

Canada in Kandahar:
An Expression of Internationalism

A Thesis Submitted to the College of
Graduate Studies and Research
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Political Studies
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

By

Sean Fitzsimmons

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis/dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis/dissertation in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis/dissertation work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis/dissertation or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis/dissertation.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other uses of materials in this thesis/dissertation in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Political Studies
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A5
Canada

OR

Dean
College of Graduate Studies and Research
University of Saskatchewan
107 Administration Place
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A2
Canada

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Prof. Donald Story for his guidance throughout the writing of this thesis. As well, I am appreciative of Prof. Ron Wheeler for his advice on how to approach the writing of a thesis. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their continual support.

Abstract

This thesis examines the decision by the government of Prime Minister Paul Martin in March of 2005 to deploy Canadian troops to the Kandahar region of Afghanistan – a region that is considered to be one of the most perilous in the country. Indeed, the Kandahar mission has produced the highest number of deaths of Canadians in combat since the Korean War. Prior to this engagement, the Chretien government had sent Canadian troops on other missions in Afghanistan, which neither were as dangerous nor involved combat against insurgents. This thesis will seek to provide an explanation for the change in policy under the Martin government. It will argue that the decision to engage Canada in combat in Afghanistan can be understood as an expression of internationalism, whose meaning had been altered by the forces of globalization growing out of the 9/11 attacks. The methodological approach that will be used in the thesis is a case study, which draws upon established theories regarding Canadian foreign policy.

Introduction

On May 17th of 2005, the Canadian government made the decision to send Canadian troops into the Kandahar region of Afghanistan. The decision was significant, given that the Kandahar province of Afghanistan is considerably more perilous than the other regions of the country. Since that time the number of Canadian casualties that have occurred in Afghanistan has grown exponentially. In the first four years of its engagement in Afghanistan, Canada experienced eight casualties, four of these casualties the result of what the military refers to as ‘friendly fire.’ Since moving to Kandahar in May of 2005, Canada has experienced 104 casualties as of April 16th 2009. Given the mounting numbers of Canadians killed in Kandahar, and the criticism among Canadians of Canada’s involvement in the war more generally, it is useful to explore why the Canadian government decided to embrace the Kandahar mission in 2005.

The decision to engage in a combat role in Kandahar was an unusual move for Canada. While Canadians have been involved in numerous wars, including two World Wars, they have resisted the idea that force is a justifiable means of pursuing Canada’s foreign policy goals. The thesis argues that the decision to pursue a combat role, rather than constituting a departure from traditional post-World War II Canadian roles, was a genuine expression of Canadian internationalism, given new meaning by a new global conception of security.

The number of academic publications that deal with Canada’s involvement in Kandahar is limited. Two books and two articles have been published that deal exclusively with Canada’s involvement in Afghanistan; however, only two of these publications are focused on its engagement in Kandahar. Grant Dawson’s “ ‘A Special

Case': Canada, Operation Apollo, and Multilateralism"¹ helps to explain Canada's original rationale for participating in the initial US-led invasion of Afghanistan. It claims that there were two primary reasons for Canada's decision to go into Afghanistan. First of all, there was pressure from Washington to join the mission. And secondly, there was also a multilateral consensus in favour of the invasion, involving countries in Asia and Europe and elsewhere, which helped to dampen allegations that Canada was acting at the behest of the US.

In his article "Reluctant Moral Middle Power"² Rick Fawn discusses the dilemmas facing Canada in formulating its Afghanistan policy in the years following 9/11. Fawn argues that Canada came to its decision to join the US-led coalition very reluctantly and, from the start, the terms of its engagement were ambiguous. This was because participation in such a mission was contrary to the perceptions which many Canadians had of themselves as non-militaristic humanitarians. But this article, like the Dawson piece, does not cover the government's later decision to move to the Kandahar province of Afghanistan.

Peter Piggot has published *Canada in Afghanistan: The War So Far*,³ which provides extensive geographic, demographic and historical information about Afghanistan. He also examines some of the factors which led Canadian policy-makers to deploy troops to Afghanistan, focusing on the decisions by Canadian leaders up to and including the decision to deploy troops to Kandahar. In the final chapter, Piggot

¹ Grant Dawson, " 'A Special Case': Canada, Operation Apollo, and Multilateralism," in *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus* eds. David Carment, Fen Hampson, and Norman Hillmer. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

² Fawn, Rick. 2003. "Reluctant Moral Middle Power," in *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan, and Beyond*. eds. Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn. (New York: Taylor & Francis).

³ Peter Piggot, *Canada in Afghanistan: The War So Far*, (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2007).

discusses the logistical challenges which face Canadian troops in Kandahar, and offers some suggestions for overcoming these challenges.

The seminal book on Afghanistan is written by Janice Gross Stein and Eugene Lang, and is entitled *The Unexpected War: Canada in Kandahar*. This book provides an examination of the policy decisions that were made inside the Canadian government regarding Canada's involvement in Afghanistan. It examines the initial phases of Canadian involvement under the Chrétien government, as well as Martin government's decision to deploy troops to Kandahar.

The strength of this book is its discussion of the domestic political factors that led to Canada's involvement in Kandahar. It discusses the key role that Canadian Chief of Defence Staff Rick Hillier played in the Martin government's decision to authorize a combat mission for Afghanistan. The authors describe how Hillier was centrally involved in the drafting of the Martin government's *International Policy Statement*, published at about the same time as the decision on Kandahar. Martin was looking for some innovative thinking by the Departments of Foreign Affairs and National Defense, and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). When this was not forthcoming, he appointed Hillier – whose views on Afghanistan would come to be very influential.

The authors note:

Hillier hit the ground running. Even before he was formally appointed CDS, he took full charge of recasting what became known in NDHQ as the Defence Policy Statement, or DPS. By the time Hillier had finished, the prime minister regarded the DPS as the best contribution to the International Policy Statement. "The Defense Review saved the IPS. Hillier's contribution was the outstanding contribution to that effort," reflected Martin. Hillier had outperformed the best minds in the Department of Foreign Affairs and the academic in Oxford.⁴

⁴ Janice Gross-Stein and Eugene Lang, *The Unexpected War: Canada in Kandahar*, (Toronto: The Penguin Group, 2007), 155.

Stein and Lang's book provides an excellent insider's view of Canada's decision to deploy troops to Kandahar. However, it analyzes the move into Kandahar with a focus on the internal foreign policy process in Canada. There is a strong emphasis on the perspectives of Canadian political and military leaders and little discussion of the Kandahar mission as an expression or manifestation of Canada's behaviour in the international system.

There are, of course, many other sources that make brief or passing reference to Canada's involvement in Afghanistan. For example, in his memoirs Jean Chrétien discusses some of the policy decisions of his government. He notes that the government committed forces to Afghanistan, in the first place, as a 'multilateral undertaking in keeping with our commitment to NATO', and then later, after the defeat of the Taliban government, agreed to position Canadian troops to "stabilize the situation, protect the new government and the Afghan people, and help keep the peace."⁵ Stephen Thorne has also written a piece on Rick Hillier in the *International Journal*, which discusses his experiences as a military commander.⁶ And there are short pieces that discuss some of the arguments used by Rick Hillier in making his case to the Prime Minister and Defence Minister in favour of going into Kandahar.⁷

The methodological approach that will be used in this thesis is a case study method that draws upon established theories regarding Canadian foreign policy. The thesis will argue that there is considerable evidence to suggest that Canadian policy-

⁵ Jean Chrétien, *My Years As Prime Minister*, (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2007), 304-5.

⁶ Stephen Thorne, "Rick Hillier," *International Journal*, Summer (2005) 3.

⁷ See for example Charles C. Krulak, "The Strategic Corporal: Leadership in the Three Block War," *Marines Magazine*, January (1999).

makers viewed the conflict through an internationalist lens, but one that cast international security in a different light.

Internationalism is frequently utilized to characterize the Canadian position towards international security issues. In *No Other Way: Canada and International Security Institutions*⁸ Ian Smart writes that Canadians know ‘no other way’ than to be engaged in the international system, since conflict among the great powers will invariably have a significant impact on Canadian security. John Holmes, still cited as the foremost authority in the field of Canadian foreign policy, maintained that the natural position for Canada to take on world issues was to be internationalist, or actively committed in the pursuit of world order.⁹ The scholarship of a variety of academics who have written on Canadian internationalism, including Holmes, Kim Richard Nossal, Denis Stairs and others who have written about Canadian internationalism will inform this study.

The objective of this thesis is to argue that the decision by the Martin government to deploy troops to Kandahar can be understood as an expression of internationalism. The thesis will begin by examining Canada’s initial engagement in Afghanistan during the Chrétien years, demonstrating that the Chrétien government undertook a variety of measures to avoid direct combat with the enemy in Afghanistan. The result was a limited number of casualties among Canadian officers. The second chapter will show that with the arrival of the Martin government, the Canadian mission in Afghanistan underwent a significant change. There was now a willingness, indeed a determination, to deploy Canadian troops in direct combat against the insurgents. The third chapter of this thesis

⁸ John W. Holmes, *No Other Way: Canada and International Security Institutions*, (Toronto: Centre for International Studies, 1986), 2.

⁹ Kim Richard Nossal, “Canada and the Search for World Order: John W. Holmes and Canadian Foreign Policy,” *International Journal*, Autumn (2004) 4, 752-753.

will demonstrate that this decision can be understood as an expression of the Martin government's tendency to view the Afghanistan conflict through an internationalist lens, one that captured the emergence of a new international security in the post 9/11 era, shaped by the trauma of 9/11 and by the related forces of globalization.

There are other theories that have been advanced to explain the Kandahar mission. First, it has been suggested that the Canadian government viewed the Kandahar mission as a means of compensating the US government for Canada's non-involvement in Iraq and ballistic missile defense. It has also been proposed that the move to Kandahar was one consequence of strong pressure from the Department of National Defense to create a new foreign policy direction for Canada, including a new and expanded role for Canada's military abroad. Neither of these theories will be contradicted by this thesis which, however, also addresses the impact which a new international security environment in the post 9/11 period has had on Canadian policy.

Chapter 1

The Chrétien government's reluctant approach to Afghanistan

“Ottawa’s conundrum was that Canadians wanted the country involved in world affairs, but did not support large armed forces.”

-Grant Dawson¹⁰

“And while Canadians have expressed their willingness over the past several weeks to join the United States in a war on terrorism, our inclusion on a short list of military allies must still have sent a shudder down the spines of many.”

-Edward Greenspan¹¹

1.1- Introduction

The Chrétien government was reluctant, from the start, to pledge military support to the US military campaign in Afghanistan. Throughout the fall of 2001, it pursued an ambiguous policy regarding its intentions in Afghanistan. In the end, it decided that it was in Canada’s best interest to take on a combat role in Afghanistan, but for a considerable time it made every effort to avoid doing so.

1.2- Operation Enduring Freedom: A Reluctant Canadian Response

Following the 9/11 attacks, there was an immediate display of international solidarity in support of the US. On September 12, the NATO allies decided to invoke Article 5 of the NATO treaty¹². The NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson stated that Article 5 would be invoked pending identification of those who attacked the US.¹³ He claimed that NATO’s actions were to be considered an act of solidarity and “a

¹⁰ Grant Dawson, “‘A Special Case’: Canada, Operation Apollo, and Multilateralism,” in *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus* eds. David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson, and Norman Hillmer, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 182.

¹¹ Edward Greenspan, “Suddenly, we’re at war,” *The Globe and Mail*, 8 October 2001: A17.

¹² John Ibbitson, “US expects its friends to back efforts to launch war on terrorism,” *The Globe and Mail*, 13 September 2001: A06.

¹³ Alan Freeman, “‘Today we are all Americans’ -NATO allies pledge support,” *The Globe and Mail*, 13 September 2001, A06.

reaffirmation of a solemn treaty commitment which these countries have entered into.”¹⁴

The wording of NATO’s decision required the US to prove that the terrorist attacks were initiated from abroad. The posing of this condition meant that the allies would most likely enhance their intelligence sharing procedures and agree to participate in economic boycotts if considered necessary.

The level of international solidarity was further enhanced on September 13 as NATO and Russia put aside their differences and promised to work together to rid the world of international terrorism. The NATO-Russia Permanent Council in Brussels released a statement that said: “NATO and Russia call on the entire international community to unite in the struggle against terrorism.”¹⁵ This statement was significant, given that Russia was vehemently opposed to NATO actions in Kosovo and US plans for missile defense.

In the days following 9/11, it became clear that the US would be taking robust military measures against what it referred to as the enemy. On September 13, it was reported that the death toll from the 9/11 attacks was likely to exceed 5000 casualties¹⁶. As US President George W. Bush toured the damage that was caused at the Pentagon, he vowed that he would hunt down those who perpetrated the attacks, and bring them to justice. Moreover, the Senate voted 100 to 0 in declaring unqualified support for the President as he planned a response to the attacks. The House of Representatives was equally supportive. Democratic Representative Shelley Berkley warned the perpetrator’s that this “act of war will be avenged.”¹⁷ Furthermore, on September 16, US Vice-

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Alan Freeman, “NATO, Russia anti-terrorism allies,” *The Globe and Mail*, 14 September 2001: A03.

¹⁶ John Stackhouse, “Bush zeros in on target,” *The Globe and Mail*, 14 September 2001: A01.

¹⁷ Ibbitson.

President Dick Cheney stated on NBC's *Meet the Press* that he had no doubt that al Qaeda was behind the attacks and that an adequate response would "require a major effort and obviously quite possibly the use of military force."¹⁸

As it became clear that the US would take military action against the perpetrators of the attacks, there was a mixed response from international leaders. On September 13, it was reported that European governments were scheduled to hold a special anti-terrorism summit. They had previously expressed their support for the US; however, several had been reluctant to endorse a US-led "war on terrorism". As the language of US political leaders began to suggest that war was likely, Prime Minister Lionel Jospin of France stated that although his country expressed its solidarity with the US, it intended to retain full control over the involvement of its own forces. In a similar tone, Belgium's Foreign Minister claimed that the war on terrorism was not an actual war, while the Italian Defense Minister claimed that Italy would categorically reject any extraordinary call to arms¹⁹. On the other hand, there were European leaders who were at once prepared to support a US military response. Britain and Australia pledged military support almost immediately. And German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder would not rule out German support for a US military strike.

The Canadian government was torn between its commitment to maintain solidarity with the US, and its reluctance to advocate or support a military response. In the House of Commons on September 17 Prime Minister Chrétien stated that the duty of Canadians lay with the US at this moment "as neighbors, as friends, as family."²⁰ He also argued that the 9/11 attacks were not an attack on the US alone, but an attack on all

¹⁸ John Ibbitson, "Prepared to attack Taliban, US says," *The Globe and Mail*, 16 September 2001: A04.

¹⁹ Alan Freeman, "'War' talk unsettles several leaders," *The Globe and Mail*, 19 September 2001: A04.

²⁰ Dawson, 183.

democratic nations: “So let us be clear, these cold-blooded killers struck a blow at the values and beliefs of free and civilized peoples everywhere. The world has been attacked.”²¹ Government officials at the time believed that Chrétien’s statements were consistent with the views of the Canadian people. Jim Wright, a senior official in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade stated that he was not surprised to hear Chrétien use these terms.

At the same time, however, Chrétien demonstrated that he was reluctant to pledge outright military support. Before leaving for Washington, he informed the House of Commons that he would urge President Bush to take a restrained approach as he responded to the attacks. The Prime Minister stated:

I intend to discuss with the President — as I have been able to do with other leaders of governments — a long term approach, and not trying to take sensational, short-term actions that could have negative effects over the long term for the whole population of the globe²².

Prior to this statement, the Prime Minister had pledged solidarity with the US but he did not specify how Canada intended to respond to the 9/11 attacks. He also expressed his regret that civilians might be casualties of any response. In an article in the *Globe and Mail* on September 16, 2001, former Foreign Affairs Lloyd Axworthy argued that Canada should take a multilateral approach to the crisis that focused on the human security of individuals.

The hesitation exhibited by Chrétien was consistent with the views of Canadians at the time. Canadians were initially very supportive of the US following the attacks, but once the implications of participation in a war on terrorism were explained, that support

²¹ Ibid, 184.

²² Shannon McCarthy, “PM plans trip to US to discuss united force: Chrétien tells Commons he will urge Bush to proceed cautiously in war on terrorism,” *The Globe and Mail*, 19 September 2001: A07.

diminished. An Ipsos-Reid poll taken on September 22, 2001, revealed that 73% of Canadians favored a role for Canada in the US-led war on terrorism. However only 43% were prepared to support such a role where there was evidence that Canadian participation might cause a terrorist attack on Canada. A similar poll taken in October 2001 by the Canadian Alliance demonstrated that 66% of Canadians favoured a role for the Canadian Forces in the war on terrorism. But if this meant the deaths of Canadian soldiers, then only 48% of Canadians would support this proposition²³.

Canadians first learned of their country's decision to participate in what was titled Operation Enduring Freedom during a speech by President Bush on October 7, in which he stated, "other close friends including Canada, Australia, Germany and France have pledged forces as the operation unfolds."²⁴ Up to this point, the Canadian government had said only that the US had not requested a troop commitment from Canada. The initial Canadian statement on 9/11 was a response to a US request for troops on October 4. By contrast, notes Rick Fawn, the British and Australian governments took the initiative and pledged military support to the US²⁵. Moreover, the words of the Canadian Defence Minister, Art Eggleton reflected reluctance and ambiguity. When asked whether Canadian troops would be deployed to Afghanistan, he responded that Canadian troops would not be deployed to any place where they were not welcome. These statements were confusing, since it was clear that the Taliban would not be welcoming Canadian troops. However, Eggleton subsequently provided clarification, claiming that Canadian troops would be welcomed by the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan.

²³ Dawson, 182.

²⁴ Don Mills, "PM sending troops to buttress coalition: Domestic security alert," *The National Post*, 8 October 2001: A01.

²⁵ Rick Fawn, "Reluctant Moral Middle Power," *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan and Beyond*, eds. Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn, (London: Routledge, 2003), 80.

Although hesitant, the Canadian government finally decided that it would be in Canada's interest to participate in the US-led initiative. On October 8, Prime Minister Chrétien announced that Canada would deploy an unspecified number of troops to the region to participate in the coalition. He claimed that he had told President Bush the day before that Canada would participate in the coalition that had formed. At this point, Chrétien, demonstrated more resolve than he had shown previously, "We must insist on living on our terms according to our values, not on terms dictated from the shadows. I cannot promise that the campaign against terrorism will be painless, but I can promise that it will be won."²⁶

The Canadian government's decision to be a part of Operation Enduring Freedom can be attributed to number of factors. First, participation in a coalition was consistent with Canada's multilateral traditions. While it was not a NATO coalition, Chrétien has since remarked in his memoirs that Canada was "the first to talk about the use of NATO's Article 5, which stated that an attack on one member was an attack on all."²⁷ As well, Canada took the familiar approach of reaching out to its other allies to moderate the aggressiveness of the US. As former Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson had once said, "for Canada, there was always security in numbers. We did not want to be alone with our close friend and neighbour."²⁸ Afghanistan was not like Iraq, inasmuch as the mission was approved by the United Nations and actively supported by a number of countries, including Canada. In his memoirs, Chrétien's chief policy advisor, Eddie Goldenberg, draws a clear distinction between the Iraq and Afghanistan wars: Iraq was not

²⁶ Don Mills, "PM sending troops to buttress coalition: Domestic security alert," *The National Post*, 8 October 2001: A01.

²⁷ Jean Chrétien, *My Years As Prime Minister*, (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2007), 304.

²⁸ Dawson, 185.

supportable because Canada “would only participate in military action that had the support of the international community.”²⁹ Chretien himself described the Afghanistan mission as a “multilateral undertaking in keeping with our commitment to NATO.”³⁰

The United Nations (UN) also influenced Canada’s decision to deploy troops to Afghanistan. The UN Security Council supported the US by adopting Resolutions 1368 and 1373, citing the inherent right of individual and collective self- defense. According to Canada’s Ambassador to the UN Paul Heinbecker:

This acknowledged that Afghanistan was a special case, in which the US had the legal right to pursue and punish bin Laden and his supporters and did not require UN sanction. The world body could support US efforts if it wished, but Washington did not require a UN sanction.³¹

The UN was important for Canada, since it provided a legal framework for anti-terrorist action. Resolution 1373 prevented terrorists from acquiring weapons, finding safe havens, and raising capital within the territory of signatory countries. By June of 2002, the UN had received reports from 161 of 189 member states affirming that progress had been made towards implementing the Resolution.

Grant Dawson has argued that the Canadian government hoped that its military commitment would earn the country some credit with the US government and that cooperation with the US would result in a louder Canadian voice in Washington. As far back as the Korean War, Lester B. Pearson had stated: “there must always be in our minds the possibility that if we do not demonstrate our fundamental solidarity [with the US] we should inevitably find it more difficult to get a favorable treatment in

²⁹ Eddie Goldenberg, *The Way it Works: Inside Ottawa*, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2006), 287.

³⁰ Chretien, *My Years*, 304.

³¹ Dawson, 188.

procurement and other problems.”³² Other scholars have noted that when the Canadian government deployed troops to Europe in 1951 as a means of buttressing NATO, the decision was made in part to enhance Canadian influence in Washington. Dawson concludes that the Canadian government’s military contribution in Afghanistan would achieve a similar result.

1.3- Canada’s Contribution to the Coalition Materializes

When Canada’s contribution to Operation Enduring Freedom materialized, it still reflected the restrained attitudes of Canadians and the Chrétien government. On October 10, 2001, the government announced that the Canadian Navy would provide four frigates, a destroyer, a supply ship and Sea King helicopters; the Air Force three Hercules transport jets, an Airbus and two Aurora maritime aircraft; and the Army an unspecified number of Joint Task Force 2 commandos. Yet military experts noted that this commitment was an attempt to show solidarity with the allies, rather than a substantive contribution to the military operation. Michael Drapeau, a retired colonel and military expert stated, “Frankly, wracking my brain, I can’t see what they will do... It’s a nice geopolitical way to show we care.”³³ Martin Shadwick, a military analyst with the Centre for International Security Studies at York University said that the six ships that Canada contributed would constitute about one-third of the Canadian Navy and would be regarded by the European powers as a significant commitment. Yet he was unable to describe what their function would be in the coalition. He noted that although the ships

³² Dawson, 184.

³³ Brian Laghi, “One-third of fleet sent to US effort,” *The Globe and Mail*, 10 October 2001: A07.

might be used to protect US carriers, this was unnecessary since the US had more than enough firepower available to protect its own ships.³⁴

On October 31, 2001, US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld announced that regular US army troops were now operating in Afghanistan.³⁵ Prior to this, there were special force operations on the ground, but there were no regular army troops committed to the conflict; the ground campaign had been carried out by the Northern Alliance with Western air support.

The deployment of ground troops in any conflict is particularly significant, given that ground troops are the most vulnerable to attacks. Indeed, this was the rationale behind the logistics used in the Kosovo war. NATO attempted to minimize casualties by carrying out the campaign exclusively through the air at high altitudes. Similarly, the US responded to the al Qaeda attacks on its embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 by launching air attacks to avoid casualties.

1.4- The Opportunity for Peacekeeping Arises

On November 15, 2001 Ottawa announced that it would be willing to send 1000 ground troops to Afghanistan as part of a UN-mandated force, whose purpose was to secure areas abandoned by the Taliban around Kabul. What would in time come to be called the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) was viewed by the Chrétien government as a largely humanitarian undertaking. Randy Mylyk, who was acting as a spokesman for the Department of National Defence, noted that the troops would be deployed to provide stabilization, and he emphasized the deliverance of food and

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Murray Campbell, "US soldiers on ground, Rumsfeld says," *The Globe and Mail*, 31 October 2001: A10.

shelter.³⁶ The following day, Defence Minister Art Eggleton stated that the commitment would be for six months and, moreover, if heavy fighting occurred the troops would be removed from combat. Eggleton stated: “These people are not intended to go in under a full-conflict situation...And if it ever came to full conflict, they’d probably be taken out...It’s intended to be a stabilization force to help settle things down and provide for corridors for humanitarian assistance.”³⁷

Gross-Stein and Lang argue that this mission was appealing to Canadian policy-makers for a variety of reasons. Canada would get credit for having a significant number of boots on the ground. Yet, these soldiers would be in more of a traditional Canadian role of providing humanitarian relief. There would be some dangers involved, however, the casualties would be limited. And furthermore, there would be no awkward news reports of Canadians fighting alongside the US in a combat role. The Chrétien government wanted to achieve “the appearance of independence and distance from Washington, even while it showed solidarity with the Americans after 9/11.”³⁸

ISAF was a British-led international peacekeeping force created to operate around the confines of Kabul. While planning got underway in Canada regarding the ISAF initiative, a further opportunity of a different kind arose for Canada. A British-led international peacekeeping force was being created to operate within the confines of Kabul. The UK was seeking 200 engineers from Canada. But this posed difficulties for the Canadian government for two reasons. First, the Canadian Armed Forces had a

³⁶ Brian Laghi, “The Fall of Kabul: Canadian soldiers will go in to give aid,” *The Globe and Mail*, 15 November 2001: A01.

³⁷ Brian Laghi, “Eggleton plays down combat role for troops,” *The Globe and Mail*, 16 November 2001: A01.

³⁸ Janice Gross-Stein and Eugene Lang, *The Unexpected War: Canada in Kandahar*, (Toronto: The Penguin Group, 2007), 16.

shortage of engineers. And second, the Chrétien government did not believe that a contingent of 200 engineers would be an identifiable Canadian commitment to the war on terrorism.³⁹

Instead of accepting this mission, the Chrétien government agreed to a request by the Bush Administration in January 2002 to engage in a more dangerous but limited combat mission in the southern region of Afghanistan. A contingent of 750 Canadian soldiers would be deployed for a period of six months as part of the US Army's Task Force Rakkasan. According to Gross-Stein and Lang, the Canadian government considered this operation to be low risk:

It was low risk because the Canadians arrived too late to make a difference on the ground. American forces had cleared the Taliban and al Qaeda from southern Afghanistan weeks before the Canadian forces arrived on the scene. However, as one former senior government official conceded, Canada's military contribution to the American effort in Kandahar in the first half of 2002 did have 'cosmetic value'. Canadian leaders used these cosmetics largely for Washington's eyes.⁴⁰

Basically, the task force was responsible for patrolling for enemy enclaves. This was to be done for a non-negotiable period of six months.⁴¹

As Canadian troops returned at the end of the six months, Assistant Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Jim Wright noted that there would be no second rotation of Canadians to the area. Canada's approach to international security, Wright noted, was very different from the US approach. Canada had other multilateral commitments in Bosnia which could not be abridged. Wright stated, "the government has always maintained that it had gone in with its allies and would depart with them as well."⁴²

³⁹ Dawson, 191.

⁴⁰ Gross-Stein and Lang), 3.

⁴¹ Marcus Gee, "Brave troops sent on a fool's errand," *The Globe and Mail*, 19 January 2002: A15.

⁴² Dawson, 193.

However, Stein and Lang note that this limited response seemed consistent with the risk-averse style of Chrétien. They note that, even immediately following 9/11, when Canada's support for the US was at an all time high, Chrétien was reluctant to be seen too close to George W. Bush and the political actions he pursued. Rather, it was British Prime Minister Tony Blair who was the first to go to Washington and express solidarity with the US. Gross-Stein and Lang argue that, usually, that role would have been filled by a Canadian Prime Minister to reflect Canada's special relationship with the US.⁴³

1.5- Canada Embraces ISAF- A Return to Traditional Peacekeeping

ISAF was initially mandated to provide security in Kabul for the Afghan Transitional Administration headed by Hamid Karzai. At this time, it consisted of 37 nations from Europe, North America and Australia. However, the characteristics of ISAF, and Canada's involvement in the organization would evolve during its tenure in Afghanistan to take on a larger role in the conflict.

Canadian officials first became aware of ISAF's evolving role in the fall of 2002, as it appeared that the US was preparing for an invasion of Iraq. At this time, Defense Minister John McCallum and US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld held a meeting on the topic of Afghanistan in Washington. At this time, Rumsfeld was attempting to free US military resources for Iraq. His strategy was to free these resources by getting more ally involvement for what he believed was a reconstruction, stabilization and nation-building effort in Afghanistan.⁴⁴ During this meeting, Rumsfeld mentioned that he was concerned about who would be replacing the Germans and Dutch when their

⁴³ Gross-Stein and Lang, 11.

⁴⁴ Gross-Stein and Lang, 48.

terms in ISAF expired in June. At this time, McCallum replied that he thought Canada and the US should work together to bring ISAF under the leadership of NATO. He noted that this would alleviate concerns of troop replacements because ISAF would then become a collective responsibility. Rumsfeld noted that this initiative was appealing to him.

The next topic that McCallum and Rumsfeld discussed would put Canada squarely in the spotlight of ISAF. Rumsfeld told McCallum that a NATO-led ISAF would still need one nation to take command and provide the bulk of the troops.⁴⁵ Rumsfeld argued that few countries were better suited to lead ISAF than Canada, noting that Canada has experience with these missions, and that Canadian culture is well suited for these missions.

After returning from Washington, McCallum explained Rumsfeld's desire to have Canada lead ISAF to Foreign Affairs Minister Graham and Prime Minister Chrétien. This initiative was appealing to both the PMO and the Foreign Affairs Ministry because Canada had just recently announced publicly that it would not be going to Iraq. Some government officials even began referring to this as the "Afghanistan solution."⁴⁶ It was further reported that there was widespread agreement for this initiative in the PMO, the Foreign Affairs Department, and the Department of National Defense pending the following conditions were met. First, that Canada would have an embassy and an ambassador in Kabul with clout. Second, Canada would have to find a partner country to supply the second largest contributor of troops. Third, Canada would have to seek assurances from the US that they would leave their headquarters in place for ISAF to use.

⁴⁵ Gross-Stein and Lang, 49.

⁴⁶ Gross-Stein and Lang, 65.

After these conditions were met, the Canadian government decided to take a leading role in ISAF.

NATO agreed to take command of ISAF on April 16, 2003. This decision was made mainly at the behest of Germany, the Netherlands and Canada. NATO control of ISAF provided Canada with the following strategic conditions. First, in theory at least, it was now up to Brussels to find a replacement nation for Canada in six months time. Second, Canada would receive additional logistical support from NATO nations. And third, the multilateralism which NATO provided helped to alleviate concerns that Canada was operating too closely with the US.

Soon after it was announced that NATO would be given command of ISAF, it was further announced that Canada would be given the chance to lead ISAF. Canada would take the lead of ISAF during February of 2004. Moreover, for Canadian officials, Rick Hillier was the obvious choice to lead this mission since he was the army's senior commander with the most operational experience on the ground. This appointment virtually guaranteed that Hillier would become Canada's next chief of Defense Staff.

It was reported in *The Globe and Mail* that the ISAF initiative was designed as a means of relieving US soldiers in Afghanistan so that they would be able to participate in the invasion of Iraq.⁴⁷ Another interpretation was offered by Defense Minister John McCallum and US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld who stated jointly that a Canadian contribution to ISAF would strengthen US efforts to stabilize Afghanistan.⁴⁸ A third interpretation has been provided by Gordon Smith:

⁴⁷ Jeff Sallot, "Canadian troops may not go to Iraq, but to Afghanistan," *The Globe and Mail*, 5 February 2003: A10.

⁴⁸ Dawson, 193.

[S]ending a second deployment of 2000 Canadian soldiers to Kabul in 2003 in the multilateral setting of NATO and the International Security Assistance Force allowed Ottawa to avoid Washington's opprobrium for staying out of Iraq by making this significant contribution to the 'US global war on terror'.⁴⁹

Smith argued further that ISAF provided Canada with a multilateral framework which allowed Canada to play a more significant role in Afghanistan. Finally, McCallum noted that the ISAF mission was appealing because it was consistent with "the peacekeeping tradition of Canadians."⁵⁰

1.6- Indications that Kandahar was becoming unstable

On April 28, 2003, as Canadian troops were preparing for their deployment in ISAF, it was reported that Kabul was relatively peaceful. Indeed, US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was preparing to refocus the mission "from major combat operations to stability operations."⁵¹ However, it was also reported that the regions outside of Kabul remained volatile. Two US soldiers had recently been killed following combat with Taliban forces along the Pakistan border. Moreover, on June 9, it was becoming clear that the insurgents were changing their organization and tactics. It was reported that many Islamic militants in Afghanistan had evolved into a more diffuse guerilla movement,⁵² and were willing to embrace suicide bombing as a modus operandi. In retrospect, these developments were indicative of an insurgency that had regrouped, and was growing in intensity.

⁴⁹ Gordon Smith, "Canada in Afghanistan: Is it Working," Prepared for the Canadian Defense and Foreign Affairs Institute, March 2007.

⁵⁰ Ibid, 193.

⁵¹ Victoria Burnett, "US to aim for Afghan stability," *The Globe and Mail*, 28 April 2003: A8.

⁵² Tu Thanh Ha, "Kabul blast shows al-Qaeda still in business," *The Globe and Mail*, 9 June 2003: A9.

A month later, on July 17, when Canada formally began its ISAF mission, it looked as though Afghanistan was stumbling in its effort towards achieving stability. There were various causes of instability, including clashes between warlords, stalled reconstruction efforts, and the weakness of the Afghan Transitional Authority. Although ISAF was called a peacekeeping mission, the troops on the ground were under no illusions regarding the dangers of Afghanistan. Captain Dan Madryga stated “We’re still in peacemaking mode; [however] we’re nowhere near a blue-helmet-type situation.”⁵³ The most dangerous threat, said Captain Madryga, was from militants who remained loyal to the Taliban and who had been using guerilla tactics in recent months.

On August 2, there were further reports which cited the instability of Afghanistan. The United Nations counted thirty major incidents of violence in Kabul over the past three months. Included in these incidents were four rocket attacks and eleven other forms of explosion. It was not entirely clear who was behind the attacks. The US argued that al Qaeda and the Taliban were responsible. However, Colonel Mangal, a police chief in Kabul, noted that much of the violence was likely perpetrated by organized crime rackets.⁵⁴

On August 5, 2003, the United Nations reported further daily attacks. The most common were in Kandahar in the south and Jalalabad in the east, both of these Provinces being located along the Pakistani border. These regions were populated by Pushtun tribes which were loyal to the Taliban. According to one report, both of these regions “let the Taliban enter without a shot being fired during the last civil war.”⁵⁵ The Pentagon also

⁵³ Mark MacKinnon, “Canadian troops see potential for danger in new Afghan mission,” 17 July 2003: A1.

⁵⁴ Mark MacKinnon, “Afghanistan attacks rise, but who is behind them?,” *The Globe and Mail*, 5 August 2003: A8.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

argued that the Taliban, which was routed in 2001, had regrouped in south-eastern Afghanistan and now formed a guerilla movement against the new Afghan government and coalition forces.

Between 2003 and 2004 there were frequent reports of a growing insurgency in southern Afghanistan. For example, on October 7 of 2003 it was reported that:

Although ISAF has brought a degree of calm to Kabul, large parts of Afghanistan remain in turmoil. More than 300 aid workers and foreign soldiers have been killed since August, when the Taliban and al-Qaeda began what is seen as a new phase of guerilla warfare targeting western interests.⁵⁶

On February 28 of 2004, there were further reports of a growing insurgency. On this date, local military officials in Afghanistan reported that around 700 Taliban militia had recently entered Afghanistan from the Pakistani cities of Peshawar and Quetta.⁵⁷ It was also reported that they had received training and funding in these cities and that they had offered locals rewards for attacks on Hamid Karzai's government and its supporters. In this scheme, a successful attack was worth \$265, whereas an attack that resulted in the death of an enemy would be \$1200. General Aouyb Khan, the local security commander in Zabul, commented on the tenuous nature of this situation. He noted that some of the Taliban commanders were Pakistani, although, this proposition was difficult to confirm since many Pushtun families straddle the border.

Scott Reid, who was Paul Martin's communications advisor, explained why the security situation in Afghanistan was deteriorating. Reid noted that the main reason was that insurgents were moving across the Afghan-Pakistani border, which he described as

⁵⁶ Hamida Ghafour, "Peacekeeping to expand beyond Kabul," *The Globe and Mail*, 7 October 2003: A7.

⁵⁷ Hamida Ghafour, "They came day and night. They are lying near the mountains and sometimes even in the mosques," *The Globe and Mail*, 28 February 2004: A1.

“unmanageable.”⁵⁸ He also noted that the Pakistani Intelligence Services, as well as the Iranians were attempting to influence affairs in Afghanistan. And perhaps most significantly, many Afghans viewed their government and the Afghan National Army as a source of instability and insecurity. This was particularly significant for Canadian policymakers since these institutions would be central to a Canadian exit strategy.

This violence in the south continued right up until the Canadian deployment to Kandahar in the spring of 2005. The Taliban had begun to demonstrate a higher capacity for violence. On June 23rd of 2005, it was reported in the *Globe and Mail* that:

After a lull in attacks during the winter, the Taliban has re-emerged with a vigorous campaign of bombings, ambushes and raids on government buildings and check posts. More than 300 people, many of them militants, have died since March in the recent attacks, including more than 20 people who were killed by a suicide bomber as they gathered at a mosque in the southern city of Kandahar on June 1 to mourn a slain cleric.⁵⁹

It is clear from this account that the security situation in Afghanistan, particularly in the south-eastern part of the country, was tenuous when the Martin government decided to deploy troops there.

1.7- Conclusion

The objective of this chapter has been to demonstrate that the Chrétien government was reluctant to engage in direct combat with the enemy in Afghanistan. It was at pains to emphasize that Canadian troops would only be engaged in peacekeeping or peacebuilding missions. Indeed, the Defense Minister stated that Canadian troops would be pulled out of Afghanistan if combat occurred. Secondly, during the first two months of the conflict, while the government provided a very large naval fleet to

⁵⁸ Gross-Stein and Lang, 94.

⁵⁹ Victoria Burnett, “Rebel violence sparks battle in Afghanistan,” *The Globe and Mail*, 23 June 2005: A17.

Afghanistan, military experts claimed that it was unlikely to see any action, that is, since it was unlikely that their Afghan adversaries would have a viable naval capacity. Thirdly, although the government would eventually provide ground troops, this occurred only after most of the combat operations had subsided. Fourthly, in the case of the one combat initiative that Canada was asked to join, the government would only commit Canada for six months. Following this period, the Chrétien government took on a peacebuilding mission in Afghanistan. But by the beginning of April 2003, there were indications that the southern region of Afghanistan was becoming increasingly unstable. There was ample evidence which suggested that the Martin government understood that Canada's role in Afghanistan was destined to become substantially more difficult.

Chapter 2

The Martin Government and Kandahar

2.1- Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to provide an account and explanation of the Martin government's decision to engage Canadian troops in direct combat against the insurgents in Afghanistan. The Martin government's approach to the war in Afghanistan was a clear departure from the approach taken by the Chrétien government: Chrétien had been hesitant to embrace anything more than a traditional peacekeeping role, and preferred Canada to be engaged in actions in the part of the country around Kabul. The explanation offered here for the change under Martin is that the international security environment underwent a significant change in the years after 9/11, with terrorist threats becoming a reality for Canada like never before. This resulted in an intensification of Canadian internationalist impulses, producing a willingness among Canadians to join their allies in the Afghanistan war in an offensive role.

2.2- The Initial Impetus for Canadian involvement in Kandahar: The PRT

"With Afghanistan's capital of Kabul relatively secure, Canadian troops will soon move south to the more dangerous centre of Kandahar and the surrounding area."⁶⁰

The first mention of possible Canadian involvement in a counter-insurgency campaign may be traced to September 28, 2003. At this time, Afghanistan's President, Hamid Karsai, thanked Canada for its involvement in ISAF. He then went on to request that Canada deploy a Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) in Afghanistan.⁶¹ A PRT is

⁶⁰ Bill Curry, "Troops expecting casualties, Hillier says," *The Globe and Mail*, 8 July 2005: A6.

⁶¹ Bill Curry, "Afghan boss asks Canada for more aide," *Calgary Herald*, 28 September 2003: A08.

composed of both military and civilian personnel who are mandated to provide reconstruction in unstable regions. The military personnel are to provide security for the civilian personnel as they undertake reconstruction projects. Prime Minister Chrétien responded that this mission would not be feasible because Canada already had a substantial number of military personnel deployed in Kabul as part of the ISAF forces there. In fact at this time, Canada was contributing 2000 soldiers, or more than 40% of the troop personnel, in Kabul.

It would appear, however, that there was some flexibility in Chrétien's position. At a NATO meeting held in Colorado on October 10, 2003, it was announced that the NATO troop deployment in Bosnia would decline sharply within the next year. Chrétien's Defence Minister, John McCallum, who was in attendance, observed that this would allow Canada to deploy a PRT in Afghanistan within the next year.⁶² McCallum's comments were admittedly very general and he made no mention of where the PRT would be deployed.

Five days later, it was reported that the United Nations had authorized NATO to expand beyond Kabul as a means of bringing stability to the provinces of Afghanistan. It became public that over the past two years, President Karzai had been lobbying the United Nations to expand its mandate beyond Kabul as a means of preventing the armed factions from derailing the political and economic reconstruction process.⁶³

Early in December 2003, McCallum went one step further and told his NATO counterparts, off the record, that Canada would likely deploy a PRT in Afghanistan.⁶⁴

⁶² Daniel Lablanc, "Military reassessing its vehicle needs for Afghanistan," *The Globe and Mail*, 10 October 2003: A06.

⁶³ Vikram Parehk, "Afghanistan's hour of reckoning," *The Globe and Mail*, 15 October 2003: A03.

⁶⁴ Gross-Stein and Lang, 115.

Yet Ottawa had still not made up its mind where the force would be deployed. The Departments of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and National Defence (DND) had conflicting views over the location. Some DFAIT officials believed that the force should be located in Kabul, because this was the most stable area in the country. Others argued that it should be deployed in the western province of Herat because this would provide Canada with greater intelligence on Iran. The Canadian embassy in Kabul argued from the beginning that Canadian troops should be deployed in Kandahar — because it was the most pivotal province of Afghanistan: historically, Kandahar had had a decisive influence over the political fortunes of Afghanistan.

Officials in the Department of National Defence also preferred a deployment to Kandahar. The Chief of Defense Staff, Raymond Henault argued that a Canadian PRT operating in Kandahar would facilitate the expansion of NATO throughout Afghanistan. One of the main arguments for an increased NATO presence in Afghanistan was that NATO troops enjoyed greater credibility than US troops.⁶⁵ In some regions, the US had backed local warlords, and in effect, crime rates had risen.

2.3- The Domestic Context

Paul Martin took over Prime Minister on December 12, 2003. One of his primary objectives as Prime Minister was to demonstrate that his Liberal government would be different from the previous one. He believed that the Chrétien government's approach to policy was characterized by 'incrementalism' and 'managerialism'.⁶⁶ In his view, Chrétien's policy initiatives were, for the most part, reactive rather than pro-active. He

⁶⁵ Hamida Ghafour, "Peacekeeping to expand beyond Kabul," *The Globe and Mail*, 7 October 2003: A7.

⁶⁶ Gross-Stein and Lang, 109.

made it clear that he was going to chart a foreign policy that was bold and ambitious, one that would demonstrate clearly that Canada had changed under his leadership.

Martin's cabinet was completely different from Chrétien's. With the exception of Bill Graham, who stayed on as Minister of Foreign Affairs, almost every other minister from Chrétien's cabinet was demoted, including Defense Minister McCallum. Although Martin was very supportive of McCallum, whom he thought he had done well at DND, he replaced him as he wanted a fresh face in that particular portfolio. His choice as Defence Minister was David Pratt, the previous Chairman of the House of Commons Standing Committee on National Defence, who over the years had been critical of his own government's cuts in defence spending. As well, immediately upon taking office Martin established two new cabinet committees — Global Affairs and Canada-US Relations, while declaring that foreign policy would be a higher priority with the new government. Signalling the importance of defence and security for the new government, the Prime Minister began his first working day with a visit to the National Defense Headquarters. Journalists noted that this was something that Chrétien had never done in his tenure as Prime Minister.

Martin indicated at once that he wanted a foreign policy that addressed the new international security environment.⁶⁷ The last comprehensive review of Canadian foreign policy had been completed in 1995 — prior to the traumatic events of 9/11 and other changes in the post-Cold War international order, including the emergence of the phenomenon of failed states and the mounting influence of the forces of globalization. In light of this transformation of the global order, Martin undertook a review that assessed Canada's foreign policy and attempted to set a new course for Canada in international

⁶⁷ Gross-Stein and Lang, 138.

affairs. The final product of this review was a foreign policy statement, bearing the title *A Role of Pride and Influence in the World: Canada's International Policy Statement*.

Martin's bold new vision of Canadian foreign policy was given a significant push when the Prime Minister appointed as his new Chief of Defence Staff the outspoken and highly popular Rick Hillier. It was Hillier who would become the chief architect of Canada's mission in Kandahar.

Martin wanted the *International Policy Statement* to be comprehensive in nature and to integrate the initiatives of the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Department of National Defence, the Department of International Trade, and CIDA. However, after months of preparation it became clear that these four units were still developing policies independently of one another. A decision was finally made that the PMO and PCO should integrate the documents.

During this process, the Department of National Defence in particular ran into an impasse. Defense Minister Bill Graham was dissatisfied with the document that was initially produced. He thought that it reflected the consensus within the Department rather than a new vision.⁶⁸ By the fall of 2005 he had become convinced that the current leadership within the Department would be unable to produce a document that would be up to the Prime Minister's standards. It was at this point that his Chief of Staff suggested that the current Chief of Defense Staff, Raymond Henault, be replaced. His replacement, General Hillier impressed both Graham and Martin and he was able to convince them that the '3 block war' would be the future strategy of choice for Canada in the international

⁶⁸ Gross-Stein and Lang, 141.

security environment. The strategy for going forward entailed a seamless transition from humanitarian relief, to peacekeeping, to full-scale combat.⁶⁹

2.4- A Robust Commitment: Canada Deploys a PRT and a Battle-group

“[Martin’s advisors] were leery of Canada taking the initiative. Even the British and Dutch, the other two NATO allies most committed to ISAF, hadn’t allowed their troops into the volatile Taliban-run south.”⁷⁰

“The full package was approved at Cabinet. Canada would be going big...very big, into Kandahar beginning in late 2005, eventually ramping up to over two thousand troops for a one-year assignment.”⁷¹

The meeting that led to the Canadian decision to deploy both a PRT and a battle-group to Kandahar occurred on March 21 of 2005. On this day, Martin met with his senior advisors, as well as Hillier in Ottawa. The meeting was called to discuss several foreign policy issues; however, at this time Hillier pushed Afghanistan to the forefront of the agenda.⁷² The decision to deploy a PRT and battle group in Kandahar was largely a result of Hillier’s arguments. His view was that Afghanistan presented an opportunity to transform the Canadian military to fit the post-Cold War, post-9/11 environment.⁷³ His understanding of contemporary peace-building operations was that they would have the characteristics of a ‘three block war’. That is to say, Hillier argued that Canadian soldiers should have the ability to engage in diplomatic measures on the first block of a war zone;

⁶⁹ Gen. Charles C. Krulak, “The Strategic Corporal: Leadership in the Three Block war,” *Marine Magazine*, January 1999.

⁷⁰ Piggot, 103.

⁷¹ Gross-Stein and Lang, 195.

⁷² Piggot, 102.

⁷³ Bill Schiller, “The road to Kandahar at an afternoon in Ottawa, a decision was made that would cost soldiers lives, billions of taxpayers dollars and, perhaps, Canada’s reputation,” *Toronto Star*, 9 September 2006: F01.

assist in economic development on the second block; and if necessary, engage in combat on the third block.

Subsequently, Hillier declared that the Canadian military was structurally outdated.⁷⁴ In his view, the likelihood of Canada going into combat against a rival state in the contemporary global system was low, and that the country must adapt to the new asymmetric threat which 9/11 demonstrated. Hillier argued that 21st century threats would be from non-state actors, who used non-traditional methods of combat – such as, improvised explosive devices, rapid ambushes and suicide-bomb attacks. He argued that Canada was part of the western alliance and this placed us at risk to be targeted by terrorists.⁷⁵

This was the approach taken by Canada's new *Defence Policy Statement (DPS)*, issued in May 2005, which stated that: "Global terrorism has become a deadly adversary and Canadians are now, in some ways, more individually threatened than at any time during the Cold War."⁷⁶ According to the DPS, the fanatics who perpetrated the 9/11 attacks and other bombings across the world did not need provocation. Nor did they discriminate between western democratic countries. All of the western democracies, including Canada were now at risk.

Hillier was also skeptical of the limited rules of engagement for the Canadian forces.⁷⁷ Such rules had been adhered to by the Canadian Forces who, however, had experienced serious difficulties in trying to mount peacekeeping operations during the 1990's. For example, the Canadian peacekeeping mission in the former Yugoslavia had

⁷⁴ Daniel Lablanc, "He's armored, but he's not thick," *The Globe and Mail*, 30 July 2005: F01.

⁷⁵ "Hillier explains the Afghan mission," *The Globe and Mail*, 16 July 2005: A16.

⁷⁶ Stephen Thorne, "Rick Hillier," *International Journal*, 60 (2005) 3, 828.

⁷⁷ see 15.

been a setback. Canadian officials felt the mission had been totally ineffective as “ceasefires were constantly violated, fighting escalated, aggression and ethnic cleansing expanded, and mass slaughter of innocents was committed.”⁷⁸ Col. George Petrolekas, who served as part of the 1993 UN protection force agreed:

The mission was for the delivery of humanitarian aid to the villages, and thus the rules did not allow the international force to stop the abuses of humanity that can only be termed aberrant. Early in my tour in 1993, a village of 280 was butchered and not a word was said, not a thing was done. There were so many such events that I saw soldiers cry at the frustration of not being able to do the right thing. If that be keeping the peace, you can have it.⁷⁹

The Canadian experience in Bosnia from 1992-1995 led many people in the Canadian Forces to believe that peacekeeping needed to be much more robust.

This sentiment was further popularized among Canadians during the Rwandan genocide. In late 1993, the United Nations asked Canada to provide a force commander for the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda. Canada chose Brigadier-General Romeo Dallaire for the mission. At the time, Rwanda was emerging from a civil war between two rival ethnic groups. The mandate of Dallaire’s peacekeeping force was to assist with the implementation of the Arusha peace accords which ended the civil war. Dallaire was only equipped with 2000 soldiers whose limited rules of engagement permitted them to fire their weapons only if they were shot at first. In the end, Dallaire’s force was grossly under-equipped and unable to prevent the slaughter of 800,000 civilians. As with Bosnia, there was a sense among the Canadian forces that they were impotent to protect the civilians whom they were sent to protect.

⁷⁸ A. Walter Dorn, “Canadian Peacekeeping: Proud Tradition, Strong Future?,” *Canadian Foreign Policy* Fall 2005, 14.

⁷⁹ Christie Blanchford, “How General Hillier has made it respectable to be a soldier again,” *The Globe and Mail*, 10 November 2007: A02.

Hillier focused tactically on the land component of the military, as a means of restructuring the Canadian Forces. His stated goal was to protect Canada and North America first and to help out in failed states second. As well, he was determined to make the Canadian Forces more agile⁸⁰. For example, he supported a decision to rid the Forces of tanks and replace them with smaller armored vehicles known as strikers. He also wanted to increase the full-time and reservist positions by 2008; and wanted the increase to be focused on the army. Furthermore, he was in favour of bolstering Canada's Special Forces. At that time, Canada's Joint Task Force 2 was considered to be a tier-2 special operations force, meaning that it was supposed to operate in relatively small units specially trained in the whole gambit of possible military activities. Hillier wanted to form a tier-1 special operations force, which was not as extensively trained as the JTF-2 but larger in size.

He also wanted to reform the Canadian Forces as a means of increasing morale. Morale had hit an all-time low on March 13, 1993 when two Canadian soldiers had beaten and killed a Somali teen who infiltrated their base in Somalia. The military leadership had allegedly attempted to conceal the true nature of the events, and the incident had caused serious damage to the reputation of Canadian soldiers both domestically and internationally. As a result, recruitment of individuals for the Canadian Forces had become problematic.

But things were now to change. In a December 30, 2005 *Globe and Mail* article, journalist Dawn Walton reported that discussions about how much to cut from the Canadian Forces had now given way to how much to spend.⁸¹ The Martin government

⁸⁰ see 15.

⁸¹ Dawn Walton, "Politicians stand at attention," *The Globe and Mail*, 30 December 2005: A03.

announced that no less than \$12.8 billion plan would be budgeted over the next five years to enhance recruitment and replace equipment. The Conservatives stated that they would spend even more. Walton also reported that she had been talking with Canadian soldiers, who reported increased public support for their activities both at home and abroad. She noted that two soldiers, Captain Manuel Panchana-Moya and Private Ryan Crawford, who were injured in Afghanistan, reported that they had received numerous e-mail messages from Canadians voicing support for them. David Bercuson, Director of the Canadian Defense and Foreign Affairs Institute, stated that:

We're so far from Somalia now. We're 10 years chronologically, but light years attitudinally. Hillier and his boys and Graham- I have to give them credit- have been trying to turn around the Titanic. It takes a lot of time, but its turning.⁸²

Christie Blatchford would make a similar comment sometime later, in a *Globe and Mail* article entitled "How General Hillier has made it respectable to be a soldier again."⁸³ She argued that Hillier had presided over a change in the military, not only in the form of funding and missions but also culturally. Hillier often referred to the 1990's as 'the dark decade' for the Canadian Forces. Indeed national newspapers ran stories of soldiers who were so underpaid that they had to resort to food banks. Moreover, stories were circulated of reservists who were so starved of funds and ammunition in combat that they were forced to create sounds that were similar to gunshots. Blatchford noted that following the Somali affair, soldiers had been asked and occasionally ordered not to wear

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Christie Blanchford, "How General Hillier has made it respectable to be a soldier again," *The Globe and Mail*, 10 November 2007: A2.

their uniforms in public. She concluded that “the forces have come along way under the blunt Newfoundlander.”⁸⁴

Hillier believed that the deployment of a battle-group in Kandahar would allow Canada to make a significant and visible contribution to an important international conflict. During the 1990’s, Canada had made large commitments to Bosnia and Croatia; however, the General felt that Canada did not receive appropriate recognition for its involvement in these conflicts. For example, he believed that the Canadian commitment to Bosnia had suffered when Canada was left out of the five-nation contact group; lacking a ‘sufficient profile’ meant that its influence was marginal. Regarding Canadian military deployments, he stated:

What we’re looking for is...to have sufficient profile...sufficient credibility that gives us the opportunity to get leadership appointments and to influence and shape regions and populations in accordance with our interests and in accordance with our values.⁸⁵

Hillier evidently viewed the deployment of a battle-group in Kandahar as a means of demonstrating that Canada was taking a leadership position in the conflict. This would result in greater Canadian influence regarding the conflict’s political dimensions. Some of Prime Minister Martin’s senior advisors agreed with this proposition. Scott Reid, his communications advisor, stated: “There was a feeling that this was the price of being a G8 country,” and went on to say, “It was a question of, you know, whether we were going to finally tend the bar.”⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Piggot, 103.

⁸⁶ Bill Schiller, “The road to Kandahar at an afternoon in Ottawa, a decision was made that would cost soldiers lives, billions of taxpayers dollars and, perhaps, Canada’s reputation,” *Toronto Star*, 9 September 2006: F01.

For Hillier, the commitment to Afghanistan was an answer to those many observers who had written during the late 1990's and 2000's that Canada's influence on the global stage had declined. Deputy Prime Minister John Manley called similarly for Canada to take up its international responsibilities:

Another one of Hillier's arguments was that the deployment of a PRT and a battle-group would improve Canadian relations with the US. He pointed out that this was a very significant contribution to the US war on terrorism, of which the White House would take note. The Departments of National Defense and Foreign Affairs both sensed that Canada had to do something that would compensate for its decisions not to participate in Iraq and in the Ballistic Missile Defense system. Michael Kirgan, Canada's Ambassador to the US, stated that "there was this sense that we had let the side down...and then there was this sense that we could be more helpful militarily, by taking on a role in Afghanistan...we could make a contribution in a place like Kandahar."⁸⁷ Martin's Chief of Staff Tim Murphy added: "We would have done this anyway, but there was pressure to be seen to be doing something as a result of BMD."⁸⁸

Indeed, within the Foreign Affairs bureaucracy there was a prevalent notion of the importance of maintaining an equilibrium in Canada-US relations. Officials in the Department strongly believed that Canada must keep track of how often they said no to initiatives that were important to the White House. For example, Scott Reid stated that:

There was a fairly strong trail of orthodoxy, that was based on an evaluation of strategic interests in terms of our relations with the United States. A lot of times, policy was put to us based on, 'This matters to the White House. And things that matter to the White House can't be taken

⁸⁷ Bill Schiller, "The road to Kandahar at an afternoon in Ottawa, a decision was made that would cost soldiers lives, billions of taxpayers dollars and, perhaps, Canada's reputation," *Toronto Star*, 9 September 2006: F01.

⁸⁸ Gross-Stein and Lang, 182.

lightly, because these guys take it personally...So we really have to evaluate the importance of making a decision that runs counter to this White House.⁸⁹

Bill Graham made similar comments:

Foreign Affairs' view was there is a limit to how much we can constantly say no to the political masters in Washington. All we had was Afghanistan to wave. On every other file we were offside. Eventually we came onside on Haiti, so we got another arrow in our quiver.⁹⁰

The Department of National Defense shared this view as well. For example, Rear Admiral Ian Mack, Canada's military attaché in Washington, argued at one point that US officials were not happy that Canada had said no so many times to US initiatives: it had refused to participate in a NATO mission to train the Iraqi army; it had not provided F-18 fighters to Southern Afghanistan; it had refused to send a reinforced company of soldiers to Haiti; and it had not committed to helping NATO expand beyond its initial mandate in Kabul.⁹¹ Canada, Mack stated, should seriously consider doing 'seven yeses' to counteract the 'seven no's'.

It is unclear whether Paul Martin was influenced by these arguments. There is evidence that he was very concerned about Canada-US relations even before he became Prime Minister. For example, while he was preparing to assume office, he convened a meeting of senior advisors to discuss foreign policy. He had been hearing from many contacts in the business community that there was frustration regarding Canada's refusal to support important US initiatives. Reportedly, Canadian business people selling into

⁸⁹ Bill Schiller, "The road to Kandahar at an afternoon in Ottawa, a decision was made that would cost soldiers lives, billions of taxpayers dollars and, perhaps, Canada's reputation," *Toronto Star*, 9 September 2006: F01.

⁹⁰ Gross-Stein and Lang, 126.

⁹¹ Gross-Stein and Lang, 168.

the US market had been experiencing poor relations.⁹² At this time, he accepted advice from his advisors who told him that he should create a Cabinet Committee on Canada-US relations; moreover, he also decided that the Prime Minister would chair the committee as a way of demonstrating its importance.

Yet he was disinclined to buckle under pressure from the White House. For example, when reflecting later on his government's decision not to participate in the US missile defense program, he stated that the issue was much bigger in Ottawa than in Washington. Likewise, US pressure had not played a role in his decision to deploy troops to Kandahar, "There was a view coming out of the military and the Department of Foreign Affairs that we had to do something in order to repair the relationship in terms of both Iraq and BMD. I didn't agree."⁹³ Furthermore, while discussing the issue of missile defence in his memoirs, Martin stated that there was a tendency for Canadian bureaucrats who worked with their American counterparts on a daily basis to exaggerate the amount of pressure that Washington was applying on Ottawa.⁹⁴

To Martin, the Canada-US relationship was much more complex than governments agreeing or disagreeing on public policy. He would later say that Canada's relationship with its closest neighbour, biggest trading partner and closest ally was:

Determined in part by our governments, of course, and waxes and wanes as any relationship does, but always within a fairly narrow band. This is because it is shaped to an even larger degree by the millions of business, educational, and cultural contacts that occur every day between people without any direction from governments. This is why the relationship is so strong. It is why our role in the world need not be restrained by that relationship.⁹⁵

⁹² Gross-Stein and Lang, 110.

⁹³ Gross-Stein and Lang, 182.

⁹⁴ Paul Martin, *Hell or High Water: My Life in and Out of Politics*, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2008), 388.

⁹⁵ Martin, 328.

Martin noted that there were advantages to pursuing a similar course of action with the US, since Canadians would be working hand-in-hand with a country that governed the most diplomatic, military, and economic resources in the world. However, there were also advantages to pursuing a dissimilar course of action to the US — that is, since these were the greatest opportunities for Canada to play a leadership role in the international arena.

On the other hand, Martin agreed with Hillier's arguments that peacekeeping had evolved over time. In his memoirs, he noted that, although Canadians always admired Canada's role as a peacekeeper, the events of the past few decades had suggested that the classic peacekeeping model had become outdated. He wrote:

During the recent decades, however, it became clear that the "classic" peacekeeping role we played in Cyprus, for example, patrolling a clearly demarcated line between former military foes, was no longer what world events were demanding. We had moved into an era in the Balkans, for instance, in which peacekeepers were called upon to play a much more robust role, helping to create the peace rather than just preserving it, and even helping to rebuild failed or failing states.⁹⁶

He then went on to conclude that the Canadian defence budget that he had cut so severely during the 1990's would have to be revamped to address these new realities. For these types of conflict would not abate any time during the near future. For example, he noted that when he became Prime Minister, Haiti was descending into chaos. The populist President Jean-Bertrand Aristide had lost control of the country as rebel groups fought pitched battles with government troops. At this time, the Department of Foreign Affairs was preparing to evacuate Canadian nationals. Almost simultaneously, the crisis in Darfur was beginning to reach a boiling point. It was clear that Arab militiamen were

⁹⁶ Martin, 328.

undertaking ‘ethnic cleansing’ of black African tribes — which some were describing as genocide. Martin also noted that these attacks were happening with the compliance of the Sudanese government, and that they were similar in nature to the massacres that had taken place in Rwanda in 1994.

The idea of a ‘three block war’ was clearly appealing to Martin,⁹⁷ for such an approach was the perfect setting for an application of the Responsibility to Protect’ Doctrine (R2P). Martin was supportive of R2P, which formed in reaction to the failure of the UN to intervene effectively in the Balkans, Rwanda and Somalia during the 1990’s:

R2P had three elements. The first was the responsibility on the international community to prevent outrages against human rights before they happen- to act, for example, as the United Nations and other had failed to do, when the Hutu-led Rwandan government first began exhorting violence against the Tutsi people. The second, was the responsibility to act in the first instance by political, economic, and diplomatic means, perhaps, but ultimately military if necessary. And the third was the responsibility to rebuild after the crisis was over.⁹⁸

Martin then went on to state that the moral imperative to these responsibilities seemed obvious.

The R2P doctrine was consistent with the three block war in the following ways. The first premise of the three block war was diplomacy. That is to say, in their initial engagement, troops would be engaged in diplomatic activities, such as for example, meeting with locals and developing good relations. This was consistent with the R2P idea that states are obligated to intervene diplomatically in states that are unable or unwilling to protect their populations. The second premise of the three block war was defense. In their second engagement, troops would have to be able to protect the population, and if necessary, engage in a full combat role. This was consistent with the

⁹⁷ Martin, 329.

⁹⁸ Martin, 339.

R2P idea that military measures may ultimately be necessary. And finally, the third premise of the three block war was development. The third activity would entail actions by the troops will be able to initiate and assist the population with development needs. This was consistent with the R2P idea that intervening states should be obligated to help rebuild after the hostilities have been tempered⁹⁹.

In his memoirs, Martin discussed at length the importance of these three elements working in conjunction with one another. He noted that:

One of the reasons I strongly supported General Hillier's appointment as chief of the defence staff was his view that Canada's Armed Forces had to be capable of responding quickly to new demands. I also strongly believe that you cannot do much good in failed or fragile states with military force alone. You need to engage people's hearts and minds, and the way to do this is rebuild economic infrastructure along with social and political and judicial institutions.¹⁰⁰

He then went on to state that the lessons of Haiti suggested that military intervention without institution building would invariably cause of repetition of the conflict.

2.5- Conclusion

A number of writers have offered different explanations for Canada's decision to engage Canadian troops in direct combat with insurgents in Kandahar. One explanation is that the Canadian military wanted to expand NATO's presence in Afghanistan. A second explanation is that military leaders considered the deployment of troops in Kandahar to be a means of transforming the Canadian Forces to meet the new security challenges of a globalized world. A third explanation is that Canadian government officials were basically seeking to improve relations with Washington;

⁹⁹ Martin, 338.

¹⁰⁰ Martin, 392.

sending troops to the perilous Kandahar region was a sure way to see this happen. Still, what remains to be explained is why Martin and his cabinet took a more aggressive approach than the Chrétien cabinet. The view of this thesis is that the Martin government was influenced by the increasing relevance of the terrorist threat to Canada and its people. The internationalist inclinations that had drawn the Chrétien government into the Afghanistan War in the first place, by 2004 were given heightened expression by the increase in terrorist actions and the terrorists' citation of Canada as one of the enemies. With Canadians increasingly alarmed by the change in the international security environment, it was no longer adequate for Canadians to simply seek a peacekeeping role in Afghanistan.

Chapter 3:

Explaining the Canadian Deployment to Kandahar:

An Internationalist View of Security

3.1- Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to show that the decision by the Martin government in May of 2005 to deploy troops to Kandahar is best understood not as an aberration in Canadian foreign policy but rather as an expression of an enduring internationalist perspective that remains a central thread in the formulation and execution of Canadian foreign policy. The international environment had been altered substantially by the events of 9/11, producing a different understanding of internationalism shaped by a new global perspective on security. In the view of Canadian policy-makers, the new international order was beset by different kinds of threats and challenges which could be best understood through an internationalist view of security.

3.2- The Internationalist Perspective on Security

The internationalist view of security is succinctly defined by Kim Richard Nossal as follows:

Internationalism begins by accepting the argument that peace is indivisible. In other words, internationalists hold that the fate of any one state and the peace of the international system as a whole are interconnected. The outbreak of war in a seemingly distant part of the globe has every potential for plunging the whole system into conflict... moreover, the advances of technology render notions of “fire-proof houses” obsolete. In the internationalist view, such interconnectedness and vulnerability demand engagement in world politics, not withdrawal.¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹ Kim Richard Nossal, *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy*, 3rd ed, (Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada Inc, 1997), 155.

In this view, the core premise of internationalism is that states share an interconnected vulnerability. Nossal has noted that there are three major implications which follow from this core premise. First, states have a responsibility to mitigate conflict in the international system. Second, states should restrain their unilateral impulses by operating through multilateral institutions. Third, states should match their rhetorical support for these institutions with material support; that is to say, they should donate a significant amount of their national resources to these institutions.

There is considerable evidence that the decision by the Martin government to take on a combat role in Kandahar province was an expression of internationalism, altered by the changes in the international environment and prompted by the extraordinary events of 9/11 and its aftermath. Clearly, the premise from which Canadians were operating was that Canada shared an unprecedented, interconnected vulnerability with other states. Canadian policy-makers came to the view that Canada, like all of the countries in the western world, was potentially a target for terrorist activity. It was on this basis that they believed Canada had a responsibility to make a substantial contribution to the achievement of international security.

The evidence shows that Canadian policy-makers often invoked the idea of responsibility while they were explaining Canada's rationale for deploying troops to Kandahar. It also suggests that Canadian policy in Afghanistan was designed, in part, to facilitate the initiatives of multilateral institutions; indeed it is arguable that the policy was successful in that regard. That is to say, Canadian actions in Afghanistan helped to facilitate the expansion of the UN-sanctioned and NATO-led stabilization force. And

thirdly, there is evidence that Canada poured a significant amount of its national resources into supporting initiatives of the UN and NATO in Afghanistan.

The idea of internationalism has a strong presence in the history of Canadian foreign policy. Both Louis St. Laurent and Lester B. Pearson were dedicated internationalists. In reflecting on World War II in his memoirs, Pearson stated: “Everything I learned during the war confirmed and strengthened my view as a Canadian that our foreign policy must not be timid or fearful of commitments but activist in accepting international responsibilities.”¹⁰² St. Laurent was just as committed to internationalism as Pearson. In the renowned Gray Lecture that he delivered at the University of Toronto in 1947, he cited five basic principles of Canadian foreign policy: national unity, political liberty, the rule of law in international affairs, the values of Christian civilization and the acceptance of international responsibilities. Internationalism became an article of faith with succeeding governments in Canada in the post-war period, prompting its leaders to play a leading role in the creation of the United Nations and NATO and in the transformation of the old Commonwealth into a diversified multi-racial organization.

But it was not only government leaders who supported an internationalist-oriented Canadian foreign policy. Critics of the Trudeau government’s foreign policy review in 1970, used internationalism either to support or oppose the government’s new policy directions. *Foreign Policy for Canadians* suggested that the ‘honest broker’ approach to foreign policy was risky and outdated, and that Canada should strengthen its focus on development assistance. Supporters of Trudeau’s approach noted that the new emphasis

¹⁰² Ibid, 156.

on increased development assistance was strongly internationalist.¹⁰³ However, for the most part, they cited Canada's proud tradition of internationalism to repudiate the new foreign policy direction. For example, when comparing the Trudeau approach to foreign policy with Pearsonian internationalism, Gilles Lalande went as far as to say that the 1970 review was heretical.

More recently, internationalism had been the central focus of the foreign policy debates that took place in 1999 over Canada's involvement in the NATO bombing campaign in the former Yugoslavia.¹⁰⁴ Canadian participation was defended on the basis of Canada's international responsibilities to NATO, the UN, and the Kosovar Albanians. Opponents meanwhile argued that the bombing was a violation of international norms, and that Canada was merely following the lead of the US. They also argued that Canadian participation would be an abandonment of Canada's international traditions – particularly those as a peacekeeper.¹⁰⁵

3.3- The Continuing Relevance of Internationalism in the 21st Century:

How the Internationalist Perspective has been intensified by Globalization and the 9/11 Attacks

The Cold war era ended a decade ago with the collapse of communist regimes in the East bloc. The result was a dramatic reduction in international tension. However, expected peace dividends have not materialized, and the world now faces an array of new threats to peace and security such as: mass and

¹⁰³ Don Munton and Tom Keating, "Internationalism and the Canadian Public," Canadian Journal of Political Science, XXXIV:3, (September 2001), 520.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, 518-519.

¹⁰⁵ It should also be noted that internationalism has traditionally been viewed as a policy approach that is distinct from approaches that have been pursued by the US.

*uncontrolled migration, transnational crime, environmental degradation, terrorism, overpopulation, underdevelopment and more.*¹⁰⁶

Colonel Gary H. Rice (ret.)

*The attacks of 11 September and the international milieu's reactions to them represent a literal 'Kuhnian paradigm shift' in how foreign policymakers view international politics, as that cataclysm suddenly and fundamentally transformed the way we all interpret international affairs, and more importantly in an age of 'globalization,' our place in those affairs.*¹⁰⁷

Graham F. Walker

In the early years of the 21st century, the internationalist view of security continues to be a relevant perspective that Canadian policy makers use to view international politics. Indeed, this thesis contends that the changing global security environment caused by 9/11 and related forces of globalization engendered a more intensified internationalist view of security among Canadian policy-makers, and particularly its core premise that states share an interconnected vulnerability and thus must pursue solutions to international problems through multilateral institutions. The objective is now to explain how the international security environment changed at the systemic level with the onset of globalization and the trauma caused by 9/11.

Globalization is a complex term. Confusion around its meaning exists because the concept has become popularized in public discourse. In popular discourse, it is used interchangeably to describe various phenomena — such as classical liberal policies in the world economy; or the growing dominance of western forms of political and cultural life; or the proliferation of new information technologies. A good general definition, paraphrasing the leading scholar William Scheurman, is that globalization is a process or

¹⁰⁶ Gary H. Rice, "The Defense of Canada after 9/11: The Foundation of a Defense White Paper for the Beginning of the 21st Century," *Conference of Defense Associations*, available from <http://www.cda-cdai.ca/pdf/NUDEFENCE.pdf>

¹⁰⁷ Graham F. Walker, "Introduction," *Independence in an Age of Empire: Assessing Unilateralism and Multilateralism*, (Halifax: The Centre for Foreign Policy Studies, 2004), 1.

set of forces that shrinks spatial and temporal boundaries for human beings in their social and political lives.¹⁰⁸

To be more concrete, globalization is associated with greater movement of commodities, money, information, and people across borders, thus having technological, economic, political and cultural dimensions. It is not a recent phenomenon. It began in 1980's, intensified during the 1990's as a result of innovations in communications technology such as jet transportation, electronic communications and extensive computerization¹⁰⁹, and became a preeminent framework for international policymakers following the 9/11 attacks.

The current round of globalization differs from past inter-state influences in the scale and speed of its operation. For example, as Majid R. Tehranian has said: "foreign exchange trading volumes had, even by the late 1980's, reached \$US 1.2 trillion per day, which is nearly forty times the volume of physical internal trade, and more than the combined foreign currency reserves of all the states in the world"¹¹⁰.

Globalization has increased the viability of transnational security threats. Edgar and Ifantis note that:

Among the issues that transcend boundaries and threaten to erode national cohesion, the most perilous may be the so-called new risks: drug trafficking, transnational organized crime, nuclear smuggling, refugee movements, uncontrolled and illegal immigration, environmental risks, and international terrorism.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ William Scheuerman, "Globalization," *The Stanford Dictionary of Philosophy*, first published 21 June 2002; substantive revision 16 June 2006. Available from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/globalization/>.

¹⁰⁹ Majid R. Tehranian, "Civilization: A Pathway to Peace?," *Globalizations* 1 (2004) 1, 84.

¹¹⁰ Robert McCorquodale and Richard Fairbrother, "Globalization and Human Rights," *Human Rights Quarterly* 21 (1999) 3, 736.

¹¹¹ Alistair Edgar and Kostas Ifantis, "What Kind of Security," *International Journal*, Summer (2007), 452.

Since all of these threats are transnational in nature, they require states to form interrelated networks of cooperation as a means of responding to them. Democracies are particularly vulnerable to such threats:

Drug traffickers, nuclear smugglers and international crime cartels, and terrorist groups take advantage of the infrastructure that open societies, open economies, and open technologies afford. They are more easily able to move people, money, and goods across international borders thanks to democratization, economic liberalization, and technological advancements. They rely on international telecommunications links to publicize their acts and political demands. While propaganda is nothing new, tools like 24/7 news stations and the internet dramatically extend the scope of a terrorist's reach.¹¹²

Canadian security expert, Janice Gross-Stein notes that global networks of terror and crime “thrive on the openness of post-industrial society, crossing borders almost as easily as do goods and services, knowledge and cultures.”¹¹³

The unprecedented threat of international terrorism, in particular, has changed the global security environment. The terrorist attacks on 9/11 demonstrated for the first time that the most powerful states in the world could be subjected to acts of war by non-state actors. Indeed, this was the critical message which 9/11 communicated to policy-makers from around the world, including Canada. Prior to 9/11, policy-makers understood that terrorism was a problem, and that globalization facilitated the objectives of terrorists; however, policy-makers did not believe that terrorist groups could inflict the massive scale of damage which they demonstrated on 9/11. As Edgar and Ifantis note:

The terrorist attacks on 9/11 and the ones that followed in Madrid and London have truly changed the world security system. The scale of these attacks, the destruction they caused, and the relative ease with which they were organized and executed against some of the most powerful and advanced countries in the world made it very clear for everybody that not

¹¹² Ifantis, 456.

¹¹³ Janice Gross Stein, “Back to the Future: Global Security From 1980 to 2030,” *Policy Options*, March-April (2005), 74.

only would no country be immune, but no country could afford to be complacent about terrorism.¹¹⁴

Prior to this, it was assumed that large-scale attacks could only be perpetrated by state-actors. During the Cold War, the primary concern of the US and its allies was the fear of a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union. In the post-Cold War period, the US continued to view states as the primary source of antagonism. The 9/11 attacks caused states to re-evaluate these assessments.

One of the features of the new security environment, as Joseph Nye explains, is that violence has become democratized:

In the 20th century, a malevolent individual like Hitler or Stalin needed the power of a government to kill millions of people; if 21st century terrorists get hold of weapons of mass destruction, that power will for the first time be available to deviant groups and individuals. This “privatization of war” is not only a major change in world politics, but the potential impact on our cities could drastically alter the nature of our civilization.¹¹⁵

The lethality of biological weapons, demonstrates the point: approximately 30 kilograms of anthrax could kill 500 times as many people as 300 kilograms of serine nerve gas. Moreover, well dispersed anthrax can kill 20 percent more people than a 12.5 kiloton nuclear bomb. Similarly, 250 pounds of anthrax can kill 3 million people, which is the equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT. In the new international environment, deviant individuals and groups have access to these potent weapons. For example, the anthrax attacks in 2001 in Florida, Nevada, New York, New Jersey and Washington DC, as well as the Ricin attacks in 2004 in Washington, could have all been carried out by one person. Similarly, 19 individuals on September 11th of 2001 were able to threaten the

¹¹⁴ Edgar and Ifantis, 456.

¹¹⁵ Frank P. Harvey, “Addicted to Security: Globalized terrorism and the inevitability of American Unilateralism,” *International Journal*, 59 Winter (2004) 1, 28.

fundamental interests of the United States, and the stability of the entire international system.¹¹⁶

3.4- A Changing International Security Environment: Canada and the Impact of Interconnected Vulnerability

This thesis contends that the changing global security environment caused a more intensified internationalist view of security among Canadian policy-makers. It brought home the idea like never before that states share an interconnected vulnerability, as well as the idea that states should mitigate this vulnerability by operating through multi-lateral institutions. The objective of this section is to explain how this change came about.

In his memoirs, Martin stated his reaction to the September 11 attacks:

The attacks of September 11, 2001, were an assault on the very idea of our civilization, as the rhetoric of Osama bin Laden and his imitators and followers subsequently confirmed. They were not related to any particular grievance or any identifiable military, social, political, or economic objective. There was no demand, however outrageous, that could be met. September 11 was simply an attack on our way of life.¹¹⁷

Martin went on to state that he was strongly supportive of the \$8 billion security budget that he brought in as Finance Minister to address these new realities. As well, he and his transition team decided to bring the various institutions responsible for Canadian security in Canada, including the RCMP, CSIS, Corrections, and the Canadian Border Security Agency, under a new Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, with the aim of providing greater communication and efficiency among the various agencies.

Within the first four days of taking office, Prime Minister Paul Martin expressed his views on the turbulent international situation. While visiting the Department of

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 29.

¹¹⁷ Martin, 390.

National Defense on 16 December 2003, he stated that no “nation can isolate itself from the perils and trials and tribulations that the world goes through.”¹¹⁸ This statement evoked the internationalist idea of interconnected vulnerability. He went on to state that the Department of National Defense had an important role to play in contributing to world order. The new Minister of Defense, David Pratt, he added, was already arguing strongly for budgetary increases for the CAF.

Three months after making the decision to send Canadian troops to Kandahar , the Martin government watched as events unfolded around the tumultuous terrorist bombings in London. On July 7 of 2005, a group of British-born Islamic extremists bombed three targets in London. The attacks were directed towards London’s transportation system as a means of instilling fear in the commuters. The bombings killed 52 people and injured 700. They also resulted in disruption of the city’s transport system and caused significant damage to Britain’s telecommunication system.

There had been previous attacks similar to those in London, including the 2002 Bali night club bombings; the Istanbul bombings in November of 2003; the Riyadh compound bombings in May of 2003; and the 2004 Madrid bombings. Moreover, there were a variety of terrorist plots that had been discovered, including five plots in the US and three plots in the UK.¹¹⁹ However, it was the London bombings that drove home the reality that these kinds of attacks could happen in Canada.

¹¹⁸ Daniel Leblanc, “PM’s visit buoys defense staff,” *The Globe and Mail*, 16 December 2003: A5.

¹¹⁹ President George W. Bush, *Fact Sheet: Plots, Casings, and Infiltrations Referenced In President George W. Bush’s Remarks on the War on Terror*, The White House, October 2005, Available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/10/20051006-7.html>.

Four days after the London bombings, Canada's Public Security Minister Anne McLellan stated that Canada was as vulnerable to terrorist attacks as places like London, Madrid or New York:

I don't believe that Canadians are as psychologically prepared for terrorist attacks as we probably should be. I think we have, perhaps for too long, thought that these are things that happen elsewhere...[Canada is] not immune from what we've seen happen in London, Madrid and 9/11...Canadians can retreat and say 'We're not like the United States, the United Kingdom, Spain or Australia' we weren't there on the ground [in Iraq]...but I don't think its about who went to Iraq, I think its about transcendent global issues that go well beyond who went to Iraq.¹²⁰

It is worth noting that McLellan's statements followed comments by CSIS officials which noted that Canada would, sooner or later, be the target of terrorism.

On July 30th of 2005, Martin was asked to comment on McLellan's remarks. Martin stated that Canadians:

...should be under no illusion that Canada, along with the rest of the world, are [not] targets for terrorists. None of us can be complacent and none of us can regard ourselves as living on some kind of an Island. [We] are not part of a different world and she is absolutely right about that. The fight against terrorism has got to be taken beyond the borders of any individual country. This is a dangerous world.¹²¹

In these statements, Martin invoked the internationalist idea of interconnected vulnerability which Canada shared with many other states.

At the same time, Hillier stated publicly that Canada was enhancing its military involvement in Afghanistan because "hotbeds for supporting terrorism remain there...and [al Qaeda] will probably attempt to prosecute attacks here in Canada."¹²² The Martin government's *Defense Policy Statement*, issued in April 2005, also noted that: "Failed

¹²⁰ Colin Freeze, "Security Minister warns Canada to stand on guard," *The Globe and Mail*, 12 July 2005: A1.

¹²¹ Gloria Galloway, "Canada may be attacked, PM warns," *The Globe and Mail*, 30 June 2005: A1.

¹²² Ibid.

and failing states dot the international landscape, creating despair and regional instability and providing a haven for those who would attack us directly.”¹²³ Well known Canadian author Michael Ignatieff argued that there was a very strong reflex in Canadians to believe that they are immune from terrorist attacks, but the reality was that acts such as the Bali nightclub bombings could have just as easily occurred in Canada. That is to say, the nightclub was attacked not because it was an Australian target, but rather because it was a western target. Ignatieff argued that Canadians were not primary targets, but secondary targets “because we are a secular, liberal, democratic state in the North Atlantic region and we stand for everything al Qaeda doesn’t like.”¹²⁴

Some commentators observed that Canada was the only country among six named by an extremist website the previous year that had not yet been attacked but still might be.¹²⁵ Martin Rudner, Director of Intelligence and Security Studies at Carleton University noted that there were a number of fronts where Canada was exposed. He noted that the energy and electricity sectors would be enticing targets for al Qaeda, because successful attacks on these sectors would have adverse effects in both Canada and the US. Akbar Ahmed, Professor International Relations at American University in Washington, agreed that Canada could be targeted by al Qaeda. He stated that terrorists might perceive Canadian targets as being “softer” than many US targets, and consequently there would be an incentive for terrorists to attack them. Ahmed explained, that Canada was perceived by many terrorists as “white, Christian, [and] like the United

¹²³ DPS, 1.

¹²⁴ Michael Ignatieff, “Canada in the Age of Terror: Multilateralism Meets a Moment of Truth,” in *Independence in an Age of Empire: Assessing Unilateralism and Multilateralism*, ed. Graham F. Walker (Dalhousie: The Centre for Foreign Policy Studies, 2004), 33.

¹²⁵ Gloria Galloway, “Experts Caution al Qaeda may hit targets in Canada,” *The Globe and Mail*, 9 July 2005: A07.

States...they would assume that if you hit or hurt Canada you are automatically hurting the United States.”¹²⁶

There is evidence that Canadians felt vulnerable to terrorism in the months preceding the Martin government’s decision to deploy troops to Kandahar. In early March of 2005, the Department of Justice conducted a survey of 1,703 Canadians; and subsequently commissioned a report titled *The anti-terrorism Act and Security Measures in Canada: Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences*.¹²⁷ The survey found that 58% of Canadians were concerned about terrorism in Canada. Moreover, on October 31st of 2005, a poll was conducted by the Innovative Research Group which found that 63% of Canadians believed that new immigrants were bringing problems from their home countries to Canada.¹²⁸ The same survey found that two-thirds of Canadians believed that Canada needed an effective military force to play a significant role in international affairs.

In the days following the arrests of 17 terrorists suspects in Toronto on June 2, 2006, this concern was again articulated by Canadian policy-makers. Canadian security agencies carried out a series of arrests against 17 individuals who were reported to be a part of an Islamist terrorist cell. The suspects were alleged to have been plotting a series of attacks in Southern Ontario. The targets of these attacks included the Canadian Parliament, the Toronto Stock Exchange, and the CSIS building in Toronto. It was reported that the suspects were planning to attack these targets with truck bombs, and open fire on civilians in crowded areas, and were planning to behead the Prime Minister.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Department of Justice Canada , *The anti-terrorism Act and Security Measures in Canada: Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences*, 2005 March 11, available from http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2005/tr05_11/p0.html.

¹²⁸ Don Butler, *The National Post*, “63% fear immigrants bring in conflicts,” 31 October 2005: A1.

Following their arrests, the Official Opposition Leader, Bill Graham stated that Canada must continue its military engagement in Afghanistan, or face more risks at home.¹²⁹ He noted that Canada's troops were engaged in that country to bring peace to Afghanistan, and "we hope we will succeed in that engagement, which is so important for Canada and the international community."¹³⁰ He added, "I'm afraid that if we don't succeed, the threats will get bigger. The success of our armed forces are more and more important, as shown by what happened this weekend."¹³¹

This particular terrorist plot illustrates the way in which Canada is inherently affected by globalization. For example, CSIS reported that the suspects were angered over their perception that Muslims were being oppressed world wide.¹³² These individuals understood Islam to be a comprehensive political ideology, and sought to establish Islamic states that practice harsh interpretations of sharia law.¹³³ According to Faheem Bukari, who was the director of the Mississauga community centre that the terrorist group frequented, one of the suspects told him that voting in Canadian elections was forbidden in Islam: "He came to me and said all this is forbidden- it is un-Islamic to take part in an election and we don't want to be any part of this society."¹³⁴

Another important aspect of globalization is the role which information technology plays in shrinking spatial and temporal boundaries. This allows individuals from different cities, states, countries and regions of the globe to communicate with one another more effectively. The Toronto incident drew attention to the importance of the

¹²⁹ Stewart Bell, Adrian Humphreys, and Chris Wattie, *The National Post*, 6 June 2006: A1.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² "Toronto terror suspects arrested," *Calgary Herald*, 3 June 2006: A1.

¹³³ "Face to face with the reality of terrorism," *Toronto Star*, 6 June 2006: A22.

¹³⁴ Michael Czobit, "Bus driver emerges as terror plot leader," *The Vancouver Sun*, 8 June 2004: A6.

internet in the new security environment. The group that was arrested in Toronto had become radicalized in part, over the internet.¹³⁵ Indeed, CSIS first learned of the intentions of the Toronto group by monitoring a chat room that some of them used.¹³⁶ Further, in the months following the arrests, there were arrests of other radicals who had taken part in the internet conversations. These individuals were located in a variety of different countries, including the UK, the US, Australia and Sweden.¹³⁷ As al Qaeda had become a global movement, radicalized groups had taken cues from leadership figures like Osama bin Laden and Ayman al Zawahiri and launched their own attacks on Western targets.

Terrorism experts have noted the efficacy of the internet as it relates to radicalizing individuals online. The internet is used by militant Islamist groups to further their objectives, including fund-raising, indoctrination and recruitment. It has also allowed them access to Western populations. According to one terrorism expert, Madeleine Gruen, the success of jihadist groups online has been a result of their ability to lure potential sympathizers to general-interest websites, and then to pull them into a network of chat groups, forums, list servers, and websites that have been produced by militant Islamists.¹³⁸ The strategy pursued by radicals is to turn online users into sympathizers, supporters, and eventually members.

The ease of air travel is another product of globalization that had altered Canadian notions of national security. The accessibility of air travel had increased dramatically in

¹³⁵ See fn. 36.

¹³⁶ Ian Austen and David Johnston, "17 held in plot to bomb sites in Ontario," *The New York Times*, 4 June 2006, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/04/world/americas/04toronto.html>

¹³⁷ Stewart Bell, "Web forum linked cells: Two Toronto suspects took part in discussions," *National Post*, 15 June 2006: A01.

¹³⁸ Madeleine Gruen, "Terrorist Indoctrination and Radicalization on the Internet," *Terrorism and Counter-terrorism: Understanding the New Security Environment*, eds. Russell D. Howard and Reid L. Sawyer, (Iowa: McGraw-Hill, 2006), 352.

the last half of the twentieth century. The unit cost of air travel fell by 80% between 1930 and 1990; moreover, the unit cost of air travel fell by approximately 18% between 1975 and 1990 alone.¹³⁹ Evidence suggests that increased accessibility to air travel helped facilitate the terrorist plot in Toronto. For example, it is alleged that four of the plotters had internet conversations with a British-Pakistani named Abu Umar.¹⁴⁰ Umar was considered to be a point man, who could help Western recruits gain access to the Lashkar-e-Tayyiba terrorist training camp in Pakistan. It was reported that one of the Toronto plotters had visited this camp, and three others had made similar plans.¹⁴¹

Globalization has also brought about increased immigration to Canada. As Jennifer Welsh notes, “Canada has quite literally opened itself to the world, and many parts of the world live within our borders.”¹⁴² Canada’s net migration rate per year is six migrants for every one thousand Canadians. Moreover, as of 2004, 18% of Canada’s population was foreign born. Although multiculturalism is a cherished part of the Canadian identity, it was also responsible for bringing terrorists to Toronto and can arguably be viewed as part of the new international security environment.

Globalization has also caused the Canadian and US economies to be more intertwined than ever before. Immediately following the 9/11 attacks, US border inspectors were put on a level 1 alert, which was defined as a “sustained, intensive, antiterrorism operation.”¹⁴³ At the time, Canada and the US were engaged in 1.3 billion worth of trade per day. As a result of the border closure, approximately 40,000

¹³⁹ Martin Wolf, *Why Globalization Works*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 119.

¹⁴⁰ Stewart Bell, “The path to terror in Canada: An exclusive report: Training ground series,” *National Post*, 2 Sept 2006: A01.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴² Jennifer Welsh, *At Home in the World: Canada’s Global Vision for the 21st Century*, (Toronto: Harper-Collins, 2004), 164.

¹⁴³ Peter Andreas, “The Mexicanization of the Canadian Border,” *International Journal*, Spring 2005, 457.

commercial shipments and 300,000 people were delayed at the border. It was reported that there was a 36 km line-up at the Windsor-Detroit border. For at least 72 hours, the entire trade regime between Canada and the US came to a standstill.¹⁴⁴

Given the impact which the 9/11 attacks had on the Canadian economy, it is not surprising that the *2005 International Policy Statement (IPS)* placed an emphasis on the open nature of the Canadian economy. The IPS noted that this was a result of two factors. First, over the past two decades, Canada had aggressively adapted to free trade and globalization.¹⁴⁵ The second factor was the revolution that had taken place in global business models; these models were no longer driven by geography but rather by investment decisions and information technology. As a result of these two factors, the IPS noted that Canada's prosperity was now "intrinsically tied to international relationships."¹⁴⁶ The IPS stated declared that Canadians were vulnerable to major economic disruptions in other parts of North America: "a major terrorist incident within one of our continental partners could have direct and potentially devastating consequences for the movements of people and commerce within the North American space."¹⁴⁷

Upon taking office the Martin government undertook a series of major national security initiatives which demonstrated that it was convinced of bona fide security threats to Canada. One of the first initiatives was to allocate \$690 million for security projects. These included the establishment of a national security advisory council; an advisory

¹⁴⁴ Andres Rozentel, "The Security and Prosperity Partnership: An Overview," *International Journal, Summer* (2006), 542.

¹⁴⁵ Jennifer M. Welsh, "The 2005 International Policy Statement: Leading with Identity?," *International Journal, Autumn* (2006), 913.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 913.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 914.

cross-cultural round table on security; a new Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness; a cabinet committee on security, public health and emergencies; and an integrated threat assessment centre.¹⁴⁸ As well, investments were made to bolster Canada's intelligence, emergency planning, public health emergencies, transportation security, and border security.

3.5- A Changing International Security Environment: The Continuing Significance of Multilateral Institutions for Canada

In the new global security environment, multilateral institutions remained particularly significant for Canada. Indeed, the Martin government frequently remarked that Canada had responsibilities in the new international security environment and multilateral institutions were the chosen means to do this.

Within the first four months of taking office, the Prime Minister invoked the internationalist idea of responsibility as he introduced a \$7 billion dollar budget for the Canadian military. He argued that such a budgetary increase was necessary since the government planned to extend Canada's mission in Afghanistan. He declared that Canadian participation was necessary to ensure that Afghanistan did not become a safe haven for terrorists. Canada had a responsibility to contribute to global order: "The [soldiers in Afghanistan] felt very strongly about what we were doing as a country and what they were doing as soldiers and that they have a *responsibility* (my italics) to the world that they want to see Canada shoulder."¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ Jasmin H. Cheung- Gertler, "A Model Power for a Troubled World?," *International Journal*, 62 (2007) 3, 1.

¹⁴⁹ Kevin Cox, "Martin boosts defense spending," *The Globe and Mail*, 15 April 2004: A04.

A day following the London bombings, General Hillier invoked the internationalist idea of responsibility as well, “We have a responsibility to our population and to the population outside of our borders to ensure that populations at risk are protected and that economic reconstruction takes place.”¹⁵⁰ Later Martin stated that he agreed with Hillier’s remarks: “I supported Gen. Hillier then and I support him now. The fact is, the world has changed and it changed on Sept. 11. We all recognize that and Canada is going to take its responsibilities.”¹⁵¹ In this statement, Martin invoked the internationalist ideas of interconnected vulnerability and responsibility to the global order.

Such comments were made as the government began to alert Canadians to the truth that the new mission in Kandahar would involve combat with insurgents, and consequently, involved more risk of casualties. In a letter to *The Globe and Mail*, Canadian Defense Minister Bill Graham noted that there is “no doubt that our new mission in Kandahar differs from our current operation in Kabul. It will require a more combat-ready approach.”¹⁵² He then went on to note that Canada, NATO, and the UN-supported Afghan government agreed that the insurgents must be defeated and the Kandahar region must be stabilized. The import of Graham’s comments was that Canada was working to support the will of multilateral institutions.

For the Martin government, deploying troops to Kandahar was the chosen vehicle for supporting multilateral institutions. During the initial discussions regarding the location of Canada’s PRT, one of the main concerns in Ottawa was the ability to facilitate

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Bill Graham, “Canada’s bridge to Kandahar,” *The Globe and Mail*, 22 Aug 2005: A13.

the expansion of NATO.¹⁵³ When Chief of Defense Staff Raymond Henault was asked to recall the main impetus for sending a PRT to Kandahar, he noted that it was as a means of facilitating the expansion of NATO:

We were looking at a number of options. Sending the PRT to Kandahar was the best option to enable NATO to expand to the next phase. We were clearly focused on the overall expansion of NATO. This was a decision which was framed within a NATO perspective.¹⁵⁴

Additionally, when Rick Hillier replaced Henault as Chief of Defense Staff, he noted that the Kandahar region would provide the Canadian forces with greater visibility than the other regions, reminding others of Canada's contribution to the multilateral efforts there.

Moreover, in May of 2005, as the decision to deploy troops was entering its final phase, Hillier argued that the deployment to Kandahar would present Canada with the opportunity to lead the Kandahar Multinational Headquarters. NATO was planning to take over this command in early 2006. According to Hillier, this would allow Canada to pave the way for that transition and help facilitate NATO's expansion.¹⁵⁵

The Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan was created by the Harper government to study Canada's role in Afghanistan. The panel was chaired by Chretien's former Deputy Prime Minister John Manley who was assisted by: former Clerk of the Privy Council Paul Tellier who served under Prime Minister Brian Mulroney; Mulroney's Chief of Staff Derek H. Burney; former Cabinet Minister Jake Epp who served in Mulroney's government; and Pamela Wallin who is senior advisor to the President of the Americas Society and Council of the Americas in New York.

¹⁵³ Gross-Stein and Lang, 136.

¹⁵⁴ Gross-Stein and Lang, 136.

¹⁵⁵ Gross-Stein and Lang, 183.

The Panel chided all Canadian governments to date for their lack of “balance and candour about the reasons for Canadian involvement” in Kandahar.¹⁵⁶ However, following consultations with Cabinet Ministers, Deputy Ministers, PCO and PMO officials, and senior diplomats from Canada and abroad, it articulated four primary reasons why Canada had originally decided to accept the mission there. Two of these had to do with supporting multilateral institutions. First of all, Canada was responding to the international threat to peace imposed by al Qaeda’s terrorist attacks. Secondly, it was supporting the United Nations efforts to respond to threats to peace and security and foster better futures in the world’s developing countries. Third, it was joining forces with other NATO members with whom it had similar views on the Afghan conflict. And fourthly, Canada was committed to promoting and protecting human security in failed and failing states.

The Panel advocated a collective use of force in Afghanistan, as provided for in Chapter VII of the UN Charter. This clause was to be used to address an international threat to peace — which long-term disorder in Afghanistan had presented to the global community. The Panel noted that the Kandahar mission “reflects the changing nature of UN-mandated peace missions, which have become more robust in the use of force to protect civilians since the harsh lessons learned in the murderous disasters of Bosnia and Rwanda.”¹⁵⁷ It went on to note that these kinds of missions had been successful in Cote d’Ivoire, Haiti and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

¹⁵⁶ Minister of Public Works and Government Services, *Independent Panel on Canada’s Future Role in Afghanistan*, Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, Represent by the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, January 2008, 21.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 21.

The Panel also noted that one of the reasons for Canadian involvement in Kandahar was to support NATO. It observed that Afghanistan was chiefly, though not exclusively, a NATO endeavor since 26 of the 39 countries in the International Stabilization Force were NATO countries.¹⁵⁸ It noted that NATO was the UN's main instrument for stabilizing Afghanistan and helping the country to develop economically and politically, and went on to state that:

Canada's political and security interests for almost 60 years have been advanced by Canadian membership in the NATO alliance, a history reaching from the early years of the Cold War to life-saving interventions in the Balkans. More often than not, Canadian interests are well served by active membership in an organization of democracies that gives every member nation a voice in protecting our shared security.¹⁵⁹

The Panel concluded that it was in Canada's interests to support NATO's efforts in Afghanistan.

Martin's later remarks also reflected the importance of supporting NATO. When discussing NATO's decision to invoke the collective response clause following the 9/11 attacks, he stated:

When the Americans decided to respond to the attack from al-Qaeda with a mission to root out its bases in Afghanistan, and its basis of support among the Taliban, their response was understandable and reasonable. As members of NATO, which is after all a self-defence pact, we had a moral if not legal duty to support them. We also had a self interest in doing so.¹⁶⁰

Martin also had praise for Canada, which he argued had played its part in NATO's collective intention to expand its presence in Afghanistan, while chastising other members of NATO that were not putting forward an equal effort. Martin concluded,

¹⁵⁸ Minister of Public Works and Government Services, *Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan*, Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, Represent by the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, January 2008, 21.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 21.

¹⁶⁰ Martin, 391,

“Our responsibilities as Canadians were to play our part, not to shoulder any and all burdens that might come our way.”¹⁶¹

It bears noting that the Martin government and the Harper government that followed were prepared to expend a very significant amount of money on the multilateral efforts in Kandahar. This is the final premise of internationalism. The Chrétien government expended \$100 million on Operation Apollo in 2002¹⁶². Moreover, in 2003 the Chrétien government expended \$200 million as a means of deploying Canadian soldiers as part of the ISAF peacekeeping operation.¹⁶³ By contrast, from the moment the Martin government deployed troops to Kandahar, the cost of Canada’s mission in Afghanistan rose considerably. In the 2005-2006 fiscal year the cost of the mission was pegged at \$402 million¹⁶⁴. And during the 2006-2007 fiscal year the mission doubled to \$803 million¹⁶⁵. In short, when Canada relocated to Kandahar, the financial cost of the mission escalated dramatically.

There is a number of reasons why Canada has remained committed to multilateral institutions. To begin with, for Canada multilateral institutions represent an institutionally based international order that relies on the rule of law. Such an order is in Canada’s interest, from a number of different standpoints. First of all, multilateral institutions have always been viewed as forums that give Canada some influence in the international system — by allowing its leaders to articulate their ideas on how to deal with any number of international issues. Secondly, multilateral institutions have provided Canada with the

¹⁶¹ Martin, 391.

¹⁶² *Times-Colonist*, “Price tag for Afghan mission rises,” 4 June 2003: A5.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ Mike Blanchford, “Cost of war at 1 billion a year; Afghan mission price tag doubled in 2006 Defense Report says,” *The Gazette*, 21 April 2008: A1.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

opportunity to distinguish its policies from those of the US and Britain. In other words, they provide Canada with a means of promoting its national identity. And thirdly, they serve a particularly important function in Canada's case of offering its people security against external enemies.

Canada has always lacked the capacity to guarantee its own security, and has been unwilling to rely exclusively on the US for its implementation.¹⁶⁶ According to Keating, Canadian diplomats played an active role in the design of the UN and NATO, viewing both organizations as a means to:

...enhance Canadian security, link that security with the United States, while at the same time, limiting or diffusing our dependence on the United States. Security was one area in which multilateralism was used as means of managing the potentially suffocating embrace of the United States.¹⁶⁷

In light of the above, it becomes clear why Canada would support a UN-sanctioned and NATO-led mission in Kandahar. First of all, the UN supported each development of the conflict in Afghanistan. In the weeks following the 9/11 attacks, the Security Council supported the US by affirming Resolutions 1368 and 1373 of the UN Charter, which cites the inherent right of individual and collective self defense. Then on November 14th of 2001, the UN passed a series of resolutions that "condemned the Taliban for allowing Afghanistan to be a base for the export of terrorism by the al Qaeda network and other terrorist groups and for providing safe haven for Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda and others associated with them, and in this context supporting the efforts of the Afghan people to replace the Taliban regime."¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Tom Keating, *Canada and World Order: The Multilateralist Tradition in Canadian Foreign Policy 2nd ed.* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2002), 4.

¹⁶⁷ Keating, 4.

¹⁶⁸ Resolution 1378, "Security Council Sets New Course for Governance Change in Afghanistan," United Nations Security Council, available from <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2001/sc7212.doc.htm>

The UN went on to sanction each step of NATO's expansion in Afghanistan. Its Resolution 1386 established an international security force under Chapter VII of the UN Charter to provide security in Kabul. Then in 2003, by virtue of Resolution 1510 it authorized the security force to expand across the country. Since that time, the mandate has been renewed annually.

NATO has also been a means for Canada to strengthen its own security. Today the website of Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade notes that NATO provides Canada with "access to strategic information, exercises with Allied forces, and an equal voice in high-level decisions affecting Euro-Atlantic security and stability."¹⁶⁹ It states that NATO is the cornerstone of Canada's relations with Europe, and that "Canada benefits significantly from the diplomatic weight, technical expertise, and military capabilities of NATO."

3.6- Conclusion

The objective of this chapter is to show that Canadian policy in Kandahar can be understood as an expression of internationalism. It is noteworthy that the ideas of interconnected vulnerability and responsibility to the international community were at the core of the arguments made by the Martin government when it authorized the Kandahar mission. While both Chrétien and Martin were prepared to deploy troops to Afghanistan, it was Martin who placed the emphasis on Canada's vulnerability and its responsibility to the international community. In taking this position, it was viewing the new international security environment through an internationalist lens. It soon became clear that al

¹⁶⁹ "Canada in NATO," Webpage, The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/nato/canada_in_nato-en.asp

Qaeda's destructive intentions would not be limited to the Pentagon and World Trade Centre. For al Qaeda forces led, or at least played a role in, a variety of terrorist attacks, such as those in Bali, Riyadh, Istanbul and Madrid, and moreover, in a variety of terrorist plots in Europe, North America and the Middle East. These developments caused Canadian leaders to believe that Canada was a potential target of Islamic extremists, and moreover, the attacks on London heightened this concern. Canadian leaders believed that this new threat of international terrorism required a multilateral response, and they subsequently began to speak of responsibilities that states have to the international community. With the onset of Operation Enduring Freedom it became clear that the US was willing to aggressively pursue unilateralist initiatives in the new security environment. Thus Canadian leaders became aware of new reasons to offer robust support for international institutions.

Conclusion:

The objective of this thesis has been to explore the nature of the policy change that occurred under the government of Prime Minister Paul Martin in May of 2005 that resulted in Canada's embrace of a combat role in Afghanistan. The thesis presents an analysis of the Martin policy on Afghanistan comparing it to the policy adopted by the previous government led by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. It concludes that there was a significant policy change under Martin, which can be understood as an expression of an intensified version of Canadian internationalism engendered by 9/11 and related pressures of globalization.

The first chapter of the thesis reveals that the Chrétien government had no interest in having Canada involved in a combat role in Afghanistan. In short, the Chrétien government was ambivalent about taking military action. This was reflected in a variety of ambiguous statements by members of the government. For example, during the initial phases of the conflict, government leaders reminded Canadians that Canadian troops in Afghanistan were engaged in humanitarian actions and would be pulled out of the country if combat occurred. The government agreed to send a naval fleet to the region, but Canadian military experts claimed that it was unlikely to see any action. In subsequent months, the government did provide ground troops to perform a modest combat role but the commitment was limited to six months. Finally, when the Chrétien government agreed that Canada would take on a second mission in Afghanistan, it emphasized that it would be a peacekeeping mission. One of the results of the limited role undertaken by Canada at this time was that the number of Canadian casualties in Afghanistan remained low.

The second chapter shows that the Martin government was more willing to have Canada engage in a combat role against the insurgents in Afghanistan. And it knew that the assignment to Kandahar province would be considerably more perilous than previous missions. As early as 9 June 2003 there were reports that countering Islamic militants in Afghanistan had become more difficult because they had evolved into a more diffuse guerilla movement. Insurgents were now willing to embrace unconventional tactics such as suicide bombings, kidnappings, and the use of improvised explosive devices. One of the main advantages that the insurgents had was their success in seeking refuge and impunity in the tribal regions of Pakistan. In such a situation there would be far more Canadian casualties than there had been in previous missions. Defense Minister Bill Graham and Chief of Defense Staff Rick Hillier relayed this message to Canadians when they travelled across Canada and explained to Canadians the nature of new assignment.

A variety of explanations have been offered by academics and journalists regarding the policy change under Martin. It has been argued that Martin was seeking a bold new direction for Canadian foreign policy – a foreign policy that was consistent with the new realities of the 21st century security environment. A second argument is that the Canadian military was seeking a means of expanding NATO's presence in Afghanistan. Third, it has been said that military leaders viewed the deployment in Kandahar as a means of transforming the Canadian forces to meet the new security challenges. This thesis looks at the policy change from the standpoint of the ideas that shape the way in Canada operates in the international system.

More specifically, it argues that the Canadian decision to deploy troops to Kandahar can be understood as an expression of internationalism. Kim Richard Nossal

has noted that internationalists understand peace to be indivisible; that is to say, they believe that states share an interconnected vulnerability.¹⁷⁰ From this belief comes the conviction that states have a responsibility to contribute to international security. Further, the best means of contributing to international security is through active engagement in multilateral institutions. This entails, in turn, the allocation of significant financial and other resources to these institutions.

The evidence shows that the Martin government evoked such internationalist ideas when explaining to Canadians that their armed forces would be deploying to Kandahar. For example, on 3 October 2003, and following the deaths of two Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan, Defense Minister John McCallum invoked the idea of interconnected vulnerability. He stated that Canada would remain committed to the mission: “Despite the dangers, the security of Canada and the greater international community depends upon it. We cannot afford to back down and we will not back down.”¹⁷¹ Similarly, while visiting the Department of National Defense on 16 December 2003, Paul Martin noted that no “nation can isolate itself from the perils and trials and tribulations that the world goes through.”¹⁷² Finally, when defending his decision to boost military spending by \$7 billion in April of 2004, Martin invoked the internationalist idea of responsibility to the international community. He stated that, “The [soldiers in Afghanistan] felt very strongly about what we were doing as a country and what they were doing as soldiers and that they have a *responsibility* (my italics) to the world that

¹⁷⁰ Kim Richard Nossal, *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy*, 3rd ed, (Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada Inc, 1997), 155.

¹⁷¹ Sandra Cordon, “Defense Minister reaffirms commitment,” *The Globe and Mail*, 3 October 2003: A7.

¹⁷² Daniel Leblanc, “PM’s visit buoys defense staff,” *The Globe and Mail*, 16 December 2003: A5.

they want to see Canada shoulder.”¹⁷³ Interviews with senior Canadian policy-makers have noted that one of the reasons given for sending troops to Kandahar was to support multilateral institutions.

The internationalist understanding of security has a strong place in the history of Canadian foreign policy. For example, both Louis St. Laurent and Lester B. Pearson were dedicated internationalists. Pearson once stated that: “Everything I learned during the war confirmed and strengthened my view as a Canadian that our foreign policy must not be timid or fearful of commitments but activists in accepting international responsibilities.”¹⁷⁴ St. Laurent was as dedicated to internationalism as Pearson. In the Gray Lecture delivered at the University of Toronto in 1947, he articulated five principles on which Canadian foreign policy were based: national unity, political liberty, the rule of law in international affairs, the values of Christian civilization, and the acceptance of international responsibilities.

Canadian leaders and officials have historically been inclined to view the international system through an internationalist lens. The pronounced emphasis in Canada on taking one’s international responsibilities seriously can be traced to its history as a colony and then Dominion loyal to the British Empire and was reflected once more in its strong dedication to the principles embodied in the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.¹⁷⁵ The thesis argues that the internationalism that had always guided Canadian foreign policy was intensified by the events of 9/11 and the

¹⁷³ Kevin Cox, “Martin boosts defense spending,” *The Globe and Mail*, 15 April 2004: A4.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 156.

¹⁷⁵ Kim Richard Nossal, “Defending the ‘Realm’: Canadian strategic culture revisited,” *International Journal* Toronto: 59 (2004) 3, 504.

related forces of globalization that created a new kind of international security environment.

Globalization processes intensified the sense of interconnected vulnerability among Canadian policy makers, strengthening their belief that Canada had responsibilities to uphold in the international system. To reiterate William Scheuerman's definition of globalization, it is a process or set of forces that shrinks spatial and temporal boundaries for human beings in their social and political lives. Canada was deeply affected by a number of these processes, including the growing prevalence of information technology, the decreasing unit cost of air travel, the increased net migration rate, and the increased linking of inter-state commerce. As demonstrated in chapter three, each of these processes presented a genuine threat to Canadian security. Moreover, it is clear that Canadian policy-makers were attuned to these threats. As Paul Martin stated:

[Canadians] should be under no illusion that Canada, along with the rest of the world, are [not] targets for terrorists. None of us can be complacent and none of us can regard ourselves as living on some kind of Island. We are not part of a different world... We have a responsibility. The fight against terrorism has got to be taken beyond the borders of any individual country. This is a dangerous world.¹⁷⁶

In short, these globalization processes presented Canadian policy-makers with a set of new incentives to contribute to international security.

Where might this study of Canada's involvement in Kandahar lead, in terms of further research? The conceptual framework within which the study is placed is the theory of internationalism in Canadian foreign policy, which continues to deserve our attention. The Kandahar study shows that internationalist impulses can produce foreign policy initiatives that focus on national security, as much as it sometimes drives trade

¹⁷⁶ Gloria Galloway, "Canada may be targeted, PM warns," *The Globe and Mail*, 30 July 2005: A01.

initiatives, or an enhanced focus on development assistance, or human rights, or climate change. An interesting related subject for study might be: what influences or forces, societal, governmental and/or international, produce the various kinds of internationalist impulses among a people like Canadians in the first place? Alternatively, one could examine the extent to which these differing expressions of internationalism compete with, and complement one another. There is also the question of how Canadian internationalism in the 21st century differs from past incarnations. The Kandahar study suggests that, in its recent focus on national security, it has a lot in common with the internationalism originally conceived by Lester Pearson.

Bibliography

- Andreas, Peter. 2005. "The Mexicanization of the Canadian Border," *International Journal*, 60, Spring , 449-463.
- Austen, Ian & David Johnston. 2006. "17 held in plot to bomb sites in Ontario," *The New York Times*, June 4, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/04/world/americas/04toronto.html>
- Bell, Stewart. 2006. "The path to terror in Canada: An exclusive report: Training ground series," *National Post*, Sept 2, A1.
- Bell, Stewart. 2006. "Web forum linked cells: Two Toronto suspects took part in discussions," *National Post*, June 15, A1.
- Bell, Stewart., Adrian Humphreys & Chris Wattie, 2006. *The National Post*, June 6, A1.
- Blanchford, Christie. 2007. "How General Hillier has made it respectable to be a soldier again," *The Globe and Mail*, November 10, A2.
- Blanchfield, Mike. 2008. "Cost of war at 1 billion a year; Afghan mission price tag doubled in 2006 Defense Report says," *The Gazette*, April 21, A1.
- Burnett, Victoria. 2005. "Rebel violence sparks battle in Afghanistan," *The Globe and Mail*, June 23, A17.
- Burnett, Victoria. 2003. "US to aim for Afghan stability," *The Globe and Mail*, April 28, A8.
- Bush, President George W. 2005. *Fact Sheet: Plots, Casings, and Infiltrations Referenced In President George W. Bush's Remarks on the War on Terror*, The White House, October 2005, Available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/10/20051006-7.html>.
- Butler, Don. 2005. *The National Post*, "63% fear immigrants bring in conflicts," October 31, A1.
- Campbell, Murray. 2001. "US soldiers on ground, Rumsfeld says," *The Globe and Mail*, October 31, A10.
- "Canada in NATO," Webpage, The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/nato/canada_in_nato-en.asp
- Cheung- Gertler, Jasmin H. 2007. "A Model Power for a Troubled World?," *International Journal*, 62 Summer 589-608.

- Chrétien, Jean. 2007. *My Years As Prime Minister*. Toronto: Knopf Canada.
- Cohen, Andrew. 2003. *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Cordon, Sandra. 2003. "Defense Minister re-affirms commitment," *The Globe and Mail*, Oct 3, A7.
- Cox, Kevin. 2004. "Martin boosts defense spending," *The Globe and Mail*, Apr 15, A4.
- Curry, Bill. 2003. "Afghan boss asks Canada for more aide: Karsai seeks a special team for rebuilding," *Calgary Herald*, September 28th, 2003.
- Curry, Bill. 2005. "Troops expecting casualties, Hillier says," *The Globe and Mail*, July 8, A6.
- Czobit, Michael. 2004. "Bus driver emerges as terror plot leader," *The Vancouver Sun*, June 8, A6.
- Dawson, Grant. 2003. "'A Special Case': Canada, Operation Apollo, and Multilateralism," in *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus* eds. David Carment, Fen Hampson, and Norman Hillmer. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Department of Justice Canada. 2005. *The anti-terrorism Act and Security Measures in Canada: Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences*, March 11, available from http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2005/rr05_11/p0.html.
- Dorn, A. Walter. 2005. "Canadian Peacekeeping: Proud Tradition, Strong Future?" *Canadian Foreign Policy* Fall.
- Edgar, Alistair D. & Kostas Ifantis, 2007. "What Kind of Security?" *International Journal*, 62, Summer, 450-458.
- "Face to face with the reality of terrorism," 2006. *Toronto Star*, June 6, A22.
- Fawn, Rick. 2003. "Reluctant Moral Middle Power," in *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan, and Beyond*. Eds. Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Freeman, Alan. 2001. "NATO, Russia anti-terrorism allies," *The Globe and Mail*, September 14, A3.
- Freeman, Alan. 2001. "'Today we are all Americans'-NATO allies pledge support," *The Globe and Mail*, September 13, A06.

- Freeman, Alan. 2001. "'War' talk unsettles several leaders," *The Globe and Mail*, September 19, A04.
- Freeze, Colin. 2005. "Security Minister warns Canada to stand on guard," *The Globe and Mail*, July 12, A1.
- Galloway, Gloria. 2005. "Canada may be targeted, PM warns," *The Globe and Mail*, July 30, A1.
- Gee, Marcus. 2002. "Brave troops sent on a fool's errand," *The Globe and Mail*, Jan 19, A15
- Ghafour, Hamida. 2003. "Peacekeeping to expand beyond Kabul," *The Globe and Mail*, October 7, A7.
- Ghafour, Hamida. 2004. "They came day and night. They are lying near the mountains and sometimes even in the mosques," *The Globe and Mail*, February 28, A1.
- Goldenberg, Eddie. 2006. *The Way it Works: Inside Ottawa*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Graham, Bill. 2005. "Canada's bridge to Kandahar," *The Globe and Mail*, Aug 22, A13.
- Greenspan, Edward. 2001. *The Globe and Mail*, October 8, A17.
- Gruen, Madeleine. 2006. "Terrorist Indoctrination and Radicalization on the Internet," *Terrorism and Counter-terrorism: Understanding the New Security Environment*. Eds. Russell D. Howard and Reid L. Sawyer. Iowa: McGraw-Hill.
- Ha, Tu Thanh. 2003. "Kabul blast shows al-Qaeda still in business," *The Globe and Mail*, June 9, A9.
- Harvey, Frank P. 2004. "Addicted to Security: Globalized terrorism and the inevitability of American Unilateralism," *International Journal*, 59 Winter (1), 27-41.
- "Hillier explains the Afghan mission," 2005. *The Globe and Mail*, July 16, A16.
- Hillmer, Norman and Maureen Appel Molot. 2002. Eds. *Canada Among Nations 2002: A Fading Power*, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Ibbitson, John. 2001. "Prepared to attack Taliban, US says," *The Globe and Mail*, September 16, A04.

- Ibbitson, John. 2001. "US expects its friends to back efforts to launch war on terrorism," *The Globe and Mail*, September 13, A06.
- Holmes, John W. 1986. *No Other Way: Canada and International Security Institutions*. Toronto: Centre for International Studies.
- Ignatieff, Michael. 2004. "Canada in the Age of Terror: Multilateralism Meets a Moment of Truth," in *Independence in an Age of Empire: Assessing Unilateralism and Multilateralism*. Ed. Graham F. Walker. Halifax: The Centre for Foreign Policy Studies.
- Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan*. 2008. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, Represent by the Minister of Public Works and Government Services.
- Keating, Tom. 2002. *Canada and World Order: The Multilateralist Tradition in Canadian Foreign Policy 2nd ed.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lablanc, Daniel. 2005. "He's armored, but he's not thick," *The Globe and Mail*, July 30, F1.
- Lablanc, Daniel. 2003. "Military reassessing its vehicle needs for Afghanistan," *The Globe and Mail*, October 10, A03.
- Leblanc, Daniel. 2003. "PM's visit buoys defense staff," *The Globe and Mail*, Dec 16, A5.
- Laghi, Brian. 2001. "Eggleton plays down combat role for troops," *The Globe and Mail*, Nov 16, A01.
- Laghi, Brian. 2001. "One-third of fleet sent to US effort," *The Globe and Mail*, October 10, A07.
- Laghi, Brian. 2001. "The Fall of Kabul: Canadian soldiers will go in to give aid," *The Globe and Mail*, Nov 15, A01.
- Martin, Paul. *Hell or High Water: My Life in and Out of Politics*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2008.
- MacKinnon, Mark. 2003. "Afghanistan attacks rise, but who is behind them?," *The Globe and Mail*, August 5, A08.
- MacKinnon, Mark. 2003. "Canadian troops see potential for danger in new Afghan mission," July 17, A03.

- McCarthy, Shannon. 2001. "PM plans trip to US to discuss united force: Chrétien tells Commons he will urge Bush to proceed cautiously in war on terrorism," *The Globe and Mail*, September 19, A07.
- McCorquodale, Robert & Richard Fairbrother, 1999. "Globalization and Human Rights," *Human Rights Quarterly*, 21, Issue 3, 735-766.
- Maloney, Sean, M. 2005. *Enduring the Freedom: A Rogue Historian in Afghanistan*. Washington D.C.: Potomac Books.
- Mills, Don. 2001. "PM sending troops to buttress coalition: Domestic security alert," *The National Post*, October 8, A01.
- Parehk, Vikram. 2003. "Afghanistan's hour of reckoning," *The Globe and Mail*, October 15, A01.
- Pedwell, Terry. 2005. "Forces brace for Taliban attacks," *The Globe and Mail*, July 7, A8.
- Piggot, Peter. 2007. *Canada in Afghanistan: The War So Far*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- Nossal, Kim R. 2004. "Canada and the Search for World Order: John W. Holmes and Canadian Foreign Policy," *International Journal*, 59, Autumn, 749-60.
- Nossal, Kim, R. 2004. "Defending the 'Realm': Canadian strategic culture revisited," *International Journal* 59 Summer, 503-520.
- Nossal, Kim, R. 1997. *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy, 3rd Ed.* Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada Inc.
- Resolution 1378, "Security Council Sets New Course for Governance Change in Afghanistan," Security Council, United Nations, available from <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2001/sc7212.doc.htm>
- Rozenal, Andreas. 2006. "The Security and Prosperity Partnership: An Overview," *International Journal*, 61, Summer, 541-545.
- Rice, Gary H. 2002. "The Defense of Canada after 9/11: The Foundation of a Defense White Paper for the Beginning of the 21st Century," *Conference of Defense Associations*, available from <http://www.cda-cdai.ca/pdf/NUDEFENCE.pdf>
- Sallot, Jeff. 2003. "Canadian troops may not go to Iraq, but to Afghanistan," *The Globe and Mail*, February 3, A10.
- Scheuerman, William. 2002. "Globalization," *The Stanford Dictionary of Philosophy*, first published 21 June 2002; substantive revision 16 June 2006. Available from

- <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/globalization/>.
- Schiller, Bill. 2006. "The road to Kandahar at an afternoon in Ottawa, a decision was made that would cost soldiers lives, billions of taxpayers dollars and, perhaps, Canada's reputation," *Toronto Star*, Sept 9, A13.
- Smith, Gordon. 2007. "Canada in Afghanistan: Is it Working," Prepared for the Canadian Defense and Foreign Affairs Institute, March.
- Stackhouse, John. 2001. "Bush zeros in on target," *The Globe and Mail*, September 14, A01.
- Stein, Janice Gross. 2005. "Back to the Future: Global Security From 1980 to 2030," *Policy Options*, March-April, 72-78.
- Stein, Janice Gross and Eugene Lang. 2007. *The Unexpected War: Canada in Kandahar*. Toronto: Penguin Group.
- Tehrani, Majid R. 2004. "Civilization: A Pathway to Peace?," *Globalizations* vol 1. Issue 1, 82-101.
- Thorne, Stephen. 2005. "Rick Hillier," *International Journal*, Summer, 60, issue, 3.
- Times-Colonist. 2003. "Price tag for Afghan mission rises," June 4, A5.
- "Toronto terror suspects arrested," 2006. *Calgary Herald*, June 3, A1.
- Walker, Graham F. 2004. "Introduction," *Independence in an Age of Empire: Assessing Unilateralism and Multilateralism*. Halifax: The Centre for Foreign Policy Studies.
- Walton, Dawn. 2005. "Politicians and the public stand at attention," *The Globe and Mail*, December 30, A3.
- Welsh, Jennifer M. 2004. *At Home in the World: Canada's Global Vision for the 21st Century*. Toronto: Harper-Collins.
- Welsh, Jennifer. M. 2006. "The 2005 International Policy Statement: Leading with Identity?," *International Journal*, 61, Autumn 909-929.
- Wolf, Martin. 2004. *Why Globalization Works*. New Haven: Yale University Press.