, Special Operations, psychology units, tanks, artillery and tactical aviation. Traditional peacekeeping is effectively dead. Regardless of developed nations doctrinal shift to robust military intervention Canadians still believe that traditional, blue-beret, peacekeeping is the main stay of its armed force.

Looking toward the future Dr Maloney offered that coalition forces are likely to coalesce around three multilateral organizations: the UN, NATO and ABCA. The Quadripartite group of America, Britain, Australia, and Canada (ABCA) is likely to be of more value to Canada as Canada establishes a forward military presence.

Seminar Summary

Dr. Douglas Bland, Queen's University and Mr Beryl Wajzman, President of the Institute for Public Affairs of Montreal attempted to sum a day, full of thought.

Dr. Bland's summary raised more questions than conclusions. While acknowledging the death of peacekeeping with an analogy to Monty Python's dead parrot, Dr Bland reminded us that transformation occurs in the act of transforming. Events are transforming Canada's military.

The New World Order is characterized by opposing renegade order with whatever means to ensure order. How does Canada fit into this New World Order? The Cold War instrument of choice was the nuclear weapon; the New World Order instrument is the foot soldier.

He challenged CDA to:

- Help rebuild Canada's military
- To keep the military in the public mind
- To ask why \$12 billion is not enough; where does the money go?

Beryl Wajzman gave a motivational speech on participation. He reminded us that the noble traits of service and sacrifice that fuel people to passion and poetry are implicit in the armed forces. There are too many Canadians with shriveled spirits that are losing passion and purpose. The military should revive shriveled spirits; the military has a noble purpose.

Politicians need to wrap themselves in the heroic military cloak and remind Canadians that we are a nation that liberates the oppressed. A new global evil is oppressing many of our fellow global citizens. CDA has the knowledge and the right to write. Politics is not a dirty word to be avoided. Find out the needs of politicians; inspire them; help them.

CDA AGM Friday 27 February 2004

This, the second day of meeting, followed the CDAI Seminar. After the "Dawn Patrol" and early morning breakfast the President of CDA, LGen Evraire introduced the first speaker. Mr. Jason Spiegel, the former Executive Director US Reserve Officer Associations, outlined the challenges facing the US Reserve community a year after OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.

The ongoing high level of deployments, (over 250,000 USA service personnel are currently on global deployments), is straining even the enormous USA defence budget that consumes more than \$US 1 billion a day. Capital projects are being cancelled in order to satisfy the operations budget. Mr. Spiegel bemoaned the fact that the USA is at war, but the nation is cutting taxes and the population is allowed to perceive that they are not at war. The general public is not being asked to fund what needs to be done. With only one person in 200 on active duty the USA is skirting the lowest military involvement level in history. (Note: by comparison Canada's military involvement level is 1 in 6,000) And, the Reserves are bearing the brunt of this operational stance.

Starting with the experiences of the Vietnam era Mr. Spiegel outlined the rationale and doctrines that now wed reserve capabilities to those of the active force. This dependency will shortly translate into the reality that 40% of all soldiers serving in Iraq are Reserve. From a Reserve community perspective this is not sustainable.

Mr. Spiegel went on to describe the US Coast Guard (CG) experience with extreme dependency post 9/11. Up until 9/11 Port Security was predominantly a CG Reserve function. This proved to be unsustainable in the medium-term as port security crews maintained 24 hour a day, 7-day week security patrols, as a result the CG is developing full-time port security units.

Reserves exist to deal with the unexpected and the unforeseen. The problem arises when Reserves are used for the expected and foreseen. The US military now plans to use Reserves as part of rotation schedules. (Note: The US forces no longer conduct person-for-person rotations, but rotate "units of action".) Reserves, for the most part, want to respond to emergencies, not participate in rotations. Mr. Spiegel referred to Defence Secretary Rumsfeld's comments on the need to rebalance the Regular-Reserve ratio. "We don't want to go too far and break the Reserves."

Mr. Spiegel encouraged the Canadian military community to learn from the USA Reserves experience. There is a level of dependency that harms the Reserves. That over dependency comes in rotational dependency and specialist dependency. Canadians were advised to avoid the USA Reserve Force experience.

During questions Mr. Spiegel made us aware that the US military wants to reduce military infrastructure by another 25%. This reduction could eliminate military presence in some states and render the Reserve component more remote from civilians.

Chief of the Air Staff

LGen K.R. Pennie, Chief of the Air Staff opened his address by acknowledging that the Air Staff are late to developing future plans and publishing a forward looking strategy. This he hoped would be rectified by spring. LGen Pennie then described his worldview and gave an assessment of Canada's situation.

Rapidly evolving global determinants are rendering Canada more vulnerable. The Canadian, historically low investment in defence coupled with a more demanding future security environment and other national imperatives persuades the commander. “ We have to be very aggressive at using what we have.”

Airpower is a fundamental tool; it is an element of national power, but as 99% of all air command resources are spent on day-to-day activities with little investment in new equipment the air force is “fragile”. Note: The Chief of Land Staff used the same descriptor last year to describe the army. (definition: **fragile** a. easily snapped or shattered, weak, perishable, of delicate frame or constitution)

LGen Pennie then focused on air force transformation by referring to the soon to be released future looking strategy, “Strategic Vector”. He reminded us that Canada is huge. Canada’s geography stretches over 10 million square kilometers of land and coastal waters. It is larger than all of Europe’s geography of 7 million square kilometers. Surveillance, sovereignty presence and patrolling are enormous challenges for Canada.

In addition to homeland needs Canada has and is likely to remain engaged in international assistance that require airpower. Years of watching airpower (includes airlift) being used as a national instrument of power persuades the Air Staff that Canada requires an “air expeditionary unit”. All of the foregoing capabilities require a network enabled command and control system.

In closing LGen Pennie referred to five elements that would mark the future of the air force: vision, relevance, achievable, resource constraints, and tough decisions.

Chief of the Maritime Staff

Vice-Admiral R.D. Buck, Chief of the Maritime Staff spoke of the new era that the navy has entered. This era is marked by naval roles being part of the Canadian Forces. It is a time of moving beyond linear modeling to joint and integrated models. This is an era in which the navy can expect more of the same (tasks), an era in which the navy is key to national security. A major challenge for the navy is achieving balance between the demands of international and national missions.

VAdm Buck then spoke of present day realities and experience. He reminded us of the inherent capabilities of naval platforms, of the naval capacity to package capabilities, and of legacy systems. He introduced the concept of “mass” (probably in the momentum or inertia sense) as it applies to sustainment and in particular to the sustainment of personnel.

Switching to the topic of transformation VAdm Buck spoke of the better coordination he enjoys due to maritime data-fusion centres and integrated surveillance. The navy has a history of constantly increasing surveillance range and well understands large area operations. The command and control transformation that the navy has already experienced could be applied to pan-CF and pan-Canada security architectures.

In closing VAdm Buck called on CDA support to ensure that maritime forces continue to offer the flexibility and relevant capabilities essential to national defence.

During the question period VAdm Buck was hopeful of enhancing port security. When acknowledging the challenge of supporting a two-ocean navy with one supply ship he mentioned that the joint support ship is a priority after maritime helicopter replacement.

Chief of Land Staff

MGen M. Caron, the Acting Chief of Land Staff, gave a presentation titled, *The Face of Change: Implementing Army Transformation*. The army is heavily engaged in operations around the world. At the time of the briefing the army was supporting 13 different military operations with 3,600 soldiers. Despite a very heavy workload the army is functioning well. The system of managed readiness and the army's foundation of regiments and quality persons greatly enable the army in this time of demand. In addition the army's situation has been helped by the recent induction of 2000 new members to the militia.

MGen Caron spoke to the elements of army transformation that are already under way. Notably, the Canadian Manoeuvre Training Centre at CFB Wainwright, Alberta is a fully instrumented facility that allows force-on-force training both real and virtual. The Leopard tank direct-fire capability is to be replaced with the Stryker Mobile Gun System, and planning is under way to acquire a multi-mission effects vehicle that incorporates medium and longer-range engagements. The army is moving toward knowledge-based command and becoming a knowledge-based institution. In summary the army is "turning the [transformation] corner while facing great challenges."

Assistant Deputy Minister (HR-Military)

Vice Admiral G.E. Jarvis, the Assistant Deputy Minister (Human Resources-Military) titled his presentation, *Surmounting Today's Challenges while Building for tomorrow*. He outlined the external and internal demographic challenges against the backdrop of the current operational tempo that, on average, keeps a sailor at sea for 114 days a year, a soldier on deployments for 104 days and a air service person away for 81 days a year. These figures do not include the internal to Canada temporary duty tasks. Primary Reserve personnel who now comprise 20% of operational rotations ease the operational burden to an extent.

With the aid of charts VAdm Jarvis explained that with a 60,000 Regular Force establishment the Trained Effective Strength (TES) would not exceed 54,000 qualified service members as at least 10% (6,000) of military personnel are continually on basic or advanced training or retirement leave, or medical holding list, etc. However due to anticipated attrition and entry-level training capacity the TES is unlikely to reach 54,000 this decade. The TES should gradually climb from the present 52,000 to 54,000 over the next six years.

He offered some statistical data that reflect the composition of today's Canadian Forces. The average age of a recruit is 24 years and the average age of those serving is 34 years. With the

shift to older recruits and an athletically minded, aging work-force application is under way to raise the Compulsory Retirement Age (CRA) from 55 to 60 years for all classifications. People are living longer and making life-long commitments later in life.

VAdm Jarvis mentioned that human resource management and policies need to transform. The present practices are not adequate; an integrated systems approach is necessary to manage all aspects of human resource development. He offered that his organization needs structural modernization and that culture of the military profession is transforming. Regardless of change the military principle of the well being of its people remains paramount.

During the question time both the army commander and the deputy minister of military human resources responded to queries. The links to community and emergency response were acknowledged functions of Reserves. Those being recruited today are not so much peacekeeping focused but more aware of the full spectrum of service employment. Attracting pilots is a real problem but Information Technology skills are abundant. A down turned technology sector and economy enhances recruiting.

When responding to lessons learned from his “sabbatical” with the Conference Board of Canada VAdm Jarvis was surprised at the lack of succession planing in the private sector. Unlike the military that has several subordinates vying for a senior position the commercial sector is often left with a person hunt to fill a senior vacancy.

Who Killed the Canadian Military

Dr. Jack Granatstein gave a summary of his recent book titled “Who Killed the Canadian Military”. He started by posing the question of how did we get into this perilous state of a fragile military conducting operations in dangerous places? Then he proceeded to interrogate the performance of each Canadian Prime Minister that could have contributed to the forty-year demise of the Canadian Forces.

Prime Minister St. Laurent was not responsible for the death of the Canadian military. In fact his leadership and ability to explain to Canadians the necessity of military participation in Korea and NATO serve as a role model in challenging times. During his tenure defence spending averaged 6.5% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, 1957-1963, served at a time of NORAD, nuclear weapons delivery, and the Avro Arrow fighter jet. He was suspicious of America in general, and USA President JFK in particular. During the Cuban missile crisis he delayed putting the military on alert which served to infuriate the Americans. PM Diefenbaker failed to understand Canada’s national interest; he made the Canadian Forces political and used defence policy to “smack” the USA. PM Diefenbaker killed the military.

PM Pearson’s only fault was that he did his job too well. His understanding of international affairs and responsible leadership lead to the successful interposition of Canadian troops and the defusing of the Suez Crisis. He won the Noble Peace Prize, making him the model statesman and envy of politicians. He established the Pearsonian peacekeeping myth that continues today to

hurt the military. The notion that peaceful intervention without fighting leads to the faulty deduction that there is no need to acquire arms for the military. Succeeding liberal leadership has tried to emulate Pearson by sending Canadian Forces on a myriad of “peacekeeping” missions. The Pearsonian peacekeeping myth along with the reluctance to arm Canada’s military has dealt the military a mortal blow. PM Pearson killed the military.

Minister of Defence, Paul Hellyer, ranks as one of the killers of the Canadian military. The idea of unification was not a bad idea. The military should work together. However Hellyer’s tactics were terrible; changing uniform and rank structures is not necessary to affect unification. MND Hellyer went too far with unification. He killed the Canadian military.

PM Pierre Trudeau viewed soldiers as unintelligent thugs. Likewise his perception of major powers was distorted; he saw the USSR and USA as moral equivalents. He played to Quebec nationalism and English nationalism, but did little to change Quebec attitudes to politics and the military. His belief that Canada could find a new way in foreign and defence policy led to reductions in NATO. PM Trudeau killed the Canadian Military.

PM Brian Mulroney came to power with the promise to restore the Canadian Forces after the Liberal government’s long neglect of the military. Every promise was broken; expectations raised by the 1987 White Paper were dashed. PM Brian Mulroney killed the Canadian Forces.

PM Jean Chrétien finished off the Canadian Forces. He did not understand Canada’s interests nor did his government understand the USA response to 9/11. With no coordinated purpose or knowledge of interests Canadian troops were sent all over the globe during his tenure. He left the military so very weak and failed to tell the Canadian people that he had depleted their force of last resort. PM Jean Chrétien killed the military.

But, it is the Canadian people who really killed their military. We elected our national leaders; we the people are responsible. We talk about values but don’t form values. Our perceived moral superiority is soft; we think that everyone loves Canadians. We believe that defence spending is unnecessary. Canadians killed their military.

In concluding Dr. Granatstein offered counsel. Canadian’s need a Prime Minister who can tell the people these things. We need to stop anti-Americanism and be realistic. We need a lot less of playing games. We cannot opt out of North American Defence; otherwise we lose our sovereignty. We need to defend ourselves from too much help from the Americans. The Americans in the defence of the USA will need to defend the approaches to their nation, even if those approaches go through Canada.

The military force cannot be conjured up over night. It took decades to render the military bankrupt it will take a long time to restore it. Who can rebuild the Canadian Forces? We can.

In response to questions he cautioned that engaging Canadians for input to a foreign and defence policy review is likely to be counter productive. Canadians, for the most part, are ill informed on national interests, defence needs and the new world order. Sadly Canadians believe the “blue-beret” peacekeeping myth. The people must be educated [on defence matters].

Summary of the days

The speakers of the CDAI Seminar and the CDA Annual Meeting agree on a number of observations:

- The world is becoming more dangerous and will require more intervention, both armed and humanitarian.
- Canada like other multilateral organizations is handicapped in that its military is not sufficiently robust for current and future tasks. In fact two of the services report themselves “fragile”.
- Both historians agreed that Canadians are tightfisted when asked to fund international endeavours, and that the national leadership neither inspires the population or makes timely strategic decisions. Canadians have shown little enthusiasm for greatly increased defence spending.
- Our closest and largest military ally is at war and will secure their nation regardless of Canadian sensibilities.
- Canada is entering the valley of tough decisions.

Given that the Canadian Forces is approaching an historical nadir of military capability and that the global strategic situation does not tolerate handicapped nations or organizations the way ahead is full of difficulties and hard decisions.