Journal of Military and Strategic Studies

VOLUME 12, ISSUE 2, WINTER 2010

The Past as Prologue: Sustaining Canadian Capacity for Defence, Diplomacy and Development[1]

Colin Robertson

Drive down Wellington Street, past the Parliament Buildings and, almost directly across from the Supreme Court are a pair of buildings buttressing both sides of Lyon Street. Built in the aftermath of World War II, the East and West Memorial Buildings once housed the Department of Veterans Affairs. Their architect had a sense of both history and the neighborhood. It is reflected in their chateau style, copper roofs and stone facing – not the usual cinder-block approach of later government buildings. Spanning the street and connecting the two buildings is an Arch. Chiseled into it, in both official languages on both the north and south side, is this inscription:

'ALL THESE WERE HONOURED IN
THEIR GENERATIONS AND WERE
THE GLORY OF THEIR TIMES'

[1] My appreciation to Nancy Pearson Mackie who graciously provided me with a set of the previous Ross Ellis Memorial Lectures. The lecture I gave on January 14, 2010 at the Museum of the Regiments drew from previous lectures, especially those given by David Pratt, John English, Terry Copp and Jack Granatstein. As always I drew on the advice and published works of Jack Granatstein, David Bercuson, Terry Copp, Desmond Morton, Denis Stairs, Robert Bothwell, Norman Hillmer, John Holmes, Allan Gotlieb, Derek Burney and Michael Hart – all of whom furnish me with ideas, inspiration and knowledge.

ISSN : 1488-559X

Taken from Ecclesiasticus, it is a fit description of Ross Ellis and his Calgary Highlanders, 'A battalion of heroes', David Bercuson's apt phrase, they fought for Canada and the Allied cause through Normandy, the Netherlands and into Germany.

Having experienced three great *Disruptions* – Ellis was born during the First World War, he came of age during the Great Depression, and then he served with distinction in the Second Great War - Ellis and the rest of what we now call the 'greatest generation' of the 20th century were determined to build a better world, a better Canada, a better Alberta.

Stability and security mattered. They'd learned at the sharp end that Canadians don't live in a 'fire-proof' house. What counted were institutions that safeguarded individual liberty, permitted the development of a market economy and at the same time provided collective security. For Canadians, this was best achieved through a 'community of shared values' - cooperative security[2] - under an umbrella that we now describe as Pearsonian internationalism.

Ellis, the soldier-turned-citizen, went into business and served as town councilor, as mayor of High River and later as a coalition Liberal-Conservative member of the provincial legislature. Among his constituents was a future prime minister, Joe Clark. Clark's father published the local newspaper. Ellis personified the civic-mindedness that characterized post-war Canadian international policy.

The Roots of Canadian Internationalism: The St. Laurent Doctrine and Pearson Corollary

The best enunciation of Canadian internationalism is still found in a speech given in Toronto by Louis St. Laurent, then our Secretary of State for External Affairs. The

[2] David Haglund uses the phrase 'cooperative security' in his *The North Atlantic Triangle Revisited-Canadian Grand Strategy at Century's End (2000)* and it builds on John Bartlet Brebner's concept of the *North Atlantic Triangle* (1945) that argued Canada's challenge was to maintain a comfortable but independent relationship with both the former and current hegemons, Britain and the United States. Played astutely, Canada could also be the Atlantic linchpin and leverage the relationships to advantage.

remarks fit the occasion. It was the inaugural lecture to the memory of Duncan and John Gray, brothers who had died during the Second World War.[3]

The five principles put forward that January evening in 1947 continue to be the touchstone for the conduct of Canada's international relations. They also set the dominant themes for our foreign policy and, for the most part, they endure. The first principle dealt with the continuing Canadian preoccupation with our 'two solitudes'. St. Laurent proclaimed that "we are agreed that our external policies shall not destroy our unity." He spoke not just of linguistic and cultural division but of sectionalism and the danger of extravagant regionalism, "no matter where they have their origin". St. Laurent warned that "a disunited Canada will be a powerless one." This first principle should be read at the commencement of every federal-provincial meeting or international meetings at which the different levels of government participate. It would have served us at Copenhagen[4] where certain members of the combined Canadian delegation of first ministers, ministers and mayors seemed more intent on scoring domestic political points than seeking to advance the Canadian interest on those areas where they shared consensus.

The second principle is that of political liberty and collective security because "we are all conscious of the danger to our own political institutions when freedom is attacked in other parts of the world." St. Laurent observed that "stability is lacking where consent is absent" and noted that "we have come as a people to distrust and dislike governments which rule by force and which suppress free comment on their activities".

The third principle is respect for "the rule of law in national and international affairs" as "the necessary antecedent to self-government". This is what the international community now asks of President Karzai but with similar application elsewhere. The rule of law, continued St. Laurent, applies not just within states but with equal vigour between states. He had very much in mind the massive and unprecedented

[3] For the text of this lecture, go to http://www.russilwvong.com/future/stlaurent.html.
[4] Copenhagen talks on Climate Change, December 2009.

construction job in post-war architecture – the UN and its alphabet soup of agencies, work that continues today in the WTO and now, of course, on climate change.

What distinguished the West from the rest, argued St. Laurent, was a commitment to the fourth principle - 'human values'. In language that would fail contemporary infatuation with the politically correct, St. Laurent spoke of "the values of a Christian civilization…the conceptions of good and evil which emerged from Hebrew and Greek civilization and which have been transformed and transmitted through Christian traditions of the Western World." Whatever the words, the intention was to underline a muscular approach to values linked to interests. In the wake of war, our foreign policy would put "emphasis on the importance of the individual, on the place of moral principles in the conduct of human relations (and) on the standards of judgment which transcend mere material well-being". Today, we'd call it 'soft power'. In this commitment to values-based foreign policy are the roots of some of the most celebrated Canadian initiatives including the Treaty on Land Mines, the initiatives against child soldiers and blood diamonds, the concept of 'right to protect', the International Criminal Court and the initiatives on Africa as well as Prime Minister Harper's initiative on improving maternal and child health.

The fifth and final principle was our "willingness to accept our international responsibilities". St. Laurent underlined that "again and again on the major questions of participation in international organization, both in peace and war, we have taken our decision to be present". Being present mattered because, "if there is one conclusion that our common experience has led us to accept, it is that security for this country lies in the development of a firm structure of international organization." A lawyer by profession, St. Laurent understood that rules-based systems leveled the playing field. Importantly, it gave a nimble 'middle power' the right to play alongside the great powers and, like a Canadian football field that is both longer and wider than its American counterpart, it gave scope and space for a foreign policy that thrived on initiative and doing diplomacy differently.

A corollary to the willingness to accept our international obligations is the acknowledgement of having the capacity to meet those obligations. As Paul Martin Sr. remarked in 1964 when he was foreign minister, "Many nations had an appetite for

power without teeth, but Canada [during the Cold War] had developed both the appetite and the teeth for a new international role." In 1964, we had a population of approximately 22 million and possessed a regular force of some 120,000 and a reserve force of some 45,000 strong.

Doing diplomacy differently – quietly, yes, but with initiative and ideas - was another defining characteristic of Canadian postwar foreign policy.

For St. Laurent, the practical application of these principles was displayed internationally in the construction of the post-war international architecture – the UN as a forum for international discussion and action, and in NATO for collective security and economic partnership and through the Commonwealth of Nations.

The transition from Empire to Commonwealth owed much to Canadian creativity and diplomacy and St. Laurent allowed that it was an example of what, "we ourselves have fashioned for achieving the ends we desire in world affairs". Sadly, the Commonwealth is now mostly neglected as a forum for Canadian initiative. This is surprising, given that the Commonwealth's history and the intersection within the organization between East and West, North and South means that it is a forum where we are seen as a leader and where we can act uninhibited by the shadow of the United States.

Aid and development was a critical dimension in this process, because, as St. Laurent said, "we believe that the economic reconstruction of the world must go hand in hand with the political reconstruction". There was also the very practical reason that we depended on markets beyond our borders for our economic prosperity.

In regards to the United States, St. Laurent sensibly observed that "we have travelled so much of the road together in close agreement that by comparison the occasions on which our paths may have diverged seems insignificant". His approach to problem-solving was grounded in commonsense: "…like farmers whose lands have a common concession line, we think of ourselves as settling from day to day, questions that arise between us without dignifying the process by the word 'policy'."

This approach towards the Americans had two characteristics. First, there was the determination to settle upon the basis of mutual satisfaction by negotiation, by arbitration, by compromise. The second characteristic was the acceptance of our responsibility as a North American nation in enterprises for the welfare of our continent through 'common action for constructive ends'.

Institutions grounded in sensible rules worked to Canada's advantage. The experience of the International Joint Commission on trans-boundary water disputes, the Ogdensburg Agreement for mutual defence and the Permanent Joint Board on Defence (PJBD) for procurement, effectively set the stage for NORAD, the Autopact, the Acid Rain Accord, Canada-US FTA and NAFTA. The recent joint action in support of our shared auto industry and a shared approach to economic recovery are the most recent examples of 'common action for constructive ends'.

Lester B. Pearson, who succeeded St. Laurent as External Affairs Minister in 1948 when St. Laurent became prime minister, would later add a third characteristic – the requirement for the forthright expression of our views in Washington. For Pearson, having served as Canadian Ambassador in Washington, this was the 'first principle of Canadian diplomacy' because "if Washington 'went it alone' where would Ottawa go?" Experience had demonstrated to Pearson the 'inescapable fact' that no country in the world has less chance of isolating itself from the effects of American policies than Canada. As we do with no other, the challenge for Canada, argued Pearson, is to use our proximity and connections to understand and constructively engage the Americans.

Setting both the tone, especially at the top, and getting the engagement right, is an ongoing challenge. When we pursued an 'independent' course as, for example, on Cuba, Vietnam, Iraq and Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD), there were inevitable complications. Pearson's Temple University speech in April 1965, in which he called for a halt in U.S. bombing in Vietnam, annoyed President Johnson but at their subsequent meeting at Camp David aside from Pearson's amour-propre, there was no appreciable damage to the relationship (especially the Autopact that had taken effect in January, 1965). Economic integration, however, meant measures like the Helms-Burton Act in the case of Cuba had the effect of curtailing trade opportunities. On Iraq and BMD, the Americans shrugged at our decisions –they didn't need us but, as with the Temple

University speech, they were mildly irritated by our failure failed to observe the basic rule of diplomacy between allies – 'No surprises'.

Pearson also understood something that his successors either forgot or never learned. When you play with Washington, look first at their agenda and be mindful of the 'burdens of primacy'. 'Place, standing and perspective,' coupled with Canadian sensitivity and sensibility, mean that when we're on game, we have the privilege, observed John Holmes who served with Pearson, "to tell our best friends when their breath is bad". Geographic propinquity gives us 'place', especially given the American preoccupation with national security and our 'standing' depends very much on how seriously we take that preoccupation.

To bring ideas and information to the table you have to 'be there'.

Thus St. Laurent spoke in Toronto of the importance in developing an "effective and non-partisan diplomatic service", because we have a "useful part to play in world affairs. Useful to ourselves through being useful to others, and to play that part we must have our own spokesmen amongst our neighbours."

A diplomatic service went hand in hand with 'functionalism', another Canadian innovation that St. Laurent described as the 'commonsense' application by those nations with 'the means and the will' to resolve the problem at hand.

Defence, diplomacy and development – these all came with a price tag. The post-war was not an easy time for a government struggling with an exchange crisis and budget deficits. St. Laurent acknowledged that application would "make demands on our financial resources" but he knew that Canadians expected us to continue to do our part and that it would be both supported and welcomed "by all sections of our people." This, of course, was not entirely true. The key point in the Gray lecture was that a French Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs said these things just three years after a conscription crisis.

We are, on occasion, an insecure people. Separatists have constructed their own prison despite the remarkably benign conditions of 'Conquest' that guaranteed their religion and law. In English Canada, the spiritual heirs of the United Empire Loyalists continue to find issues of umbrage with the Republic that obliged their departure after

the Revolution. It is a condition that baffles the rest of the world who look on us with envy as a place of plenty and a land of hope where pluralism works. We welcome outside approval and take particular pride in achievements and accomplishments beyond our borders. It also serves to reinforce our sense of what it is to be Canadian.

The Legacy of St. Laurent and Pearson

Progressive, pragmatic and internationalist and inspired by moral idealism, the St. Laurent doctrine and the Pearson/Martin corollaries have served Canada well. Its intellectual application can be seen in the construction of NATO, especially Article II and, in a more muscular sense, in Pearson's Suez solution and the concept of 'peacekeeping'. In terms of development assistance, the Colombo Plan helped to resurrect the Asian market economy in the same fashion as the Marshall Plan was doing in Europe.

For Canada, it has been an investment that continues to pay dividends through easy entrée into the meld of governments and business from Delhi and Islamabad to Kuala Lumpur, Singapore and Hong Kong. As I found during my own assignment in Hong Kong many of the mandarins and ministers had been schooled in Canada. The appreciation of those who became taipans is apparent in their sponsorship of libraries, sports arenas and university buildings across Canada.

Today, as Asia looms large in global economics, we benefit from an enlightened immigration policy that puts the emphasis on skills and talent and, unlike that of the U.S., is not captive to country quota. The result has literally changed the face of Canada. Since 1980, the 'Old Country' for the majority of our new settlers are China and India and their diaspora as well as the other Asian tigers. This gives us a natural advantage in trade, investment and commerce; our challenge is how to make use of our entrée.

Peacekeeping became for many the manifestation of Pearsonian internationalism and, for some, the sole purpose of our armed forces. That this was a perversion of what Pearson had in mind didn't matter. It came, unfortunately, to stigmatize debates on both the purpose of the Forces and defence procurement. As Geoffrey Pearson, who

would follow his father into Foreign Service, remarked to me years later the application of 'soft power' depended on 'hard power'. In the wake of Korea, Mike Pearson wanted the creation of a permanent UN Legion and felt it would be the test of the "new effort to put force behind the collective will for peace of the UN." [5] Ironically, Korea was the closest the UN ever came to developing a standing capacity for 'hard power'. As we've tragically witnessed, especially in Africa, from the Congo to Rwanda, the UN has yet to meet the Pearson test.

Pearson, ever the pragmatist, understood that our national security would depend on maintaining and investing in our own Forces. In turn, this provided us the collateral for the web of bi-national defence arrangements with the United States and our contribution to collective security within the North Atlantic Pact. Pearson and St. Laurent would have understood intuitively that 'free-loading' under the American umbrella would bring both American contempt and exclusion from consultation. Pulling our weight in the alliance required compromises, especially when it came to issues of security like participation in BOMARC. Even if Pearson wasn't entirely persuaded of its efficacy he recognized that for the Americans it was a litmus test. Trudeau reached a similar conclusion on cruise missiles.

Given the circumstances, BMD should have been an easy decision – we weren't being asked to either test weapons or place nuclear devices on our soil. Instead, all the Americans asked was that we signal our assent and they would take care of both the cost and siting. A somewhat incredulous George W. Bush would later ask Stephen Harper what Canada expected America to do if ever some of Kim Jong-il's fireworks veered in the direction of Vancouver or Calgary.

What is past is prologue

Once again, the Canadian government faces financial challenges. As Prime Minister Harper said in his Boxing Day interview, the path to the black will involve a new era of 'fiscal discipline'. Get ready, he warned us, for five frugal years.

[5] Geoffrey A.H. Pearson *Seize the Day: Lester B. Pearson and Crisis Diplomacy*, Carleton 1993 p161

The squeeze on government budgets obliges prioritization. The lesson of getting government right in the Chretien/Martin years meant that only the allocations for health care and First Nations remained unscathed.

Health care continues to be the elephant in the room, especially as boomers put more strain on a system that is already stretched and adapting to extraordinary advances in medical procedures and drugs. All the things that we will expect and demand access. Not to forget home care, pharmacare, electronic medical records and a national child-care initiative. All cost money.

Then there is education – the second biggest slice in the budget. And teachers are a formidable lobby group.

Nor can we forget the environment. The green lobby is fired by the failure of Copenhagen and determined on action. Unfortunately, the movement risks being captured by those with a grievance against globalization, capitalism and the 'powers that be'. It reminds me of the opposition to free trade during the eighties and nineties.

This is the backdrop against which decisions will be made with one significant addition. Afghanistan.

Afghanistan

Unless there is a substantial change in circumstances, eighteen months from now, in July 2011, we will sound the last post in Kandahar. There will be the ceremonial march past the memorial for the fallen. Then our troops will climb aboard the C-130s and head home. We will still have some uniformed presence in Afghanistan to protect our Embassy in Kabul and our development projects, but we will no longer be at the sharp end. At home, there will be relief at no more caskets arriving at CFB Trenton. Coverage of Afghanistan and by extension, the role of our Forces, will fade.

Like many Canadians, I'm unsure what the net result of our efforts will be. Churchill's 1897 Afghan account is still a cautionary tale. Circumstances - corruption, culture, chaos – continue to be powerful factors in Afghanistan.

Our efforts at good governance and reconstruction are well intentioned and earnestly Canadian. It grieves me to see Canadians laying down their lives for a government of

questionable legitimacy with policies – especially towards women – that are offensive. For me our western values of human rights and what Roosevelt famously called the Four Freedoms: freedom of speech and religion, freedom from fear and want - are absolutes.

Radical Islam sees it differently – call it a cultural chasm. The Taliban exploit it to portray us as occupiers and imperialists.

Afghanistan is a case where we are doing the right things for the right reasons: our commitment to collective security and to keep Al Qaeda from returning. Pull out now? No.

Change takes time. History teaches us that lasting change is more likely to come step by step than in a grand sweep. I think our military strategy – aimed at winning hearts and minds of Afghans as well as in the fight against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda is the right one.

But there are two critical questions that are beyond us:

- Can Karzai govern beyond Kabul?; and
- Can and will the Afghans stand up for themselves as a fighting force?

We need to recognize that, notwithstanding our best efforts, success ultimately depends on the people and their leaders to whom we lend a helping hand.

I hear from my colleagues in the field and listen to people I respect like Flora Macdonald who, at 83, is still in the field. They point to a school built or dam being constructed or a well that now delivers fresh water.

We are moved and inspired by messages like the farewell left by Sergeant Kirk Taylor, killed just before New Year's with four of his comrades.

Taylor wrote: "I believe that the mission in Afghanistan is vital for us, not only as Canadians but as human beings … What we are doing is trying to help Afghans develop solutions to Afghan problems and to help them help themselves build today for a better tomorrow. This will not be accomplished overnight but neither was Rome built in a day."

For Canadians, the Afghan campaign has been instructive on several counts. First, it underlined the requirement for hard power. Hard power, of course, does not come cheap. The Americans recently estimated that keeping a soldier in the field costs one million dollars a year. I spent my career in diplomacy and I believe in development but I have come to appreciate the wisdom of Obama's observation when he accepted his Nobel prize in December. As the president put it, "evil does exist in the world. A non-violent movement could not have halted Hitler's armies. Negotiations cannot convince al Qaeda's leaders to lay down their arms. To say that force is sometimes necessary is not a call to cynicism – it is a recognition of history; the imperfections of man and the limits of reason."

Jack Granatstein observes, "Soft power – peacekeeping and values – is well and good. But without the capacity to deploy effective, well-trained, well-led hard power when needed, no one will pay attention to Canada."

I am reminded of the exchange that Tim Goddard related in his poignant eulogy to his daughter, the late Captain Nichola Goddard. Father and daughter were arguing over Michael Ignatieff's contention in his book, *Empire Lite*, that military force may ultimately be required to permit the reconstruction of civil society. Professor Goddard maintained that education is the key to development. Captain Goddard replied: "You can't do that when the bad guys run things, Dad, they just shoot you. You have to have peace and good government in order for the rest to happen. I do what I do so you can do what you do."

The war has effectively redefined the myth that our Forces were strictly for peacekeeping. Canada has never been a neutral country. Lest we forget, there are the graves in Europe and Asia to prove otherwise. Peacekeeping makes a valuable contribution but it is a means to an end. To echo Jack Granatstein, we owe Rick Hillier a great debt for "changing the conceit that Canadians were peacekeepers first, last and always."

Second, despite the fears in Ottawa that public support would plummet when the caskets began to come home, Canadians accepted that casualties are part of war. More importantly, we differentiate between the valour of our Forces and the Afghan situation which most do not support and would prefer we left sooner than later.

It is right and proper that we honour our valiant dead.

We should also publicly celebrate the valour of those who return from the fight and those who keep the home fires burning. On their homecoming, British Forces are granted a 'Freedom of the Town'. It is a joyous occasion to reconnect with friends and family. It pays tribute to their achievement but it also recognizes the support and efforts of those at home who shoulder extra responsibilites when their husbands or wives are on foreign fields.

Third, despite the usual claque from now-aging separatist editorialists and their talking head equivalents warning of another Conscription-type reaction in Quebec and the tightened sphincters this created in Ottawa, it didn't happen. While there is significantly lower support for the campaign in Quebec, the deployment of the Van Doos elicited a reaction of pride in Quebeckers. And, when the inevitable caskets came home, there has been a similar blend of pride and sorrow.

The fourth lesson from the Afghan campaign is that support for our troops remains high. Canadians have connected to their Armed Forces and their pride is reflected in the banners and bumper stickers saying 'We support our troops'. And, when the caskets are borne down the Highway of Heroes the overpasses are lined with Canadians.

The Forces are arguably our most popular public institution. Perhaps the greatest asset of the Forces is their appeal to service and, as the DND commercials put it – 'to fight fear, to fight chaos, to fight distress.'

The Forces will need all of that support in the coming budget battle.

Even before the end of the Afghan campaign, they have become a target for budget cuts.

In a report released in late November, the left-leaning Centre for Policy Alternatives argues that military spending in Canada is disproportionately high – 10% of government spending - and that it sucks up money that could be used for other government programs, such as environmental spending or foreign aid. The Center points to spending within NATO and argues that we now spend slightly more than the average.

The Center's facts are questionable and their conclusions are dead wrong.

We spend a little over a penny for every dollar we generate in Canada on defence. Twenty years ago we spend two cents. The US, with a population ten times that of Canada, spends 25 times that amount. Nor does the Centre acknowledge that we are obliged to provide security across five and a half time zones.

The Centre complains we are spending more than most NATO allies. Yet, we could plunk all of the European nations of NATO into a corner of Canada. With the second largest land mass in the world, threats from space, the air and sea will have a disproportionate impact on Canada. Serious countries maintain adequate defence and deterrent capacities. Would the authors be comfortable having the Americans do it for us?

Collective security, that both equalizes and shares the defence burden, also depends on pulling our weight. And it requires being ready for the unexpected. Tuesday evening, Haiti suffers a devastating earthquake and by week's end we have a DART team on the ground and HMCS Halifax and HMCS Athabasca have sailed out of Halifax harbour with five hundred members of the Forces to assist in the relief effort. You can't do that without sustaining capacity for the unexpected.

In terms of positioning, the Canadian Armed Forces goes into the budget battles better situated than they were in the early nineties when capacity was 'hollowed out'.

We have a more-or-less coherent policy in the Canada First Defence Strategy.

It is less because the current bidding process for procurement is inadequate. It wastes time and money.

There is little commitment to significant research. Experience has taught us that operational research is the fourth arm of national defence.

We need to do more with the reserves. The reserves, as Rick Hillier writes in *A Soldier First*, give the Forces a direct link with Canadians working in other areas. It is estimated that 20% of those serving in Afghanistan are reservists. We need to make it easier for them to serve. It means ensuring that they have a job on return. And why not

provide secure benefits like credits for education. Our country benefitted hugely from those who were able to further their education after the Second World War on our equivalent of the GI Bill.

Our military roots began with our militias. In 1964 in the heyday of peacekeeping we had 45,000 reservists and an armed force of 125,000 sustained by a population of 19 million. Today we have 22,000 reservists and 68, 000 in our armed forces and a population of 33 million.

The good news about the Canada First Defence Strategy is that it commits the Government to increase the numbers of the Forces and fund new equipment – the ships, planes and the armoured carriers that our troops require. The test for Government will be in holding firm on the recruitment and schedule for tendering contracts.

The leadership of the Forces is vigorous, innovative and battle-tested. In General Walt Natynczyk and the heads of the service branch commands, we have experienced and highly competent leaders. Just as we adapted to peacekeeping in the transition from Cold War now in a post 9-11 world we now adapt to operations focused on counter-insurgency, disaster relief and broken states. The playing field for the Forces is increasingly defined less as one of home versus away game, but rather 'one big skating rink' with the puck flying back and forth, reflecting the constant global flow of people, goods and services.

Marketing matters. In his memoir, *A Soldier First*, Rick Hillier describes how the Forces consciously set about recruiting the nation, using symbols like the Snowbirds and Tim Hortons. He did this with the support of celebrities like Don Cherry and Rick Mercer. We see special license plates saying 'Support our Troops' and events like Toronto's recent True Patriot Love dinner. The ongoing support for the Military Families Fund that Hillier created.

Taking a page from the American forces, we have linked sport, flag and our men and women in uniform. The call to service that runs as a commercial during football and hockey games draws more inspiration from Jack Bauer's '24' than the usual insipid public service announcements. The ads are done with panache, portraying what is the

reality of our Forces: 'ordinary men and women from next door carrying out dangerous work with professionalism, decency and fair play.'

There is the award winning series on CBC Radio One, Afghanada, now in its fourth season, which takes us "outside the wire". Christie Blatchford collected her Globe & Mail dispatches into her bestselling book, *Fifteen Days*, describing the triumphs and tragedies of the PPCLI in Afghanistan. Reporting from the battlefield is in the tradition of Charlie Lynch and Matthew Halton. But, like soldiering, war reporting comes with a price as Michelle Lang's death reminds us.

In recent years we've rediscovered our military heritage.

We may not be a warlike nation but, when required, we are a nation of warriors.

The overwhelming popular response to the events around the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War began a catalyst for popular action. There was a realization that our veterans – our fathers and grandfathers - would not be with us much longer. We wanted to both remember the 'Greatest Generation' and honour their record.

The Dominion Institute, in part born out of this popular response, created its 'Memory Project'. In collaboration with the Royal Canadian Legion, they have created oral histories from more than 2000 veterans. They've brought them into schools and incorporated them into curriculum, especially around Remembrance Day.

Historica, in partnership with Terry Copp and the Canadian Battlefields Foundation and with support from Veterans Affairs, takes a dozen teachers each summer to follow the path of Canadian forces during the First and Second World Wars. This knowledge goes right back into the classroom.

Veterans Affairs demonstrates considerable imagination in their 'Canada Remembers' campaign. It has succeeded beyond expectations and the program continues to grow. There now exists a shelf of well-written books, from Pierre Berton's popular *Vimy* to historian Tim Cook's recent award-winners: *At the Sharp End* and *Shock*

Troops. And, of course, thanks to popular support, including from the Alberta Government, there is Paul Gross' *Passchendaele*.

After the consecration of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier came the construction and opening of the Canadian War Museum – the place that Jack Granatstein built. I speak here at the Military Museums that reopened on the 65th anniversary of D-Day. Your mission: 'Remember, Preserve and Educate' says it all.

The stories of the men and women who serve are the best advertisement for the Forces.

When responding to a reporter who suggested that there was no beating the Taliban, Michelle Brown, widow of slain Warrant Officer Dennis Raymond Brown, said: "You know what, we may not be able to beat the Taliban. There's lots of things in our life we can't beat — obesity, child pornography, crime. Do you give up? Do you stop? Absolutely not."

Marketing the Canadian contribution to national and global security is critical. We need to keep explaining to ourselves what the Forces are about and how they serve the Canadian interest:

First, in defending Canada;

Second, as an effective partner in continental defence; and,

Third, as a responsible ally in international peace and security missions with a capability to lead, in part because of our interoperability, especially in maritime operations, with the Americans.

It means going beyond Afghanistan and giving a perspective that the 'rink' we play on is global, national and local. And it doesn't stop at our borders.

While posted in Washington, thanks to a highly innovative team and an ingenious Lieutenant Colonel, Jamie Robertson, who would later win an award for his work, we created canadianally.com. To underline our role in Afghanistan, we put

posters depicting our 'boots on the ground' in the metro stops at the Pentagon, State Department and around Capitol Hill.

My job was to lobby on the Canadian issues – beef, lumber, the environment. I realized that, before I could make the case for Canada, I first had to convince American legislators that we took national security seriously. Since 9-11 it is their abiding preoccupation.

Jamie and I worked Capitol Hill together – the 'Suit' and the 'Uniform'. He would begin with a description of what Canada was doing in the Gulf and Afghanistan and describe his experiences in the Balkans and his time with NORAD at Cheyenne Mountain. We would then hand the Congressman a 'Canadianally.com' coin. Only then were they ready to listen to our needs. Then I'd make my case for Canada.

These presentations were often emotional, especially in the aftermath of Canadian casualties. What most impressed the legislators was the fact that we are reliable allies and that 'we've got their back' – something we have to reinforce continually given the continuing resonance of the Millenium Bomber.

Our joint efforts were a good example of the partnership between defence and diplomacy working in tandem as we do in Kabul and Kandahar.

We're back to the future in explaining what the Canadian Forces are about. The developments in the North, for example, are a parable for what is taking place around the world. With the second largest land mass in the world, threats from space, the air and sea will have a disproportionate impact on Canada. The maritime estate on which we claim jurisdiction is about 70% of our land mass. The changes in the ocean's regulatory regime have changed more in the last thirty years as coastal states extend their jurisdiction than in the last three centuries. The oceans carry 90% of global traffic including an estimated 40% of Canadian trade. Maintenance of our sovereignty and prosperity will depend on our capacity to provide surveillance and security for what is happening on our land, seas and overhead in our skies.

The Case for Development

The case for development assistance is a relatively easy sell to Canadians although we have learned that good intentions alone are not the recipe for successful development. We need to continue to focus and assess results against objectives. A more realistic approach has the virtue of what William Easterly describes as an appreciation that "poverty is a complicated tangle of political, social, historical, institutional and technological factors."[6] Easterly's recipe for success is gradualism, or, to use his favourite expression, "piecemeal" reforms that puts as much emphasis on local education as providing foreign expertise.

Open to debate is the country prioritization and spending. We are a nation of the Americas and, post-Afghanistan, I'd like us to put Mexico alongside Haiti at the top of our priority list. Haiti is a long-term project in reconstruction.

In the Mexican case, the short-term priority is continuing to lend security advice and assistance in the existential war with the drug cartels. We do this not only because it is the right thing to do but because if the situation in Mexico goes badly, the United States will face an unprecedented refugee problem on its southern border that will inevitably have implications for our own border. Robert Pastor has come up with an innovative plan for a North American Development Bank, inspired in part by the experience of the Marshall Plan. It deserves our attention and support.[7]

Just as Asian migration is changing the face of Canada, so Latino migration is giving the United States a salsa flavour. There are now more Americans with Latino roots than there are Canadians and this is changing the American political dynamic regardless of whether a Democrat or Republican occupies the White House or possesses a majority in the Senate or House of Representatives.

---

[6] William Easterly, *The White Man's Burden: How the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*, 2006

[7] Robert Pastor see for example a good summary in *A North American Community: A Background Paper for The Trilateral Commission*, Toronto, 2002

The Case for Diplomacy

Development and diplomacy go hand in hand and the next evolution in CIDA's development should be to bring development policy into even closer alignment with our diplomacy in the same fashion as Secretary Clinton is doing in the United States.

Years ago I worked for Petro-Canada International Assistance Corporation and while I realize there are few who lament the end of Petro Canada, PCIAC to me was what an aid agency should be: we had a staff of less than 10 and a budget of $60 million that we used to hire expertise in the off-season for onshore and offshore energy development in the Third World – places like Tanzania, the Caribbean, and Bangladesh. I thought it worked pretty well as the money went directly into Canadian firms who, in turn, provided service and technical expertise in a sector where Canada is an acknowledged world leader. At the time the industry was in the doldrums so it proved very helpful. Unfortunately, PCIAC was folded up in the Nielsen Task Force review of government and the responsibility was centralized in CIDA. Our energy footprint evaporated.

The case for a diplomatic service put forward by St. Laurent remains valid. Globalization and the multiplication of relevant players all using instant communications to get out their conflicting messages only underlines the need for a diplomatic service with an appreciation and understanding of local culture. Branding Canada through public diplomacy is hard to achieve when there is no budget.

Diplomacy is complicated and the requirement for specialization means that diplomacy no longer has a monopoly on the conduct of international relations. Is our talent being trained sufficiently in foreign languages? Do we have a sufficient float sizeable of people available to be pulled away from regular assignments and devote a year or six months or two years to training or to be focused solely on the planning activity?

The Prime Minister has proclaimed that Canada is an energy superpower – although until we can find a second buyer (and this makes the case for a pipeline to open a second market in Asia) it is more accurate to say we have super amounts of energy. Through innovation and research we have become leaders in the development

of oil, gas, hydro-electricity and nuclear technology. Yet we are mostly silent about these achievements. Instead of playing defence we should be mounting an aggressive international campaign to underline our experience in these areas and in the new fields of carbon capture and storage, tidal, biomass, solar and wind power. The British have a hundred officers working at their missions abroad dedicated to climate change. Given the prominence of 'clean energy' on the Canada-US agenda as well as internationally shouldn't we be adjusting our diplomatic strategy accordingly?

Then there are the policy challenges that go beyond issues of war and peace. Dual citizenship, for example, has only increased the challenges as we've learned in the Lebanese evacuation and through the difficult cases like that of Maher Arar.

The Department of Foreign Affairs had tripled the number of senior executives and nearly doubled the number of those responsible for accountability and information technology. Yet the number of foreign service officers remains the same and this year's recruitment exercise has been cancelled as a restraint measure. Successful succession planning, especially as the Public Service faces a significant increase in retirements, requires ongoing recruitment. Shifting more foreign service officers from Ottawa into the field makes a lot of sense – we need eyes, ears and spokespersons - but the creation of overseas administrative centers filled with bean-counters seems to miss the point. Meanwhile, the Department is undergoing yet another in a series of budget cuts.

The extraordinary revolution in communications and the emergence of a G-20 world means that, once again, we need to do diplomacy differently if we want to make a difference. Both Evan Potter's *Branding Canada* and Daryl Copeland's *Guerilla Diplomacy* provide new ideas based on best practises.[8] Why can't we, for example, practice risk-management on our communications? We've spent hundreds of millions on creating secure communications systems yet we know they are still being hacked. And shouldn't we be adapting to our purposes the emerging social networks and the world of Facebook, Twitter and Youtube? If Ambassador Jacobson can blog, why can't Ambassador Doer?

[8] Daryl Copeland, *Guerilla Diplomacy: Rethinking International Relations*, Rienner, 2009. Evan Potter, *Branding Canada: Projecting Canada's Soft Power through Public Diplomacy*, McGill Queens, 2009

It's time to adapt the protocols of yesteryear in the same fashion that Pearson dispensed with the diplomatic frock coat. While you can't do diplomacy out of the basement in Washington, you could in Butte or Boise. We should have a presence in every American state and we can achieve this by hiring locally-based, star-spangled Canadians. Arm them with a blackberry and focus their efforts on a specific objective, like life sciences. Develop a local Canadian Business Council. Link it to the Canadian American Business Council, and let trade lead the flag. We did this in Phoenix and adapted the model to Tucson and San Diego. We situated our officers in the local Chamber of Commerce and Economic Development offices. It worked because we thought out-of-the-box.

In making the case for 'guerilla diplomacy', Daryl Copeland observes:

Current practice is authoritarian, inflexible and this produces people who are risk adverse. Autonomy means that diplomats enjoy the confidence and trust, not just of their superiors, but also of their clients. I'm not talking about rogues or secret agents, but people who have some traditional skills like tact, discretion, but operating within broad parameters, they are trusted to get result.

Guerrilla diplomats act smarter, faster than traditional diplomats, tend to be extremely cross culturally enabled, with a skill set that includes language and detailed knowledge of cultures and peoples that allows them to sink down into local systems of power and influence, navigating pathways that are closed to others. Its a grass roots networked centric approach that doesn't require the overheads of state centred diplomacy. we would find a group of practitioners that have acuity, agility and autonomy. They are very high functioning, adaptable and can solve problems without constantly referring upwards.[9]

In Conclusion

Today's youth, surveys consistently confirm, are internationalist, green, very comfortable with pluralism and, willing to do service. The times and the context may be different but the attitudes to duty, honour and country that took Ross Ellis and his generation first to war and then to building a better tomorrow continue to have resonance today.

[9] Interview with Daryl Copeland in *New Europe*, 18 May 2009 http://www.neurope.eu/articles/Meet-A-Guerrilla-Diplomat-/97362.php

We live in an age of the unthinkable. A world of disruptions both natural – as we witness in Haiti, and man-made – as in Afghanistan. We know that over the coming decades, population, resource, energy, climate, economic, and environmental pressures will combine with rapid cultural, social, and technological change to produce new sources of deprivation, rage, and instability. For these reasons, as well as to exercise sovereignty over our immense land and the surrounding oceans, we require a strong and capable Canadian Forces.

Our Forces are remarkably versatile. We earned a reputation as shock troops in the First World War and then peacekeepers in the Cold War era. Today our Forces use their skills to create the conditions that allow diplomats to negotiate a durable peace and our development program can build schools and hospitals and train teachers and nurses.

Our successful and continuing historical experiment with pluralism gives us a remarkable asset and a position of responsibility to make a better world. We can be bridge between nations and a linch-pin across oceans. The diversity of our population and especially the networks that we gain through immigration gives us 'standing' and an ability to 'Think Big' on the major developments of our time, like the rise of China and India and climate change.

Our global diplomatic service give us a different 'perspective,' especially on places like Cuba and the quiet work we are doing in development through, for example, training judges and police in the rule of law and the importance of governance. Our relationship with the United States gives us a unique influence as interpreter of America to the world and to America on the world. Played effectively, our global relationships have immense value both in themselves and in reinforcing our sense of who we are and what we represent as a nation.

Maintaining this capacity requires leadership and sustained commitment. It will make demands on our financial resources. Are we prepared to make that commitment?

"To whom much is given, much is expected."