



centre for security
and defence studies

centre for security and defence studies

norman paterson school of international affairs
carleton university

annual report 2006-07

prepared for
the security and defence forum (SDF)
department of national defence
30 march 2007

centre for security and defence studies
norman paterson school of international affairs
carleton university
1401 dunton tower | 1125 colonel by drive | ottawa ON K1V 8H8
tel 613.520.6655 | fax 613.520.2889
csds@carleton.ca | www.carleton.ca/csds

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----------|
| Section 1 | Mission Statement | |
| | Mission Statement..... | 1 |
| | Relationship between mission statement and Centre activities..... | 1 |
| | Match between current fiscal year activities and original five-year funding proposal..... | 1 |
| | Activities planned for next year and their match with original five-year funding proposal..... | 2 |
| Section 2 | Performance Indicators | |
| | 2.1. Resident academic research population..... | 3 |
| | 2.2. Publications..... | 3 |
| | 2.3. Participation in relevant off-campus events..... | 7 |
| | 2.4. Courses with significant security and defence content..... | 9 |
| | 2.5. Student research activities on security and defence issues..... | 12 |
| | 2.6. Media contact..... | 16 |
| | 2.7. Outreach strategy..... | 18 |
| | a. All Centre-sponsored events on security and defence..... | 18 |
| | b. Interaction with government departments and Canadian Forces..... | 23 |
| | c. Interaction with non-governmental organizations..... | 25 |
| | d. Efforts to speak to the general public and those beyond the regular audience of the Centre..... | 27 |
| Section 3 | Financial Information | |
| | 3.1. Overall Centre Budget..... | 28 |
| | 3.2. Research Grants/Awards..... | 28 |
| | 3.3. Complete Financial Information..... | 28 |
| Annex A | List of Centre Associates and Fellows..... | 30 |
| Annex B | Selected Op-Eds and Media Transcripts (from 2.6)..... | 32 |

Section One – Mission Statement

Mission Statement

The Centre for Security and Defence Studies (CSDS) at Carleton University's Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA) seeks to increase awareness and enrich understanding of international and Canadian security, foreign and defence policy issues. The Centre's primary mission is to promote knowledge of, and innovative solutions to, Canadian and global security challenges through a program of interdisciplinary undergraduate- and graduate-level teaching and development of young scholars, research, and outreach to the academic and policy communities and general public.

Relationship between the mission statement and Centre activities

To fulfill its mandate, CSDS engages in three main activities:

- 1. Education.** CSDS promotes interdisciplinary post-graduate, graduate and undergraduate education at NPSIA and other Carleton departments in the fields of conflict analysis, international conflict management and resolution, defence and security studies, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, intelligence studies, and Canadian foreign policy. CSDS provides support for security and defence-related course instruction, course design, teaching innovation, student thesis supervision, and student research and conference travel, as well as support for student-initiatives, such as Carleton's Model NATO conference.
- 2. Research.** CSDS provides support for advanced interdisciplinary research and publication on security and defence-related issues by NPSIA and Carleton faculty, MA and doctoral students, and outside specialists. This includes a doctoral fellows program; visiting senior research fellows program; graduate fellows program; conference participation support for Centre Associates; support for the NPSIA Resource Centre, which affords access to specialized publications that meet the research and teaching requirements of our students and faculty; and the Working Paper Series, which provides a publishing venue for Centre Associates, students and the broader NPSIA and Carleton community.
- 3. Outreach.** CSDS undertakes outreach activities targeting the Carleton University and broader Ottawa-area security and defence community, including Government of Canada departments and agencies, the Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps, Ottawa-area high schools and colleges, national and international professional and scholarly associations, non-governmental organizations, the general public, and the security and defence community throughout Canada and internationally. Centre activities include public lectures and seminars, academic and policy conferences, specialized workshops, publications, and interviews with electronic and print media on security and defence-related issues.

Match between current fiscal year activities and original five-year funding proposal

All major elements of the CSDS funding proposal were implemented during the past year.

CSDS implemented its **education** goals through a variety of mechanisms, as outlined in its funding proposal. The Centre supported the teaching of 33 graduate and undergraduate courses with substantive security and defence content, while CSDS faculty and research associates supervised 77 graduate and undergraduate research projects. CSDS Associates also delivered NPSIA's first interdisciplinary doctoral field seminar focusing on peace and security issues. The Centre organized a field trip for graduate students to the Peace Support Training Centre in Kingston, Ontario to observe a live training exercise. In addition, CSDS supported

a two-day academic field trip for 17 graduate students to the United Nations in New York City, for substantive briefings by personnel at the organization and Canadian Permanent Mission. The Centre also consolidated its support for the very successful annual Carleton Model NATO Conference, which attracts nearly 200 university students from across Canada and internationally, by providing core funding for the establishment of a Model NATO Fellowship. In cooperation with the Department of Political Science at Carleton, the MNATO Fellowship supports the activities of the conference coordinator.

The active, interdisciplinary **research** program of Centre Associates, identified in the CSDS funding proposal, led to the publication of 8 books and monographs, 24 book chapters, 19 scholarly journal articles, and more than 100 conference papers and presentations on security and defence-related issues. Dissemination of Centre-focused as well as outside research on defence and security issues was facilitated through the CSDS Working Paper Series as well as its continued support for the highly-acclaimed *Canada Among Nations* series. The recent establishment of Centre Working Groups has helped to focus CSDS research activities by providing a strong foundation for future innovative research projects, including a collaborative project with the Canadian Council on International Law, "Canadian Perspectives on International Humanitarian Law."

In keeping with its funding proposal, CSDS also pursued an active **outreach** program engaging a diverse audience on Canadian and international defence and security issues. CSDS organized, co-organized or sponsored 31 events that attracted more than 2,200 people from academia, government (including members of Parliament, PCO, DFAIT, DND, and the Canadian Forces), the Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps, NGOs, media, members of the public, and "non-traditional" audiences such as high school students. These events included: a major international conference on exit strategies that brought together leading international scholars on military strategy, statebuilding and intervention to engage a select audience of Canadian policy makers, academics, and students; more than a dozen public lectures, roundtables, and seminars held at Carleton University; six Strategic Analysis Seminar Series meetings held in downtown Ottawa, directed at foreign policy, defence, security and intelligence officials; and the 20th Annual High School World Issues conference, which brought nearly 700 students from Ottawa-area Francophone and Anglophone high schools to Carleton for a day of seminar presentations on international and Canadian foreign, security and defence policy issues. Centre associates also engaged the broader public through nearly 140 media interviews and a dozen op-eds in international, national and local newspapers.

Activities planned for next year and their match with the original five-year funding proposal

The next fiscal year begins the second year of the current five-year grant cycle. In keeping with its funding proposal, the Centre will continue to pursue its core mission of teaching, research, and outreach on international and Canadian defence and security issues. In its funding proposal, CSDS proposed hosting the annual SDF conference in Ottawa on a biennial basis, and will host the first one this fall. In addition, CSDS will organize at least one major international, interdisciplinary conference; 15-20 Speaker Series lectures, roundtables, workshops and seminars; 6-8 Strategic Analysis Seminar meetings; and the 21st Annual High School World Issues conference. In addition, the Centre will continue to support faculty and student research and publication, participation in domestic and international conferences, Model NATO, and innovative teaching in international security issues, including the new Intelligence and National Security cluster at NPSIA.

Section Two – Performance Indicators

2.1 Resident academic research population focused on security and defence issues (i.e. core group affiliated and residing with the Centre)

| | Current Total | Last Year's Total |
|---|---------------|-------------------|
| Number of Centre faculty involved in research | 15 | 15 |
| Number of Centre staff involved in research | 7 | 8 |
| Number of graduate students involved in research | 62 | 50 |

Relationship and work of research associates

The Centre's 15 Faculty Associates are full-time Carleton University faculty members drawn from the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Department of Political Science, Department of History, The School of Journalism and Communication, and the Sprott School of Business. Faculty Associates are engaged in teaching, research and student supervisions primarily, though not exclusively, in the area of Canadian and international security, defence and foreign affairs. The Centre's affiliated Research Associates include NPSIA and political science department sessional lecturers (N. Mychajlyszyn, G. Dawson, and L. Stovel), a retired Privy Council Office intelligence official (A. Campbell), a DND Strategic Analyst (B. Greene), a DFAIT analyst (C. McQueen), a retired CF officer (K. Pennie), and an employee of the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre (S. Meharg). They are all active members of the Centre, engaging in research, teaching and outreach activities on security and defence issues.

A list of current Faculty and Research Associates is included in Annex A.

Post-doctoral accomplishments

Dr. Grant Dawson, the CSDS Post-Doctoral Fellow through August 2006, saw the publication of his book, *Here is Hell: Canada's Engagement in Somalia in 1992-93* (UBC Press), completed while resident at the Centre. In addition, he worked closely with the Director and Deputy Director in running the day-to-day operations of the Centre and organizing Centre events. In particular, Dr. Dawson programmed and coordinated the CSDS Speaker Series lectures and assisted the Director and Deputy Director with organization of special seminars through August 2006. Dr. Dawson has since become a resident Research Associate of the Centre. The Post-Doctoral Fellowship program concluded as of September 2006, with the addition of a Doctoral Fellow and a part-time administrator to the Centre.

2.2 Publications (authored by core group affiliated and residing with the Centre)

| | Current Total | Last Year's Total |
|--|---------------|-------------------|
| External or Academic Press (includes books, book chapters, journals, reviews, etc.) | 52 | 49 |
| Internal or In-House Publications | 3 | 3 |

External or Academic Press

Armstrong, M.J. "Effective attacks in the salvo combat model: salvo sizes and quantities of targets." Journal article in Naval Research Logistics, Vol. 54, No. 1 (2007): 66-77.

Bouffard, Sonia and David Carment. "The Sri Lanka Peace Process: A Review and Critique." Journal article in Journal of South Asian Development, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2006).

Carment, David and Caroline Delany, with Susan Ampleford, George Conway and Angelica Ospina. "Country Indicators for Foreign Policy: Developing an Indicators-Based User Friendly Risk Assessment Capability." Book chapter in Robert Trappi (ed), Programming for Peace: Computer-Aided Methods for International Conflict Resolution and Prevention. Dordrecht, NL: Springer, 2006.

Carment, David and Dane Rowlands. "Assessing Chaim Kaufmann's Claims on Separation." Book chapter in Roy Licklider (ed), Living Together After Ethnic Killing. London: Routledge, 2006.

Carment, David and Martin Rudner (eds). Peacekeeping Intelligence: New Players and Extended Boundaries. Abingdon, Oxford, UK: Frank Cass Publishers, 2006. Edited volume.

Carment, David, Kristine St. Pierre and Genevieve Asselin. "Rwanda: A Case Study." Book chapter in Karl DeRouen and UK Heo (eds), Civil Wars of the World: Major Conflicts since World War II. ABC-CLIO, 2006.

Carment, David, Martin Rudner, and Rachel Lea Heide. "Peacekeeping Intelligence: Extending Partnerships and Boundaries for Peacekeeping." Book chapter in David Carment and Martin Rudner (eds), Peacekeeping Intelligence: New Players and Extended Boundaries. Abingdon, Oxford, UK: Frank Cass Publishers, 2006.

Carment, David, Patrick James and Zeynep Taydas. Who Intervenes? Ethnic Conflict and Interstate Crises. Ohio State University Press, 2006. Book.

Carment, David, Souleima el-Achkar, Stewart Prest, and Yiagadeesen Samy. "The 2006 Country Indicators for Foreign Policy: Opportunities and Challenges for the Canadian Government." Journal article in Canadian Foreign Policy, Vol. 13, No. 1 (2006).

Carment, David, Stewart Prest and Yiagadeesen Samy. "Assessing Small Island Developing State Fragility." Book Chapter in Lino Briguglio and Eliawony J. Kisanga (eds), Building the Economic Resilience of Small States. London: The Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006.

Crocker, Chester A., Fen Osler Hampson and Pamela Aall (eds). Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007. Edited volume.

Dawson, Grant. Here is Hell: Canada's Engagement in Somalia. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007. Book.

Findlay, Trevor. "Lessons of UNSCOM and UNMOVIC for WMD." Book chapter in Waheguru Pal Sidhu and Ramesh Thakur (eds), Arms Control After Iraq. United Nations University Press, 2006.

Findlay, Trevor. "Monitoring, verification and compliance." Book chapter in G. Geeraerts, N. Pauwels, and E. Remacle (eds), Dimensions of Peace and Security: A Reader. Brussels: P.I.E.-Peter Lang S.A., 2006.

Findlay, Trevor. "Verification and the BWC: last gasp or signs of life?" Journal article in Arms Control Today, Vol. 36, No. 7, September 2006.

Findlay, Trevor. "Weapons of mass destruction." Book chapter in Edward Newman, Ramesh Thakur and John Tirman (eds), Multilateralism Under Challenge? Power, International Order, and Structural Change. United Nations University Press, 2006.

Findlay, Trevor. «La problématique de l'utilisation de la force dans le cadre d'opérations de paix». Book chapter in Jocelyn Coulon (ed), Guide du Maintien de la Paix 2007. Montreal: Centre d'études des politiques étrangères et de sécurité.

Hampson, Fen Osler. "Leashing the Dogs of War." Book chapter in Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (eds). Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World, 3-16. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Hampson, Fen Osler. "Negotiation and Conflict Management." Book chapter in Charles Weber and Johann Galtung (eds). Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

Hampson, Fen Osler. "The Risks of Peace: Implications for International Mediation." Journal article in Negotiation Journal, Vol. 22, No. 1 (January 2006): 13-30.

Hampson, Fen Osler. "Peace in Our Time? Despite the headlines, the world has actually become a less violent place." A Review of the Human Security Report 2005: War and Peace in the 21st Century. Literary Review of Canada (May 2006): 8-10.

Hillmer, Norman and J.L. Granatstein (eds). The Land Newly Found: Eyewitness Accounts of the Canadian Immigrant Experience. Toronto: Thomas Allen Publishers, 2006. Edited volume.

Hillmer, Norman. "Are Canadians Anti-American?" Journal article in Policy Options (July-August 2006): 63-65.

Hillmer, Norman. "Our Military Tradition." Book chapter in Our Military Tradition: Historica-CN Teacher Resource Guide, 2006.

Lagassé, Philippe. "Suspenders and a Belt: Perimeter and Border Security in Canada-United States Relations" (with Joel J. Sokolsky). Journal article in Canadian Foreign Policy, Vol. 12 (2006).

Long, David. "Liberalism, Imperialism and Empire." Journal article in Studies in Political Economy, No. 78 (Autumn 2006).

Long, David. "NATO After Atlanticism." Book chapter in Osvaldo Croci and Amy Verdun (eds), Storm over the Atlantic: Transatlantic Relations from Kosovo to Iraq, Manchester University Press, 2006.

Long, David. "Quidditch, Imperialism and the Sport-War Intertext." Book chapter in Iver Neumann and Daniel Nexon (eds), Harry Potter and World Politics. London: Routledge, 2006.

Long, David. "Who Killed the International Studies Conference?" Journal article in Review of International Studies, Vol. 32, No. 4 (October 2006).

Marriot, Koren and David Carment. "International Conflict Prevention: An Assessment of Canadian Perceptions and Policies." Book chapter in Patrick James and Marc O'Reilly (eds), Handbook of Canadian Foreign Policy. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006.

Mendeloff, David and Fen Osler Hampson. "Intervention and the Nation-building Debate." Book chapter in Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (eds). Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World, 670-700. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Mendeloff, David and Sven Biscop (eds). Studia Diplomatica Vol. LVIII, No. 2 (2005) [published 2006]. Special issue, "Power to the System: The UN High Level Panel and the Reinvigoration of Collective Security," based on proceedings of the joint NPSIA/CSDS-IRRI/KIIB conference held June 2005. Edited volume.

McQueen, Carol. "Democratic Republic of Congo." Book chapter in Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2006. New York: Lynne Rienner, 2006.

McQueen, Carol. Humanitarian Intervention and Safety Zones: Iraq, Bosnia and Rwanda. London: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2006. Book.

Mychajlyszyn, Natalie. "Review of Philip G. Roeder and Donald Rothchild, eds., Sustainable Peace: Power and Democracy After Civil Wars." Book review in International Studies Review Vol. 8, No. 4 (December 2006).

Mychajlyszyn, Natalie. "Review of Richard Caplan, International Governance of War-Torn Territories: Rule and Reconstruction." Book review in International Studies Review Vol. 8, No. 1 (March 2006).

Penny, Christopher K. "Book Review: New Wars, New Laws? and The Prosecution and Defense of Peacekeepers under International Criminal Law," journal article in Canadian Yearbook of International Law, Vol. 43 (2007): 683-686.

Penny, Christopher K. "Greening the Security Council: Climate Change as an Emerging Threat to International Peace and Security." Journal article in International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, Vol. 7 (2007): 35-71.

Penny, Christopher K. "Just Peacekeeping: Managing the Relationship between Peacekeeping Intelligence and the Prevention and Punishment of International Crimes." Book chapter in D. Carment and M. Rudner (eds), Peacekeeping Intelligence: New Players, Extended Boundaries. London: Routledge, 2006.

Penny, Christopher K. "The Challenges of Frail, Failed and Failing States," Nonrefereed conference proceeding published in special issue of Studia Diplomatica Vol. LVIII, No. 2 (2005) [published 2006]: 37-41.

Rowlands, Dane and Andrew Cooper (eds). Canada Among Nations 2006: Minorities and Priorities. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. Edited volume.

Rowlands, Dane and David Carment. "Force and Bias: Towards a Predictive Model of Effective Third-Party Intervention." Journal article in Journal of Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 17, No. 5 (2006): 435-456.

Rudner, Martin and Larry Black (eds). The Gouzenko Affair. Canada and the Beginnings of Cold War Counter-Espionage, Canada/Russia Series No. 8. Ottawa: Penumbra Press, 2006. Edited Volume.

Rudner, Martin. "Intelligence Analysis and Counter-Terrorism: How Lies the Landscape?" Book chapter in Magnus Ranstorp (ed), Mapping Terrorism Research: State of the Art, Gaps and Future Direction. Cass Series on Political Violence. London: Routledge, 2007, 189-209.

Rudner, Martin. "Protecting North America's Energy Infrastructure Against Terrorism." Journal article in International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Fall, 2006): 424-442.

Rudner, Martin. "The Historical Evolution of Canada's Foreign Intelligence Capability: Cold War SIGINT Strategy and its Legacy." Journal article in Journal of Intelligence History, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2006): 81-98.

Rudner, Martin. "The Media in Intelligence Oversight: Who Watches the Watchers of the Watchers?" Book chapter in W.K. Smidt, U. Poppe, W. Krieger, H. Müller-Enbergs (eds), Geheimhaltung und Transparenz Demokratische Kontrolle der Geheimdienste im internationalen Vergleich. Münster: Lit Verlag, 2006.

Schmidt, Brian. "Epilogue." Book chapter in Knud Erik Jorgensen and Tony Brems Knudsen (eds), International Relations in Europe: Traditions, Perspectives and Destinations. London: Routledge: 2006: 253-269.

Schmidt, Brian. "Review of Christopher Layne, The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present." Journal article in International Affairs (September 2006): 1031-1032.

Schnabel, Albrecht and Carment, David. "Conflict Prevention, Concept and Application." Book chapter in Geeraerts, G. Pauwels, N and Remacle, E. (eds). Dimensions of Peace and Security: A Reader . Brussels: Peter Lang, 2006.

Sloan, Elinor. "Canada's International Security Policy Under a Conservative Government." Book chapter in Andrew Cooper and Dane Rowlands (eds), Canada Among Nations 2006: Minorities and Priorities. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Sucharov, Mira. "Social Identity and the National Interest in Canadian Middle East Policy." Book chapter in Tami Amanda Jacoby and Ayla Kiliç (eds), Maple Sands: Canada and the Middle East During the Chretien Era. Bison Paper Series. Winnipeg: Centre for Defence and Security Studies, 2006.

Internal or In-House Publications

Lagassé, Philippe. "American Conservatives and Homeland Security." Canadian Institute for Strategic Studies Datalink, No.135 (June 2006)

Meharg, Sarah Jane. "Identicide: Precursor to Genocide." CSDS Working Paper 05 (November 2006).

St-Pierre, Kristine. "The Role of Rapid Reaction Forces: Predicating Responsibility in Cases of Humanitarian Crises," CSDS Working Paper 04 (July 2006).

2.3 Participation in relevant off-campus external events

| | Faculty/Associates & Number of Events | Students & Number of Events |
|---|--|--|
| Number of resident staff who participated in domestic conferences | 22 Associates attended 55 events. | 8 Students attended 9 events. |
| Number of resident staff who participated in international conferences | 13 Associates attended 38 events. | 4 Students attended 5 events. |

Use of the SDF International Conference Fund

Grant Dawson: *Atlantic Treaty Association/Youth Atlantic Treaty Association*, Annual General Meeting, 5-10 December 2006, Athens, Greece; chaired conference wrap-up panel and presented conclusions from conference roundtable.

Urmi Desai: 2006 Harvard Project for Asian and International Relations (HPAIR) Conference in Singapore, 18-21 August 2006; presented paper, "When Ideas Do Matter: Indian Worldviews, Framing Contests and Nuclear Policy Patterns."

Natalie Mychajlyszyn: *Democratic Development and Democratic Education in Ukraine*, Fourth Annual International Conference, Ministry of Education Ukraine, CIDA, Canada-Ukraine Democratic Development Project – Queen's University, Yalta, Ukraine, September 2006; presented paper, "Ukraine and Democratic Civil-Military Relations" on a panel discussing the impact of NATO programs on Ukraine's civil-military reforms.

Michael Vladars: *Achilles Seminar on Transformation and the Transatlantic Relationship*, Atlantic Council of the United States, Washington, DC and Norfolk, VA, 16-19 October 06; chaired student delegation to the meeting.

Michael Vladars: *Tomorrow's Leaders and the Future of Euro-Atlantic Security*, 2006 Rome Atlantic Forum meeting, Centre for Advanced Defence Studies, Rome, September 25-27; sole Canadian representative to the meeting; chaired the "Future Operations Working Group."

Use of the SDF National Conference Fund

Andrew Harrington: "Capacity Building for Peace and Development: Roles of Diaspora," Conference organized by the University for Peace, 19-20 October 2006 in Toronto; presentation of co-authored paper, "Jamaica, Haiti, Diasporas and Peace Building."

Chris Penny: 7th Canadian Conference on Ethical Leadership, Royal Military College, Kingston, ON, 29 November 2006; presented paper, "Amoral Automatons: A Moral Critique of Superior Orders as a Full Defence to War Crimes Charges."

Per Unheim: "Capacity Building for Peace and Development: Roles of Diaspora," Conference organized by the University for Peace, 19-20 October 2006 in Toronto; presentation of co-authored paper, "Jamaica, Haiti, Diasporas and Peace Building."

Elizabeth St. Jean: SDF Annual Conference, Kingston, 21-22 September 2006; presentation of research project on UN peacekeeping missions in the Congo.

2.4 Courses with significant (at least 50%) security and defence content

| Course Name and Calendar Description | Instructor | Course Enrolment |
|--|------------|------------------|
| 1. FYSM 1602: Selected Topics in Political Science: United Nations and Peace and Security Selected topics in politics and governance. | Schmidt | 30 |
| 2. HIST 1300: History of Canada An historical study of the political, economic and social development of Canada with emphasis on the twentieth century. | Hillmer | 130 |
| 3. HIST 3304: Canadian-American Relations An examination of diplomatic, economic, cultural and military relations, with particular attention to the twentieth century. | Hillmer | 30 |
| 4. HIST 3306: Canadian External Policy The development of Canadian attitudes and policies toward external affairs, with emphasis on the twentieth century. | Hillmer | 60 |
| 5. IANF 5506: International Law: Use of Force How legal constraints govern the use of force in international relations. Topics include legal options available to states and the international community, the use of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, peacekeeping, and humanitarian intervention. | Penny | 18 |
| 6. IANF 3000: Policy in a Global Context Analysis of international policy processes relevant to governments, non-governmental organizations, international organizations and multinational corporations, drawing upon theories of international relations, Political science, law and economics. Emphasis on analytical and normative aspects of public policy processes in international relations. | Penny | 29 |
| 7. IANF 4101F: Special Topics in Conflict Analysis and International Affairs: Post-Conflict Peacebuilding Selected issues in conflict analysis from an interdisciplinary perspective. | Mendeloff | 25 |
| 8. IANF 5108F: Conflict Analysis This seminar examines the sources of international and intrastate conflict. Students will gain practical insight and understanding of the causes of conflict by drawing on frameworks from a number of social science disciplines, with a focus on diagnostic and analytical skills in the decision making process. | Mendeloff | 8 |
| 9. IANF 5109W: Conflict Management: Theory and Evidence An evaluation of both process and content-oriented measurements of effectiveness in the practice of conflict management with special attention to third party intervention such as peacekeeping, crisis decision making, the management of terrorism and conflict prevention with applications to regional and intrastate conflict | Carment | 12 |

| | | |
|---|--------------|----|
| 10. INAF5200W: Peacebuilding and Reconstruction: Theory and Practice Social, economic and military dimensions of post-conflict reconstruction with special attention to the role of local and international government and NGOs in the peacebuilding process. Evidence is drawn from recent cases. | Bush | 21 |
| 11. INAF 5201: Theory and Practice of Arms Control Theoretical and analytical underpinnings of modern arms control, including nuclear non-proliferation issues in the post Cold War era with special emphasis on the impact of political, economic, technological and social-psychological factors on international security. | Findlay | 9 |
| 12. INAF 5203W: International Mediation and Conflict Resolution This seminar explores various approaches to the management and resolution of international economic, political and security conflicts. These approaches may include arbitration, conciliation and mediation as well as less formal mechanisms for third party consultation and collaborative problem-solving. | Carment | 15 |
| 13. INAF 5204F: Intelligence, Statecraft and International Affairs The role of intelligence in foreign and security policy after the Cold War. Evolution of intelligence as regards strategic and policy requirements, the capabilities of selected services, interactions within government and civil society. Particular attention to the structure and functions of Canada's intelligence community. | Rudner | 19 |
| 14. INAF 5205W: Economics of Conflict The economic dimensions of conflict and the application of economic methods to understanding conflict and conflict management. | Rowlands | 28 |
| 15. INAF 5207W: Middle East Economic and Political Relations Economic and political relations among countries of the Middle East; emphasis on the peace process and arrangements for regional security and regional economic cooperation; prospects for regional collaboration. | Rudner | 10 |
| 16. INAF 5209: Conflict and development A critical examination of competing interpretations of conflict in developing countries, with a focus on material conditions, institutional factors, and ideological, or identity-based framing processes. Includes an analysis of the impact of war on development, and the implications for policy. | Daudelin | 21 |
| 17. INAF 5305F: International Bargaining and Negotiation: Theory and Practice An examination of bargaining and negotiation in international economic, political and security issue areas, emphasizing case studies as well as theoretical analysis. | Hampson | 22 |
| 18. INAF 5405: International Organizations in International Affairs A critical analysis of the roles played by the UN and other international organizations in the fields of international conflict, development, and political economy. | Penny | 21 |
| 19. INAF 5409S: Civil-Military Relations Examines the theoretical and practical issues of civil-military relations, emphasising the multidisciplinary and multidimensional nature of the relationship between society, political authority and the military, using comparative and global frames of reference. | Mychajlyszyn | 11 |

| | | |
|--|---------|-----|
| <p>20. INAF 5505: International Law: Theory and Practice Examines various theoretical perspectives on international law and locates the role international law plays in the international system. Topics include basis, creation and sources of international law, international dispute resolution, and international law and world order transformation.</p> | Penny | 16 |
| <p>21. INAF 5704W: Human Security: From Policy to Practice Exploration of human security issues drawing on the perspectives of key governmental, international and non-governmental actors. Topics include: micro-disarmament; the protection of civilians; war economies; and post-conflict security issues.</p> | Ron | 16 |
| <p>22. INAF 5800F - Asia Pacific Economic and Political Relations The evolving pattern of economic and political relations in the Asia-Pacific region. Topics will include security issues; trade and investment; and development cooperation; institutional arrangements, including ASEAN, APEC, AFTA, and Canada's role in the regional affairs.</p> | Tepper | 10 |
| <p>23. INAF 6100: Field Seminar in Conflict Management & Resolution Interdisciplinary and policy-oriented research on international and intrastate conflict management and resolution. Topics include Conflict management, peacekeeping, crisis decision-making, the management of terrorism, concepts of security, arms control, peacebuilding, and conflict prevention.</p> | Hampson | 8 |
| <p>24. INAF5102W: Canada-US Relations The relationship between Canada and the United States from political, economic, diplomatic, military, and cultural perspectives. The history of Canada's relations with the United States, as our neighbor, trading partner, ally, and sometime antagonist</p> | Cohen | 12 |
| <p>25. INAF5202: International Security After the Cold War This course examines the evolving strategic and security environment in international relations after the Cold war, addressing both traditional and non-traditional concepts of national and international security. Topics discussed include new threats to security such as transnational crime, forced migration and international terrorism.</p> | Findlay | 18 |
| <p>26. PSCI 2601: Global Politics Introduction to theories, concepts and issues in global politics. Topics may include conflict and intervention, peace and security, international institutions, norms and ethics, human rights, gender, culture, and globalization.</p> | Sloan | 200 |
| <p>27. PSCI 2601T: Global Politics Introduction to theories, concepts and issues in global politics. Topics may include conflict and intervention, peace and security, international institutions, norms and ethics, human rights, gender, culture, and globalization.</p> | Sloan | 100 |
| <p>28. PSCI 3107: The Causes of War Alternate theories of the causes of war. Such alternate perspectives as biological, social and comparative historical approaches, including the results of peace research activities of the past two decades, are covered.</p> | Schmidt | 120 |

| | | |
|---|---------|----|
| 29. PSCI 3603: Strategic Thought and International Security Issues The ideas of classical and contemporary strategic thinkers. International security issues and concepts. | Sloan | 60 |
| 30. PSCI 3605: Comparative Analysis of Foreign Policy The utility of comparative analysis in the study of the objectives, strategies and decision-making processes involved in the foreign policies of states. | Dawson | 40 |
| 31. PSCI 3607: North American Security and Defence Policy The evolution of Canadian and U.S. security and defence policy as it pertains to North America. Contemporary issues and development. | Legassé | 58 |
| 32. PSCI 4606: American Foreign Policy The sources, trends and conflicting interpretations of the international roles of the United States since World War II. Foreign policy machinery and processes assessed in terms of the relative importance of perceptions, ideology, self-interest, and domestic and foreign pressures. | Schmidt | 25 |
| 33. PSCI 5803: Transatlantic Security Issues NATO as a political and military alliance. NATO and 21st-century threats. Security roles for the European Union. Broader transatlantic security issues. | Sloan | 14 |

2.5 Student research activities on security and defence issues

| Student Name | Type of Activity | Activity Description/Title |
|----------------|---|---|
| 1. Aldrich, R. | BA, Political Science | BA Honours Thesis, "The Role of Women in the Canadian Forces." |
| 2. Asselin, G. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Gender-Sensitive Peacebuilding: What the Discourse and Its Practice Have Meant for Women in Guatemala." |
| 3. Babcock, A. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "The Royal Canadian Air Force, 1945-1964." |
| 4. Baker, J. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay on CIMIC in Afghanistan. |
| 5. Bamford, C. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Past the Crossroads: Identity Realism in Post-Millennial Japan." |
| 6. Bérubé, E. | MA, International Affairs/LLB | MA Research Essay, "A Rights-Based Approach to Transitional Justice: How the Guatemalan Truth Commission Impacted Victim's Rights." |
| 7. Biggs, C.D. | BA, Political Science | B.A. Honours Thesis, "International Relations Theory and International Terrorism" |
| 8. Blais, M-J | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "The Name Game: Should Truth Commissions Name Names?" |
| 9. Blank, T. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "Transitional Justice: Measuring the Effectiveness of Prosecution In Latin America." |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 10. Bleakney, J. | BA, Public Affairs and Policy Management | B.A. Honours Thesis on conflict in Africa. |
| 11. Bradfield, H. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay on legal responses to massive human rights violations. |
| 12. Bruneau, R. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Non-Violence and Human Security in Civil Wars: Unarmed Humanitarian Protection and Non-State Armed Groups." |
| 13. Bubrin, A. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Declining Refugee Protection Standards in Africa: Causes, Implications, Solutions." |
| 14. Burkes, I. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay on organized crime, interstate conflict and post-conflict peacebuilding. |
| 15. Burtch, A. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "Canadian Civil Defence in the 1950s and 1960s." |
| 16. Cholich, M. | BA, Political Science | BA Honours Thesis, "The Ottawa Convention Against Landmines: The Decision to Sign or Not Sign with Reference to Canada, Finland and the United States." |
| 17. Desai, U. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Emerging or Lurching? Making (Better) Sense of Foreign Policy Patterns in India and Brazil." |
| 18. Dowswell, M. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "International law and Preemptive Self-Defence." |
| 19. El Achkar, S. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay on resources and conflict. |
| 20. Facchin, J. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "Hybrid Post-Conflict Prosecution in Cambodia and Sierra Leone." |
| 21. Gagne, C. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral dissertation, "Canada and Vietnam." |
| 22. Galldin, K. | MA, International Affairs/LLB | MA Research Essay, "The GACACA'S Uneasy Balance: Post-Conflict Justice and Its Effect on Ethnic Security." |
| 23. Gentles, C. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "Canada and the Hungarian Revolution." |
| 24. Green, D. | PhD, Political Science (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "Domestic Impacts of External Threat Interpretation and the Militarization of Space." |
| 25. Grenon, J. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "Critical Infrastructure Jurisdiction in Canada: A Security Achilles' Heel?" |
| 26. Harrington, A. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay on private military companies. |
| 27. Heide, R. L. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "Organizing the RCAF, 1937-57." |
| 28. Hussein, H. | PhD, Political Science (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "Citizenship and the One-State Solution in Israel/Palestine." |
| 29. Janzen, D. | MA, Political Science | Major Research Paper, "Facing New Intelligence Challenges in the 21st Century: The Establishment of Security-Mdl in the Canadian Community." |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| 30. Kilberg, J. | PhD, International Affairs (in progress) | Research on mass casualty terrorism. |
| 31. Krystel, C. | BA, Political Science | BA Honours Thesis, "Measuring the Success of the Canadian 3-D Approach in Afghanistan." |
| 32. Lagassé, P. | PhD, Political Science (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "Canadian Grand Strategy After 1945." |
| 33. Laldin, A. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "The Impact of Negative Security Assurance on Compliance to NPT." |
| 34. Loftquist-Morgan, S. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Constructing a European Strategic Culture: The United States as a Catalytic Significant Other." |
| 35. Lulashnyk, T. | PhD, Political Science (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "Canadian Counter-Terrorism Policy." |
| 36. Mai, Y. | BA, Public Affairs and Policy Management (in progress) | BA Honours Thesis on internally-displaced populations. |
| 37. Martin, S. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay on democratization and stability. |
| 38. Masson, S. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "Canada and the SPP." |
| 39. Meester, D. | BA, Public Affairs and Policy Management | BA Honours Thesis, "Reforming the United Nations Security Council." |
| 40. Mensah, E. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Local Conflict Analysis: A Critique of National Conflict Indicators in Ghana." |
| 41. Michel, T. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "A Social History of the Nile Voyageurs." |
| 42. Milford, J. | BA, Public Affairs and Policy Management | BA Honours Thesis, "The Impact of Sanctions on Democratic Consolidation in Haiti." |
| 43. Mittleman, S. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "Impact of International Court of Justice Advisory Opinions." |
| 44. Morrell, K. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "The United Nations and Children's Rights." |
| 45. Muscant, L. | PhD, Political Science (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "US-Israel Relations." |
| 46. Newcombe, Q. | MA, International Affairs | MA Thesis, "Windows of Opportunity: Public Policy Formation and Human Security in Canadian Foreign Policy: 1996-2000." |
| 47. Newport, R. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "Canada and the Middle-East after 1945." |
| 48. Nisan, R. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Tactics for Tourists: Achieving Objectives as a Non-Permanent Member of the United Nations Security Council." |

| | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| 49. Pinkney, S. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Who's Your Daddy? Investigating the Organizational Responsibility for Children Fathered by UN Peacekeepers." |
| 50. Polyakov, S. | MA, European and Russian Studies | MA Thesis, "NATO-Russia Relations: Public Diplomacy, 2001-2006." |
| 51. Popa, D. | PhD, Political Science (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "The Challenge of the New Threat Environment to Civilian Control of Armed Forces." |
| 52. Popplewell, B. | BA, Political Science | BA Honours Thesis, "Rivals to America." |
| 53. Porter, N. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral dissertation, "Bridges Without Abutments? National Security Policy and the Relations Between the Departments of National Defence and External Affairs, History, 1944-1964." |
| 54. Powell, M. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "Canada and the Law of the Sea." |
| 55. Pratt, D. | BA, Political Science | Major Research Paper, "Is There a Canadian Grand Strategy?" |
| 56. Praught, C. | BA, Political Science | BA Honours Thesis, "Toward a Lasting Peace in Israel and Palestine." |
| 57. Prest, S. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Falling into war: The Role of Economic and Political Weakness in the Onset and Persistence of Civil Conflict." |
| 58. Robidoux, L. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "From Natural Resource Scarcity to Social Resource Scarcity: A Better Explanatory Model for Environmental Conflict." |
| 59. Ross, R. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Legality v. Legitimacy: A Great Divide in the Status of Humanitarian Intervention Since Kosovo." |
| 60. Roy, N. | PhD, Political Science (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation, "The 'New' Foreign Policy: India's Attempt at Great Powerdom?" |
| 61. Rubenstein, M. | BA, Political Science (in progress) | BA Honours Thesis on compliance theory: security vs. economic cases. |
| 62. Russomanno, L. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "International Politics and International Criminal Justice." |
| 63. Schryer-Roy, A-M | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "International Norms and Laws in a Changing World: Non-State Armed Groups and the Recruitment and Use of Child Soldiers." |
| 64. Seabrook, S. | BA, Political Science (in progress) | BA Honours Thesis on just war theory and humanitarian intervention. |
| 65. Shull, A. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay on the International Criminal Court. |
| 66. Sistovaris, M. | PhD, Public Administration (in progress) | Doctoral Dissertation on US Cuban policy. |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| 67. Smits, K. | BA, Public Affairs and Policy Management | BA Honours Thesis, "Economic Sanctions versus Humanitarian Intervention: What are the Humanitarian Impacts on Civilians in the Target State?" |
| 68. Spencer, C. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "The Trouble with Travel: The Impact of Consular Crises on Bilateral Relations." |
| 69. St. Jean, E. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "Use of Force in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations in the Congo." |
| 70. St. Pierre, K. | MA, International Affairs | MA Research Essay, "Opportunity and Willingness: Reconceptualizing Natural Resources in Intrastate Armed Conflict." |
| 71. Stange, C. | BA, Public Affairs and Policy Management (in progress) | BA Honours Thesis on internally-displaced populations. |
| 72. Stevens, A. | MA, International Affairs/LLB (in progress) | MA Research Essay on private military companies and failed states. |
| 73. Vladars, M. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay on US counter-insurgency strategy in Iraq. |
| 74. Wall, E. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay on DDR and Peacebuilding. |
| 75. Watson, B. | PhD, History (in progress) | Doctoral dissertation, "Fascism in Canada in the 1930s." |
| 76. Wilson, A. | MA, International Affairs/LLB | MA Research Essay, "International Criminal Tribunals: Does Distance Distort Justice?" |
| 77. Wyjad, K. | MA, International Affairs (in progress) | MA Research Essay, "Great Powers and PMC since the Cold War: Significance for the Debate over the Threat of PMC to State Sovereignty." |

2.6 Media Contact

Media Interviews (print, broadcast, radio etc.)

- Samples included in Annex B

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Total | 120 |
|--------------|-----|

Summary of the nature of the interviews

Centre Associates provided interviews and commentary to national and local-market print media, television, and radio on a wide-range of security and defence matters including the Canadian mission in Afghanistan, weapons procurement, the defence budget, terrorism and national security, border security, Canadian foreign policy and foreign aid, UN peacekeeping, weapons proliferation and multilateral arms control, and conflicts in North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Israel and Palestine, and the horn of Africa. In 2006, CSDS Associates provided interviews to international, national and local print media, including *The National Post*, *The Globe and Mail*, *The Ottawa Citizen*, *The Toronto Star*, *The Toronto Sun*, *Calgary Herald*, *The Winnipeg Sun*, *Montreal Gazette*, *Le Soleil*, *Macleans*, *The Walrus*, *The Chronicle-Herald (Halifax)*, *Edmonton Sun*, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Scotsman*, *Baltimore Sun*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, *San Diego Union Tribune*, *Reuters*, *Embassy Magazine*. CSDS Associates were also interviewed on national television news programs

such as CBC's *The National*, *CBC Newsworld*, *Global National News*, *CTV Newsnet*, *CITY Television*, and CPAC. In addition, Centre Associates provided commentary and interviews to national and provincial radio news programs, such as CBC's *World Report*, *The House*, as well as local and regional radio in Ottawa and across Canada, including Vancouver, Calgary, Saskatoon, Windsor, and Toronto.

OpEd Articles Published

- Samples included in Annex B

| | |
|--------------|----|
| Total | 11 |
|--------------|----|

Details for each article: author, title, newspaper where published, date published

Philippe Lagassé and Joel Sokolsky: "Suspenders and a Belt: Canada-United States Security Relations since September 2001," *Globe and Mail Online*, 19 June 2006.

Elinor Sloan: "More Protection, More Information: By Embracing BMD, Canada Can Ensure Ongoing Access to Critical U.S. Data," *National Post*, 19 May 2006, p. A18.

Elinor Sloan: "We Must Sacrifice Some Liberties," *Ottawa Citizen*, 27 June 2006, p. A13.

Norman Hillmer: "We Love Our Neighbours, We Love Them Not," *Calgary Herald*, 9 July 2006, A10.

David Carment: "Guess What? We Already Give More Than 0.7% Already," *Ottawa Citizen*, 3 March 2007, p. B7.

Andrew Cohen, "Big wind in Washington," *Ottawa Citizen*, 11 April 2006, p. A12.

Andrew Cohen, "War takes a rest on the DMZ," *Ottawa Citizen*, 9 May 2006, p. A14.

Andrew Cohen, "Dismembering Canada," *Ottawa Citizen*, 30 May 2006, p. A14.

Andrew Cohen, "Agonizing decisions," *Ottawa Citizen*, 25 July 2006, p. A10.

Andrew Cohen, "Mr. Harper's war," *Ottawa Citizen*, 15 August 2006, p. A10.

Andrew Cohen, "Canada awakens to the world," *Ottawa Citizen*, 17 October 2006, p. A16.

Media Background Briefings

| | |
|--------------|----|
| Total | 16 |
|--------------|----|

Description of the briefing topics and the media outlets receiving them

Centre background briefings and interviews were provided on a wide range of topics – Afghanistan, terrorism and border security, intelligence, middle east conflicts – to television, radio and print journalists at CBC Radio, CBC TV, CTV, *The National Post* and *Ottawa Citizen*.

2.7 Outreach Strategy: How the Centre attempted to meet the outreach strategy outlined in the five-year funding proposal

The Centre's outreach strategy is four-pronged: public lectures, conferences/specialized seminars, media engagement, and parliamentary engagement. The Centre actively engaged in all four areas over the past fiscal year: In terms of **public lectures**, CSDS organized, co-organized or sponsored 15 events as part of the CSDS Speaker Series. In terms of **conferences**, CSDS organized, co-organized or sponsored 5 major conferences and 11 specialized seminars and roundtables. In terms of **media engagement**, CSDS associates engaged in 140 media interviews and backgrounders and wrote 11 op-eds. In terms of **parliamentary engagement**, CSDS associates offered testimony to parliamentary and senate committees and engaged members of parliament in CSDS seminars and conferences. All told, CSDS events attracted more than 2,200 people, and reached many thousands more through media engagement.

Centre sponsored events on security and defence

Total Number of Events

| |
|----|
| 31 |
|----|

a) All Centre sponsored events on security and defence

NOTE: All events in Table a) will also likely appear in Table b) **and/or** Table c) **and/or** Table d) below

| Event | Number of Attendees | Audience Description |
|--|---------------------|--|
| Major Conferences | | |
| 1. 20th Annual High School World Issues Conference. Workshops on international and security affairs for high school students. Held over two days (one day for English schools, one for French schools). Workshop presenters included senior graduate students at Carleton, representatives of NGOs and government departments and agencies, including the CF. 20 and 22 February 2007. | 700 | Anglophone and Francophone high school students from the Ottawa area. |
| 2. Exit Strategies: Iraq, Afghanistan and Beyond. Major international conference featuring leading academics and policy experts on state-building, military strategy and foreign military intervention from Harvard, MIT, Georgetown, Columbia, RAND Corporation, Miami University, RMC, Carleton and University of Ottawa. 23 March 2007. | 130 | International and Canadian academics and students, members of Canadian government departments and agencies (DND/CF, DFAIT, CIDA, PCO, Public Safety), Members of Parliament and parliamentary staff, NGOs, members of foreign diplomatic community; members of the public. |

CSDS Speaker Series Public Lectures

The **CSDS Speaker Series**, brings leading security and defence-related scholars and practitioners to Carleton University 1-3 times per month throughout the year. Though targeted to students, the events are open to the public, widely advertised and are in fact well-attended by a wide range of individuals from the Ottawa-area academic, diplomatic and policy communities. Occasionally Speaker Series events are held in cooperation with NPSIA's other major research centres (the Canadian Centre of Security and Intelligence Studies and the Canadian Centre for Treaty Compliance), as well as other Carleton units (European and Russian Studies, Political Science, and the Committee on Values and Ethics).

| | | |
|--|----|--|
| 3. HE Howar Ziad , Ambassador of the Republic of Iraq to Canada. <i>"The Current Situation in Iraq and Prospects for the Future."</i> 6 April 2006. | 60 | Carleton, Ottawa U. and St. Paul university faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; NGOs; members of public. |
| 4. Adm. Sir Mark Stanhope , NATO Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Transformation. <i>"Understanding NATO Military Transformation."</i> 2 June 2006. | 62 | Carleton and Ottawa-area (Ottawa U. and St. Paul) university faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; representatives of government departments and agencies (DND/CF); NGOs; members of public. |
| 5. Michael J. Armstrong , Sprott School of Business and Michael B. Powell , History Department, Carleton University. <i>"Alternative Outcomes to the Battle of the Coral Sea."</i> 18 September 2006. | 14 | Carleton and Ottawa-area (Ottawa U. and St. Paul) university faculty, researchers, students. |
| 6. Raphael Cohen-Almagor , Director, Center for Democratic Studies, University of Haifa. <i>"The Hezbollah War."</i> 20 September 2006. | 41 | Carleton and Ottawa-area university (Ottawa U.) faculty, researchers, students; government departments and agencies (CBSA, DND/CF, CSE, DFAIT). |
| 7. Sir Emyr Jones Parry , UK Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations. <i>"Preventing and Resolving Conflict: How to Build Peace."</i> 25 September 2006. | 29 | Carleton and Ottawa-area university (Ottawa U.) faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps. |
| 8. Kevin McCort , Senior Vice President, International Operations, CARE Canada. <i>"Roles, Relationships and Rapport among NGOs and the Canadian Forces in Afghanistan."</i> 10 October 2006. | 28 | Carleton and Ottawa-area university (Ottawa U. and St. Paul) faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; representatives of government departments and agencies (IDRC, CIDA; DND/CF); NGOs; members of public. |
| 9. Don Neill , Directorate of Strategic Analysis, DND. <i>"The Chemical Weapons Convention at the Second Review Conference and Beyond."</i> 16 October 2006. Co-sponsor: Canadian Centre for Treaty Compliance, Carleton University. | 19 | Carleton university faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; representatives of government departments and agencies (DFAIT, DND/CF); members of public. |

| | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| <p>10. Carol McQueen, Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Group, DFAIT. <i>"Making the Democratic Republic of Congo Safe: MONUC and the Robust Use of Force in UN Peacekeeping Operations."</i> 1 November 2006.</p> | <p>37</p> | <p>Carleton and Ottawa-area (Ottawa U. and St. Paul) faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; representatives of government departments and agencies (DFAIT, IDRC, CIDA, DND/CF); NGOs; members of public.</p> |
| <p>11. Laura Stovel, Saint Paul University, Ottawa. <i>"Two Faces of Reconciliation: The Case of Post-War Sierra Leone."</i> 23 October 2006.</p> | <p>25</p> | <p>Carleton and Ottawa-area university (Ottawa U. and St. Paul) faculty, researchers, students.</p> |
| <p>12. Hein Goemans, University of Rochester. <i>"The Territorial Order of the International System: How Borders Are Drawn."</i> 17 November 2006.</p> | <p>25</p> | <p>Carleton and Ottawa-area university (Ottawa U. and St. Paul) faculty, researchers, students.</p> |
| <p>13. Grant Dawson, Carleton University. <i>"Canadian Military Intervention in Failed States: Lessons from Somalia."</i> 8 January 2007.</p> | <p>74</p> | <p>Carleton and Ottawa-area (Ottawa U. and St. Paul) faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; representatives of governmental departments and agencies (DFAIT, IDRC, CIDA, DND/CF); NGOs; members of public.</p> |
| <p>14. Jez Littlewood, Moutbatten Centre for International Studies, University of Southampton (UK). <i>"Mission Impossible 6: The outcome of the Bioweapons Conference and its Implications."</i> 11 January 2007. Co-sponsor: Canadian Centre for Treaty Compliance.</p> | <p>15</p> | <p>Carleton university faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; DND/CF; DFAIT.</p> |
| <p>15. Clifford Bob, Duquesne University. "Gunning for the Globe: The International Battle Over Small Arms Control." 2 February 2007.</p> | <p>39</p> | <p>Carleton university faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; DND/CF; NGOs (CIIA); members of public.</p> |
| <p>16. Brendon O'Connor, Griffith University (Australia). <i>"Canadians are from Venus, Australians are from Mars: Comparing Canadian and Australian Relations with the United States."</i> 26 February 2007.</p> | <p>10</p> | <p>Carleton University faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; NGOs (CIIA); members of public.</p> |
| <p>17. Angela Gendron, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University. <i>"The Ethics of Intelligence Collection."</i> 28 February 2007. Co-sponsor: Committee on Values and Ethics, Canadian Centre of Intelligence and Security Studies, Carleton University.</p> | <p>65</p> | <p>Carleton and Ottawa-area (Ottawa U. and St. Paul's) faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic corps; representatives of government departments and agencies (CSIS, RCMP, CISC, OPP, DND/CF); NGOs; members of public.</p> |

Strategic Analysis Seminar Series

The **Strategic Analysis Seminar Series**, held in downtown Ottawa approximately 6-8 times per year, is an invitation-only luncheon meeting that brings leading scholars and practitioners of international and Canadian security issues to provide an off-the-record, closed-door presentation and engage in discussions with members of the Canadian foreign policy, security, defence and intelligence communities and members of the foreign diplomatic corps based in Ottawa. This year's series drew an average of 40 participants per session, including junior, mid-level and senior policy officials from a variety of federal government departments (DND, CBSA, PCO/IAS, RCMP, CISC, CFIA, PSEPC, CSPS, Transport Canada, NRCan, CSE, CIC, Justice, and DFAIT), government agencies (CIDA and ITAC), Parliamentary staff, Ottawa-area academics and students, members of the Ottawa-based foreign diplomatic community (such as Russian Embassy, Swedish Embassy, Embassy of Japan and US Embassy), former executive public servants, journalists, representatives from the public sector.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| 18. Michael Kergin , Premier's Special Advisor on Border Issues, Province of Ontario; Ambassador to the United States, 2000-05. <i>"Border Security."</i> 6 June 2006. | 35 | Senior government officials (PCO, Transport, Justice, Industry, CBSA, CSIS, CSPS, DND); Member of the Senate (Pierre de Bane); Parliamentary Centre; Library of Parliament; Ottawa-area faculty and graduate students. |
| 19. Richard Evans , Senior Editor of the Terrorism Studies Group, Jane's Information Group, London, UK. <i>"Jihad In Mesopotamia: What foreign fighters learn in Iraq."</i> 14 September 2006. | 61 | Representatives from PCO/IAS, CISC RCMP, Justice, CBSA, DFAIT, DND, CSE, Transport; Ottawa-area University faculty and graduate students; members of foreign diplomatic community (Russia, Poland). |
| 20. Michael Herman , author of <i>Intelligence Power in Peace and War</i> . <i>"Did Intelligence Help in the Cold War?"</i> 25 October 2006. | 35 | Representatives from PCO/IAS, CISC RCMP, DFAIT, DND, CSE, CBSA; Ottawa-area University faculty and graduate students; members of foreign diplomatic community (Germany, US). |
| 21. Patrick Armstrong , Department of National Defence. <i>"Whither Russia?"</i> 21 November 2006. | 47 | Representatives from PCO/IAS, DND, CSIS, CISC RCMP, DFAIT, CBSA, Public Safety; Ottawa-area University faculty and graduate students; member of foreign diplomatic community (Japan). |
| 22. Paul Kennedy , Chairman of the Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP and former Senior Assistant Deputy Minister in the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness. <i>"Modernizing Oversight of the RCMP."</i> 15 January 2007. | 44 | Representatives from PCO/IAS, CISC RCMP, DFAIT, DND, CSE, CBSA, CSIS, Public Safety, Transport, Justice; Ottawa-area University faculty and graduate students; members of foreign diplomatic community (Germany, US, Poland). |
| 23. Paul Thibault , former President of CIDA, former Assistant Secretary for Security and Defence in PCO. <i>"History and Myths in Middle East Analysis."</i> 15 March 2007. | 30 | Representatives from PCO/IAS, CISC RCMP, DFAIT, DND, CBSA, Transport, Justice; Ottawa-area University faculty and graduate students. |

| Special Seminars, Roundtables and Workshops | | |
|--|-----|--|
| 24. "Canada-US Security Cooperation: A Briefing on the Final Report of the Canada-US Bi-National Planning Group." Briefing and discussion with Capt R. Bergeron (Canadian Navy) and Capt P. McClune (US Navy), Carleton University. 18 April 2006. | 11 | Carleton university faculty and students; members of Ottawa-based diplomatic corps; media; non-governmental organizations and members of public. |
| 25. "Transatlantic Security and German Views of US International Security Policies." Seminar by Karsten Voigt (German Foreign Ministry) with comments from Philippe Lagassé (CSDS Research Fellow), Carleton University. 16 October 2006. Co-sponsor: Centre for European Studies and the Institute for European and Russian Studies, Carleton University. | 45 | Carleton and Ottawa-area university (Ottawa U.) faculty, researchers, students; members of Ottawa-based diplomatic corps; representatives of government departments and agencies; members of public. |
| 26. "Norway's and Canada's Role in Peace and Reconciliation." Roundtable discussion with Jonas Gahr Støre, Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Carleton University. 26 February 2007. Co-Sponsor: Norman Paterson School of International Affairs; Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. | 54 | Carleton and Ottawa-area faculty, students; members of Ottawa-based diplomatic corps; representatives of government departments and agencies (DFAIT, CIDA, PCO, RCMP); representatives of the Norwegian foreign ministry; NGOs; and members of public. |
| 27. Roundtable discussion with Sir Jeremy Greenstock , Director, The Ditchley Foundation and Former UK Permanent Representative to the UN (1998-2003) and UK Special Representative for Iraq (2003-04). 2 March 2007. | 9 | NPSIA faculty, CSDS research associates, students. |
| Sponsored Events | | |
| 28. "Canada and the Future of Peacekeeping." Sponsored lunchtime keynote address by Dwight Mason , Senior Associate, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, DC, at the Conference, "50+ Years: Canada and Peacekeeping - History, Evolutions, Perceptions," University of Ottawa, 11-13 May 2006. | 55 | Canadian and international academics and students; members of government departments and agencies (DFAIT, DND/CF). |
| 29. "Foreign Policy Under a Conservative Government: An Interim Report Card." CDFAI 2006 Annual Conference, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Ottawa. 30 October 2006. Contributing Partners: CDFAI, CIGI, Université Laval, UQAM, Queen's University, Research Group in International Security, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Canada Institute. | 200 | Canadian academics and students; members of government departments and agencies (DND/CF, DFAIT, NRC, Citizenship and Immigration, CIDA, RCMP, CSE); NGOs; private industry, members of public. |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| <p>30. “Preventing Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity: What Can Canada and Canada’s Parliament Do?” Roundtable with Juan Mendez (Advisor to the UN Secretary-General), Gerald Caplan (author), Kathy Vandergrift (Sudan Inter-Agency Reference Group), Allan Thompson (Carleton School of Journalism), Dom Hubert (Human Security Policy, DFAIT), Hon. Irwin Cotler, (MP), Carleton University. 21 November 2006.</p> <p>Contributing Partners: All-Parliamentary Group for the Prevention of Genocide; Office of the Dean of Public Affairs, Department of Political Science, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, and African Studies Committee, Carleton University.</p> | 80 | Carleton University faculty and students; members of parliament, senators, and their staff; representatives of INGOs (International Centre for Transitional Justice, UN Office of the Special Advisor for Genocide Prevention), Canadian NGOs. |
| <p>31. 6th Annual Carleton Model NATO Conference, Delta Suites Hotel, Ottawa. 9-11 March 2007. CSDS is a core funder of this major international student-organized event through the CSDS Model NATO Fellowship, which provides half the funds (the other coming from the Political Science Department at Carleton University) for the Model NATO student coordinator.</p> | 150 | Canadian (Anglophone and Francophone) and international University students. |

| b) Interaction with Government Departments and with Canadian Forces | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|
| Event | Number of Govt Reps | Government Departments/ Agencies in the Audience |
| Exit Strategies: Iraq, Afghanistan and Beyond (event 2) | 55 | DND, CF (CEFCOM, CFEC), DFAIT, CIDA, PCO, Public Safety, Members of Parliament and parliamentary staff |
| Adm. Sir Mark Stanhope (event 4) | 26 | DND/CF |
| Raphael Cohen-Almagor (event 6) | 14 | CBSA, DND/CF, CSE, DFAIT |
| Kevin McCort (event 8) | 6 | IDRC, CIDA, DND/CF, Health Services, DFAIT |
| Don Neill (event 9) | 2 | DFAIT, DND/CF, Library of Parliament |
| Carol McQueen (event 10) | 12 | DFAIT, IDRC, CIDA, DND/CF, Justice, Library of Parliament |
| Grant Dawson (event 13) | 7 | DFAIT, IDRC, CIDA, CBSA, DND/CF, Public Safety, Library of Parliament |

| | | |
|--|----|--|
| Jez Littlewood (event 14) | 4 | DFAIT, DND/CF |
| Clifford Bob (event 15) | 5 | DFAIT, DND/CF |
| Angela Gendron (event 17) | 39 | CSIS, RCMP, CISC, OPP, DND/CF, PCO |
| Michael Kergin (event 18) | 20 | PCO, Transport, Justice, Industry, CBSA, CSIS, NRCan, National Parole Board, CSPS, DND, Health, Fisheries and Oceans; Member of the Senate (Pierre de Bane); Parliamentary Centre; Library of Parliament |
| Richard Evans (event 19) | 35 | PCO/IAS, CISC RCMP, Justice, CBSA, DFAIT, DND, CSE, Transport |
| Michael Herman (event 20) | 17 | PCO/IAS, CISC RCMP, DFAIT, DND, CSE, CBSA |
| Patrick Armstrong (event 21) | 31 | PCO/IAS, DND, CSIS, CISC RCMP, DFAIT, CBSA, Public Safety |
| Paul Kennedy (event 22) | 28 | PCO/IAS, CISC RCMP, DFAIT, DND, CSE, CBSA, CSIS, Public Safety, Transport, Justice |
| Paul Thibault (event 23) | 15 | PCO/IAS, CISC RCMP, DFAIT, DND, CBSA, Transport, Justice |
| Transatlantic Security and German Views of US International Security Policies (event 25) | 5 | DFAIT |
| Norway's and Canada's Role in Peace and Reconciliation (event 26) | 15 | DFAIT, CIDA, PCO, RCMP |
| Canada and the Future of Peacekeeping (event 28) | 14 | DFAIT, DND/CF |
| Foreign Policy Under a Conservative Government: An Interim Report Card (event 29) | 44 | DND/CF, DFAIT, NRC, Citizenship and Immigration, CIDA, RCMP, CSE |
| Preventing Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity (event 30) | 16 | Members of Parliament, Senators and their staffs |
| <i>Below are activities of individual Centre Associates to engage members of government and CF at events not organized by CSDS.</i> | | |
| Student presentation of papers on NATO and India/Canada nuclear issues at Joint NPSIA/CIIA event, DFAIT, 24 November 2006. | 10 | DFAIT |
| T. Findlay: Presentation at launch of DFAIT-funded research book on peace operations and Responsibility to Protect, DFAIT, 12 December 2006. | 30 | DFAIT, DND |

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| T. Findlay: Briefing to all-party forum on nuclear disarmament on nuclear verification/ compliance issues, House of Commons, 7 November 2006. | 12 | Members of Parliament, DFAIT, DND |
| R. Heide: Distance Learning Instructor/ Subject Matter Expert for Canadian Forces College Joint Reserve Command and Staff Program, "Warfare Theory and History," February-June 2007. | 40 | Canadian and foreign army, navy, and air force officers at rank of Captain, Major, LCol, and LCdr |
| R. Heide: Distance Learning Instructor/ Subject Matter Expert for Canadian Forces College Joint Reserve Command and Staff Course, "Warfare Theory and History," February-June 2006. | 16 | Canadian and foreign army, navy, and air force officers at rank of Captain, Major, LCol, and LCdr |
| P. Legassé: Visit to NORAD/ NorthCom headquarters in Colorado Springs (in partnership with the Royal Military College and Canadian Forces College), May 2006. | 4 | Civilian and military staff from NORAD and US NorthCom |
| N. Mychajlyzyn: participant, "Three Block Wars and Humanitarianism: Theory, Policy and Practice," Consultation Workshop, Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, Ottawa, September 2006. | 20 | DFAIT, CIDA, DND/CF |
| D. Long: Testimony to visiting Members of the European Parliament, House of Commons, November 2006. | 20 | Canadian and European Members of Parliament |
| C. Penny: Witness Testimony, Senate Standing Committee on Human Rights, on "Responsibility to Protect," 26 February 2007. | 19 | Senate Standing Committee Members; interested members of the public; broadcast audience on CPAC |

| c) Interaction with Nov-Governmental Organizations | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| Event | Number of NGO Reps | NGOs in the Audience |
| Exit Strategies: Iraq, Afghanistan and Beyond (event 2) | 16 | PPC, CIIA, Senlis Council, CARE Canada, Peace Support Training Consultants, Rideau Institute, Peace Operations Working Group, CDAI, Iraq Civil Society Program, RAND Corp, et al. |
| Howar Ziad (event 3) | 5 | PPC, CIIA, CPCC |
| Raphael Cohen-Almagor (event 6) | 2 | CIIA |
| Kevin McCort (event 8) | 4 | PPC, CIIA, Peace Operations Working Group, CPCC |

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| Carol McQueen (event 10) | 9 | PPC, CIIA, CPCC, North-South Institute, CARE Canada, UNAC |
| Grant Dawson (event 13) | 9 | PPC, CIIA, Human Rights Internet, Immigrant Women's Ass'n, et al. |
| Clifford Bob (event 15) | 4 | PPC, CIIA, CPCC, Peace Operations Working Group |
| Angela Gendron (event 17) | 3 | CIIA |
| Norway's and Canada's Role in Peace and Reconciliation (event 26) | 15 | PPC, CIIA, CPCC, Group 78, et al. |
| Foreign Policy Under a Conservative Government: An Interim Report Card (event 29) | 27 | PPC, Forum of Federations, CDFAI, Woodrow Wilson Center, CIGI, Canadian Red Cross, CDAI, Project Ploughshares, Aga Khan Foundation, CIIA, et al. |
| Preventing Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity (event 30) | 19 | UNAC, Canadian Jewish Congress, Save Darfur Canada, International Center for Transitional Justice, STAND, Canadian Centre for Victims of Torture, UN Office of Special Advisor for Genocide Prevention, among others. |
| <i>Below are activities of individual Centre Associates to engage NGOs at events not organized by CSDS.</i> | | |
| T. Findlay: Presentation to Annual Conference of Middle Powers Initiative, DFAIT, 28 September 2006. | 8 | Members of Canadian NGOs |
| N. Mychajlyszyn: participant, "Three Block Wars and Humanitarianism: Theory, Policy and Practice," Consultation Workshop, Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, Ottawa, September 2006. | 10 | Canadian Red Cross, CARE Canada, Medecins San Frontieres |
| C. Rojas: panelist, "Colombia and the Militarization in the Andean Region," Canadian Council for International Co-operation General Meeting, May 2006. | 12 | Members of Canadian NGOs |

d) Efforts to speak to the general public and those beyond the regular audience of the Centre

| Event | Number of Attendees | Audience Description |
|--|----------------------------|--|
| 20th Annual High School World Issues Conference (event 1) | 700 | Anglophone and Francophone high school students from the Ottawa area. |
| <i>Below are activities of Centre Associates to engage members of the public and non-traditional audiences not organized by CSDS.</i> | | |
| M. Sucharov, "Israeli-Palestinian Relations: A Post-Election Overview," presentation to Jewish community organization, <i>Na'amat Ottawa</i> , 29 May 2006. | 50 | Members of the Ottawa area Jewish community |
| B. Schmidt, "Neoconservatism, Realism and the Iraq War," public lecture at University of Exeter, Exeter, England, 15 December 2006. | 30 | Students, faculty, members of the public. |
| B. Schmidt, "Realism versus Neoconservatism and the Iraq War," public lecture, Potsdam College, Potsdam, New York, 12 March 2007. | 25 | Students, faculty, members of the public. |
| G. Dawson, "Canada and Somalia: Assessment of the Somalia Intervention and its Lessons for Afghanistan," presentation at the Canadian Embassy in Egypt, Cairo, 27 November 2006. | 40 | Canadian Foreign Service officers and Embassy staff; Egyptian diplomats. |
| G. Dawson, "The Somalia Crisis of 1992-93 and the New Peacekeeping," lecture to students at Cairo University, Egypt, 28 November 2006. | 60 | Egyptian undergraduate university students. |

Section 3 – Financial Information

3.1 Overall Centre Budget

NOTE: This figure includes **all** sources of revenue, including the SDF grant, ICF money, Special Projects money, other DND money, funds from other government departments and outside sources of funds.

| Name of Awarding Organization | Amount Awarded |
|---|----------------------|
| Security and Defence Forum Operating Grant | \$ 140,000 |
| SDF Conference Funds | \$ 9,300 |
| SDF Special Projects Funds | \$ 6,650 |
| Conference fees | \$ 3,928 |
| SDF Operating Grant Carryover (2001-06 Grant Cycle) | \$13,884.84 |
| Total: | \$ 173,758.84 |

3.2 Research grants/awards on security and defence issues awarded to academic and research population within the Centre

| Name of Granting Organization and Recipient(s) | Amount Awarded |
|--|------------------|
| Social Science and Humanities Research Council, Doctoral Canada Graduate Scholarship, (Recipient: P. Lagassé). | \$ 35,000 |
| Total: | \$ 35,000 |

3.3 Complete Financial Information

| Type of Disbursement | Total Budget | SDF Grant Breakdown | Actual Disbursements to Date | Projected Disbursements for Remainder |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| a) Research | | | | |
| Faculty Salaries or Top-Ups | | | 0.00 | |
| Research Associates | | | 29,834.15 | |
| Research Assistants | | | 9,022.33 | |
| Publication Costs | | | 865.00 | |
| Research-Related Travel | | | 403.95 | |
| Research Total: | 42,000.00 | 42,000.00 | 40,125.43 | 950.00 |
| b) Hosting Conferences | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Administrative Personnel | | | 4,160.00 | |
| Hospitality Costs (i.e. food, beverage, entertainment, gifts) | | | 500.96 | 16,868.22 |
| Travel Costs (accommodation and per diems) | | | 0.00 | 9,837.00 |
| Advertising | | | 0.00 | |
| Other | | | 4,172.34 | 20,000.00 |
| Hosting Conferences Total: | 55,500.00 | 35,000.00 | 8,833.30 | 46,705.22 |
| c) Teaching | | | | |
| Faculty Salaries (full time and sessionals) | | | 0.00 | |
| Teaching Assistants | | | 0.00 | |
| Course Supplies and Development | | | 2,184.04 | |
| Other | | | 186.56 | |
| Teaching Total: | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 | 2,370.60 | 0.00 |
| d) Student Initiatives | | | | |
| Scholarship Money | | | 0.00 | |
| Student Research Grants | | | 0.00 | |
| Student Associations | | | 159.60 | |
| Other | | | 12,681.46 | |
| Student Initiatives Total: | 13,000.00 | 13,000.00 | 12,841.06 | 0.00 |
| e) Attendance at Academic Conferences (1 st column includes ICF funds, 2 nd column should not) | | | | |
| Airfare/Hotel/Per Diems | | | 5,458.80 | |
| Registration | | | 937.24 | |
| Other | | | 424.28 | |
| Attend Conference Total: | 16,500.00 | 7,000.00 | 6,820.32 | 2,300.00 |
| f) Outreach Activities | | | | |
| Travel | | | 1,041.23 | |
| Hospitality | | | 6,842.24 | 605.88 |
| Advertising | | | 0.00 | |
| Other | | | 6,618.98 | 300.00 |
| Outreach Activities Total: | 17,500.00 | 13,500.00 | 14,502.45 | 905.88 |
| g) Miscellaneous | | | | |
| Administration Salaries (secretarial support) | | | 16,106.59 | 1,086.00 |
| University Overhead | | | 0.00 | |
| Computer/Technology Purchase | | | 1,264.55 | |
| Software | | | 184.00 | |
| Website Maintenance | | | 100.00 | |
| Other | | | 1,934.65 | 500.00 |
| Resource Centre | | | 4,014.93 | |
| Miscellaneous Total: | 26,250.00 | 26,000.00 | 23,604.72 | 1,586.00 |
| GRAND TOTAL: | 173,500.00 | 140,000.00 | 109,097.88 | 52,447.10 |

Annex A – Centre Associates and Fellows

| |
|---|
| A. Faculty Associates |
| Director |
| David Mendeloff, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs * |
| Deputy Director |
| Chris Penny, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs * |
| Faculty Associates |
| <p>Michael Armstrong, Sprott School of Business</p> <p>David Carment, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs *</p> <p>Andrew Cohen, School of Journalism and Communication</p> <p>Jean Daudelin, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs *</p> <p>Trevor Findlay, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs and Canadian Centre on Treaty Compliance (CCTC)</p> <p>Fen Hampson, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs *</p> <p>G. Norman Hillmer, Department of History</p> <p>David Long, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs</p> <p>Christina Rojas, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs</p> <p>Dane Rowlands, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs</p> <p>Martin Rudner, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs and Canadian Centre of Intelligence and Security Studies (CCISS) *</p> <p>Brian Schmidt, Department of Political Science</p> <p>Elinor Sloan, Department of Political Science</p> <p>Mira Sucharov, Department of Political Science</p> |
| B. Research Associates and Fellows |
| Research Associates |
| <p>Jianxiang Bi, Independent Scholar (Non-resident 2006-07)</p> <p>Grant Dawson, Carleton University (CSDS Post-Doctoral Fellow, 2005-06)</p> <p>Brian Greene, Department of National Defence</p> <p>Carol McQueen, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade</p> <p>Laura Stovel, Carleton University</p> <p>Sarah Jane Meharg, Pearson Peacekeeping Centre</p> <p>Natalie Mychajlyszyn, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs</p> |
| Senior Research Fellows |
| <p>Anthony Campbell, President, Campbell Intel Services, Inc.</p> <p>LGen (Ret'd) Ken Pennie, Carleton University</p> |
| Doctoral Fellow |
| Joshua Kilberg, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs |

| |
|---|
| Pre-Doctoral Fellows |
| <p>Trista Grant, University of Western Ontario</p> <p>Rachel Lea Heide, Carleton University and Department of National Defence</p> <p>Philippe Lagassé, Carleton University</p> |
| MA Fellows / Research Assistants |
| <p>Veronique McKinnon, Research Assistant 2005-06</p> <p>Clarisa Waldman, MA Fellow / Research Assistant, 2006-07</p> |
| C. Centre Staff |
| <p>Cathleen Schmidt, Centre Administrator</p> <p>Vivian Cummins, Resource Centre</p> <p>Elizabeth James, High School Conference Coordinator</p> |

** Member of Management Committee*

Annex B – Selected Op-Eds and Media Transcripts (from 2.6)

| Articles Included |
|--|
| Selected Op-Eds written by Centre Associates |
| <p>Philippe Lagassé and Joel Sokolsky: "Suspenders and a Belt: Canada-United States Security Relations since September 2001," <i>Globe and Mail Online</i>, 19 June 2006.</p> <p>Elinor Sloan: "More Protection, More Information: By Embracing BMD, Canada Can Ensure Ongoing Access to Critical U.S. Data," <i>National Post</i>, 19 May 2006, p. A18.</p> <p>Norman Hillmer: "We Love Our Neighbours, We Love Them Not," <i>Calgary Herald</i>, 9 July 2006, A10.</p> <p>Andrew Cohen, "War takes a rest on the DMZ," <i>Ottawa Citizen</i>, 9 May 2006, p. A14.</p> <p>Andrew Cohen, "Agonizing decisions," <i>Ottawa Citizen</i>, 25 July 2006, p. A10.</p> <p>Andrew Cohen, "Mr. Harper's war," <i>Ottawa Citizen</i>, 15 August 2006, p. A10.</p> |
| Selected articles and transcripts quoting Centre Associates |
| <p>"Perils of peacekeeping: 1956: Harvest of Crisis," <i>The Ottawa Citizen</i>, Oct 17, 2006.</p> <p>"The myth of Canada as peacekeeper: Despite high-minded policy statements and public perception, Canada's global role," <i>The Globe And Mail</i>, Feb 28, 2007, p. A8.</p> <p>"The ballad of the blue beret," <i>The Globe And Mail</i>, Nov 11, 2006, p. F4.</p> <p>"Their pain, but our legacy: Not exactly a Canadian event?" [on Canada's response to 9/11 attacks], <i>Toronto Star</i>, Sep 10, 2006, p. D1.</p> <p>"Polls, history experts point to sea change in opinion of military," <i>The Globe and Mail</i>, Apr 11, 2006, p. A4.</p> <p>"Harper says troops from Middle East should enforce peace," <i>Winnipeg Free Press</i>, Jul 26, 2006, p. A5.</p> <p>Trevor Findlay on nuclear proliferation, <i>The Current</i>, CBC national radio, 11 October 2006.</p> |

Globe and Mail Online: Web-exclusive comment

Canada-U.S. border security: belt, suspenders or both?

19/06/06

JOEL SOKOLSKY AND PHILIPPE LAGASSÉ

Special to Globe and Mail Update

"How can you trust a man who wears both a belt and suspenders? The man can't even trust his own pants?"

Henry Fonda, *Once Upon a Time in the West*

The recent arrest of 17 suspected Canadian terrorists has re-energized American concerns about the Canada-U.S. border and the future of the two neighbours' security relations.

While the Bush administration is praising Ottawa's counterterrorism efforts, other American politicians are suggesting that Canada is a hotbed for potential threats to the United States. Canadians, meanwhile, are increasingly anxious about Washington's determination to move ahead with a plan to require a passport or other secure document to enter the United States from Canada.

What is particularly interesting about these developments, however, is how closely they conform to the "belt and suspenders" approaches that have characterized discussions about Canada-U.S. security co-operation since 9/11, wherein the belt represents a focus on the border and the suspenders place an emphasis on creating a continental security perimeter.

The Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America, initiated in the spring of 2005, is an example of the suspenders approach. This trilateral agreement is meant to bolster continental security without hindering a free flow of legal goods and documented people among Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. Both critics and supporters of the accord have suggested that it could be a first step toward the erection of a continental security perimeter.

Under such a perimeter, Canada, the U.S. and Mexico would adopt harmonious security (including immigration and refugee) policies, making every entry point into North America equally tight and thus, in theory, allowing an easing of the scrutiny applied to travellers at the Canada-U.S. and Mexico-U.S. borders. Of course, since Washington would refuse to weaken its security measures, the perimeter would involve an acceptance of American security standards and practices by Canada and Mexico.

To perimeter advocates, such as the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, an embrace of American security standards is a small price to pay to secure flows at the Canada-U.S. border. Only a perimeter, as Stephen Handelman suggested in a recent New York Times commentary, can reverse the post-9/11 constrictions of the Canada-U.S. border and ensure that it remains open in the event of another attack on North American soil.

Perimeter proponents, however, overlook four factors that have stalled, and will ultimately prevent, the erection of a North American security perimeter. First, Washington understandably believes that security at the U.S. borders is vital, and neither the President nor Congress will abandon the right to unilaterally tighten America's borders. As outlined in the Pentagon's 2005 National Defense Strategy, the U.S. follows a layered approach to homeland security. Threats are first met overseas, then at the continental level, and finally at U.S. borders.

Were a North American security perimeter erected, Washington would see it as part of the second layer. In line with the layered approach, a perimeter would merely bolster continental

efforts, not obviate the need for strong border controls. At the end of the day, the layered approach demands that effective border controls remain in place, regardless of whether Canada and Mexico adopt American security standards. This is not a view found only in the right wing of the Republican Party. Americans from across the political spectrum will never wholly rely on the efforts of other governments when it comes to the security of their homeland.

Second, Ottawa is aware that a perimeter will not lead Washington to loosen controls at the Canada-U.S. border. If Canada accepted American security standards as part of a trilateral perimeter arrangement, Ottawa would be outsourcing its security policymaking to the U.S., with little to show in return. Neither the Conservatives nor the Liberals would risk presenting a trade-off of this sort to a Canadian public that, though generally supportive of counterterrorism measures, has become increasingly wary of Washington's security policies.

Third, Ottawa wishes to avoid the "Mexicanization" of the Canada-U.S. border. It rightly worries that a trilateral approach to continental security on Washington's part, especially one likely to garner widespread congressional backing, could not sufficiently differentiate between the threat emanating from "South Toronto" and the one coming from south of the border. Canada might thereby face even stricter measures than those being implemented and proposed.

Fourth, and most important, it is precisely because Canada and the U.S. have eschewed the "suspenders" and large-scale perimeter-style schemes in favour of the "belt" method (which focuses on incremental bilateral agreements on the border) that Canada-U.S. security co-operation flourished after 9/11. Contrary to lamentations of certain critics on both sides of the border, bilateral agreements allowed Canada to address the United States' security concerns at a time when the American people felt most vulnerable. Ottawa knows that security is Washington's top priority and that the U.S. expects Canada to be a reliable security partner. But this does not mean that the logic of a perimeter is infallible. Bilateral security arrangements negotiated after 9/11, such as the Smart Border Accord, have upheld Canada's reputation as a reliable partner, while avoiding the sovereignty costs associated with a perimeter.

Of course, if it could have its way entirely, Washington would like to enjoy the benefits of both belts and suspenders, and any other protective apparel considered necessary to guard the American homeland. But it is aware that this is not possible or feasible and so it, too, is focusing on the border.

And from Ottawa's perspective, that is just fine. Because for different, but surprisingly complementary, reasons, Canadians also prefer a belt to suspenders when negotiating continental security arrangements.

Joel Sokolsky is dean of arts and professor of political science at the Royal Military College of Canada. Philippe Lagassé is a doctoral candidate at Carleton University. A full-length version of this article will be published in the journal Canadian Foreign Policy.

More protection, more information;; [National Edition]

Elinor Sloan. National Post. Don Mills, Ont.: May 19, 2006. pg. A.18

Author(s): Elinor Sloan
Document types: News
Section: *Issues & Ideas*
Publication title: National Post. Don Mills, Ont.: May 19, 2006. pg. A.18
Source type: Newspaper
ISSN: 14868008
ProQuest document ID: 1039730041
Text Word Count 780
Document URL: <http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/pqdweb?did=1039730041&sid=2&Fmt=3&clientId=13709&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Abstract (Document Summary)

In August, 2004, Canada agreed that assessment information from NORAD could be channelled to another American command, Northern Command, which is in charge of ballistic missile defense. Thus, all the sensor information now goes from a U.S. command, which owns all the sensor assets, and then on to NORAD for assessment, and then on to another U.S. command for ballistic missile response. This set up is analogous to the Cold War situation, when NORAD processed sensor information and sent it to a U.S. command for response to an intercontinental ballistic missile strike from the Soviet Union.

Unlike the Cold War procedure, however, the August, 2004, agreement is unlikely to be a long-term solution. The United States did not intend to shoot down missiles coming from the Soviet Union, only respond in kind after absorbing a first strike. By contrast, assessment and response timelines in this era would be far shorter when defending against a ballistic missile, making it difficult if not impossible to accommodate a three-step division of responsibilities. As processing systems are modernized, the United States is likely to set up a separate assessment centre within either Strategic Command or Northern Command, taking NORAD out of the loop. There are already indications that this is starting to happen. Information from the new U.S. Navy sensors, for example, is being processed by strategic command directly, and is not shared with NORAD.

Full Text (780 words)

(Copyright National Post 2006)

By embracing BMD, Canada can ensure ongoing access to critical U.S. data

With the Canada-U.S. NORAD agreement recently renewed, it is time to reconsider the wisdom of Canada's February, 2005, decision to refuse participation in America's ballistic missile defence (BMD) system.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, combined with the improving long-range ballistic-missile capabilities of rogue states such as North Korea, pose a threat to North America.

True, there are probably greater threats to Canada, such as the threat of terrorism. It is also far from clear that the BMD system will work, since hitting a bullet with a bullet has always been an exceedingly difficult technological goal. But it makes sense for Canada to take part in America's BMD system anyway. Apart from the fact that giving up the chance to play a role in the U.S. response to a ballistic missile strike in North America represents a loss of our sovereignty, our failure to join BMD could cut Canada out of access to critical information from America's space surveillance network and ballistic-missile early-warning system -- including information about a missile heading for North America.

America's early-warning systems comprise radars in Greenland, the United Kingdom and Alaska, and about 10 satellites that were launched in the 1970s (scheduled to be replaced by a new system of some two dozen satellites). The U.S. Navy is also deploying new early warning radars on ships in the Pacific and on an oil rig in the Aleutian Islands.

Since the early 1960s, all the sensor information from early-warning and space-surveillance systems has been channelled into the NORAD command centre for assessment. But these systems do not belong to NORAD. They have always belonged to an American command, currently U.S. Strategic Command. Canada has no ballistic-missile early-warning or space-surveillance systems.

In August, 2004, Canada agreed that assessment information from NORAD could be channelled to another American command, Northern Command, which is in charge of ballistic missile defense. Thus, all the sensor information now goes from a U.S. command, which owns all the sensor assets, and then on to NORAD for assessment, and then on to another

U.S. command for ballistic missile response. This set up is analogous to the Cold War situation, when NORAD processed sensor information and sent it to a U.S. command for response to an intercontinental ballistic missile strike from the Soviet Union.

Unlike the Cold War procedure, however, the August, 2004, agreement is unlikely to be a long-term solution. The United States did not intend to shoot down missiles coming from the Soviet Union, only respond in kind after absorbing a first strike. By contrast, assessment and response timelines in this era would be far shorter when defending against a ballistic missile, making it difficult if not impossible to accommodate a three-step division of responsibilities. As processing systems are modernized, the United States is likely to set up a separate assessment centre within either Strategic Command or Northern Command, taking NORAD out of the loop. There are already indications that this is starting to happen. Information from the new U.S. Navy sensors, for example, is being processed by strategic command directly, and is not shared with NORAD.

NORAD will continue to assess and respond to the air threat to North America -- a function of renewed importance since 9/11. Nonetheless, NORAD (read Canada) will likely be progressively cut out of space surveillance and ballistic-missile early-warning information.

This matters because Canada benefits from having information about ballistic missile launches around the world, including not only missiles that may be headed our way but also events such as Scud missile launches in the Middle East. We also benefit from having space-surveillance information about objects orbiting or coming at the Earth.

In around 2010, Canada will launch a satellite that will conduct surveillance of space, called the Sapphire system. Part of its role will be to feed information into America's space-surveillance network. But our Sapphire contribution may not be enough to keep the window open to Canada on the vast amount of information collected by America's far more extensive systems.

Questions about whether there is a ballistic-missile threat to Canada, or whether America's BMD system will actually work, are not the biggest issues to consider when thinking about Canada's participation in continental missile defence. What is at stake is our knowledge about Canada's own space approaches, and about developments around the world that impact Canada's international role.

Information is central to security. If we do not sign on to BMD, Canada will have a lot less of both.

- Elinor Sloan is assistant professor of international relations at Carleton University, and the author of Security and Defence in the Terrorist Era.

We love our neighbours, we love them not:; [Final Edition]

Norman Hillmer. **Calgary Herald**. Calgary, Alta.: Jul 9, 2006. pg. A.10

People: Hillmer, Norman, Bush, George W

Author(s): Norman Hillmer

Document types: Opinion

Section: *The Editorial Page*

Publication title: Calgary Herald. Calgary, Alta.: Jul 9, 2006. pg. A.10

Source type: Newspaper

ISSN: 08281815

ProQuest document ID: 1074757791

Text Word Count 1157

Document URL: <http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/pqdweb?did=1074757791&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=13709&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Abstract (Document Summary)

North Americans shared stances on international issues, and Canadians looked up to U.S. leadership in a dangerous world. In 1943, almost one in four Canadians was willing to join the U.S.; in 1964, three of every 10 were inclined that way. Free trade was enormously popular, favoured by 70 per cent of Canadians in the 1940s and '50s.

The attractions of U.S. power, consumer culture and example remained powerful in this era of burgeoning Canadian nationalism. Francophone Quebecers felt the same ambivalence toward the U.S. as other Canadians, and the same magnetic pull. Jean-Francois Lisee's *In the Eye of the Eagle* describes Rene Levesque's enduring love affair with the U.S. and the efforts of his Parti Quebecois to court American opinion.

Sept. 11, 2001, and the George W. Bush world it hatched brought that skepticism to the fore. While still thinking of the U.S. as a good friend, Canadians easily fell back on the bromides that have propped up the national experiment since the days of the Loyalists. The Americans were violent, disorderly, venal. We were the tolerant, peaceful, multicultural, bilingual, moral superpower. We put the emphasis on our humanity, peacefulness, compassion and civility, while the U.S. boosted its size, efficiency, power and material prosperity.

Full Text (1157 words)

(Copyright Calgary Herald 2006)

Norman Hillmer probes the longstanding ambivalence between two nations.

Are Canadians anti-American? I am beginning to wonder. Has anti-Americanism been used so indiscriminately and often, particularly in the recent past, that it has lost all meaning?

Isn't there a distinction between periodic outbursts of fear and resentment and the anti-Americanism often described as a Canadian obsession? Isn't the history of Canadian-American relations one of convergence, similarity and interdependence, which speaks to values as well as interests?

Canada's first foreign policy was the National Policy, a tough nation-building strategy developed during the late 19th century as a means of survival on this continent. Canada wanted to be another United States -- a prosperous transcontinental nation bound together by tariffs, immigration and railways. Within that framework, almost everyone wanted freer trade with the Americans.

The first four decades of the 20th century saw the rise of a North American idea on both sides of the border. Canadians and Americans resolved the many disputes that threatened their relationship and, in 1909, invented the International Joint Commission, which rapidly became a symbol of a new world that worked through its problems peacefully.

J. W. Dafoe, the celebrated editor of the *Winnipeg Free Press*, told a buoyant 1935 Canadian-American relations conference in upstate New York that Canada and the U.S. constituted a fundamental cultural, intellectual and moral unity "North American in character and range." To that intellectual trajectory were added strong links of culture and commerce. The U.S. became Canada's leading trading partner and the key investor in the Canadian economy.

The period from the early 1940s to the early 1960s was the most favourable to the U.S., as the two countries built the intimate ties of the Second World War and the Cold War.

North Americans shared stances on international issues, and Canadians looked up to U.S. leadership in a dangerous world. In 1943, almost one in four Canadians was willing to join the U.S.; in 1964, three of every 10 were inclined that way. Free trade was enormously popular, favoured by 70 per cent of Canadians in the 1940s and '50s.

A 1963 survey, done in the year of a raucous election that had the U.S. and its military clout as the central issue, revealed 50 per cent of Canadians believed dependence on the U.S. was beneficial.

Conservative leader John Diefenbaker might play the anti-American card, but he was, as historian Robert Bothwell has pointed out, pro-American in the essentials. Bothwell also stipulates Canadian anti-Americanism was frequently made in the U.S. Canadians picked up their critiques of their mammoth neighbour from the U.S. itself, as ideas passed northward across the border.

From the middle 1960s until the early '80s, Canadians indulged in a heightened particularism, an impulse that vibrated at a time when the U.S. was troubled by adventures abroad and violence at home. Scandals in Congress and a presidency weighed down by Watergate reinforced the notion of a corrupt superpower. An emotional nationalism fed on the rich food of American excess, as it does today, but Canada and the U.S. were steadfast allies.

The attractions of U.S. power, consumer culture and example remained powerful in this era of burgeoning Canadian nationalism. Francophone Quebecers felt the same ambivalence toward the U.S. as other Canadians, and the same magnetic pull. Jean-Francois Lisee's *In the Eye of the Eagle* describes Rene Levesque's enduring love affair with the U.S. and the efforts of his Parti Quebecois to court American opinion.

The campaign to create distance between Canada and the U.S. had concrete policy impacts, but few were successful or lasting. The Mulroney years put paid to the National Energy Program and the Foreign Investment Review Agency and brought a free trade agreement. By the end of the 20th century, there were widespread claims the border would soon be irrelevant.

Public opinion data suggested sentiments not unlike those of the glory years of Canadian-American relations in the 1950s. Polls also exposed a similar attachment to a unique Canadian identity, and a traditional skepticism about the U.S.

Sept. 11, 2001, and the George W. Bush world it hatched brought that skepticism to the fore. While still thinking of the U.S. as a good friend, Canadians easily fell back on the bromides that have propped up the national experiment since the days of the Loyalists. The Americans were violent, disorderly, venal. We were the tolerant, peaceful, multicultural, bilingual, moral superpower. We put the emphasis on our humanity, peacefulness, compassion and civility, while the U.S. boosted its size, efficiency, power and material prosperity.

Lest that seem immodest, there is a second act in the Canadian play. In that guise, we imagine the Americans to be everywhere and overwhelming. Canada becomes the polite, underambitious underachiever next door. Look at our self-deprecating humour. Apologetic Canadians, pleading "I'm sorry" after an American steps on them. Forlorn Canadians, thinking our Thanksgiving is celebrated before American Thanksgiving because Canada has so much less for which to be grateful.

These are counterfeit Canadianisms, both calculated to obscure how little separates Canada and the U.S.

That creates a Canadian problem. The solution, rooted deep in our history, is to highlight America's problems and Canada's strengths. The more the distinctions "between Canadian and American life and institutions diminished," Carleton University's Syd Wise wrote in *Canada Views the United States*, the more "the need to insist upon them intensified. What Freud termed 'the narcissism of small differences' became more and more characteristic of the Canadian mentality."

The media is apt to parrot the fashion of the age. On the eve of Stephen Harper's first meeting with Bush on the margins of a NAFTA summit in Mexico last March, the *Globe and Mail* published a poll by Allan Gregg's Strategic Counsel under the headline *Canadians Turn More Sour on U.S.* Gregg's findings mainly showed Canadians had soured on Bush since his re-election. But so had Americans, as their leader stumbled in Iraq. His popularity plummeted to a 29 per cent approval rating in May.

Attitudes toward the U.S. remained much as they had been in 2004. Half the country believed Canadians and Americans were either "essentially the same" or "mainly the same with small differences." Even in an era when commentators claimed relations between the two countries were at a historic low, less than one-third thought the two peoples were "mainly different," with only "some small similarities."

The U.S. is the inevitable standard against which Canadians have always measured themselves. Canadians will accentuate what differentiates. That is natural and necessary. The great national challenge pits a clumsy groping for identity and independence against an intense integration with a great neighbour's culture, military and commerce.

This makes us paradoxical, even at times narrow-minded and hypocritical. It does not make us anti-American.

Norman Hillmer is professor of history and international affairs at Carleton University. This article is adapted from a longer piece in the IRPP's magazine, *Policy Options*, in July. www.irpp.org.

[Illustration]

Andrew Cohen, "War takes a rest on the DMZ" *The Ottawa Citizen*. May 9, 2006. p. A14

PANMUNJOM, South Korea - For years, they famously called this slender, undulating band of grass, rock and wood running the breadth of the Korean peninsula "the most dangerous place in the world."

On the surface, there is no reason to doubt it. The border between North Korea and South Korea is an archipelago of guards, towers and wire strewn across 241 kilometres. In fact, the "Demilitarized Zone" is a cruel misnomer for what remains a terrifyingly fortified border.

Since the end of the Korean War in 1953, the DMZ has been the crucible of prejudices, hatreds, suspicions, fears, cries and laments. For 53 years, it has been ground zero in a conflict that has never ended.

Forget the triumph of globalization and other lesser boasts of the borderless, wireless world. Forget the fall of Communism and "the end of history." Forget the Berlin Wall, apartheid in South Africa and juntas in South America, all of which mercifully went out with the last century.

Here, on the 38th parallel, history is in repose. A visitor returns to this haunting frontier after 13 years and finds things look the same. At Camp Boniface, the U.S. forward military base, they still play one hole of golf in "the world's most dangerous course" and chow down at "Freedom's Frontier Dining Facility".

But there are differences. The loudspeakers on both sides of the border, for example, no longer blast propaganda. And as there have been no armistice talks since 1994, there is no need to preserve that icon of the Cold War: the negotiating table in the makeshift committee room in Panmunjom, covered in green baize, adorned with standing national flags down the centre, flanked by the ramrod soldiers of the North and South. Now only the mirthless sentries of South Korea stand guard here; their adversaries don't even show up anymore.

If this is no longer the most dangerous place in the world, it isn't just that it has been overtaken by the chaos of Iraq. Nor is it because North Korea has withdrawn its army of 1.2 million (about half remain within 150 kilometres of here) or that South Korea has disarmed (it hasn't, though its smaller armed forces rely on superior air power).

What is different today is the sea change in attitude in South Korea.

In Seoul, only 50 kilometres away, where 19 million of the country's 48 million live, the talk is of rapprochement. Ever since former president Kim Dae Jung declared his "sunshine policy" and went up to visit the odious Kim Jong Il in Pyongyang in 2000, South Korea has seen only sweetness and light in North Korea, whatever its behaviour. They have a kind of practical -- if unconditional -- love for their northern cousins.

The relaxation in attitude is reflected in many ways. In fact, this desire for accommodation is the most striking characteristic of South Korea today.

In several of the burgeoning towns between Seoul and the DMZ, which have become bedroom communities of the capital, they are dismantling anti-tank barriers. These have long been seen as ugly but necessary. Now they are just seen as ugly, and, in the age of engagement, an anachronism.

Of course, you could say that modern warfare makes them obsolete. But there is something else at work here: a strong feeling among South Koreans that the North is no longer the enemy. This is particularly true among those under 40, who certainly have no memory of the Korean War and probably little knowledge of it as well.

"The North?" says a 20-something chattering into her cellphone. "My friends and I never talk about it." To hear her talk, the Koreas might as well be the Carolinas.

For analysts who spend their lives divining the meaning of every arcane pronouncement from the North, it is a dangerous view of a rogue regime that runs labour camps, starves its people and builds nuclear bombs.

Yet the South Koreans don't necessarily see things that way. So they spend billions creating the industrial complex of Kaesong in North Korea, on the edge of the Demilitarized Zone, which will employ an anticipated 700,000 North Koreans by 2012. Or they ease restrictions on civilian traffic in military zones around the country. Or they talk of re-unification as if it were going to happen tomorrow, to the point of rebuilding their part of the inter-Korean railway, which hasn't run since 1950.

Next month, they will cheer when Mr. Kim makes a return visit to the North, hoping to arrive in triumph on that newly reopened railway.

To Pyongyang, fighting for survival, this is about money and legitimacy. To Washington, worried about terrorism, this is about weakness and naivete.

Meanwhile, on the frontier, soldiers a world away still point guns and glare at each other, as they have for 53 years.

Andrew Cohen is a professor of journalism and international affairs at Carleton University.

Andrew Cohen, "Agonizing decisions." *The Ottawa Citizen*. Jul 25, 2006. p. A10. [Also published in *Times - Colonist* (Victoria, B.C.), Jul 26, 2006, p. A.12; *Daily Bulletin* (Kimberley, B.C.), Jul 25, 2006, p. 4; *Daily Townsman* (Cranbrook, B.C.), Jul 25, 2006, p. 4.]

Sometimes a people find out who they are in the oddest places. They discover fundamental truths about themselves when they aren't even looking, let alone asking existential questions of nationhood.

Historically, Canadians have been given to much wringing of hands and tugging of forelocks about themselves. We ponder, therefore we are. We call this our search for identity.

In recent years, we have been faced with wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Lebanon. They have laid bare our anxieties, our mythologies, our contradictions. They have shown us the kind of people we are.

When the United States asked us to join its coalition in Iraq three years ago, we refused. Today we are relieved that we did not take part in a wasting civil war.

In our self-congratulation, we forget that public opinion in Canada was divided at the time. Indeed, finding a Canadian today who supported the invasion of Iraq three years ago is like trying to find an American in 1964, the year after John F. Kennedy was assassinated, who admitted to not voting for him in 1960.

Jean Chretien announced Canada's decision on Iraq in a terse response to a question in Parliament. He offered little context, little explanation and little empathy.

But this much we could say: We supported multilateralism; we chose the United Nations over the United States; we affirmed our hoary self-perception as peacekeepers rather than warriors.

Today, amid the daily carnage, the decision looks brilliant. Perhaps it was. Perhaps we showed independence and strength. But if Iraq does become a democracy in a new Middle East, unlikely as that seems now, history will judge our decision as a reflexive anti-Americanism, a failure to see the big picture, and a blindness on human rights.

As Iraq tell us something about ourselves, so does Afghanistan. After all, this mission was more us. This was not about killing terrorists: It was about nation-building. Here we chose idealism, engagement, the United Nations and the United States.

Unlike Iraq, Afghanistan was popular. As long as we thought this was "peacekeeping," it didn't seem to anger, inspire or even interest Canadians.

Afghanistan wasn't an issue in the two federal elections in 2004 and 2006. Last spring, when the Conservatives asked Parliament to approve a two-year mandate, it limited debate to a day, lest we talk too much about this.

Yet when Stephen Harper went to Afghanistan last winter, he promised that we would not "cut and run," because that was not "the Canadian way." Tough talk, to be sure. But whose Canada? Did it really reflect contemporary Canada, which hasn't been at war since Korea?

Now, as casualties begin to rise, polls show that most Canadians oppose the mission. If that is so, the political consensus on foreign policy is cracking and Canadians are not nearly as committed to Afghanistan as Mr. Harper thought.

Now Lebanon has opened another window on the Canadian character. When Mr. Harper supported Israel without reservation, arguing that its response was "measured," he reflected his view of Canadians as moral, principled and steadfast in their opposition to terrorism, and willing to bear the cost. But was that so?

The New Democrats said that we should maintain our "neutrality" in the region. The Liberals said that we should be more "nuanced" in the region. Both think that distance and detachment allows us to support and serve the United Nations. Both reflect a view of Canadians with an instinct to mediate, to keep the peace, to find compromise. It was the role that Canada famously played in the Suez Crisis of 1956.

Mr. Harper has rejected this. As it was in Afghanistan, his Canadian here is moral and unequivocal. He sees Hezbollah and Hamas as terrorists, and isn't afraid to say so. He isn't about ambiguity or incongruity; here, his Canadian is an American, the American, whether Democrat or Republican, who has no doubts about Israel.

At the same time, though, the shrewd Mr. Harper has also played the compassionate Canadian -- evacuating thousands of Canadians from Lebanon, paying their way home, using his own plane and giving a lift to an accused criminal, playing down the contradictions of dual citizenship.

In each war, and our response, we see something of ourselves. We see ambiguity, empathy, multilateralism on one hand; we see clarity, morality and continentalism on the other. We see Canadians of compromise under the United Nations or crusaders under the United States. We are conciliators. We are crusaders. We make a commitment. We fear a commitment.

This week the world has challenged us anew to make choices. To support Israel or to support a ceasefire? To judge it a moral question or a strategic one?

The agony of events weighs heavily upon Canada today. The world will not go away. Our ability to respond as one is the difference between an aimless, adolescent people or a resolute, mature one.

Andrew Cohen is a professor of journalism and international affairs at Carleton University.

Andrew Cohen, "Mr. Harper's war." *The Ottawa Citizen*. Aug 15, 2006. p. A10 [Also appeared in *Times - Colonist*.(Victoria, B.C.), Aug 15, 2006. p. A.10]

On the day Canada lost its seventh soldier in Afghanistan in little more than a week, the country barely noticed. The war in Lebanon and the terrorist plot threat in Britain dominated The National, which didn't report the soldier's death until well into the broadcast, as if it were a plane crash in Zambia.

Only a few months ago the flag flying above the Peace Tower would have been lowered; politicians would have issued condolences and rushed to the tarmac at Trenton. Today you might think that Afghanistan has a kind of normalcy. You might think that our mission there has lost its capacity to shock, that Canadians are used to casualties now. Certainly the Conservatives hope so.

Yet the reality is that Canada is at war in Afghanistan -- the CBC, the flag, and the politicians notwithstanding -- and the price in blood and treasure is starting to cut in Canada. How deeply? Enough to endanger the prospect of a Conservative majority in the next election.

The greatest threat to the success of the Conservatives, who have governed with discipline and clarity in their six months in power, isn't medicare or the fiscal imbalance. It is avian flu and Afghanistan. Avian flu hasn't happened and may never happen. But Afghanistan is happening every day, much as we deny it, unfolding with an awful, perverse predictability.

Casualties are rising, support is falling and the Canadian consensus is cracking. The intensity of violence has picked up, killing Canadians in twos and threes. Soon it may be fours and sixes.

Even now, with 26 deaths over four years, the polls show most Canadians oppose the mission. That, in turn, has emboldened prominent Liberals to question why we are there, as if this commitment simply happened yesterday, *deus ex machina*. And what that means is a growing division among the parties, which is unusual on foreign policy.

For this the Conservatives largely have themselves to blame. First, they misread the national psyche and its appetite for this mission; then they refused to create a sense of unity last spring when they had the chance. Life presents a bill, and this one is coming due.

When Stephen Harper went to Afghanistan last winter, a brilliant stroke for a new prime minister, he talked passionately of values ("Canadians don't cut and run") that evoke a generation or two ago. His Canada is at war in Korea more than in Kandahar. It sounded swell, all that bravura about the Canadian Way and staying the course, and maybe he believed it. But if you look at the polls and listen to the phlegmatic Canadian, we are all about neutrality, morality and diplomacy. And the sad truth is that Canadians would be quite happy to cut and run from Afghanistan, thank you very much.

So what does a leader committed to this project do? He leads. He explains. He builds consensus. Mr. Harper hasn't. Ramming a resolution of support through Parliament last spring unnecessarily politicized the issue and gave Liberals grounds to oppose it. Other than the principled Bill Graham, Michael Ignatieff, Scott Brison and a few other independent souls, the Liberals overwhelmingly rejected a two-year extension of the mission.

The Conservatives could have taken their time and sent the resolution to committee. With a little patience and flexibility, they could have rallied overwhelming support for the mission. Instead, it barely passed, and the Conservatives are wearing it. They own it.

Now Liberals have licence to attack the mission they once embraced. They see the politics in this, especially in romancing a skittish Quebec, where opposition to the Afghanistan mission is greatest. The most opportunistic of the Liberals is Ujjal Dosanjh, who laments that "this has become almost totally a combat mission, and that was not our intention."

Gee, what did he think it was? A tea party? Surely he knows that Canada is spending \$100 million a year on aid and reconstruction. He also knows that southern Afghanistan is a dangerous place that needs a climate of security for democracy to succeed.

His position compelled the estimable Grant Kippen, a Liberal who has worked in Afghanistan, to write an open letter to the leadership contenders calling Mr. Dosanjh "confusing and naive." That was being nice: Mr. Dosanjh is simply out of his depth.

Still, could we be doing this another way in Afghanistan? Maybe. There is a growing skepticism among some senior officers over how Canadians are fighting the Taliban. The question is one of tactics, not strategy. This hasn't surfaced publicly yet, but it may.

Meanwhile, Mr. Harper is thinking politically. He tries to prevent Canadians from seeing the bodies come home. He tries to exploit differences among Liberals by appointing one of their Muslim MPs to advise him on Afghanistan. He muzzles Gen. Rick Hillier and Gen. Andrew Leslie and other forceful advocates who can make the case for Afghanistan to Canadians.

More than ever, this is Mr. Harper's war.

Andrew Cohen is a professor of journalism and international affairs at Carleton University.

Perils of peacekeeping: Series: 1956: Harvest of Crisis; [Final Edition]

Alexandra Zabjek. *The Ottawa Citizen*. Ottawa, Ont.: Oct 17, 2006. pg. A.14

Companies: United Nations (NAICS: 928120)
Author(s): Alexandra Zabjek
Document types: Series
Section: News
Publication title: The Ottawa Citizen. Ottawa, Ont.: Oct 17, 2006. pg. A.14
Source type: Newspaper
ISSN: 08393222
ProQuest document ID: 1147841421
Text Word Count 2294
Document URL: <http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/pqdweb?did=1147841421&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=13709&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Abstract (Document Summary)

Canadians for years viewed peacekeeping as a noble endeavour that allowed their country to take a stand on international conflicts without getting involved in fighting. But it's been a long road from Egypt to Afghanistan: today critics regularly decry the peacekeeping "myth," saying there are few Canadians sporting blue berets; military types insist new missions must be "robust" and that peacekeepers should be allowed to pick up arms in order to "enforce" peace.

Historians like to note that during the Cold War, Canada's armed forces mainly worked for NATO, not peacekeeping. Still, the Canadians involved in acronymic UN missions like UNFICYP in Cyprus and UNOGIL in Lebanon, earned solid reputations. In military circles, Canadians were known for their skilled signals units. But even if their peacekeeping contributions were relatively small, their successes were "burned into the national personality," says Mr. [Norman Hillmer].

Photo: Jana Chytilova, *The Ottawa Citizen* / [Don Clarke], 79, served in Canada's historic peacekeeping mission in the Sinai Peninsula in 1958. The retired chief warrant officer, shown with a mid-1950s picture of himself, says that while the nature of 'peacekeeping' has changed, Canada should still play a role where it can.; Photo: Jana Chytilova, *The Ottawa Citizen* / [Deb Glover], an armed forces nurse, was part of a 1993 mission to escort and protect humanitarian convoys in Bosnia. But the Canadians were shot at as soon as they stepped off their aircraft in Sarajevo, leaving them with no illusions about the challenges they faced. 'Maj.-Gen. [Lewis MacKenzie] said that calling it a peacekeeping mission was a misnomer,' she says, 'and I agree with that 100 per cent. '; Photo: (See hard copy for photo description.)

Full Text (2294 words)

(Copyright The Ottawa Citizen 2006)

Ran with fact box "On the Web", which has been appended to the story.

After 1956, the idea of peacekeeping was 'burned into our personality' as Canadians. But what does the legacy mean today?

Don Clarke remembers clearly the days of peacekeeping lore. In 1958, the retired army clerk wore a blue beret in the Sinai Peninsula and organized Canadian troops who walked the line separating Egyptians and Israelis -- even then, it must have seemed a quaint solution to a conflict that nearly sparked a world war.

There were, of course, frightening moments during Mr. Clarke's year-long tour: the intestinal virus that landed him in the infirmary for days; the time he drew his pistol to defend his Nikon camera from an Egyptian officer; and the day someone fired a lone shot at his UN jeep, hurting no one but startling the 32-year-old soldier.

This November marks the 50th anniversary of Lester B. Pearson's historic plan to send an international force into the Sinai Peninsula in response to the Suez Crisis. The rules were simple: a neutral force would stand between two sides that had agreed to a ceasefire.

Yet even in that comparatively simple time for peacekeepers, a fundamental question worried Mr. Clarke and his fellow soldiers: "We often thought about what the hell will we do if they start fighting?"

The same dilemma has resurfaced during the past 50 years as the international community sends peacekeepers into world hot spots. What's more, missions such as Bosnia and Rwanda have raised painful questions about the usefulness of sending "neutral" forces into conflicts where civilians are under attack.

Canadians for years viewed peacekeeping as a noble endeavour that allowed their country to take a stand on international conflicts without getting involved in fighting. But it's been a long road from Egypt to Afghanistan: today critics regularly decry the peacekeeping "myth," saying there are few Canadians sporting blue berets; military types insist new missions must be "robust" and that peacekeepers should be allowed to pick up arms in order to "enforce" peace.

Meanwhile, many Canadians are now asking: can we still be peacekeepers in the 21st century? And perhaps just as important: do we want to be?

For a soldier like Mr. Clarke, the success of his first tour in Egypt was measured by one thing: no major conflicts took place under his watch. Two wars would later erupt in the desert, leading Mr. Clarke to believe that peacekeepers can do only so much without a political settlement, but he still insists peacekeepers saved lives. What's more, they helped garner an international reputation for Canada among both Egyptians and Israelis.

"I think we were ambassadors. We made good friends on the business sides of both countries. We made them understand more about Canada than maybe they ever needed to know," says Mr. Clarke, who served a second tour in Egypt in 1977 and later became military secretary to Canada's national defence minister.

Canadian politicians were aware of the internationalist halo that seemed to float above their peacekeepers after initial success in the Middle East. Never mind that soldiers from other countries like Brazil, India and Yugoslavia were also part of that first mission; by the 1960s, policy makers and politicians came to view Canada as the "first international country," says Norman Hillmer, a Carleton University historian.

"Out of Suez there's a notion of Canada as a moral beacon, a moral superpower. We're a nation that's specially qualified to show the world the way," he says.

Canada's next major peacekeeping effort in the Congo, however, would cast doubt on the notion that countries with mere good intentions could always broker peace. A multinational force convened on the African country in 1960, after a pullout by the Belgian colonial power. The peacekeepers found themselves in the middle of a civil war. The supposedly "neutral" observers -- who numbered 20,000 at the mission's peak -- were outwardly attacked and 249 died there.

Painful lessons from the Congolese disaster shaped future peacekeeping missions for almost 35 years; the UN started sending smaller missions into less hostile environs, says Kevin Spooner of Sir Wilfrid Laurier University. But memories from the Congo started to fade by the time the Balkan wars erupted in the 1990s, and Canadian peacekeepers would confront eerily similar predicaments there.

In 1967, peacekeeping took another blow: Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser demanded peacekeepers withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula and Gaza Strip. The UN's star mission had been duped, forcing many to scratch their heads and ask whether their efforts to broker peace had gone to waste.

"People said we've been good soldiers for 10 years (in Egypt) and look what happened -- peacekeeping didn't look so good in 1967," says Mr. Hillmer. "But underneath it all, we keep doing it."

More than 170,000 Canadian peacekeepers have travelled to the world's trouble spots in the past 50 years. Since 1964, approximately 33,000 have been deployed to Cyprus alone; it's a small island country, roughly half the size of Lake Ontario, where Greek- and Turkish-speaking populations are locked in a stalemate marked by a thick buffer zone that cuts through the territory.

Historians like to note that during the Cold War, Canada's armed forces mainly worked for NATO, not peacekeeping. Still, the Canadians involved in acronymic UN missions like UNFICYP in Cyprus and UNOGIL in Lebanon, earned solid reputations. In military circles, Canadians were known for their skilled signals units. But even if their peacekeeping contributions were relatively small, their successes were "burned into the national personality," says Mr. Hillmer.

Then three things happened: genocide in Rwanda; murder in Somalia; and slaughter in Bosnia -- all under the peacekeeping watch.

Ottawa resident Deb Glover had served as a nurse in the Canadian Armed Forces for 11 years when she was assigned a peacekeeping tour in Bosnia in late 1993. Her mission's mandate -- to help escort and protect humanitarian convoys -- was altruistic. But as soon as her regiment landed at Sarajevo's battered airport, it became clear there was no room for goodwill in the Balkans. Small arms fire greeted the Canadians when they stepped onto the tarmac.

"I didn't expect to hear shooting and shelling as soon as I got off the airplane, but apparently that was standard procedure whenever we were rotating troops," says Ms. Glover, now 50, and retired from the military.

As a nurse, Ms. Glover mainly worked from the Canadians' camp, located about 20 kilometres from Sarajevo near the town of Visoko. She operated on Canadian soldiers whose convoys had been ambushed, and treated Visoko's police chief for four days. The chief had been involved in a bad car accident; in any other situation, he would have been airlifted to Sarajevo, but the fighting that had erupted around their camp made it impossible to leave.

The contradictions of serving as a peacekeeper in a war zone have not been lost on Ms. Glover. "Maj.-Gen. Lewis MacKenzie said that calling it a 'peacekeeping' mission was a misnomer, and I agree with that 100 per cent," she says.

Ms. Glover would leave the Balkans in April 1994, one year before the massacre at Srebrenica. Almost 7,000 Muslim men and boys were executed in that town, a supposed "safe haven" that was guarded by UN peacekeepers. Lightly-armed Dutch forces were bowled over by the Serbian army and some were even taken hostage during the tragedy.

The killings in Srebrenica have been called the worst massacre in Europe since the Second World War. The atrocities in Bosnia -- along with the incomprehensible genocide in Rwanda -- forced countries to soberly re-think the "classic" peacekeeping missions that had seemed to serve the world well for almost 40 years.

Diplomats at UN headquarters in New York started drafting proposals to reshape peacekeeping's central tenets; a new buzzword, "robust," was bandied about. By 2000, the UN's Brahimi Report stated that "United Nations peacekeepers who witness violence against civilians should be presumed authorized to stop it," and it stressed the importance of "robust rules of engagement."

At the same time, Canada's military was undergoing drastic changes. Budget cuts in the mid-1990s shrunk the country's armed forces. Meanwhile, the number of peacekeeping operations exploded across the post-Cold War world and suddenly Canadians were far less likely than Bangladeshis, Indians or Ethiopians to don classic blue berets in places such as Sierra Leone or Liberia.

For the most part, Canada's grip on UN peacekeeping operations is now light: for example, there are four soldiers serving in Haiti; nine troops stationed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and the once-ample mission in Cyprus has been whittled down to one soldier. More than 3,000 Canadian soldiers are deployed out of the country today, however, the vast majority are in NATO's Afghanistan mission, where Canadian forces have lost 42 soldiers since 2002.

Canada's current peacekeeping numbers tend to bring out "mythbusters" from different sides of the peacekeeping debate. The so-called "decline" in Canadian peacekeepers is among the most popular myths, argues Don Munton, an international studies professor at the University of Northern British Columbia.

"It's not that we're providing fewer forces than we used to, it's fewer compared to other countries. ... Arguing Canada has declined as a peacekeeper is playing with statistics in a way they shouldn't be played with," he says, adding that: "Except for Cyprus, Canada has never provided huge numbers of ground troops with rifles ... that idea is part of the mythology."

Others, such as Col. Mike Hanrahan of the National Defence Department, believe the few troops that Canada contributes to UN peacekeeping operations is justified by the changing nature of world conflicts and the international community's approach to those conflicts.

The days of "classic" peacekeeping are now almost over as most of the world's hot spots are in failed states, says Col. Hanrahan -- it's an observation many military observers agree with. New "complex" UN missions may involve anything from setting up border security systems, to monitoring elections, to policing an entire state, rather than a single blue line. Col. Hanrahan, however, argues soldiers from countries with well-developed militaries like Canada's are best-suited to serve in dangerous operations like Afghanistan.

"We're in Afghanistan because we're one of the few nations that can actually deal with the threats in Afghanistan. You cannot put Fiji, you cannot put Uruguay, there to try and provide stability," he says. "Since the end of the Cold War, Canada has consistently had 3,000 soldiers outside doing international peace and security. What colour of beret we're wearing is irrelevant."

Not everyone, of course, agrees with those sentiments. Critics argue that Canada can't contribute to difficult, important peacekeeping missions in places like Darfur and Lebanon because so many of its forces and funds are tied up in Afghanistan.

And no one is questioning a shortage of places that could use international aid. Countries like Burundi, Liberia and Ethiopia -- all known as much for their grinding poverty as their civil strife -- currently host UN peacekeeping forces. In Haiti, Maj. Warren Beatty recently spent six months as part of Canada's tiny, 4-person military contribution to the UN mission, which is very much a "new"- style operation. UN forces are trying to control gangs that still control large swaths of the island, and the major's job was to help co-ordinate security during Haiti's elections and the recent visit of Gov. Gen. Michaëlle Jean.

It's hardly a "classic" peacekeeping operation, and Maj. Beatty bluntly states that he doesn't "know if you'd call it peacekeeping." But he has no doubt that his work is needed in a country like Haiti that's desperate for international help: "It's a country with severe economic problems trying to get on its feet," he says.

For veterans like Mr. Clarke, who served in that first UN mission in the Sinai Peninsula, the changes in peacekeeping are impossible to ignore. He acknowledges that UN missions need "teeth" in order to be respected. "Today it's not so much peacekeeping as it was in the days we were there. Now, it's more like an armed buffer between two camps -- I think that's the only realistic way to look at it. Everyone has more weapons," says the 79-year-old veteran.

Still, Mr. Clarke believes Canada's peacekeepers must play a role in helping to stabilize international conflicts, both to preserve the country's reputation and serve those in need.

"It's important that we keep the profile that we've built so that other countries regard us as a peaceful nation that would help resolve difficulties," he says. "As peacekeepers, if we can offer assistance, I think we should."

On the Web

- Go online to meet Deb Glover, Don Clarke and other peacekeepers as they share their stories in video diaries
- Read short biographies of some of Canada's peacekeepers
- Read the diary of a Canadian peacekeeper
- Check out our interactive chronology, view audio photo galleries and see archival images www.ottawacitizen.com

See editor's picks

[Illustration]

Photo: Jana Chytilova, The Ottawa Citizen / Don Clarke, 79, served in Canada's historic peacekeeping mission in the Sinai Peninsula in 1958. The retired chief warrant officer, shown with a mid-1950s picture of himself, says that while the nature of 'peacekeeping' has changed, Canada should still play a role where it can.; Photo: Jana Chytilova, The Ottawa Citizen / Deb Glover, an armed forces nurse, was part of a 1993 mission to escort and protect humanitarian convoys in Bosnia. But the Canadians were shot at as soon as they stepped off their aircraft in Sarajevo, leaving them with no illusions about the challenges they faced. 'Maj.-Gen. Lewis MacKenzie said that calling it a peacekeeping mission was a misnomer,' she says, 'and I agree with that 100 per cent.'; Photo: (See hard copy for photo description.)

Copyright © 2007 ProQuest Information and Learning Company. All rights reserved. [Terms and Conditions](#)

[Text-only interface](#)



The myth of Canada as peacekeeper

Despite high-minded policy statements and public perception, Canada's global role, Michael Valpy reports

MICHAEL VALPY
FROM WEDNESDAY'S GLOBE AND MAIL

It's so hard to square mythology with reality. While 70 per cent of Canadians consider military peacekeeping a defining characteristic of their country, Canada has turned down so many United Nations' requests to join peacekeeping missions during the past decade that the UN has stopped asking.

In 1991, Canada contributed more than 10 per cent of all peacekeeping troops to the UN. Sixteen years later, its contribution is less than 0.1 per cent.

On this month's fifth anniversary of Canadian troops being sent to Afghanistan and one year after assuming responsibility for the counterinsurgency campaign -- a war by any other name -- in Kandahar province, one of the country's biggest unanswered questions is: What is Canadian military policy? It's certainly not to be the global leader in peacekeeping the country once was.

Little more than a year ago, Colonel Michael Hanrahan, the Canadian Armed Forces' top expert on peacekeeping, was offered the job as chief of staff of the UN's Department of Peacekeeping Operations. His Ottawa superiors nixed the idea. There is, in fact, not a single Canadian officer in the UN's peacekeeping headquarters.

Related to this article



[Enlarge Image](#)

A view of the bunker and trench system in Afghanistan. (CP)

Articles

- [Watchdog probes Canadian troops](#) 
- [Afghan aid package to help teachers, police](#) 
- [One year later, Part I: 'We have absolutely no reason to give up'](#)
- [Big dreams for Kandahar city](#)
- [One year later, Part II: Lives lost, lessons learned](#)

Interactives

- **Map:** [Where Canadians have fallen](#)

Internet Links

- **Timeline:** A Year in Afghanistan [↗](#)
- **Special report:** Canada's mission in Afghanistan

Follow this writer [✉](#)

- Add MICHAEL VALPY to my e-mail alerts [🔒](#)

Latest Comments [🗨](#)

- the previous Liberal government engaged Canada in a slow merger...
- Yes Bertram, the Italian mainland at Salerno in September '43...
- Valpy's slanted arguments leave out a few common sense issue...
- glenn hoefer from Forks, United States writes: The western allies...
- 229 reader comments | Join the conversation



The Department of National Defence website touts in glowing terms Canada's support and participation in SHIRBRIG -- the Danish-inspired multinational Standby High Readiness Brigade for United Nations Operations designed to provide rapid deployment of peacekeeping troops for up to six months. In reality, Canada's SHIRBRIG commitment is a will-o'-the-wisp.

Canada invented the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect that the UN accepted in 2005. Since then, successive Liberal and Conservative governments have stood by with their hands pretty much in their pockets while the doctrine glaringly failed its first test: The call for robust and, if necessary, uninvited UN military intervention to halt the genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan.

The military has been given the money to upgrade its equipment, increase its personnel and enhance its capability. Now, what's it supposed to do? In particular, what's it supposed to do after Afghanistan?

Is it to play deputy sheriff to the U.S. military in hot spots such as Afghanistan, fighting so-called three-block wars few people believe can be won?

Is it to fight terrorism militarily? Or acknowledge that resistance to international terrorism likely comes first and foremost from intelligence and the military should be used for other tasks?

Should it follow a Canada-first policy -- which, as former UN ambassador Paul Heinbecker points out, leads inevitably to the next question: What would the military be defending Canada against? "I don't see a threat myself," he says.

Should it serve Canada's national interests, however those are defined? David Carment of Carleton University's Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, suggests the Conservative government has little enthusiasm for a military mission in Africa, but more interest in treating the Caribbean and Latin America -- regions with large diasporas in Canada and considerable Canadian economic involvement -- as a sphere for possible engagement in the event of trouble.

Should it reflect Canadian values and interests in advancing the concept of Responsibility to Protect -- R2P, as it's abbreviated? If so, how does Canada persuade the world to embrace a doctrine that supersedes the principle of sovereignty of states, because Sudan does not want a UN force on its territory?

Or is the problem really as described by Ann Livingstone, director of research for Ottawa's Pearson Peacekeeping Centre: In the wake of the Cold War, where everyone more or less knew the rules and what to do, no one today, including the Americans, has accurately nailed down what the role of their respective militaries should be.

"The hard reality of the complexity of conflict is so significant that our reactions and responses universally are changing," she says. "How do you deal with the intersection of security with development? And how do you deal with the intersection of development and humanitarian assistance, negotiations at the diplomatic level and safety and security? It's another huge conundrum."

The best anyone can do is look at patterns, Dr. Livingstone says. Although, she adds, to predict the future on that basis would be an act of hubris. "We're feeling our way into a new way of thinking . . . and I think acting as responsibly as anyone does in the middle of significant change."

Fen Hampson, director of the Norman Paterson School, notes that, while the world overall is more peaceful since the Cold War ended at the close of the 1980s, significant terrorist attacks have risen steadily, global crime networks have become key players in today's conflicts, more nations are acquiring nuclear weapons and great power rivalries are coming back into fashion (with China and India, for example).

In addition, he says, the conflicts still remaining in the world are becoming more intractable and more prone to escalation, and separatist clashes are on the rise. And while the world needs the United States to maintain international order, the U.S. also threatens it -- it got things horribly wrong in Iraq, Prof. Hampson says -- and it may become isolationist post-Iraq, which would put it in opposition to Canada's tradition of multilateral global involvement.

All of these factors, he says, "reduce the likelihood of coherent and effective international responses to global security challenges.

"In view of the multiple security challenges we now confront, we should be extremely skeptical about arguments that the days of peacekeeping are over and our armed forces are now only in the business of fighting insurgents and targeting terrorists."

Yet several academics who study Canadian military and foreign policy see patterns of anti-UN bias among senior army officers and a preference for operating beside the United States. The anti-UN bias comes from their experience in UN peacekeeping missions of the past, and their U.S. preference is based on top-grade logistics and tactical support that the U.S. military can offer their own troops.

Thus Afghanistan -- a U.S.-led NATO mission authorized by the UN Security Council -- is ideal for them, even though Department of Foreign Affairs officials have been heard talking about the operation as "un-R2P-able," one that can't be won.

One Canadian academic, who asked to speak anonymously because he works for the military, said he had been told confidently by a senior army officer that Canadian troops would never take part in another UN-led operation. But Prof. Roland Paris, a specialist in international security at the University of Ottawa, is less convinced that Canada is deliberately turning away from the UN. He cites previous cycles of troughs in Canada's peacekeeping involvement.

In any event, the patterns seen by Mr. Heinbecker, now director of the Centre for Global Relations, Governance and Policy at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ont., suggest traditional UN peacekeeping operations are a thing of the past, that they have become more akin to the mission in Afghanistan.

"They are almost all complex missions now. They involve combat. Very often the UN is expected to get involved before the fighting is over. There's very often more than two sides to the fight. In the Congo [where a UN force successfully ended hostilities], at a certain stage there was 12."

Walter Dorn, an academic specialist in security studies at Royal Military College now on sabbatical with the UN, says Canada's military still possesses superb conflict-resolution skills and has enormous expertise in peacekeeping operations. "Yet my fear is that we're rapidly becoming a single-mission military . . . and the UN is being dropped by the wayside."

The difficulty in getting R2P back on track at the UN is sizable, but experts such as Mr. Heinbecker and Prof. Hampson say it lies within Canada's capability -- if the government has the will.

Many poor countries are afraid of it because they think it will be used against them. The U.S. did not help by at one point citing R2P as a rationale for invading Iraq, Mr. Heinbecker said. At the same time, several powerful countries, such as China, don't like it because it might interfere with their interests.

"R2P will be a hard sell," Prof. Hampson says. "And the selling gets harder post-Iraq. Darfur meets the test of R2P, it meets all the benchmarks, and it may make Afghanistan look like a picnic. No one wants to engage in what's becoming a regional conflict. No regional actor is willing to take the lead. It underscores the need for UN leadership."

Says Mr. Heinbecker: "I'm not sure if Canada could lead a Darfur mission. Although Hillier [General Rick Hillier, Chief of the Defence Staff] could lead anything."

BOWING OUT

Canada's contribution to United Nations peacekeeping operations around the world has slipped dramatically since 1991.

Canada's contribution to UN peacekeeping*

| | Area | Troops | Police | Military observers |
|----------|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| MINUSTAH | Haiti | 4 | 72 | - |
| MONUC | Democratic Republic of the Congo | - | - | 9 |
| UNAMI | Iraq | - | - | 1 |
| UNDOF | Golan Heights | 3 | - | - |
| UNFYCIP | Cyprus | 1 | - | - |
| UNMIS | Sudan | 7 | 2 | 24 |
| UNMIT | East Timor | - | 6 | - |
| UNOCI | Ivory Coast | - | 5 | - |
| UNTSO | Middle East | - | - | 7 |
| Total | | 15 | 85 | 41 |

*As of Jan. 31, 2007

Total military personnel on UN peacekeeping operations

Jan., 2007: 72,784, Canada's contribution: 56 (0.077%)

Aug., 1991: 10,801, Canada's contribution: 1,149 (10.6%)

© Copyright 2007 CTVglobemedia Publishing Inc. All Rights Reserved.

CTVglobemedia

globeandmail.com and The Globe and Mail are divisions of CTVglobemedia Publishing Inc., 444 Front St. W., Toronto, ON Canada M5V 2S9

Phillip Crawley, Publisher

The ballad of the blue beret

Fifty years after Lester Pearson's bright idea 'saved the world,' the peacekeeper's role once so identified with Canada has become passé and a little embarrassing. Trouble is, instead of feeling they could have done more, MICHAEL VALPY writes, Canadians are coming home in body bags

MICHAEL VALPY
FROM SATURDAY'S GLOBE AND MAIL

It began exactly 50 years ago, the mythology of Canada as the nation of peacekeepers. It began when Canada had an aircraft carrier splendidly named HMCS Magnificent that sailed across the seas carrying Canadian troops to pull the globe back from the lip of cataclysmic conflict.

It began -- as the myth had it -- when Canada exercised an independent foreign policy that defied and infuriated the Americans, the British and the French.

It began when Canada had a foreign minister deemed to have "saved the world" by the Nobel Peace Prize committee for creating the first United Nations Emergency Force to halt a war -- Lester B. Pearson, who so Canadianishly said "gosh" when a reporter telephoned him with the news he had won the award.

That was the Suez Crisis of November, 1956.

Related to this article



Gerry O'Pray joined the armed forces right out of high school in Nova Scotia. He was then sent overseas to serve with the United Nations in the Congo from 1961-63. After several years back in Canada, O'Pray was then sent to Egypt and the Suez Canal from 1965-66. (*Fred Lum/The Globe and Mail*)

Articles

- Blue beret history, timeline
- Profile: William Tiner
- Profile: Gerry O'Pray
- Profile: Rod Vautour

- Profile: William Porter
- Live, 2 p.m. EST: Michael Valpy on the 50th anniversary of peacekeeping

Follow this writer 

- Add MICHAEL VALPY to my e-mail alerts 

Latest Comments 

- To #1 IR, Army Transformation was a program designed to adapt...
- The UN single handedly killed the idea of peace keeping. Having...
- The traditional role of peacekeeping IS dead wether IR or SB...
- I believe that the term peace keeping is a misnomer, it assume...
- 6 reader comments | Comments closed



Israel, Britain and France jointly launched an attack on Egypt three months after it nationalized the Suez Canal. In response, Egypt sank all shipping then in the canal and the Soviet Union declared it would come to Egypt's aid, thus threatening planetary conflagration.

Canada abstained from an American United Nations resolution demanding a ceasefire -- because, in Mr. Pearson's words, it called merely for a return to an unacceptable status quo. Instead, he put forward a proposal for a "UN force large enough to keep these borders at peace while a political settlement is worked out."

The resolution passed unanimously on Nov. 4.

"Within the next 48 hours," historian John English wrote, "the Israelis trounced the Egyptians, the British and French landed in Egypt, the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) took form, Egypt accepted its presence . . . and the British and French agreed to a ceasefire. Soviet tanks slaughtered Hungarians, as 'volunteers' gathered in the USSR and China to serve against the 'imperialist' invasion of Egypt."

A Canadian, General E.L.M. Burns was given the UNEF command, and the first troops arrived 50 years ago next Tuesday, ferried to Cairo from the staging point in Naples by the Canadian air force. HMCS Magnificent -- long since consigned to the wreckers -- put to sea from Halifax carrying Canadian logistics specialists, trucks and patrol planes.

The bloodshed stopped. Noble times for Canada. We saved the world. The UN's most historic moment.

And yet Suez put us on the road that has led half a century later to Afghanistan and the deaths of 42 of our soldiers and one diplomat, and a national debate over whether the country has abandoned the moral high road of peacekeeping to become a military gofer of the United States, shooting Afghans for a cause that's increasingly in doubt and unsupported at home.

It is a debate characterized by confusion over what the international role of our military should be, over how the world has changed since 1956 -- especially how it has changed since the Cold War ended 15 years ago -- and over what the reality has been behind the mythology of Canadian peacekeeping.

Once we were certain about what our troops did when they put on the blue berets and helmets of UN peacekeepers. They stopped wars.

We built a monument to them in Ottawa and put their images on stamps and our money.

We trained our military to be peacekeeping specialists, basked in the pride of them being the best

peacekeepers in the world, told ourselves that peacekeeping distinguished us from the Americans, who fought wars, and said yes year after year to the UN's request to send Canadian troops to the Congo and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa, to Cyprus, Latin America, the Middle East, the Iran-Iraq borderlands and Vietnam.

For nearly 40 years, Canada was one of the top 10 participants in peacekeeping missions. Our military presence under UN auspices in Vietnam, in fact, enabled us to resist U.S. pressure to become involved in the Vietnam War.

Canada today ranks 59th on the list of contributors. Afghanistan, where more than 2,000 Canadian troops are fighting as part of a UN-mandated North Atlantic Treaty Organization force, is not peacekeeping. Canadian troops are basically combatants on one side of a ghastly civil war.

More than half of Canadians tell pollsters that they don't think their troops should be there, although Parliament recently voted to extend the Afghan mission to 2009. The debate has been framed -- when it has been framed at all -- by the question of whether we should "return to peacekeeping" or be engaged in some fuzzily defined military adventurism.

Canadian troops are, to be sure, engaged in a fuzzily defined military adventure. But so -- under the emerging doctrine of "responsibility to protect," a doctrine the previous Liberal government worked hard to create and Prime Minister Stephen Harper inherited -- is the rest of the global community. Which includes the UN and its increasingly "robust" peacekeeping.

It's a changed world and governments and military everywhere are on a learning curve as to how to deal with it. Peacekeeping, before the Cold War's end, was an exercise not in conflict resolution but in keeping conflicts, many of them proxies for the U.S.-Soviet Union confrontation, from getting worse. It was containment, not fixes.

Canadian policy makers understood that conflicts in small patches of land of relative insignificance, if they got out of hand, could lead to global catastrophe against which isolationism was no protection. And so Korea remained divided, Cyprus -- where Canadian peacekeepers went for six months in 1964 and stayed for more than four decades -- remained divided, Europe remained divided, the Middle East remained divided. And so on.

But no one was prepared for the demise of the Soviet Union so quickly and for what happened as a result, says Dr. Ann Livingstone, director of research for Canada's Pearson Peacekeeping Centre.

The world quickly became a more unpredictable and unstable place, leading to a dramatic increase in both U.S.-led and UN interventions. For example, the UN has run about 54 peacekeeping operations in its history -- 14 before 1989 and 40 since 1989, meaning 80 per cent of UN peacekeeping operations have occurred in the last 20 per cent of that period.

Traditional peacekeeping, in which unarmed or lightly armed UN troops patrolled like kindly village cops between easily identifiable factions, have faded away. Interstate conflicts have been replaced by intrastate conflicts. The number of "fragile" -- a word the UN prefers to "failed" -- states has increased, countries whose governments cannot or will not protect their citizens from human-rights abuse.

Global terrorism, and its amorphous nature, is a fact.

A new language emerged in the 1990s to reflect the more intransigent nature of global problems. Instead of peacekeeping, the talk was of peacemaking, peace support operations (PSOs), nation-building and the "three-block war" -- a highly controversial notion among academic specialists (many of whom say it's impossible) but not to the Canadian Forces.

The Department of National Defence says on its website, under the heading *A Soldier's Guide to Army Transformation*: "Experience on missions of the last few years has confirmed and reinforced our view of

the way ahead: the Canadian army must be prepared to fight and win the 'three-block war.'

"On the first block . . . we will deliver humanitarian aid or assist others in doing that. On the second, we will conduct stabilization or peace support operations. On the third, we will be engaged in a high-intensity fight. We must be ready to conduct these operations simultaneously and very close to one another. We must be prepared to conduct them in large urban centres and complex terrain."

Former army captain Sandra Perron, of Île Bizard, Que., one of the first women soldiers to transfer to combat duty, served in two missions -- Bosnia in 1993 and Croatia in 1995.

Peacekeeping, she says, is no longer a simple exercise in separating belligerents, even assuming peacekeepers can tell who the belligerents are. "It's kind of scary."

The Canadian military is more than capable of carrying out a new, transformed role, she says. "We have the right attitude, the right troops. But should we be playing that role? I never know what to answer. I think we should be asking our soldiers in Afghanistan if they're building a nation, if they're freeing people."

The mission experiences the DND website speaks of have come from Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia -- where the 1995 photograph of Canadian peacekeeper Patrick Rechner handcuffed by Serbian forces to a pole beside an ammunition dump as a human shield against air attack was flashed around the world, and Dutch peacekeepers in Srebrenica were forced to stand by as more than 7,000 unarmed Bosnian Muslim men and boys were dragged out of a so-called safe area and summarily shot.

(Nicholas Ribic, an Edmonton-born Serbo-Canadian, was extradited to Canada and tried and convicted of breaking Canadian law by taking Major Rechner captive. Now stationed in Europe, the major said in an interview this week he could not speak about his experiences because the case is under appeal.)

The experience has come from the battle of Medak Pocket, where the Second Battalion of the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, assigned to Croatia, was caught between Serbs and Croats and involved in the fiercest fighting Canadian troops had engaged in since Korea.

It has come from the disastrous mission in Somalia, where there never was a peace to keep and which led to the elite Airborne regiment being disbanded after a Somali teen was tortured and killed.

It has come, of course, from Rwanda, where a UN peacekeeping force under Canadian Gen. Roméo Dallaire was unable to prevent a massacre of 800,000 Tutsis and Hutu moderates by Hutu extremists.

But as Ms. Perron, now a marketing executive with General Motors, says, there are questions to be asked.

The first deals with our peacekeeping mythology. Is Afghanistan something new or have we been there before?

In fact, we have been there before -- in the 1960 UN mission to Congo, where Canadian troops were attacked and beaten by mobs and came repeatedly under fire as the UN force became involved in an open war to prevent the province of Katanga from seceding.

John Diefenbaker's Conservative government had little desire to commit Canadian troops but public opinion forced a change of mind. How does that differ from Canadian troops in 2006 defending a UN-mandated government in Afghanistan by fighting insurgents and terrorists?

Is there any distinction on the ground between "robust" UN interventions and interventions led by the U.S. or NATO but mandated by the UN, such as Afghanistan?

In theory, no, most academic experts say. In fact, James Dobbins, the Clinton administration's special envoy for Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia and Kosovo and the Bush administration's special envoy for Afghanistan, has argued that that the UN has done a somewhat better job at peacemaking or nation-building than have

U.S.-led interventions.

But the Canadian military, led by the chief of the defence staff, Gen. Rick Hillier, still feel scarred by the UN experience in the former Yugoslavia -- a criticism that fails to take into account substantial improvements the UN has made to managing its peacekeeping operations since then, says Prof. Walter Dorn, a specialist in defence studies at the Royal Military College.

But both Dr. Livingston of the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre and Prof. David Carment, of the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Ottawa's Carleton University, say there are questions Canada should be asking about any Afghanistan-type mission: What is the nature of the mission, and will Canadian forces be able to discriminate between insurgents and the local population? How stable is the government, and does it have a chance? What is the regional situation and can it be managed? (In the view of many analysts, Prof. Carment says, neighbouring Pakistan is less stable than Afghanistan.) What Canadian interests are being served by committing to the mission?

Is Afghanistan an established sanctuary and source of financial support for terrorists who pose a threat to Canada? Should Canada be there in terms of its values, in a role of supporting human rights? And finally, Prof. Carment says, there's a question of whether Canada is creating more enemies by being there.

"It's all very much an exercise of self-analysis."

Or, as Canada's best-known military historian, Jack Granatstein, has written: "We have been right to participate in most of the peacekeeping missions in which we have served. But let us, at the very least, retain and enhance our right to consider which operations we shall participate in, just as we have the right to consider which wars we shall fight."

The problem, these days, is how do you tell the peacekeeping missions from the wars?

Michael Valpy is a senior writer for The Globe and Mail.

© Copyright 2007 CTVglobemedia Publishing Inc. All Rights Reserved.

CTVglobemedia

globeandmail.com and The Globe and Mail are divisions of CTVglobemedia Publishing Inc., 444 Front St. W., Toronto, ON Canada M5V 2S9
Phillip Crawley, Publisher

Their pain, but our legacy Not exactly a Canadian event?; The 9/11 attacks happened in the U.S., yet Canada commemorates them every year. Why is that?; [ONT Edition]

Andrew Chung. **Toronto Star**. Toronto, Ont.: Sep 10, 2006. pg. D.1

People: Clarkson, Stephen, Hillmer, Norman, Martin, Douglas, Bush, George
Author(s): Andrew Chung
Section: *Ideas*
Publication title: Toronto Star. Toronto, Ont.: Sep 10, 2006. pg. D.1
Source type: Newspaper
ISSN: 03190781
ProQuest document ID: 1125091041
Text Word Count 1400
Document URL: <http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/pqdweb?did=1125091041&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=13709&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Abstract (Document Summary)

The heinous attacks on New York's Twin Towers and the Pentagon changed the tenor of Sept. 11 forever, and Canada is still presenting as sensitive a side as possible under the American gaze. Public Safety Minister Stockwell Day will today deliver a speech to the Canadian Fallen Firefighters Foundation ceremony on Parliament Hill that will touch on the subject. Tomorrow, Foreign Affairs Minister Peter Mackay will also talk about 9/11 in Halifax and participate in a ceremony at the American consulate there. Prime Minister Stephen Harper himself will commemorate the tragedy with his own speech.

It is five years after the fact. The attack didn't happen on Canadian soil. Twenty-four Canadians perished in the World Trade Center in New York, yet far more have died in other disasters. Take the Halifax explosion for instance. Or the Air India bombing. Official commemorations of those events are few and far between. Other terrorist attacks are similarly not acknowledged in the same way the Madrid or London bombings? The atrocities in Russia? Bombings in India or Jordan?

For Canadians, [Norman Hillmer] explains, "it seems to be that if you embrace 9/11, you are also embracing America. And in the context of [George Bush] foreign policy, the majority of Canadians don't want to do that."

Full Text (1400 words)

(Copyright (c) 2006 Toronto Star, All Rights Reserved.)

The picture is emotive two little girls smiling from windows side-by-side, one peeking from behind an American flag, the other beside the Maple Leaf. "Friends. Neighbors. Allies," it reads. "Remembering 9/11."

Last week, the picture went up on posters in District of Columbia subway stations, including those for the Pentagon and the White House, as well as on a giant banner on the Pennsylvania Ave. side of the Canadian embassy in Washington. In bold letters, the advertisements trumpet Canadianally.com, a website managed by the military side of the embassy. If you click on that picture, it takes you directly to an explanation of Canada's response to the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, five years ago tomorrow.

Another click gets you to Canada's military contribution to the War on Terror, and this is where Canada's soldiers in Afghanistan are prominently highlighted, with dramatic desert photographs and a review of the mission and the deaths.

The heinous attacks on New York's Twin Towers and the Pentagon changed the tenor of Sept. 11 forever, and Canada is still presenting as sensitive a side as possible under the American gaze. Public Safety Minister Stockwell Day will today deliver a speech to the Canadian Fallen Firefighters Foundation ceremony on Parliament Hill that will touch on the subject. Tomorrow, Foreign Affairs Minister Peter Mackay will also talk about 9/11 in Halifax and participate in a ceremony at the American consulate there. Prime Minister Stephen Harper himself will commemorate the tragedy with his own speech.

The media are also commemorating 9/11 relentlessly. For instance, CBC's The National ran a week-long documentary series leading up to this year's anniversary.

But it is five years after the fact. The attack didn't happen on Canadian soil. Twenty-four Canadians perished in the World Trade Center in New York, yet far more have died in other disasters. Take the Halifax explosion for instance. Or the Air India bombing. Official commemorations of those events are few and far between. Other terrorist attacks are similarly not acknowledged in the same way the Madrid or London bombings? The atrocities in Russia? Bombings in India or Jordan?

Does Canada still need to commemorate 9/11? Or is it time to let it go?

For Canadians, "it's not as big a disaster as many others," says Stephen Clarkson, professor of political economy and expert on Canada-U.S. relations at the University of Toronto. "But it's an event that transformed the United States and therefore had a huge impact on us because we are so inter-dependent, if not to say dependent, on them."

How we interpret 9/11 - whether we view it as our event or their event - depends on our own attitudes, Clarkson says.

And our attitude is different. While Americans feel they could be attacked again, while they worry about emergency exits in their workplaces and feel they're at war with terrorism, Clarkson says, "Canadians don't feel that as a whole, even though (Canada's current military campaign in) Afghanistan is being packaged as that."

There is little question 9/11 will hold a special, if dark, significance in people's memories. The horror of the images of planes slamming into buildings, of people jumping from the highest floors, was seared into the public's collective imagination as the most recorded and broadcast disaster in human history. That will not soon be forgotten.

"It happened in front of us, like President Kennedy's assassination. So of course we're going to remember it," says Carleton University historian Norman Hillmer, co-author of a recent book on Canada-U.S. relations.

"But what happened afterwards? Was it, in any sense, turned into a Canadian event?"

The significance of 9/11 in Canada should naturally be different than in the U.S., perhaps less visceral. And yet, on an official level, at least, Canada is still trying to treat 9/11 as no ordinary day.

More than most, Lt. Col. Douglas Martin, the Canadian embassy military spokesperson in Washington, wants the Americans to know that. He says remembering 9/11 is essential because "it wasn't just the U.S. that was attacked that day. Sixty other countries lost their countrymen. How many Canadians died? 24. Yes, the United States was attacked, but the pain was felt around the world."

For him, posters and websites such as Canadianally.com, combined with visits to congressional leaders, help to eliminate myths that keep cropping up, like the idea that some of the 9/11 hijackers entered the U.S. from Canada.

He also wants Americans to know Canada is pulling its weight in the War on Terror, which began that day.

"To think that you have people thinking things that are totally untrue, you have to dispel those myths," Douglas says. So, too, is it "important to stand up and be recognized that we are a culture that is totally against terrorism."

Which Canada has done. The U.S. girded for war; Canada, meanwhile, toughened anti-terror laws, expanded the use of controversial security certificates to hold terror suspects, spent billions on air and border security, and, under the new Conservative government, is now beefing up the military. Though Canada declined to assist in Iraq, it sent troops to Afghanistan, where they remain and dozens have died.

"Our own government responded in significant ways to American pressure, but also by agreeing that terrorism is newly significant and more invasively important than it used to be," Clarkson says.

The Canadian response - like many government decisions, whether we like to believe it or not - was crafted in part to curry favour with Washington.

"If you want to get along with George Bush, you do things that will make him feel that you're on his side, because he lives in a black-and-white, kind of elementary schoolkids' world of, 'We have friends and we have enemies and there are no subtleties,'" Clarkson says. "Symbolic acts are very important, as well as putting your money where your mouth is, which is buying big pieces of military hardware."

But even more enduring than the changes strewn throughout Canadian law and society is how Canadians, as the War on Terror picked up speed, reverted to their somewhat default state-of-mind that of distancing themselves from the U.S.

In this way, the idea that we commemorate 9/11 like the Americans may already be a myth.

"We don't need to let go of 9/11 because we never embraced it," Hillmer argues. "In fact, Canada went in a completely different direction. We didn't divorce 9/11 from what came in its wake, which was Bushism, unilateralism, Iraq, and what Canadians saw as excess."

We don't just have to look to current times to find this sentiment. It was there not long after Sept. 11. On the six-month anniversary of the attacks, then-prime minister Jean Chretien rejected calls for a permanent memorial to the Canadian victims. "There are other tragedies that occur from time to time," he said, though Monte Solberg, then in opposition and now the Immigration minister, labelled him "cold and callow."

Chretien also enraged critics when, on the first anniversary of the attacks, he said poverty was a root cause of terrorism and 9/11, which flew in the face of American rhetoric and, to some, let murderers off the hook.

Last week, Bush gave speeches reminding his fellow Americans they were at war. In Canada it's a different story. "No matter what Stephen Harper might say about terrorism or Canadians dying," Hillmer ventures, "I don't think we think of it as a Canadian tragedy at all."

For Canadians, Hillmer explains, "it seems to be that if you embrace 9/11, you are also embracing America. And in the context of Bush foreign policy, the majority of Canadians don't want to do that."

It seems inevitable that 9/11's resonance will become diminished as time passes. And in Canada, that time will come sooner than in the U.S. Some would argue it has already arrived.

And yet, a 9/11 legacy is mounting the growing number of Canadian soldier deaths in and around Kandahar, Afghanistan, where they are fighting the fanatical Taliban.

But as Lt. Col. Martin himself admits, they're going to be remembered not on the anniversary of 9/11, but when all our dead from wars past are.

On Nov. 11 - Remembrance Day.

[Illustration]

canadianally.com This image was hung as a huge banner on Pennsylvania Ave. in Washington, D.C., last week. It promotes a government website that reminds Americans of Canada's response to the 9 11 attacks.

Credit: Toronto Star

Polls, history experts point to sea change in opinion of military

Gloria Galloway. **The Globe and Mail**. Toronto, Ont.: Apr 11, 2006. pg. A.4

Author(s): Gloria Galloway

Dateline: *Ottawa ONT*

Section: *National News*

Publication title: The Globe and Mail. Toronto, Ont.: Apr 11, 2006. pg. A.4

Source type: Newspaper

ISSN: 03190714

ProQuest document ID: 1058922201

Text Word Count 774

Document URL: <http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/pqdweb?did=1058922201&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=13709&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Abstract (Document Summary)

The Cold War was ending and there was a feeling "that the military didn't have much to do and the Americans would protect us anyway," Dr. [Norman Hillmer] said. "There was also a kind of visceral feeling that grew up in the post Second World War years that we weren't really a military people, we were a peaceful folk."

Full Text (774 words)

All material copyright Bell Globemedia Publishing Inc. or its licensors. All rights reserved.

Canadians have found new faith in their military.

Politicians spent last night discussing the mission in Afghanistan but all sides went into the debate professing full support for the men and women who are serving in one of the most dangerous regions of the world.

Defence spending, which fell during the 1990s, is back to within 5 per cent in real terms of its highest point ever, and it promises to soar far higher over the next four years.

Ottawa is the site of a glistening new museum dedicated solely to Canada's participation in war.

And 78 per cent of respondents to a recent Strategic Counsel poll said they believe Canadian troops will have a positive impact on the lives of the Afghans. The pollster points out that this is consistent with broad public opinion that the Canadian military does good deeds when it is sent abroad.

The military has often been called Prime Minister Stephen Harper's "sixth priority," falling after the top five of accountability, health, child care, tax cuts and safe streets. Mr. Harper talked often during the recent election campaign about the new cash his government was willing to invest in national defence.

It was much different in the early 1990s, when Conservative prime minister Brian Mulroney read Canadian attitudes and cut the military, said Norman Hillmer, who specializes in military affairs at Carleton University in Ottawa.

The Cold War was ending and there was a feeling "that the military didn't have much to do and the Americans would protect us anyway," Dr. Hillmer said. "There was also a kind of visceral feeling that grew up in the post Second World War years that we weren't really a military people, we were a peaceful folk."

So the military was allowed to decline from about 125,000 personnel in the mid-1960s to about 60,000 in the mid-1990s, Dr. Hillmer said. "And there was a downgrading in all kinds of other ways too." Military salaries were allowed to decline to the point where soldiers were forced to take part-time jobs and visited food banks to support their families. All of this occurred as Canadian troops were perhaps busier than they had ever been in peacetime.

Canada took part in two wars in the 1990s -- in the Persian Gulf and Kosovo -- and its soldiers were involved in an estimated 40 other peacekeeping missions. During that time, "a whole lot of things happened in or near Canada to make people think twice about our military tradition," Dr. Hillmer said.

The CBC documentary series *The Valour and the Horror* sparked intense public outcry because it was perceived as denigrating the work of Canadian soldiers. And celebrations of the anniversaries of events like D-Day reminded the public of the heroism of the country's troops.

Politicians of the mid-1990s had a hard time selling the notion of that the military needed bolstering, but by the turn of the

millennium, ordinary people began asking why Canada had depleted defence.

Mr. Mulroney could have argued that nuclear weapons in the hands of other states made military spending necessary, Dr. Hillmer said. "Mr. Harper can just say, 'Well, a number of our people were killed on Sept. 11 and we have to contribute to the war on terror.' It's a much less easy case to make, and yet it seems much easier to make it."

So much so that, according to the Polaris Institute, a think tank on multilateral issues, defence spending is approaching 1990 levels in adjusted dollars and will climb by more than 30 per cent over the next four years.

Michel Drapeau, an Ottawa lawyer who served in the military between 1959 and 1993 and rose to the rank of colonel, said he doesn't believe public opinion about the military has fully turned around. But, he said, support has increased. "Canadians are getting a daily diet of our soldiers doing excellent work in the face of a very perilous mission" in Afghanistan, Mr. Drapeau said.

"So Canadians are responding as I would expect, because, after all, they are the moms and pops of our soldiers over there, so they are responding with pride and support. . . . All of these people serving in the military are not mercenaries. They are our sons and daughters and nieces and nephews and we know they are good people."

That makes us protective of them, Mr. Drapeau said. "We want to make sure that our troops are used only for what needs to be done in the most effective manner possible," he said. "And I find that refreshing, that we take such an interest in the welfare of our soldiers."

Copyright © 2007 ProQuest Information and Learning Company. All rights reserved. [Terms and Conditions](#)

[Text-only interface](#)

ProQuest
COMPANY

Harper says troops from Middle East should enforce peace

Michael Hammond. **Winnipeg Free Press**. Winnipeg, Man.: Jul 26, 2006. pg. A.5

Author(s): Michael Hammond

Section: *Canada Wire*

Publication title: Winnipeg Free Press. Winnipeg, Man.: Jul 26, 2006. pg. A.5

Source type: Newspaper

ISSN: 08281785

ProQuest document ID: 1083380401

Text Word Count 391

Document URL: <http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/pqdweb?did=1083380401&sid=6&Fmt=3&clientId=13709&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Abstract (Document Summary)

"I think, ultimately, a solution lies in the region," [Stephen Harper] said yesterday in Cambridge, Ont. "Canada's first choice is not to have Canadians or foreign troops enforcing this."

"Canada hasn't been a top peacekeeper in many years," she said. "We can't expect what we would have expected a decade ago."

"We can expect any motion that Canada will push for will have strong language that any ceasefire include a concerted effort to disarm Hezbollah," said [Mira Sucharov].

Full Text (391 words)

Copyright F.P. Canadian Newspapers Limited Partnership Jul 26, 2006

By Michael Hammond

OTTAWA -- Prime Minister Stephen Harper says Canada would prefer to keep its troops out of the Middle East.

Ahead of a Rome summit that will include Foreign Affairs Minister Peter MacKay, the prime minister said that any ceasefire between Israel and the Lebanese militant group Hezbollah would be better enforced by Middle East countries.

"I think, ultimately, a solution lies in the region," Harper said yesterday in Cambridge, Ont. "Canada's first choice is not to have Canadians or foreign troops enforcing this."

Gar Pardy, Canada's former director general of consular affairs, said Canada's inability to commit combat troops does not rule out its involvement in an international force.

Pardy said Canada has several communications and medical units that are in high demand.

Mira Sucharov, a political science professor at Carleton University, said Canadians can't expect the country to play a leading role in the conflict resolution.

"Canada hasn't been a top peacekeeper in many years," she said. "We can't expect what we would have expected a decade ago."

Israel has suggested it would maintain a security zone in southern Lebanon until either a multinational force "with enforcement capability" is deployed on the border, or Hezbollah is pushed back in a ceasefire agreement that also cuts off the supply of its weapons.

In Rome, MacKay will meet U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice as well as representatives from Britain, France, Italy, Jordan, Egypt, the United Nations and the World Bank. Rice will moderate the meeting today.

The United States is proposing a NATO-led intervention force in southern Lebanon. It wants the United Nations to sanction a force as it did for coalition forces in Afghanistan.

Given what both Harper and MacKay have said in the last week, Sucharov says Canada's role in solving the crisis will likely mirror that of the United States.

"We can expect any motion that Canada will push for will have strong language that any ceasefire include a concerted effort

to disarm Hezbollah," said Sucharov.

"I think it would be fair to say this government has more of a good-versus-evil world view."

Neither Canada nor the United States has called for a ceasefire in the region, insisting that Hezbollah must first be dismantled.

Harper also said the government intends to look closely at the rights and responsibilities of dual Canadian citizens.

-- Canadian Press

Copyright © 2007 ProQuest Information and Learning Company. All rights reserved. [Terms and Conditions](#)

[Text-only interface](#)



TREVOR FINDLAY

The Current, CBC Radio: OCTOBER 11, 2006

Wither Non-Proliferation

The nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT) was an international agreement born of mutual fear. In 1970, the original five nuclear powers -- the U.S., China, France, Great Britain and the then Soviet Union -- agreed to reduce and eventually eliminate their stockpiles. No one wanted to see nuclear weapons fall into the hands of the wrong regime.

But although dozens of countries gladly signed onto the NPT, the so-called "nuclear club" has also grown -- with this week's ominous test in North Korea bringing membership to nine.

First, we wanted to take a look back at a pact that seems to be on the cusp of falling apart. Trevor Findlay is the director of the Canadian Centre for Treaty Compliance at Carleton University in Ottawa. He's also the former Executive Director of the Verification Research, Training and Information Centre, or VERTIC, in London. And we reached him at his office in Ottawa.

Full transcript available at: <http://www.cbc.ca/thecurrent/2006/200610/20061011.html>