



FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Colonel (Retd) Alain Pellerin, OMM, CD

Our 17th annual seminar, which was presented in association with the Institute for Research on Public Policy and was held on the 22nd of February, had as its theme *The Canadian Forces and the Public*. I am pleased to note that the feedback that has been received has been 100% positive. The seminar proved to be very stimulating and informative, as advertized!

The seminar was well attended by members of the Canadian Forces, senators, members of Parliament and, most importantly, members of the Canadian public, including a large number of students from the DND-sponsored Security and Defence Forum. The day was filled with prominent speakers from across Canada and the United States. Addresses included those of the Minister of National Defence, the Chief of Defence Staff, the Chairman of the Institute for Research on Public Policy, and others from a variety of backgrounds. It was gratifying for the profession of arms to see the lively exchange of views that took place between our panelists and their audiences.

Copies of the addresses that were delivered will appear on our website, www.cda-cdai.ca. Our Senior Defence Analyst, Colonel (Retd) Seán Henry, presents the readers of *ON TRACK* with a summary of the seminar. The 17th annual seminar was our best in years. Our challenge is for all of us to maintain that level of professional interest in the Institute and its work. We can do this but only with your support and continued membership in the CDA Institute.

Contributing to the success of the seminar were Computing Devices Canada (CDC), hosting the CDAI Luncheon, and GM Defense, hosting the CDAI Reception which followed the close of the seminar. The Institute is grateful for the generous support of both CDC and GM Defense.

(continued p.2)

LE MOT DU DIRECTEUR EXÉCUTIF

Colonel (ret) Alain Pellerin, OMM, CD

Notre 17^e séminaire annuel, présenté de concert avec l'Institut de recherche en politiques publiques, a eu lieu le 22 février dernier. Il avait pour thème *Les Forces canadiennes et le public*. J'ai le plaisir de vous signaler que l'événement n'a suscité que des commentaires positifs. Le séminaire s'est avéré très stimulant et instructif, tel qu'annoncé!

Le séminaire a attiré bon nombre de membres des Forces canadiennes, de sénateurs, de membres du Parlement et, ce qui est encore plus important, des gens du public canadien, en particulier le grand nombre d'étudiants du Forum sur la sécurité et la défense. Pendant toute la journée, les participants ont pu assister aux exposés faits par d'éminents conférenciers venus de diverses régions du Canada et des États-Unis. Citons notamment le ministre de la Défense nationale, le président de l'Institut de recherche en politiques publiques, le Chef d'état-major de la Défense et d'autres personnes de formations diverses. Il a été très agréable pour la profession militaire d'assister au vivant échange d'opinions qui a eu lieu entre nos panélistes et leur auditoire.

Les textes des présentations seront affichés sur notre site Web, www.cda-cdai.ca. Notre analyste de défense principal, le colonel (ret) Seán Henry, présente un résumé du séminaire pour le bénéfice des lecteurs de la revue *ON TRACK*. Le 17^e séminaire annuel est le meilleur que nous avons organisé depuis des années. Notre défi consiste maintenant à conserver le même niveau d'intérêt professionnel à l'égard de l'Institut et du travail qu'il accomplit. Nous pouvons y arriver, mais pour cela nous avons be-

(voir p.2)

Donor Patrons of CDAI

Donateur Patrons de l'Institut de la CAD

*Business Council On National Issues/Conseil Canadien des Chefs d'Entreprise - The Molson Foundation - The War Amputations of Canada
Major-General Bruce J. Legge, CMM, CM, K St J, ED, CD, QC
Mr. Howard B. Ripstein, CA - Colonel J.H. Turnbull, OMM, C St J, CD, FCIP*

The annual CDAI seminar was held in conjunction with the 64th AGM of the Conference of Defence Associations at the Fairmont Château Laurier, 21-24 February 2001. The AGM commenced with a meeting of the CDA Council on Wednesday, and carried on with the general meeting Friday, the day following the annual seminar. Of particular interest were the very informative presentations by the chiefs of the environmental staffs at NDHQ, the Director General Reserves and Cadets, and the Executive Director of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. As Executive Director I congratulate the Council for its

(continued p. 3)

The Conference of Defence Associations is a non-governmental, non-profit organization. It restricts its aim to one specific area - **defence issues**. CDA expresses its ideas and opinions and utilizes its political rights to influence government defence policy. It is the most senior and influential interest group in Canada's pro-defence community. Defence issues are brought to the public's attention by analysis and informed discussion through CDA's Institute.

The CDA Institute, a self-supporting entity within CDA, is dependant on private donations. See the donor application form in this newsletter. In return, donors will receive *ON TRACK* and other publications for the next 12 months. The CDA Institute is a registered charity and donations to it qualify for tax receipts.



La Conférence des associations de la Défense est un organisme non-gouvernemental et à but non-lucratif. Son champ d'expertise se limite aux **questions de la défense**. La CAD exprime ses opinions et ses idées et se prévaut de ses droits politiques pour influencer le gouvernement en matière de défense. La CAD est le groupe le plus ancien et ayant le plus d'influence au sein de la communauté canadienne pro-défense.

Les questions de défense sont portées à l'attention du public par le truchement d'analyse et de discussions informées parrainées par l'Institut de la CAD. L'Institut, un organisme autonome, est complètement dépendant des dons reçus. Veuillez donc vous référer au formulaire inclus à ce bulletin. En guise de retour, les donateurs recevront *ON TRACK* et les autres publications pendant les 12 prochains mois. L'Institut de la CAD est un organisme de charité enregistré et tous les dons reçus sont déductibles d'impôt.

Officers - CDA Institute

President/Président.....
Lieutenant-général (Rét) Richard J. Evraire, CMM, CD
Secretary-Treasurer/Secrétaire-trésorier.....
Lieutenant-Colonel (Retd) G.D. Metcalfe, CD
Executive Director/Directeur exécutif.....
Colonel (Retd) A. Pellerin, OMM, CD

Officers - Institut de la CAD

soin de votre appui et de votre constante adhésion à l'Institut de la CAD.

La société Computing Devices Canada, qui a commandité le déjeuner de l'ICAD et GM Defense, qui a assumé les frais de la réception donnée par l'ICAD après la clôture du séminaire, ont aussi contribué au succès de l'événement. L'Institut remercie donc Computing Devices Canada et GM Defense de leur générosité.

Le séminaire annuel de l'ICAD a eu lieu conjointement à la 64^e Assemblée générale annuelle (AGA) de la Conférence des associations de défense à l'hôtel Fairmont Château Laurier, du 21 au 24 février 2001. L'AGA a débuté par une réunion du Conseil de la CAD le mercredi et s'est poursuivie avec l'assemblée générale, le vendredi, au lendemain du séminaire annuel. D'intérêt particulier, étaient les excellentes présentations des chefs d'état-major des forces maritimes, terrestres, et aérienne ainsi que du Directeur général-Réserves et cadets, et le directeur général de la Reserve Officers Association of the United States. À titre de directeur exécutif, je tiens à féliciter le Conseil d'avoir approuvé la nomination du lieutenant-général (ret) Richard Evraire à la présidence de l'Institut de la Conférence des associations de défense. Vous trouverez, à la suite du présent article, les notes biographiques concernant le lieutenant-général Evraire.

Le Mess des officiers de l'Armée de terre a accueilli vendredi soir une foule d'adeptes de l'Institut de la CAD, ainsi qu'un bon nombre des participants au séminaire annuel et à l'AGA, à l'occasion du dîner officiel annuel de la CAD. L'AGA s'est terminée samedi.

Deux des nombreux articles présentés au 3^e symposium des diplômés de l'Institut de la CAD ont été publiés dans le nu-

(voir p. 3)

<i>Contents</i>	<i>Contenu</i>
<i>From the Executive Director</i>	1
<i>Mot du Directeur Exécutif</i>	1
<i>Biography - LGen (Retd) Richard J. Evraire</i>	5
<i>Biographie - LGén (Rét) Richard J. Evraire</i>	4
<i>The Canadian Forces and the Public</i>	5
<i>Les Forces canadiennes et le public</i>	5
<i>On Army's Resurgence</i>	12
<i>Editorial - Maritime Affairs</i>	15
<i>Editorial - National Defence Anyone?</i>	16
<i>Joint Force Development</i>	17

Companions of CDAI

EDS Systemhouse Inc. - Dr. Allan L. Hepburn, CD, MD - Major-General Stuart McDonald, CD - Captain (N) M.J. Pandzich, CD - Captain (N) D.J. Scott, CD, MD, FRCPC (Ret'd) - Mr. Robert G. Tucker - Lieutenant-Colonel J. Roy Weir

Compagnons de l'Ide la CAD

endorsement in the appointment of Lieutenant-général (Ret) Richard Evraire as President Conference of Defence Associations Institute. A biographical sketch of Lieutenant-général Evraire follows this article.

The Army Officers Mess was the scene Friday evening of a large gathering of supporters of the CDA Institute, as well as many who participated in the annual seminar and AGM, for CDA's annual mess dinner. The AGM concluded its business Saturday and adjourned.

Of the many papers that were presented at the CDA Institute's 3rd Annual Graduate Student Symposium, two were published in the Vol 5, No 4 edition of *ON TRACK*. We are pleased to publish in this edition Lieutenant-colonel Richard Giguère's paper *On Army's Resurgence*, which he presented at the symposium. Lieutenant-colonel Giguère outlines the new tendencies that are influencing contemporary military interventions, emphasizing the crucial role played by ground forces. He formulates suggestions that may help the Canadian Army to successfully meet new challenges. Until recently, Lieutenant-colonel Giguère commanded 2^e Battalion Royal 22^e Régiment. He is now pursuing his doctoral thesis at l'Université Laval.

The adequacy of the provision of resources for the Canadian Forces has been a concern of military observers of late. With thanks to the editors for their kind permission we are pleased to re-print two articles that outline the need for adequate resources that our Navy and Air Force need to get their job done. From the Fall 2000 edition of *Maritime Affairs* we have the editorial that reminds us that warships are symbols of their home state, and what that entails.

In the guest editorial for the Winter 2001 edition of *Airforce Magazine*, Lieutenant-General (Retd) David Adamson has written that mobility implies the ability to move the full range of DND equipment over intercontinental distances in compressed periods of time.

In producing *Strategy 2020*, DND recognized that the cold-war era of threat-based planning was obsolete and required a new capability-based approach. Colonel Mark Aruja, Director General Joint Force Development, tells us in *Joint Force Development - Implementing Strategy 2020*, how the Canadian Forces are addressing this requirement with the establishment of the Joint Force Development Division at NDHQ.

(continued p. 4)

méro 4 du vol 5 de la revue *ON TRACK*. En effet, nous avons le plaisir de publier dans le présent numéro le document intitulé « *On Army's Resurgence* », que le lieutenant-colonel Richard Giguère a présenté au symposium. Dans ce document, le lcol Giguère énonce les nouvelles tendances qui influencent les interventions militaires contemporaines, en insistant sur le rôle essentiel que jouent les forces terrestres. L'auteur formule des suggestions qui pourraient aider l'Armée de terre du Canada à relever avec succès les nouveaux défis qui lui sont lancés. Jusqu'à tout dernièrement, le lieutenant-colonel Giguère était commandant du 2^e Bataillon du Royal 22^e Régiment. Il rédige actuellement une thèse de doctorat à l'Université Laval.

Les observateurs militaires se préoccupent depuis quelque temps des ressources à la disposition des Forces canadiennes. Avec la permission des éditeurs, que nous remercions, vous trouverez dans le présent numéro deux articles traitant des ressources dont notre Marine et notre Force aérienne ont besoin pour accomplir leur tâche. Vous pourrez lire dans l'éditorial du numéro de l'automne 2000 de la publication *Maritime Affairs*, que les navires de guerre sont les symboles de leur État d'attache et ce que cela signifie.

À titre de rédacteur invité du numéro d'hiver 2001 du *Airforce Magazine*, le lieutenant-général (ret) David Adamson a écrit que l'on entend par mobilité la capacité de déplacer tout l'équipement du MDN d'un continent à l'autre dans des délais limités.

Lors de l'élaboration de sa *Stratégie 2020*, le MDN a reconnu que l'ère de la guerre froide, où la planification était fondée sur les menaces, est terminée et qu'il faut maintenant adopter une approche axée sur les capacités. Le colonel Mark Aruja, Directeur général - Développement de la force interarmées, nous explique dans « *Joint Force Development - Implementing Strategy 2020* », comment les Forces canadiennes s'y prennent pour répondre à cette exigence avec la mise sur pied de la Division du Développement de la force interarmées au QGDN.

Parmi les principales activités prévues au programme de l'Institut des CAD, citons la remise annuelle du Prix Vimy à un Canadien ayant contribué de façon significative et

(voir p. 4)

Officer Level Donors to CDAI

Donateurs de l'ICAD - niveau d'officier

Honorary Colonel James W. Burns; Mr. M.G. Corbett; Brigadier-General James S. Cox; Dr. Dawson W. Einarson; Dr. Donald Heckman;
Lieutenant-Colonel Markus C. Martin; Colonel (Retd) W.J. McCullough;

One of the major events in the CDA Institute's calendar is the annual presentation of the Vimy Award to one Canadian who has made a significant and outstanding contribution to the defence and security of our nation and the preservation of our democratic values. Last year's award programme was an outstanding success, with the large number of submissions that were received for the consideration of the Vimy Award Jury, and culminating with the presentation of the award to the Honourable Barnett Danson by Her Excellency, the Right Honourable Adrienne Clarkson, Patron of the Conference of Defence Associations.

This year's presentation of the Vimy Award will take place 16 November at a gala dinner that will be held at the Fairmont Château Laurier, in Ottawa. To make the award truly meaningful the Institute needs your nomination for the award's recipient. CDA member associations as well as individuals are encouraged to submit nominations for their candidate to the Institute. Please refer to the notice of the call for nominations which appears elsewhere in this issue.

In closing I wish to remind our readers that without your financial support the national office cannot carry out the work of CDA and the CDA Institute on your behalf. Your past support is reaping dividends through the increased awareness of Canadians for a credible military. We are making some progress. We add to the debate on issues of defence and national security and, with your continued support, we can promote the study and awareness of Canadian military affairs. **Your continued financial support as members of the Institute is vital** to our continuing success. Even better - introduce a fellow Canadian to the Institute.

exceptionnelle à la défense et à la sécurité de notre nation et à la préservation de nos valeurs démocratiques.

Le programme de récompense de l'an dernier s'est révélé un succès retentissant. En effet, le jury chargé de l'attribution du Prix Vimy a reçu un grand nombre de candidatures et a finalement porté son choix sur l'honorable Barnett Danson, qui s'est vu remettre le Prix par Son Excellence la très honorable Adrienne Clarkson, présidente d'honneur de la Conférence des associations de défense.

Cette année, la remise du Prix Vimy aura lieu le 16 novembre lors d'un dîner de gala qui se tiendra à l'hôtel Fairmont Château Laurier, à Ottawa. Pour que ce prix ait réellement de la valeur, il faut que vous fassiez parvenir des mises en candidature à l'Institut. Vous pouvez le faire au nom d'une association membre de la CAD et à titre individuel. Pour de plus amples renseignements, veuillez consulter l'avis d'appel de candidatures publié dans ce numéro.

En guise de conclusion, je me permets de vous rappeler, chers lecteurs, que sans leur soutien financier, le bureau national ne peut accomplir le travail de la CAD et de l'Institut de la CAD en votre nom. L'appui que vous nous avez accordé par le passé porte fruit. En effet, on remarque que les Canadiens sont davantage sensibilisés à l'égard des forces armées qui, elles, font preuve de crédibilité. Nous réalisons des progrès. Nous participons au débat sur les questions de défense et de sécurité nationale et, grâce à votre appui continu, nous pouvons promouvoir l'étude des affaires militaires canadiennes. **Votre soutien financier continu à titre de membres de l'Institut est essentiel** au succès de celui-ci. Faites encore mieux - parlez de l'Institut à un de vos compatriotes.

BIOGRAPHIE

Lieutenant-général Richard J. EVRAIRE, CMM, CD

Né à Ottawa en 1938, le lieutenant-général Evraire fait ses études au Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean (Québec), au Royal Military College de Kingston (Ontario), et à l'Université McGill (baccalauréat ès sciences en génie civil, 1960) (Montréal). Il s'est illustré au sein de l'Armée et des Forces canadiennes de 1954 à 1997.

En 1989, il complète une maîtrise en Administration publique à l'Université Queen's, et en 1994, un baccalauréat ès sciences au Royal Military College de Kingston, Ontario.

(voir p. 5)

ON TRACK
Advertising Rates - Per Issue
Camera-ready material

Full page.....	\$400
Half page.....	\$200
Quarter page.....	\$100
business card size.....	\$ 50

✓ **Members Receive 10% Discount**

Contact the Editor at (613) 236-9903

BIOGRAPHY

Lieutenant-General (Retired) Richard J. Evraire,
CMM, CD

Lieutenant-General Evraire was born in Ottawa in 1938. He attended the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean, Québec (1954-57), the Royal Military College, Kingston, (1957-59), and McGill University where he obtained a BEng (Civil) in 1960. There followed an illustrious career in the Canadian Army and the Canadian Forces from 1954 to 1997.

In 1989, Lieutenant-General Evraire obtained a Master's degree in Public Administration from Queen's University, and in 1994, a BSc from the Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario.

He retired from the Canadian Forces in 1997 upon completion of more than 42 years of military service, and is currently on contract with InterCon Consultants Inc., representatives, in Canada, of Arianespace of France.

Lieutenant-General Evraire was awarded a Doctorate (Honoris Causa) in military sciences from the Royal Military College of Canada in May 1997. In March 1998, he accepted an invitation to become a Research Associate with the Defence Management Studies Program (DMSP) at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. In July 1998, he was appointed by the Chairman of NATO's Military Committee to one of six positions on the NATO Defence College's Academic Advisory Board, a post he will occupy till 2003.

At the 2001 Annual General Meeting of the Conference of Defence Associations, Lieutenant-General Evraire accepted the appointment of President Conference of Defence Associations Institute.

Le 1er mai 1997, le lieutenant-général Evraire prend sa retraite des Forces armées après plus de 42 ans de service. Il est actuellement Conseillé principal avec la compagnie InterCon Consultants Inc., représentants au Canada de Arianespace, France.

En mai 1997, le lieutenant-général Evraire est nommé Docteur (Honoris Causa) en sciences militaires par le Sénat du Collège militaire royal du Canada. En mars 1998, il accepte de devenir Rechercheur-associé, Programme d'études en gestion de défense, Université Queen's, Kingston, Ontario. En juillet 1998, il est nommé au Comité-conseil de Pédagogie du Collège de défense de l'OTAN, Rome, poste qu'il occupera jusqu'en mai 2003.

Lors de l'assemblée générale annuelle de la Conférence des associations de la défense, le lieutenant-général Evraire a accepté le poste de Président de l'Institut de la Conférence des associations de la défense.

CDA INSTITUTE 17TH ANNUAL SEMINAR THE CANADIAN FORCES AND THE PUBLIC

Colonel (Retd) Seán Henry, OMM, CD Senior Defence Analyst CDA

The seventeenth Annual Seminar of the CDA Institute was held in Ottawa on February 22, 2001, in conjunction with the CDA Annual General Meeting. Welcome and opening remarks were delivered by **Lieutenant-General (Retd) Richard Evraire**, President CDA Institute. He welcomed the distinguished speakers, and the large turnout of seminar participants. He noted that although public support for the Canadian Forces had weathered the storms of the early 1990s, the relationship still needed work. In particular, for CDA Institute, there was a need to explore new ways to execute

its mandate to inform the public on matters of defence.

The Honourable Arthur C. Eggleton, Minister of National Defence, delivered the Introductory Address. He opened his remarks by stating that the work of CDA and CDA Institute was both useful and valuable in putting the message regarding defence issues and the Canadian Forces before

(continued p. 8)

CONFERENCE OF DEFENCE ASSOCIATIONS INSTITUTE

WISHES TO THANK OUR SPONSORS FOR THEIR GENEROUS SUPPORT OF THE

17TH ANNUAL SEMINAR

THE CANADIAN FORCES AND THE PUBLIC

Computing Devices Canada

A GENERAL DYNAMICS COMPANY

Sponsor Seminar Luncheon



Sponsor Seminar Reception

L'INSTITUT DE LA CONFÉRENCE DES ASSOCIATIONS DE LA DÉFENSE
DÉSIRE REMERCIER SES COMMANDITAIRES POUR LEUR GÉNÉREUX APPUI AU
17^E SÉMINAIRE
LES FORCES CANADIENNES ET LE PUBLIC

Computing Devices Canada **A GENERAL DYNAMICS COMPANY**

Commanditaire du déjeuner



Commanditaire de la réception

the public. He indicated it was a two-way process, with an informed public contributing to the formation of beneficial government policy. In this respect, the public showed support for peacekeeping and human rights. Overall, recent polls showed there was an 80% approval rating for the armed forces. The government is now in part drawing on this support to increase the budget of DND after the severe cuts dating from the mid-1990s. He noted that in addition to the \$2.5 billion added in the last two years, there would likely be Supplementary Estimates to Budget 2000, to cover items such as quality of life, pay increases, and capital projects. (the Supplementary Estimates totalled \$624 million). He did indicate, however, that even with new money there was not enough to cover all requirements. Tough choices would still have to be made.

The Minister then surveyed the past year regarding the Department and the Canadian Forces. He covered items such as the ongoing process of reform in many areas; the need to recruit more and better-qualified people; the importance of quality of life measures, including health care; the effort to increase money allocated to capital. He also commented on evolving concepts for commitment of the Canadian forces to overseas operations. This included the ability “to get in and out quickly,” and implied the need for improved strategic air and sea transport resources. He also spoke on the importance of Canada/US security relations, including Nuclear Missile Defence (NMD), critical infrastructure, and interoperability in coalition operations. There are no plans for a defence review or a new white paper. The aim is to make the 1994 version more efficient and effective. He noted that the Chief of the Defence Staff had reported that the CF was more operationally effective today than they were ten years ago.

The Keynote Address for the seminar was presented by **Mr. Hugh Segal**, President, Institute for Research on Public Policy. He opened by commenting that Canadians seldom consider that the present good times could easily turn to bad times. This has been the case with optimistic remarks about the economy, and was reflected during the election and the Speech from the Throne. There is a similar attitude on the part of the public towards defence policy and the state of the Canadian Forces. They do not perceive any shortfalls, nor do they perceive any major threat to Canadian well being. There was not one reference to security issues in the recent election campaign – surely an exceptional situation for a G-7 nation confronting much international instability.

The public must be informed by the senior leadership of the serious deficiencies in the Canadian Forces. The annual reports to Parliament do not tell the real story. DND has been too good at doing more with less – thereby moving closer to a breaking point. As in the US, there needs to be public debate in parliament and elsewhere on important issues of national security. Senior

military officers should be allowed to comment within this debate. The Canadian public needs to know what the realities are.

NMD presents a rare and important opportunity to initiate national debate on security. One can be assured that the anti-defence and anti-US interests will be out in force. It is wrong that the government should regard national security as a blank cheque which it may write as it sees fit, without public discussion. This situation could not be changed overnight, as it has gone on for so long and the public ignorance (of the real issues and real state of the CF) is so extensive. There is a real danger of quiet government approval of *faits accomplis* or policy flip-flops.

Enhanced trade relations and national well being are seldom put forward as elements of defence policy. The typical Canadian approach is to avoid issues and instead muddle through. What the public is unaware of is that there could be a steep price to be paid for such inattention. In summary, there is a new world emerging. There are new threats, and a new young generation in Canada which has no concept of national security. They also do not understand that the military is a unique institution, which needs special attention. Once again, the anti-defence forces are mobilizing to exploit this situation, and they do not expect to be challenged. This must change.

Panel 1 – *How the Canadian Public Views the Canadian Forces* was moderated by **Dr. David Haglund**, Director, Centre for International Relations, Queen’s University. He opened by stating that in Canada public opinion is a constraint on defence policy formulation. It is therefore a concern that the public does not really understand defence or the military – in spite of being broadly supportive of both.

Dr. Jack Granatstein, distinguished historian and former Director of the Canadian War Museum, stated that throughout 300 years of history the Canadian military has gone through successive cycles of feast and famine. This follows largely from public perceptions of the threat the public divides into pro and anti-military factions. There is also a trend today towards believing it is better for Canadians to do peacekeeping rather than war fighting – to leave the latter to the US and others. However, if Canada does go to war, then the public demands that we be the best!

There are also a number of persistent background elements that complicate the situation. These include the lingering conflict between reserves and regulars; the Militia ‘myth’ that in times of peril people will emerge trained and ready to go; an array of modern social factors such as the need to enrol women and minorities; an evolving rights-based society. The need for the military to reflect these new Canadian values was underscored

(continued p. 9)

THE VIMY AWARD

Nominations are invited for the year 2001 Vimy Award.

The Vimy Award was initiated in 1991 to recognize, annually, one Canadian who has made a significant and outstanding contribution to the defence and security of our nation and the preservation of our democratic values.

Previous recipients of this prestigious award include the Right Honourable Brian Dickson, General John deChastelain, Vice-Admiral Larry Murray, Lieutenant-Général Charles H. Belzile, Major-General Lewis MacKenzie, Dr. Jack Granatstein, and the Honourable Barnett Danson.

Any Canadian may nominate a fellow citizen for the award. Nominations must be in writing and be accompanied by a summary of the reasons for your nomination. Nominations must be received by 1 August 2001, and should be addressed to:

VIMY AWARD SELECTION COMMITTEE
CONFERENCE OF DEFENCE ASSOCIATIONS INSTITUTE
359 KENT STREET, SUITE 502
OTTAWA ON K2P 0R7

The Vimy Award will be presented on Friday, 16 November 2001, at a gala dinner that will be held at the Fairmont Château Laurier, Ottawa.

For more information, including ticket orders for the Award dinner, contact the Conference of Defence Associations Institute at the above address, or Fax (613) 236 8191; E-mail cdai@cda-cdai.ca; or telephone (613) 236 9903.

LA DISTINCTION HONORIFIQUE VIMY

Nous invitons les nominations pour la Distinction honorifique Vimy 2001.

La distinction honorifique Vimy a été instituée en 1991 dans le but de reconnaître, chaque année, le Canadien ou la Canadienne ayant apporté une contribution extraordinaire à la sécurité ou à la défense de notre nation et à la préservation de notre démocratie.

Les récipiendaires précédents de la Distinction honorifique Vimy sont, entre autres, le Très honorable Brian Dickson, le Général John deChastelain, le Vice-amiral Larry Murray, le Lieutenant-général Charles H. Belzile, le Major-général Lewis MacKenzie, le Dr. Jack Granatstein, et l'Honorable Barnett Danson.

Tout Canadien/Canadienne peut nommer un citoyen/citoyenne pour la distinction honorifique Vimy. Les nominations doivent nous parvenir par écrit et accompagnées d'un sommaire des raisons motivant votre nomination et une courte biographie du candidat. Les nominations doivent nous parvenir au plus tard le 1 août 2001, et doivent être adressées au:

COMITÉ DE SÉLECTION DE LA DISTINCTION HONORIFIQUE VIMY
L'INSTITUT DE LA CONFÉRENCE DES ASSOCIATIONS DE LA DÉFENSE
359 RUE KENT, SUITE 502
OTTAWA ON K2P 0R7

La Distinction honorifique Vimy sera présentée vendredi, le 16 novembre 2001, à un dîner gala qui aura lieu au Fairmont Château Laurier à Ottawa.

Pour de plus amples informations, incluant la demande de billets pour le banquet, veuillez contacter l'Institut de la conférence des associations de la Défense à l'adresse ci-haut mentionnée, ou Télécopieur (613) 236 8191; courriel cdai@cda-cdai.ca; ou téléphone (613) 236 9903.

by the demise of the Canadian Airborne Regiment. The public remains largely ignorant of defence policy and the military. The public still wants the latter to "do it all," but at little cost. This is not sensible, but it is the reality that must be faced.

Mr. David Hanley, journalist, and former member of The Ottawa Citizen editorial board, made the point that the public does not

think often of the military, but does have a high regard for it. The problem is, the public does not "understand" the military. Blame for this lies with a diminishing presence in local communities, and a falling number people with personal experience, who can "tell" new generations of the realities

(continued p. 10)

of defence and military service.

Overall, people believe what they are told, and today they are not being told the right things. This is especially important since it means losing the younger generation. As well, headlines in the newspapers tend to blame soldiers themselves for scandals and other problems. Little is said to indicate that it is the government and the public who are responsible through under funding and lack of concrete support. As in the past, only disasters at home and overseas will grab public attention, but then it may be too late. Don't blame the media. Be pro-active to inform the media. Then don't look at the headlines, look at the content of articles. Pro-defence forces must be good storytellers, rather than always being severely critical.

Mr. Jocelyn Coulon, Director, Pearson Peacekeeping Centre (Montreal) observed that Canada does not have a military tradition similar to many of its allies. Often public perception of the military reflects a melange of outlooks – depending on whether current operations are viewed as positive or negative. There is also an emerging array of sociological problems for the military that never existed before. The question then is how to go about informing the public and making necessary changes to their perceptions.

Since the end of the Cold War the Canadian military image has changed dramatically. Today the peacekeeping image is dominant. But ultimately, the role of the military is to defend and advance Canadian national interests. The Canadian Forces are undoubtedly struggling, but this has not been conveyed to the public in a meaningful way. Overall, the public outlook is positive, and conveying the positive elements of Canada's image in the world should reinforce this.

Mr. David Pratt, MP, opened by noting that in the recent past the relations between soldiers and politicians have often been strained. He observed this must be resolved and that accurate public information is a key element. There have been some improvements here, and the results of a recent very extensive poll reflect it. In general the results are in the 80% to 90% approval rate for the CF doing a good job, especially in the area of peacekeeping operations. There is also a good understanding that the CF suffer because of a lack of adequate equipment and other resources. As well, up to 80% see the need for a strong military to serve and advance Canadian interests at home and abroad. 95% support peacekeeping and human security missions, but 90% also support the use of military force if necessary. 64% see the world as becoming more dangerous through nuclear proliferation, drugs, terrorism, NBCW threats. Women are more pessimistic in this regard. Even the need for more funding is supported by 78% of respondents – but only 37% think the DND budget is being managed well.

In summary, the public support the military and agrees it needs more resources to do its job. The problem is, defence takes a back seat in relation to many other public needs – especially those relating to social policy. In spite of this, the data show there is a strong foundation to build on in terms of cultivating public support for defence policy and the CF.

The time to engage in public debate has never been better, and Mr. Pratt looks forward to participating in it. (He has since been appointed Chairman of the Standing Committee on Defence and Veterans Affairs). He looks forward to working with CDA/CDAI. If defence problems are out of sight, they are out of mind. They must be placed more in the public view.

The afternoon session opened with an address by **General Maurice Baril**, Chief of the Defence Staff. He stated that the topic of the seminar was very important. If it could be somewhat ignored in the past, that was not the case today. The relationship that exists between Canadians and their military is complex, and has far-reaching effects on defence-related issues.

He then reviewed the past year from a CF operational perspective. The operational tempo remained high, although not as high as the end of 1999, when some 4500 troops were deployed overseas. Today that number stands at approximately 3000. He then outlined peace support commitments to NATO and the United Nations, noting that in several cases Canadian general officers were in command of specific missions. As well, there was a heavy commitment to activities in Canada, such as search and rescue, sovereignty operations, assistance to law enforcement, and so on.

He then remarked that although the CF must serve Canadians and respond to their values and beliefs, the relationship between the military and the public is unique. There is no avoiding the development of a distinct military culture to ensure that military missions may be accomplished. Unfortunately, the profile of the CF is relatively low, due to downsizing and limited contact with the general population – and yet this is the time when the profile should be raised to justify the resources needed to assure the well being of Canadians.

To add to the problem a long list of other priorities are competing for government attention. Hence, building a productive CF/public relationship is not an afterthought, it is essential. He then listed a number of initiatives undertaken to open up communication, and noted that members of the CF are encouraged to speak in public about what they do.

Perhaps the biggest challenges today are to recruit more people and respond to the Revolution in Military Affairs. To re-establish

(continued p. 11)

strong links in local communities, Militia strength will be increased and training and equipment states will be improved. In the end, however, the CF remains hard-pressed, and will have to continue to make tough choices, and improve efficiency.

Panel 2 – How the Canadian Forces View the Public was chaired by **Major-General (Retd) Lewis MacKenzie**, former Commander UN forces in Sarajevo. He noted that the gap between the CF and public is not as wide as some interpret it. However, DND does not handle itself well in communicating about problems within the CF. Overall, there is a public hunger for detailed and truthful information about the CF which remains largely unfulfilled. Although it might be distasteful to some, the route to improvement of the state of the CF is through politics.

Do people really believe the armed forces are in better shape today than they were ten years ago? Senior leaders should have the right to speak frankly. Part of the problem is the way in which members of DND and the CF view the public – an adversarial outlook is counter-productive.

Sergeant Athur Majoor, Royal Canadian Regiment, stated that without public interest in the problems of the CF there would be no political will generated to force the government to act on improvements. Problems associated with an increased tempo of operations, falling personnel strength, rust-out of equipment are made much worse in the face of rapid changes caused by new threats and improved technology.

Contact with the CF is reduced because most bases are far from centres of population. However, even in cities like London, ON, where there has been a military presence since the 1800s, the public is surprised to see people in uniform. The public sees the military mainly through the lens of CNN and the image of high-tech war. Local military news is often bad news. Hence, it is often easier to cast the armed forces aside, rather than try to understand them. There is a new young generation out there that has little knowledge of past Canadian military achievements or current military operations. If the CF sees the public as indifferent, or worse still as the enemy, there is a risk of alienation of the public, with adverse effects on political support. Members of the CF must take the lead to educate the public.

Major-General (Retd) Reginald Lewis, former Chief of Reserves, indicated that the Reserves may be more effective in addressing CF problems than the public and the politicians realise.

Reserves have leverage because they are closer to both

the public and the politicians. This should be exploited by DND. Instead, the reverse is true as the Reserves have been downgraded.. It seems that for the last 30 years, the problems have remained the same: little public interest in defence; media ignorance; the myth of peacekeeping; the constant CF fight for resources to do their job. There is a need to be able to discuss the realities of defence with the public.

Sources, such as the CDA website and the Canadian Military Journal are excellent and need to be utilized. A revised and expanded officer training scheme in the universities (like the old Canadian Officers Training Contingent) would pay large dividends.

General (Ret) Anthony Zinni, former CINC US Central Command, indicated that the seminar topic was of special interest to him, since during his last years of active service he spent considerable time speaking to civilian groups.

In most democracies the problems of military/civilian interface and understanding are similar. It must be remembered that the military is under civilian control – but the military have an obligation to ensure the public understands defence issues and the needs of the armed forces. Senior military leadership has a particular responsibility in this respect. However, once the government approves a policy, the military must get on with it. Also in democracies the public wants the military to reflect its values.

Sometimes there are problems because of the special nature of military service, which requires suspension of some rights. Ultimately, the public will get the kind of military it wants. The militia system usually results in better communication between the public and the military. Volunteer armies tend to become isolated.

Relationships with the media are also of concern. Scandal sells. Example of Somalia – Canadians were outstanding, but people did want to hear about that. Today, the military does not appear on the screens of most young people. However, there is still a need for the warrior ethos. Accountability for the military is a first priority – but not for civilians.

In the end, the public and the military are part of the same family. On this basis, you cannot quit and go into a bunker mentality. Continue to fight the good fight to improve public understanding of the military.

Summary. A seminar summary was conducted by **The Honourable J.J. Blais**, former Minister of National Defence. He observed that one needs to deal with reality in the realm of politics. For example, a number of speakers were obligated to say things they would rather not have said. In this respect, the work of CDA/CDAI in conveying the pro-defence message to the public is

(continued p. 12)

of vital assistance to the Minister of National Defence. The progress made in the last two years with additions to the DND budget will continue with the Supplementary Estimates. This momentum should be exploited and increased.

A number of important points emerged during the seminar. Foremost amongst these was the principle that, in a democracy, the military is subordinate to the civil authorities within the rule of law. This is reinforced by the reality that war is politics by other means.

The question of the how far the military can proceed in

discussing problems in public is a sensitive one. In the case of the CDS, he has it about right. He has said that if the level of activity remains high he will need more resources.

Another important point brought forth in the discussions was that there is quite high public support for the CF. This needs to be exploited. However, in the end, the CF will still have to reflect Canadian society and this is proving to be problematical. It is one more aspect of the era of seminal change in which we live.

Finally, keep in mind that the most important motivator of politicians is public opinion.

ON ARMY'S RESURGENCE

*Lieutenant-colonel Richard Giguère, Royal 22^e Régiment,
Chargé de recherche à l'Institut Québécois des Hautes Études Internationales, Université Laval, Québec*

In this postmodern era¹, the discussion surrounding the use of armed forces for the promotion of political objectives is more timely than ever. All over the world, military formations are called upon to fulfill non-traditional roles, primarily in the context of operations other than wars. The end of the Cold War, far from making military power obsolete, resulted in the multiplication of military interventions for purposes of international peacekeeping and security. Consequently, the armed forces are seeing increasing action, as a paradoxical debate arises about issues such as the right and duty to intervene by means of military deployment, the size of defense budgets², the impact of new information technologies and the ensuing potential revolution in military affairs, the emergence of asymmetric threats, the 'zero dead' doctrine and the public condemnation of collateral damages and human losses in our ranks, etc. This paper aims to outline the new tendencies that are influencing contemporary military interventions, to emphasize the crucial role played by ground forces within such interventions and to formulate suggestions that may help the Canadian Army to successfully meet future challenges so that it will be perceived by political leaders as an efficient and useful instrument to support our diplomacy by other means.

The first part of my presentation will address three factors that I consider of the foremost importance: the context of action, enemy forces and friendly forces.

En ce qui concerne l'analyse du cadre d'actions et son évolution, rappelons-nous que la réforme des missions de paix fut un sujet sérieusement débattu lors du Sommet du Millénaire organisé au siège de l'ONU au début de septembre dernier. Endossant les principales recommandations du Rapport Brahimi, les membres du Conseil de sécurité désirent de toute évidence

animer les opérations de maintien de la paix d'un nouveau souffle de vitalité et d'efficacité, prônant entre autres la définition réaliste des mandats en fonction des réalités vécues sur le terrain et l'octroi de ressources suffisantes.³ Les débats visaient de toute évidence à donner des dents aux Casques bleus déployés de par le monde dans le but de leur permettre d'effectuer leur mandat plus efficacement, d'autant plus que certains spécialistes sont convaincus que l'impartialité onusienne n'est pas sans limite et que les Casques bleus pourraient avoir le devoir de se battre, surtout s'ils se trouvent opposés à des gens qui font peu de cas du droit humanitaire.⁴ Au plan stratégique, voilà donc pour le discours.

Au plan opérationnel et tactique, ces vœux sont-ils pragmatiques? La condamnation par l'opinion publique des dommages collatéraux et des pertes humaines ouvre grand la porte aux apôtres de la guerre déshumanisée, de la guerre à distance, ces disciples de Douhet⁵ qui prônent les frappes chirurgicales et l'utilisation massive des armes de haute précision. L'affaire du Kosovo nous donne une preuve flagrante de cette nouvelle tendance dans le règlement des crises contemporaines. Les interventions militaires et l'usage de la force se font de plus en plus au nom des droits universels et non plus seulement et strictement pour défendre et promouvoir ses seuls intérêts. La tendance n'est pas à une diminution des opérations mais bien à une augmentation dans le cadre de mandats encore plus difficiles à faire respecter, le consentement des partis en présence n'étant pas nécessairement l'apanage des missions humanitaires. À l'ère de la primauté de l'emploi des armes de haute technologie, des règles d'engagement restrictives, des pertes humaines et des dommages collatéraux

(continued/voir p. 13)

inconcevables et des échecs interdits, comment allons-nous pouvoir exiger de nos commandants d'être plus incisifs sur le terrain, surtout quand nos intérêts nationaux sont plus ou moins en jeu?

As concerns enemy forces, the emergence of new types of threats is worthy of note. Asymmetric and transnational security threats, for instance, include organized crime, all forms of terrorist action, migratory flows, urbanization, epidemics and other health risks, ecological and environmental disasters, and climate perturbations.⁶ These non-traditional threats are increasingly perceived as security threats by the capitals of the world. Should the military forces be involved in the fight against such threats? It may be pertinent to remember the famous words of Brigadier Norman Wilson-Smith, who declared about peacekeeping in 1964: "Peacekeeping is no job for a soldier, but a job only a soldier can do". Would we be justified to conclude, paraphrasing Wilson-Smith, that "Asymmetric threats are no job for a soldier, but a job only a soldier can do"? Personally, I believe that the military forces will see their role intensify in the fight against threats of that nature. In addition, one reality must be taken into consideration: traditional threats did not disappear with the fall of the Berlin wall. On this subject, it is interesting to refer to a defense document published on October 16, 2000 by the Chinese government, in which the United States are singled out as the number one enemy.⁷ We may be justified in feeling that fairness and peace in the world are not close at hand and that members of the armed forces need not fear unemployment in the near future.

A propos des forces armées, l'ouvrage de Moskos⁸ est éducatif en ce qui concerne les bouleversements vécus par les forces armées en cette époque post-moderne. Moskos et les auteurs ayant contribué à son ouvrage concluent à cinq changements organisationnels majeurs influençant les armées contemporaines : dans un premier temps, les civils occupent une place de plus en plus importante au sein des forces armées; les différenciations traditionnelles entre les armes, les branches, les grades, les forces de combat versus les forces de soutien s'amenuisent graduellement; le rôle traditionnel des forces armées axé sur le combat et les guerres évolue vers des rôles plutôt orientés vers des missions non-militaires; des forces de coalition et multinationales sont de plus en plus utilisées sous la gouverne d'institutions supranationales comme l'ONU ou l'OTAN; finalement, les forces armées se retrouvent de plus en plus diversifiées à l'interne.

The partial conclusions that may be drawn from this brief analysis of the three factors examined here are the following:

- In the foreseeable future, the armed forces are likely to be involved in settling various types of conflicts, within a wide

variety of operations. Humanitarian interventions will multiply and the consent of interested parties will not necessarily be a pre-requisite for international peacekeeping and security interventions. Therefore, the armed forces will still be called upon frequently, in the context of more ambiguous mandates.

- While traditional security threats have not disappeared, military personnel will be increasingly confronted with asymmetric threats in the performance of their duties, placing them in situations for which they are not adequately trained.
- The realities of the postmodern world force us to reassess the current state of the military. We must ask ourselves whether the Canadian Forces in their present condition, shaped as they are by obsolete Cold War parameters, are in a position to react appropriately to future challenges in terms of technology, doctrine and organization.

I would like to offer a brief plea for the cause of the ground forces' role in crisis management. The importance of the ground forces should not be diminished in this information age. We must exercise caution when heeding the siren's song of high-tech weapons or distance hits. In an article published last summer in *Parameters*, William Hawkins wrote: "Clearly, the notion that air strikes can break the will of the enemy is as old as the biplane, but it has yet to be proven, even in the days of stealth fighters and cruise missiles".⁹ We should not think that we will be able to settle future conflicts through massive bombings with high-tech missiles. If we adhere to Raymond Aron's interpretation of Clausewitz¹⁰, the ultimate objective of war is peace, not military victories. Air strikes may secure victories but only soldiers can ensure durable peace. Soldiers need to be deployed on the ground, with all the associated risks. It may be wise to remember the words of historian Fehrenbach: "You may fly over a land forever; you may bomb it, pulverize it, and wipe it clean of life – but if you desire to defend it, protect it and keep it for civilization, you must do this on the ground, the way the Roman legions did".¹¹ Hawkins also alludes to the Romans: "War is about politics and politics is about governing of land and people. Enhanced sensors and precision-guided weapons may have greatly improved search and destroy operations, but technology is not a strategy. When the smoke clears, it still takes boots on the ground to consolidate a victory that really matters. In that respect, two millennia of scientific progress has not made the cruise missile a more effective tool of high politics than the Roman Legionnaires."¹² A last quotation taken from Hawkins will conclude my plea: "A squad of infantry that can kick the door of the presidential palace, haul down its flag, and hoist the Stars and Stripes in its place is still the ultimate weapon of war".¹³ There is no doubt that this proposition

(continued/voir p. 14)

provides some food for thought. I am not seeking to minimize the significance of technology in our profession. It is necessary; however, to be sufficiently intuitive and courageous to set the right priorities. I am often reminded of the title of an article published in the January 20, 1992 edition of *Newsweek*, following the success of the Desert Storm operation: “High Tech Pays, but People still Win Wars”.

We have to think differently about defense: would it be advisable, for instance, to establish a new Canadian government agency to oversee not only defense but global security matters as well, a super-department of defense and security, which would deal with traditional and emerging asymmetric threats and coordinate needs and resources? It has become clear that the Department of Defense cannot be the sole repository of security in Canada. Other departments are gradually more involved and efficient coordination is essential. Many new threats could fall between the cracks of the different ministerial areas of responsibility.

We have to renew the military, yet the budgets presently allocated to defense and the need to modernize equipment generally result in further cuts in personnel. We are rationalizing military formations that have not changed one iota since the fall of the Berlin wall. I am not questioning the current make-up of our armed forces. What I am suggesting is that in light of the changes taking place in this postmodern era, we should make sure that our formations and units fully meet contemporary requirements. In order to maintain our credibility (and budgets), we must absolutely avoid being viewed as preparing for yesterday’s war.

We have to contend with the landmarks of the new strategic context. Military leaders must now learn to manage the unpredictable, at a more significant level than during the Cold War. We must not only evolve, but transform ourselves. We must question our present certainties and expertise. The paradigms of the Cold War are debatable and should be discussed. They have to be preserved or changed. We must address the challenges presented by tomorrow’s potential conflicts and not prepare for yesterday’s war.

Quoting the words of General Douhet, who declared that victory belongs to those who foresee the changes in the character of war and not to those who wait until they happen before they adapt, I will conclude with an African proverb that is both very wise and timely: “Shall we wait until we are defeated before we change?”¹⁴

¹ About this issue, refer to Moskos, Charles C., John Allen Williams and David Segal, *The Postmodern Military*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

² Canada’s defense budget totals \$11 billion, or 1.1% of its GNP. A recent article published in an Ottawa daily estimated that an additional \$4.8 billion would be required to honor the present commitments of the Canadian Armed Forces and modernize equipment. See “In Defence of Defence”, *Ottawa Citizen*, October 21, 2000.

³ Le rapport Brahimi a été très bien accueilli par les membres du Conseil de sécurité lors du Sommet du Millénaire. Douze de ses membres l’ont longuement cité dans leurs interventions. Kpatindé, Francis, « Lakhdar Brahimi : Que faire des casques bleus » dans *Jeune Afrique/L’intelligent*, no 2071, 19-25 septembre 2000, p. 35.

⁴ Kpatindé, op.cit., p. 37.

⁵ “Avoir la maîtrise du ciel, c’est avoir la victoire.”

⁶ See the article by Paul J. Smith “Transnational Security Threats and State Survival : A Role for the Military” *Parameters*, Autumn 2000, pp. 77-91.

⁷ Leicester, John, “Chinese prepare for war with the U.S.”, *Washington Times*, October 23, 2000.

⁸ Moskos, Charles C., op. cit.

⁹ Hawkins, William R., “Imposing Peace: Total vs Limited Wars, and the Need to Put Boots on the Ground “, *Parameters*, Summer 2000, pp. 72-82.

¹⁰ See Aron, Raymond, *Clausewitz, Philosopher of War*, Prentice Hall, N.J., 1985, p. 97.

¹¹ Fehrenbach T.R., *This Kind of War: A Study in Unpreparedness*, Cardinal, New York, 1964, p. 454.

¹² Hawkins, op.cit.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Dogon proverb quoted in Chaliand, Gérard, *Anthropologie mondiale de la stratégie*, Robert Laffont, Paris, 1990.

EDITORIAL: MARITIME AFFAIRS

(The following editorial appeared in the Fall 2000 edition of Maritime Affairs. Re-printed here with kind permission of the editor)

With a new government imminent we have to wonder what the future holds for Canada's maritime dimension. Will it get the political attention it so desperately needs? If we are to believe all the pre-election rhetoric then perhaps some key issues may be held in a brighter political light. *Maritime Affairs* has several concerns that we hope will be high on the next government's agenda: shipbuilding, helicopters, and oceans management top that list.

The past few months have, however, been marked with two particularly significant tragedies that we believe need acknowledgment. The loss of the Russian submarine *Kursk* brought home to those of us who have served in submarines the risks associated with those vessels. It is fair to say that many of us have survived crises at sea and have thought on more than one occasion that our survival was in doubt. But it is the families who wait ashore who face the greatest uncertainty and do so bravely not knowing the fate of their loved ones. Our deepest sympathies go to all those who lost family members in *Kursk*.

It was a human tragedy that unfortunately became trapped in the media feeding frenzy for sensationalism. It was sickening, to say the least, to hear so-called "experts" speculate on speculation in the light of the uncertain situation aboard the crippled submarine with so little regard for the anxiety of those who had family aboard *Kursk*. Enough said!

The other tragedy was the terrorist attack on the USS *Cole* in harbour in Yemen. Our sympathies also go to the families who lost members in that explosion. Recent first-hand accounts of the situation in Aden as the *Cole* begins to get itself seaworthy are telling, not only of the awful conditions but also of the state of mind of the survivors. The stench below decks was so bad that the crew had to sleep on deck despite the 90 degree plus temperatures. The electrical power system was damaged and so there almost no light throughout the ship. Despite what has been said officially, resentment and suspicion of the local community exists, and the *Cole*'s crew was naturally leery of eating anything prepared ashore.

How easy it is to forget that warships are symbols of their

home state and thus vulnerable to any lunatic who wants to make a statement against that state. Yes, those ships can be protected, and they can be kept out of potentially dangerous waters and ports, and extensive security measures can be put in place. But what kind of signal does that send to the host? More importantly, what kind of host would perpetrate that kind of outrage against a guest? The world is not the wonderful, friendly "global village" many would have us believe. It is still wracked with resentment and hatred that fuel the fires of cowardly violence.

Many states, including Canada, use their navies to support foreign policy initiatives and this requires that individual warships and their crews go 'in harm's way' from time to time. Members of coast guards and other government agencies charged with the preservation of law and order and safety at sea must also take risks in doing their work. It is unconscionable, therefore, that governments not provide safe equipment—vessels and aircraft—for those people to use. It is also totally unacceptable when political rather than operational considerations are allowed to determine what new equipment is bought.

If Canadian governments, of whatever political stripe, intend to keep on using the military to support foreign policy initiatives, they should accept the basic fact that parts of the world remain violent and Canadian servicemen and women thus have to run risks to do their political masters' bidding in those places.

Canadian warships and their helicopters, which serve as extensions of the ships capabilities as well as having unique capabilities of their own, are frequently put in harm's way in government service. How many Canadian warships, for instance, have been deployed to the uncertain waters of the Middle East? More than most people recognize! What would happen if a terrorist cell chose to make their statement against a Canadian warship? After all, in their eyes we are part of the coalition led by the "Great Satan" and thus a potential target. If the government intends to use its navy and coast guard as instruments of its foreign and domestic policies, there should be an acceptance that the men and women who go forth to do the government's bidding be given the best equipment possible.

We have said much of this before and we will say it again until the government accepts that it has an obligation to ensure the physical safety of its seagoing servants.

EDITORIAL: NATIONAL DEFENCE ANYONE?

Lieutenant-General (Retd) David Anderson, CD

(National Defence Anyone? first appeared as the guest editorial in the Winter 2001 edition of Airforce Magazine. Re-printed here with kind permission of the editor)

Now that our latest national emergency has ended - i.e. 'How to get re-elected by seeking advice from the electorate on how to spend the mounting budgetary surplus' - it is time to reconsider the policies and priorities of the Department of National Defence. Certainly the rhetoric on the hustings provided little illumination of the topic other than being 'conspicuous by its absence.'

Notwithstanding that, candidates of all stripes ranted on in glowing terms on the world scene and our annual rating by the United Nations as the best country in the world in which to live. So much for a reputation that was attained over four decades through our humanitarian and foreign aid programs and our military support of United Nations peacekeeping efforts around the world. Those were the golden years when our air force and our army filled valued and essential roles in Europe and our navy and air force made a major contribution to insulating North America to the threat from the seas. During that time we had the flexibility in numbers, personnel, budget, and equipment to meet our military commitments and to respond to humanitarian emergencies. As the song goes, "we thought it would never end" - but it did.

It ended for a number of reasons. First, on the success of the Marshall Plan which rebuilt central Europe and in so doing relegated Canada to a world position subordinate to France and Germany. Second, a major adjustment came with the rising tide of technology and all that has followed to bring about the obsolescence of policies that no longer meet either the economic or the military equation. In some measure both the governments of the day and the military ourselves failed to recognize the degree to which this world economic power change would impact our national policies. In essence a united Europe became strong enough to defend European interests while the collapse of communist doctrine brought credible advances in disarmament and a substantial de-escalation in the level of nuclear confrontation.

How then should Canada structure its military forces to ensure national security, while enabling a credible response to international requirements for humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping? This is the conundrum that successive governments have failed to resolve despite severe adjustments

and morale-shaking cultural reorganizations of our military forces. The generally accepted political term that best describes Canada's military requirements seems to be , 'a force that is lightly equipped and highly mobile.'

Mobility implies the ability to move the full range of DND equipment over intercontinental distances in compressed periods of time. It is apparent that the quality and capability of our airlift resources is insufficient to meet that criteria. While Canada has a sizeable force of CC-130 HERCULES aircraft the CC-130 cannot accommodate the full range of army equipment. It is an undersized tactical intra-theatre aircraft that we have utilized as a strategic resource capability. By present day standards it is slow, and inefficient over the intercontinental ranges to which Canada is required to react.

A second military mobility requirement is to maintain national control over the resources we utilize to deploy our personnel and equipment. The spectre of chartering heavy lift aircraft, and ships too, that may be operated and maintained at levels that do not necessarily meet our standards is a derogation of our responsibilities to our personnel. Moreover it compromises our sovereign right to act independently in accordance with national policies and leaves our intentions dependant on outside agencies and/or governments.

A further consideration in mobility operations is interoperability - that is the ability to enjoy common support of our equipment with like-minded allies. In Canada's case that suggests NATO aircraft, particularly those of the United States.

From an airlift point of view the Boeing MDC-17 aircraft is the type that could redress the shortfall in our airlift force. Doing so would provide an opportunity to rationalize the size of the HERCULES fleet while offering the possibility of personnel savings. The MDC-17 has the full range of capabilities needed to lift personnel, paratroops, personnel carriers, reconnaissance vehicles, helicopters etc. into austere destinations. A rule of thumb is that, on a ton/mile basis, one MDC-17 has the deployment capability of seven or eight CC-130 HERCULES and it could move the full range of DND equipment.

Hopefully therefore, now that the election 'emergency' is behind us, the Minister and his government will settle down to rectifying the distressing shortcomings of Canada's military

(continued p. 17)

forces including the acquisition of a viable national strategic heavy airlift capability. By doing so the government would considerably enhance its political ‘bragging rights.’

(Ed note: Dave Adamson of North Saanich, BC, a WW II

bomber pilot, is a former deputy commander-in-chief of NORAD and former vice president of marketing and sales of de Havilland Canada. He served more than 35 years in a variety of flying and staff positions in the air force, compiling more than 12,000 flying hours on domestic and international transport operations.)

JOINT FORCE DEVELOPMENT - IMPLEMENTING STRATEGY 2020

Colonel Mark Aruja, CD, Director General Joint Force Development NDHQ

In 2000, a relatively small change in NDHQ organization was undertaken as one step of many in transforming to the Canadian Forces of tomorrow as envisaged in DND’s *Strategy 2020*. In producing *Strategy 2020*, and a Strategic and Military Assessment, DND recognized that the cold-war era of threat-based planning was obsolete and required a new capability-based approach.

This capability-based approach places force development in the context of creating future forces which are able to rapidly respond to crises, are organized and equipped for an unpredictable future in complex operations ranging from peacekeeping to warfighting, can respond to asymmetric threats and recognize that information will be the key to decision making at all levels of command. Many, if not most, future capabilities will not be determined by traditional service-centric views, but will require a pan-CF view.

Reporting to the Deputy Chief of Defence Staff, the Joint Force Development Division brings together a multidisciplinary team to focus on future force development in the pan-CF context.

The Joint Force Development Division is comprised of four directorates: a directorate which combines into a new entity the functions of Defence Plans, Doctrine and Training (DPDT), the previously existing directorates of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence, and Space Development, and, a new directorate of Joint Force Capabilities. An exposé of their current and planned efforts will give some insight into Departmental priorities and the shape of the future force.

The Directorate of Plans, Doctrine and Training brings a new and long-overdue focus to Joint Doctrine. Co-located with force developers, expertise can be focussed on future doctrine, crucial to the introduction of new capabilities but one wholly neglected to date. Plans and Training have natural synergies

with doctrine, to ensure that Joint Doctrine is reflected in national training programs and in Operational Plans.

A particular focus is being placed on the National Joint Training Plan which takes a five-year outlook on CF participation in major exercises, both domestic and combined, including NORAD and NATO. In addition, a significant contribution is made to the Partnership for Peace program through exercises. For example, in March of this year, Exercise Co-operative Osprey, led by a Canadian brigadier-general, was conducted at the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre to train Partnership for Peace nations in NATO crisis planning procedures as a follow-on to CMX, a NATO Headquarters crisis response exercise.

The development of doctrine is supported by a Lessons Learned cell within DPDT. From the outset of operations and exercise planning, the Lessons Learned cell observes the process and provides a necessary perspective upon completion from which action is taken to improve both today’s force employment process and the future force.

The Directorate of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence is at the forefront of assessing the implications of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and asymmetric threats. A comprehensive acquisition program covering the full spectrum of NBC defence is in progress, ranging from threat warning and detection, prophylaxis, protection, decontamination and supporting command and control. This program is backed by a solid R&D capability, primarily at the Defence Research Establishment Suffield. With issues such as Depleted Uranium and industrial toxins, their activity continues to have considerable visibility.

A most recent initiative heralded by the appointment of Ms. Margaret Purdy as the Associate DM responsible for Critical Infrastructure Protection assigns DND the

(continued p. 18)

responsibility for co-ordinating government actions in this area. This broader remit will undoubtedly shape future decisions on how DND deals with asymmetric threats from domestic, continental and deployed perspectives.

The Directorate of Space Development has now matured into an organization which is implementing the original conception of the Joint Space Project. In tandem, with the Canadian Military Satellite Communications Project, these two projects will form part of the information backbone for the future force bringing significant new capabilities to both acquire and disseminate information.

A Surveillance of Space project is now in the Definition phase with the intent of providing, through our NORAD commitment, an improved ability to track objects in earth orbit. Polar Star, a separate initiative, is examining options on how to best conduct space-based surveillance to fulfill our domestic surveillance responsibilities from a three-ocean and a deployed operations perspective. As an example, the Canadian Space Agency/MacDonald Dettwiler Radarsat II will have a DND-sponsored experimental mode to detect moving targets (GMTI). How we will integrate that moving target capability with other sensor systems is being examined, in collaboration with the US and NATO, in a seven-nation experiment called CAESAR. This also involves examining the Army's tactical ground station as a common interface for the integration of air and space-based sensors.

Bringing space expertise to the deployed forces is another initiative being undertaken in collaboration with the newly formed Joint Operations Group in Kingston. A small cadre of trained personnel will be provided with the tools to bring expert advice on the full spectrum of space-capabilities to bear in the development and execution of a campaign plan.

The newly created Joint Force Capability (JFC) directorate is focussed on Command and Control, and Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance. The overarching task is to have a single architectural view on how information will be acquired, processed, disseminated and actions taken. A number of parallel efforts are underway in support of developing this architecture.

The JFC directorate has operational oversight of the evolving Canadian Forces Command System (CFCS), the technology backbone for the dissemination of classified information between our forces, government and coalition allies. This project has a novel implementation approach based on evolutionary cycles, with one cycle corresponding to approximately a year's worth of effort in implementation while concurrently the next cycle is being fully defined. CFCS is currently integrating the separate service-based information

systems with the existing classified-information architecture and has as a near-term objective delivery of the Common Operating Picture. In order to do so, however, it is the current assessment that existing information sources are not adequately synchronized in terms of their tasking, collation and decision product development. Technology is not the challenge, but rather our ability to implement it is; new organizational structures may be a necessary condition for success if we are to eliminate the stovepipes of today.

R&D is progressing to develop the so-called Common Operating Picture, a digital geospatially referenced fusion of data for commanders at all levels. This calls for the development of not only new doctrine, but also an examination of the current personnel structures and skill sets. The notion of a grouping of careers or trades under the moniker 'information warrior' has some persuasive argument.

Information acquisition from alternative platforms is also being examined under a fledgling initiative termed JUSTAS: Joint Uninhabited Airborne Surveillance to Target Acquisition System. The central question to be answered in determining how to insert new technologies and processes is an understanding of what decisions are to be made, by whom, and what information is required to make those decisions. An examination of command and control structures is a necessary undertaking to support this future information architecture.

The creation of the Joint Force Development Division is one of many steps the CF and DND will undertake to transform itself into an information-centric force based on capability-based planning. The division's role will expand again this summer. To enable exploration of new ideas and bring the lengthy acquisition cycle into congruence with the technology cycle, a Canadian Forces Experimentation Centre will begin initial operations in Ottawa this summer staffed by a multi-disciplinary group of officers, scientists and contracted staff.

Although only in existence for eight months, the Joint Force Development Division has already proven the necessity of having an organization with the requisite capacity to undertake future force development from a pan-CF perspective. Its report card will be based on the ability to provide reasoned advice and leadership to all of the elements which comprise capability, from doctrine to personnel, equipment, technology and research and development.

Whereas many will continue to debate the theory of the Revolution in Military Affairs, the Joint Force Development Division will champion the transformation of the Canadian Forces to meet the demands of the future.

NATIONAL OFFICE STAFF/L'EXÉCUTIF NATIONAL

Executive Director/Directeur exécutif: Colonel (Retd) A. Pellerin, OMM, CD, (613) 236-1252; **Executive Secretary and Treasurer/Secrétaire exécutif et Secrétaire-trésorier:** Lieutenant-Colonel (Retd) G.D. Metcalfe, CD, (613) 236-9903/1252; **Senior Defence Analyst/Analyste principal sur la Défense:** Colonel (Retd) A.S. Henry, OMM, CD, (613) 236-1252; **Archivist/Archiviste:** Major (Retd) G.V. Clark, CD, (613) 828-6124; **Honorary Counsel/Avocat-conseil honoraire:** Colonel J.H.C. Clarry, MBE, ED, CD, QC (416) 601-7752; **Public Affairs Officer/Officier de relations publiques:** Captain (Retd) P.W. Forsberg, CD, (613) 236-9903

ON TRACK is published by the Conference of Defence Associations Institute. Submissions on past and present defence issues, news of CDA member associations and of associate members, and letters to the editor are encouraged. Forward to the attention of the editor at the address below.

ON TRACK est publié par l'Institut de la conférence des associations de la Défense. Nous encourageons les soumissions d'articles sur des questions de défense, les faits nouveaux ayant trait aux membres et associations de la CAD et également les lettres à l'éditeur. Veuillez faire parvenir vos soumissions à l'adresse indiquée ci-dessous.

ATTENTION NEWSPAPER EDITORS/ATTENTION AUX ÉDITEURS DE JOURNEAUX

Permission is granted to reproduce, in whole or in part, articles from *ON TRACK*. A credit line is desired. For inquiries contact the Public Affairs Officer, Captain (Retd) Peter Forsberg, CD at: (tele) (613) 236-9903; (fax) 236-8191; (E-mail) cda@cda-cdai.ca

Il vous est permis de reproduire, intégralement ou en partie, les articles du *ON TRACK*, en donnant le crédit à la publication. Pour tout renseignement, veuillez vous adresser à l'officier des relations publiques, le Capitaine (retraité) Peter Forsberg, CD au numéro de téléphone (613) 236-9903; télécopieur (613) 236-8191; courriel cda@cda-cdai.ca

L'Institut de la Conférence des Associations de la Défense

Membre/Donateur - formulaire d'adhésion

359 rue Kent, Pièce 502, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0R7

Tél: (613) 236-9903 Bélino: (613) 236-8191 Courrier électronique (E-mail): cda@cda-cdai.ca URL: cda-cdai.ca

- Patron (\$ 1,000+) ___ Chèque/mandat poste
 Compagnon (\$ 500) ___ Master Card
 Officier (\$ 300) ___ VISA _____ Date d'expiration: _____ Signature: _____
 Associé (\$ 150) Nom: _____
 Supporter (\$ 65) Adresse: _____
 Autre _____ (\$50) (\$40) (\$30) (20) Endroit: _____ Prov: ___ Code postal: _____ Tel: (____) ____-____

CONFERENCE OF DEFENCE ASSOCIATIONS INSTITUTE
359 KENT STREET, SUITE 502
OTTAWA ON K2P 0R7

The Conference of Defence Associations Institute
Member/Donor Application Form

359 Kent Street, Ste 502, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0R7
Tel: (613) 236-9903 Fax: 236-8191 E-mail: cda@cda-cdai.ca URL: cda-cdai.ca

- Patron (\$ 1,000+)
- Companion (\$ 500)
- Officer (\$ 300)
- Associate (\$ 150)
- Supporter (\$ 65)
- Other _____ (\$50) (\$40) (\$30) (\$20)
- ___ Cheque/Money Order
___ Master Card
___ VISA _____ Expiry Date: _____ Signature: _____
- Name: _____
- Address: _____
- City: _____ Prov: ___ Postal Code: _____ Tel: (____) ____-_____