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For the past few months the Harper government has been taking it on the chin for allegedly low-balling the acquisition costs of the controversial F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.

Throughout the 2011 election campaign, the Conservatives insisted repeatedly that no matter what transpired among the 10 partner nations, and regardless of reported delays and cost overruns in the project, Canada would spend $15 billion to acquire and operate 65 fighter jets for a 20-year lifespan.

To further alleviate any voter concerns, Defence Minister Peter MacKay personally flew down to Fort Worth, Texas, to tour Lockheed Martin’s F-35 production facilities. After a brief inspection, MacKay told any reporter who would listen that the whole program looked cool to him. He promised the acquisition would come in on time — and on budget.

However, subsequent reports by both the Parliamentary Budget Officer and the Auditor General have cast some serious doubts on MacKay’s prediction.

After crunching the numbers, the Auditor General concluded that the F-35 purchase will set taxpayers back at least $25 billion — a whopping $10 billion more than the Conservatives have admitted to the Canadian public.

Unrepentant DND and government officials are attempting to shrug off this massive discrepancy as nothing more than a simple difference in accounting principles, rather than a deliberate attempt to mislead citizens.

(Fellow taxpayers should keep this F-35 defence handy for any future Revenue Canada audit. But I digress.)

To be fair to MacKay and his senior bureaucrats, it would be a very difficult task to attempt to predict a finite cost of purchasing and operating a new generation fighter aircraft for the next 20 to 30 years. This is especially true given that the F-35 is still in the development phase, and no unit price per plane has been established. As for future maintenance expenses, only a crystal ball could determine the magnitude of these potential costs.

That being said, let’s take a look at how accurate MacKay and company have been at predicting and calculating far more tangible present-day operational costs.

Last June, at the height of the conflict in Libya, when Parliament was debating whether or not to extend Canada’s contribution to the mission by another three months, MacKay was asked to calculate the monetary cost. His estimate at the time was roughly $60 million for a full six-month operation. That same month, the Rideau Institute, an independent Ottawa-based think-tank, released its own estimate of $85 million for the same six-month mission.

When asked to comment on the projected difference, MacKay smugly retorted, “The Rideau Institute, as so often is the case, is wrong.”

On October 28, eight days after the death of Moammar Gadhafi and three days before Canada officially ended its mission, MacKay gleefully told the CBC that Canada’s mission in Libya proves problematic for Peter MacKay.

Counting the actual costs of Canada’s mission in Libya proves problematic for Peter MacKay... CONTINUED ON P. 78
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ANTICIPATE TOMORROW
The Canadian contingent to Kandahar has returned to Canada having given up “combat.” Thanks to aggressive offensive operations by the Americans, Kandahar is now basically clear of Taliban. The American mission is to defeat the Taliban; the Canadian mission was, unfortunately, scrambled into a combination of reconstruction, good governance promotion and local security with a view to winning hearts and minds.

Real COIN (population-centric counter-insurgency) calls for the separation of the populace from the insurgents accompanied by aggressive offensive operations until the insurgents are destroyed or sue for peace. The old maxim of infantry’s role being to close with and destroy the enemy seems to have been forgotten in favour of being satisfied to “shoo” the enemy with fire supremacy, which only results in fighting him again and again. The army needs to learn and apply “isolation of the battlefield.”

After exemplary performance in 2006-2008 (Operation MEDUSA and follow-up offensives), by 2009 the defence became the modus operandi supported by patrolling. What a waste; patrolling only guarantees casualties with no tactical or strategic advantage. Remember Korea (1952-1953)? Over 150 Canadian soldiers were killed in action while patrolling. Withdrawing to defensive FOB deployment in 2010-2011 resulted in fewer casualties, but the job was not done when Canada withdrew from a combat mission. Now Canada has joined the “Caveat Contingents,” acting in a training role only. Creating “Potemkin Villages” in the Panjwaii district may have been good public relations but is not combat. Canada did not go to Afghanistan to win but only not to lose!

Look for a return to emphasis on peacekeeping or, in the more extreme, peace-making, but not to combat. “No boots on the ground,” please, we’re peacekeepers — although bombing from 20,000 feet as in Libya or Serbia seems acceptable to Canadians, collateral damage notwithstanding. It appears Canada will participate under RPT [Responsibility to Protect initiatives] as long as casualties are few.

How tiresome it is to listen to the self-congratulatory murmurings regarding Canada’s performance in “combat” in Afghanistan. “Best little army in the world,” “punching above our weight,” etc. If Britain can deploy 10,000 to Afghanistan and are still in theatre in the fight, why did Canada skulk away leaving its allies to continue combat? How telling it is to look at casualty figures for 2010-2011, compared to 2006-2009 when real combat took place.

The longer Canada was deployed in Afghanistan, the more reservists were added to combat units and the more women were also deployed. Unfortunately, casualties are not a sign of success!

Basicly, the army’s problem has been that the officer corps does not view the battalion group as a fighting unit, but rather as a number of sub-units to be tasked and deployed separately. Too much peacekeeping residual influence remains rather than a mastering of sub-unit deployment in a mutually supporting role capable of concentrating force in space and time. After exemplary performance in 2006-2008 (Operation MEDUSA and follow-up offensives), by 2009 the defence became the modus operandi supported by patrolling.

In May 2010, soldiers from 1 Royal Canadian Regiment’s Bravo Company conducted a presence patrol of Haji Baba and the surrounding area. As part of Joint Task Force Afghanistan (JTF-Afg), the Canadian Forces contributed to the international effort in Afghanistan. Its operations focus was on working with Afghan authorities to improve security, governance and economic development in Afghanistan. Many foot patrols were conducted during the Canadian Forces’ “combat” mission. Some have argued that patrolling only guarantees casualties with no tactical or strategic advantage. Of the 158 Canadian soldiers who lost their lives or were seriously wounded in Afghanistan, many occurred while conducting foot patrols. (Sgt Daren Kraus, JTF-AFGHANISTAN, ROTO 9, COMBAT CAMERA)
ranks at shocking levels, and physical fitness standards for soldiers reduced to accommodate women. Such social experiments are wrong-headed and dangerous, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms notwithstanding.

Does the formation of a new regiment — the Special Operations Regiment — compensate for the decline in standards in regular infantry battalions? Shades of the Airborne Regiment here, I sense, as this new regiment, formed without permanent culture or committed personnel, operates in secret, performing tasks that may contravene the Geneva Convention as the American special forces do.

An infantry battalion group trained for all phases of war will find peacekeeping easy, but those trained specifically for peacekeeping will find combat terrifying. It’s too bad, because the legacy of Afghanistan will surely be a return to an emphasis on risk which is adverse to peacekeeping. So the army becomes a gendarmerie, but the nation will be pleased.

Canada now talks openly of pursuing a brawnier, more hard-nosed foreign policy? For a nation that could hardly sustain 1,000 in a combat role without leaving early, that is truly a stretch of the imagination!

Major (ret’d) Arthur Cobham

NOT A THIRD-WORLD COUNTRY
In response to publisher Scott Taylor’s “On Target” column in Volume 19, Issue 4, he states: “The F-35 controversy is just the latest in a long string of [procurement] boondoggles.”

I have always found is so very odd that Canadians make such a fuss about equipping our military, regardless of which branch, with anything that resembles proper kit.

Used subs, Sea Kings, C-17s or new jets.

When Canada is called to fulfill our NATO or NORAD commitments, we arrive looking like third-world countries. I recall the same issue as now when we bought the CF-18s [in the late 1970s].

If Canadians still want us to be thought of as mere UN peacekeepers, then let’s sell everything off and buy a big box of blue berets and be done with it. If, on the other hand, we see our military as having some useful security purpose, then our men and women deserve no less than the very best equipment that can be sourced. Worrying about industrial spinoffs be damned. New subs, new ships, new tanks, and the best new fighters money can buy. Maybe then when we show up to fight or keep the peace, we don’t look ridiculous.

A.F.
Nova Scotia

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE
Canada’s military role has morphed from an international peacekeeping/home defence role to one of a more offensive (literally and figuratively) one. I would assume that the equipment requirements beyond the standard for each role would differ considerable.

LETTERS ... CONTINUED ON PAGE 70
Survivability and Protection:
Priorities for the Canadian Army in the new millennium
by David Pugliese
If there were an overall theme for many CANSEC 2012 exhibitors interested in selling products to the Canadian Army then the phrase that comes to mind is “protection and survivability for the soldier.”

These words dominate the marketing for many of the products being featured at the annual military trade show, whether it is for new integrated systems for the individual on the battlefield or one of the many new vehicles the army wants to purchase.

The land force is in the process of increasing its protection for the soldier by acquiring Tactical Armoured Patrol Vehicles (TAPV), Close Combat Vehicles (CCV), upgraded Light Armoured Vehicles (LAV III), armoured engineering as well as recovery vehicles and upgraded Leopard 2 tanks.

CANSEC 2012 exhibitors BAE, Nexter Systems and General Dynamics Land Systems – Canada will all be promoting their candidates for the CCV. General Dynamics had offered the army the Piranha 5, while BAE/Hagglunds put forward the CV-90 and Nexter proposed its VBCI, with the option of two different turret/gun systems.

But when it comes to the CCV, expect the discussions and trade talk among CANSEC exhibitors as well as attendees to focus on the Conservative government’s recent controversial decision to restart the $2 billion program.

The CCV will be a medium weight vehicle (30 to 45 tonnes), which meets the requirements of an infantry fighting vehicle to operate with Leopard main battle tanks. Canada wants to acquire 108 of them with an option for up to 30 more.

Testing of the CCV candidates finished at the U.S. Army’s Aberdeen Proving Ground in December and the Defence Department had been expecting a contract to be awarded by the summer. But on April 27 the three companies were told their bids had been rejected since they didn’t meet technical specifications. It was the second time in less than two years that candidate vehicles, including those in service with allied nations in Afghanistan, have been rejected as not meeting Canadian Army needs.

A new request for proposals (RFP) has been issued and interested companies have until August 14 to respond.

Firms will still highlight their CCV products at CANSEC 2012. Indeed, some are putting a positive spin on the restarting of the project.

Patrick Lier, vice-president of international affairs for Nexter Systems, says the company will transport a VBCI from Europe to display at CANSEC.

“We understand the complexities of the defence procurement process in Canada and we firmly believe that the results of this new competition will confirm that our VBCI is the best choice for the Canadian Army, from the standpoint of protection, mobility, firepower and value,” Lier noted.

BAE spokesman Mike Sweeney said the firm would be asking the Defence Department for clarification on the reasons for rejecting its bid. “We look forward to receiving and reviewing the new RFP for the CCV program,” he added. “We are committed to working with our Canadian partners to deliver the protection, mobility and firepower the Canadian Armed Forces need.”

Ken Yamashita, manager of corporate affairs for General Dynamics Land Systems – Canada noted that “We will review all documentation we receive from the government thoroughly and after full consideration we will determine the best way forward.”

The Tactical Armoured Patrol Vehicle (TAPV) program will also be highlighted at CANSEC 2012 by the various bidders involved, although with the contract expected to be awarded sometime in the summer, industry sources say the winner is already likely selected.

At one point there were discussions within government about announcing the TAPV winner at CANSEC 2012 to give the show, and project, a higher public profile and allow Conservative government ministers to present a “good news” procurement story. But that plan was overruled.

Still, the various firms will use CANSEC as a public relations platform to show off their TAPV capabilities.

The project will see the purchase of 500 vehicles in two variants. Of these, 193 will be reconnaissance vehicles, while 307 will fill a general utility role. The TAPV will conduct reconnaissance, surveillance, command and control, as well as armoured personnel transport tasks. It will replace the Coyote armoured vehicle and RG-31 Nyala currently in the army’s fleet.

Force Protection Industries Inc. submitted its bid, offering the...
Canadian Forces a 6X6 variant of the Cougar wheeled combat vehicle. CAE is Force Protection’s main Canadian partner and the firm intends to promote its TAPV capabilities at CANSEC, says CAE spokesman Chris Stellwag. CAE will have overall responsibility for the in-service support for the fleet including: vehicle operator and mission training systems; engineering information environment; fleet management services; systems engineering support; and life cycle and integrated logistics support services. Elbit Systems, Lockheed Martin, Malley Industries, Marmen, and ArmorWorks are also involved in the Force Protection vehicle, dubbed the Timberwolf.

Textron Systems Canada Inc. is also pursuing TAPV. Their TAPV Team is led by Textron Systems Canada, and includes Textron Marine & Land Systems and Rheinmetall Canada. Additional key Canadian suppliers include: Kongsberg Protech Systems Canada, a subcontractor to Rheinmetall Canada for the remote weapons systems; and Engineering Office Deisenroth Canada (EODC), a subcontractor direct to Textron Systems Canada for add-on armour.

Kongsberg Protech Systems Canada will provide its Protector Remote Weapon Station (RWS) for the Textron TAPV vehicle through a subcontract with Rheinmetall Canada. At past CANSEC shows this system was highlighted as a centrepiece at its booth. Kongsberg would be responsible for assembly, testing, and delivery of its RWS for the TAPV program, using its production facility in London, Ontario.

EODC, an IBD Deisenroth-owned Canadian company based in Ottawa, is offering IBD’s fourth-generation Advanced Modular Armour Protection (AMAP) technology in support of the Textron TAPV. This ballistic protection technology includes the use of nano-ceramics and nano-steels to provide enhanced vehicle survivability at lower weight levels, according to the firm.

BAE Systems is proposing the RG35 reconnaissance, patrol and utility platform. Add-on armour will come from its team member DEW Engineering, while Thales Canada will be involved in the combat suite.

DEW Engineering will also provide design services and vehicle assembly as part of its agreement with BAE. In-service support is...
THE TIMBERWOLF is built to survive battlefield blasts while saving lives. To keep it performing mission after mission, the vehicle also needs a proven in-service support solution. With 25 years of experience providing ISS solutions, CAE leads the Canadian support team that will provide the engineering and logistics needed to keep the Timberwolf in the field and meeting its most important mission: bringing heroes home safely.

TEAMTIMBERWOLF.CA
to include vehicle repair, field service support, technical publications; material support is also part of the DEW Engineering share of work on TAPV.

Oshkosh Defense is teamed with General Dynamics Land Systems – Canada and Oshkosh Corporation subsidiary London Machinery Inc. in its bid for the TAPV program. The Oshkosh TAPV proposal is based on the company’s Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected All-Terrain Vehicle (M-ATV).

It is promoting the high commonality of chassis, crew capsule and cargo body based on the battle-proven M-ATV as a way to minimize support costs. Oshkosh recently opened an Ottawa office to expand its presence. London Machinery Inc. will provide advanced vehicle manufacturing capabilities including assembly, subsystem integration and final acceptance testing for DND programs. General Dynamics Land Systems – Canada would provide in-country vehicle support and system integration.

Rheinmetall Canada also plans to unveil its upgraded Leopard 2 at CANSEC 2012. In the fall of 2010, the firm won the Leopard 2 repair and overhaul contract for the upgrade of 42 Leopard 2 tanks, which were at the time in storage in Montreal. The tanks will form the backbone of the Leopard training units in Canada.

MRAP vehicles, like Oshkosh’s M-ATV, are armoured vehicles with a blast-resistant, V-bottomed underbody designed to protect the crew from mine blasts, fragmentary and direct-fire weapons. MRAP features four vehicle categories, with the MRAP All-Terrain Vehicle (M-ATV) being the smaller, lighter-weight platform. The M-ATV is the platform Oshkosh is presenting the Canadian government for the Tactical Armoured Patrol Vehicle program.

This diagram provides a simplified explanation of the many various components of EODC’s Advanced Modular Armour Protection (AMAP). Advanced technologies and materials are used in a layered structure, providing excellent levels of protection against both conventional and unconventional weapon systems. EODC is working with Textron and will provide this fourth generation technology in its TAPV bid. (GRAPHIC COURTESY EODC)

The first of those tanks is expected to be delivered to Canadian Forces Base Gagetown by the summer, where it will be given a final inspection and test firing. Company officials, however, expect the unveiling of the upgraded tank at CANSEC to draw a lot of attention from army personnel.

The Rheinmetall Group is also promoting its other areas of business with the army, after also having been awarded the contract to supply the service with the Buffel/Buffalo armoured recovery vehicle (ARV). Delivery of the ARVs is slated to take place in 2013-2014. The Canadian Army is furnishing the Leopard 2 tank chassis from those acquired from the Dutch and Rheinmetall will convert those into Buffel/Buffalo ARVs.

This vehicle is designed for recovering disabled tanks as well as for conducting maintenance and repair work under field conditions. Thanks to a built-in crane, the Buffel/Buffalo is able to exchange a Leopard 2 power pack or complete turret.

General Dynamics Land Systems – Canada has highlighted its upgrade of the LAV III at the last couple of CANSEC shows through its display of its technology demonstrator — dubbed the LAV-H. Now that it has been awarded the contract to produce the new generation of Light Armoured Vehicle, the firm will further promote its lead role in that project.

This latest upgrade will modernize 550 vehicles, extending the fleet’s life to 2035. Survivability upgrades will include the introduction of double-V hull technology, as well as add-on armour protection and energy-attenuating seats.

At last year’s CANSEC Defence Minister Peter MacKay and Associate Defence Minister Julian Fantino stopped by the General Dynamics booth for a briefing on the new technologies that are being built into the LAV IIIIs.

CANSEC exhibitors will also highlight other ongoing army
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The fog of war has no place in procurement

The fog of war is an unfortunate consequence of conflict but it has no place in procurement.

The Harper Conservatives’ deceitful campaign of misinformation contributed to his election victory but at the cost of deliberately lying to confuse Parliament and the people of Canada on the F-35 procurement. It has created a poisonous atmosphere which puts at risk Canadians, our sovereignty, our security and our military personnel.

It is said that there is a holy trinity of procurement: costs, mission profile, and industrial benefits. Under Harper it has become the unholy trinity of understated costs, mission mystery, and dubious benefits.

On costs, the development of this plane has been plagued by well-documented problems. Currently, Lockheed Martin is only four per cent along the development schedule when they should have been 35–45 per cent through by now.

In the unlikely event that all the planes contemplated were actually produced and sold, U.S. law says no nation can buy more cheaply than the U.S. Department of Defense. To date, the U.S. estimates the F-35 to cost at least $137 million per plane.

The Minister and Associate Minister of Defence keep repeating that the purchasing envelope will be $9 billion for 65 airplanes at $75 million — this is a fantasy.

On life cycle costs, the Parliamentary Budget Officer (PBO) has noted that the Minister has used the CF-18 repair history as the basis for predicting this plane’s likely repair costs and availability. This is like saying that a pickup truck spends as much time in the garage as a Porsche.

On the industrial benefits the Auditor General notes that there is no guarantee Canada will get contracts. It’s helpful to think of the CF-18s and the F-35s as being like a PC versus a Mac. Any computer shop can repair a PC. The F-35, however, is the Steve Jobs repair model. You can’t even pry it open. Only Apple can repair it and you only get it back when Apple says that it’s available.

Traditional procurement contracts work on a two-for-one model. One dollar of taxpayer’s money yields two dollars in industrial benefits over the life cycle of the assets.

Not so with the F-35. There is little or no chance that Canada will ever host repair centres because the F-35 is like a Mac, not a PC. This means there will be few contracts for Canadian companies to compete for.

Finally, the government was disingenuous when it told Canadians that billions of industrial offsets would come our way.

**Commentary**

John McKay is the Member of Parliament for Scarborough–Guildwood and Critic for Defence for the Liberal Party of Canada
THE GOOD OLD DAYS; EVERYBODY longs for them. Things were better then. Kids listened to their parents. Music wasn’t full of cuss words, the movies weren’t full of sex, and everyone’s picket fence was white. Men were men: they smoked, drank, worked hard and had happy wives meeting them at the door with slippers and a highball. Sure, people lathered themselves in Brylcreem or dressed like permed poodles, but that never really hurt anyone, now did it? No, they were good times, good times indeed.

All garbage, mind you, but you can’t blame people for lamenting days past when the present isn’t exactly going as planned. Never mind that it didn’t go according to plan then either. But with movie reels and television shows, songs and stories all giving the impression that past generations lived lives pulled right from the pages of a Disney fairy tale, it’s the sort of nostalgia you can understand. What is beyond comprehension is any sort of longing for a return to global conflict. From veterans’ testimonials to film footage and stories all giving the impression that past generations lived lives pulled right from the pages of a Disney fairy tale, it’s the sort of nostalgia you can understand.

More than a few, apparently. For years exhortations to war have come from the likes of Rick Hillier and a generation of officers sick of blue helmets, yearning for a time when soldiers were soldiers, and officers could send them off to the meat grinder without so many troubling restrictions. Historians and politicians alike have been pounding the nation-forming drum that was Vimy Ridge, conveniently forgetting the tanker loads of blood spilt to bring that nostalgic twinkle to their eye. Even overpaid athletes like to catch a little of that warrior mojo, with nowhere to prove their bravery outside of a hockey rink. They’re soldiers, they’re at war, even confronting the same fears of death as 9/11 first responders, if the hyperbole of CBC’s Ron MacLean is to be believed. Who knew NHL hockey pucks were explosive?

Not to be outdone, it seems Stephen Harper and John Baird aren’t content with their current roles, seeing themselves as latter-day Churchills and Roosevelts, making those big decisions in the face of the mortal threat that is the Taliban. While not exactly a new tactic amongst members of the Harper Government™, Harper and Baird invoked the Hitler boogeyman in their ongoing defence of extending Canada’s military efforts in Afghanistan. Specifically, they suggested that the NDP was against Canada’s decision to join Britain to fight Hitler and his Nazi horde. The implication was obvious: you were yellow then and you’re yellow now! Leave it to statesmen with balls, if you don’t mind.

Like most trips down memory lane, they got it all wrong, not the least of which being that the NDP didn’t even exist in 1939, and its precursor party, the CCF, most definitely did vote with parliament to declare war. Their leader’s sole dissenting vote was that of a conscientious objector; a deeply religious man who could not reconcile the reality of war with his principles.

But more to the point, what Canada and the world faced then and what they face now is so utterly different in scale one wonders if the Harper cabinet gets its military intelligence from reruns of A Bridge Too Far. The Nazis had the blood of forty-plus-million lives on their hands by the end of WWII. They had the might of an advanced, industrialized nation at their command. The terrorists of today achieve more through luck than might, their successes are relatively few, and their resources and abilities are pitiful in comparison.

Yet you’d think there was a new blitzkrieg about to run us down. We need the latest jet fighters! We need tanks! Helicopters! Boots on the ground! But we aren’t dealing with Panzers and U-boats anymore; what stops terrorism is intelligence, intelligence and more intelligence, not stealth fighters. Nevertheless, Harper continues to cut from Foreign Affairs, which contrary to popular opinion was good for more than a good cocktail party. He’s also cut funding for border security, leaving the threat of an overpriced intelligence, intelligence and more intel U-boats anymore; what stops terrorism is intelligence, not stealth fighters. Nevertheless, Harper continues to cut from Foreign Affairs, which contrary to popular opinion was good for more than a good cocktail party. He’s also cut funding for border security, leaving the threat of an overpriced intelligence, intelligence and more intel.

For when it comes down to it jets are sexy. War is sexy. Intelligence reports and relative peace aren’t. Where are the good old days when you need them, eh? Forgotten is the fact that those days saw a Blitzkrieg about to run us down. We need the latest jet fighters! We need tanks! Helicopters! Boots on the ground!

But for when it comes down to it jets are sexy. War is sexy. Intelligence reports and relative peace aren’t. Where are the good old days when you need them, eh? Forgotten is the fact that those days saw a Blitzkrieg about to run us down. We need the latest jet fighters! We need tanks! Helicopters! Boots on the ground!

Michael Nickerson is a freelance writer and satirist based in Toronto. His website is www.NickersonOnline.com
Dereliction of duty on the F-35

THE FOREMOST RESPONSIBILITY OF a national government is the protection of the country and her citizens. The military exists to ensure that protection. The bureaucracy is required to arm, armour, and supply the military in fulfillment of national security.

In terms of replacing our aging CF-18 Hornet fighters, all three entities are currently in a “dereliction of duty.” Our military leaders in particular know that there must always be alternate plans, strategic contingencies, and evolving tactics; because potential antagonists will not follow your carefully drawn scenarios.

If the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter turns out to be a flightless dodo bird, what are plans B, C, D, etc.? Any flag-ranked officer will have gone to a military college to study the past, but be ready for the future, with the full understanding that on meeting the enemy, our equipment, tactics, or warriors may fail, and that other actions and options must be at the ready.

To say that the F-35 cannot fail because there are no other options is the height of irresponsibility, and makes one wonder whether the leaders in question have a sound mix of education, intellect, and common sense.

Appeasement towards the United States is another unspoken factor, but even the Americans are questioning the money pit that the JSF program is becoming. In that same vein, is Canada to be interoperable with her allies, or merely a redundant cog in the American military machine?

Sixty-five whiz-bang, almost invisible, super-duper, first-strike aircraft are meant to replace 138 Canadian Hornets (now down to 77), and would spend almost all of their time having their Klingon cloaking device repaired. To have an effective air force capability in the near- to mid-term, we will have to operate two different fighter aircraft types — and that is not a bad thing.

We are a (very) junior partner in NORAD, which is charged with the defence of North America from airborne threats, but should we not at least attempt to have an aerial intercept capability for the Pacific region?

Recently, there was a bomb threat aboard a Korean Airlines jet leaving Vancouver en route to Korea. Guess what happened? Because the western-most of our two fighter bases is located on the Alberta/Saskatchewan border, the CF-18s are simply too far away, so the Americans scrambled two F-15s from Portland, Oregon to intercept the airliner over the Queen Charlotte Islands.

Sixty-five fighter aircraft, especially ones that have a short range and cannot work from short northern airfields is simply not enough. And as the song goes, “The times they are a changing” applies doubly for aerospace and robotic technology.

“The drones are coming.” And following on are autonomous combat robots, which is something the entire world should talk about — and maybe ban. Aerial drones will not, in the medium term, replace tactical fighters, but they will be capable of long duration reconnaissance and patrol, as well as the search part of search and rescue.

Remotely-piloted drones require two-way communication connectivity from satellites, aircraft, or ground sources to operate. That connectivity requirement is the weak link in the “massive swarm of cheap combat drones” idea, and assures that human-piloted aircraft will be around for quite a while. If in doubt, google the US-Iran spy drone incident. It is not only major technological countries that can threaten drone viability, even Iran can spoof American technology.

In the end, Canada needs up to 100 fighter aircraft to meet our sovereignty requirements and allied obligations. We should stay involved in the JSF program as long as massive further investments are not required. But another fighter, preferably of the air superiority variety, is needed before the F-35 can be fully operational and combat ready.

If the F-35 does produce a cost-effective combat aircraft sometime in the mid-2020s, then we could procure a couple of squadrons of them to compliment the 60 or more modern fighters that will replace the CF-18s in the near-term. On the chance the JSF does not come to fruition, then we will still be involved in technologies that can be applied to future aircraft, such as a workable F-22 Raptor, or a more international Eurofighter-type aircraft.

Japan, Australia, Canada, and South Korea are pretty much in the same boat regarding the need for a modern high-tech fighter that is interoperable with our allies.

Mark M. Miller

is a Vancouver-based research consultant who writes on international and military affairs.
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This Infantry Fighting Vehicle offers Canada a battle-proven solution for the CCV program

by Scott Taylor

For those Canadian soldiers who had the opportunity to observe the French Army contingent in Afghanistan, it would have been readily apparent that France is fielding some state-of-the-art new armoured vehicles. Most notable would be the Véhicule blindé de combat d’infanterie (VBCI), the new generation armoured infantry fighting vehicle.

With a height of three metres and a normal combat weight of 25 tonnes, these 8x8 wheeled vehicles present an imposing force on the Afghan battlefield. The aluminium hull of the VBCI, with its modular THD steel and titanium armour, has repeatedly proven itself to be the match of all improvised explosive devices (IEDs).

Although the vehicles have sustained severe damage — in one case, the loss of three road wheels — all VBCIs were able to extricate themselves from ambush sites under their own power. While some French soldiers have been lightly wounded during these engagements, not a single fatality has been incurred among crewmembers of a VBCI.

As for mobility, despite the fact that it is a wheeled armoured vehicle, the VBCI was custom-designed to accompany France’s Leclerc Main Battle Tanks into combat. As such, it possesses the ability to traverse the same challenging terrain as that of a tracked vehicle. It is exactly these qualities that Canada is seeking to acquire with the Close Combat Vehicle (CCV) procurement project. When the CCV was first announced in 2009, the criterion for the 108-vehicle fleet required that it be a battle-proven, well-protected infantry fighting vehicle, capable of operating in conjunction with our Leopard 2 main battle tanks on future battlefields. Normally, it would be specified in the competition criteria whether the new vehicles could be either tracked or wheeled. In this case, Canada has kept both options open.

Nexter Systems, the manufacturer of the VBCI, felt so confident in their design that they submitted two variants for consideration in the Canadian CCV competition. The first variant was the VBCI-25 — essentially the same infantry fighting vehicle model currently in service with the French army in Afghanistan. This proposed solution offers a 25mm M811, dual-feed automatic gun, along with a coaxial 7.62mm machine gun in an all-enclosed one-man turret.

The second vehicle submitted by Nexter was the VBCI-30, which combines the standard chassis and drive train with a new two-man HITFIST power-operated turret made by the Italian company Oto Melara. As indicated by the designation number, this model packs a Mk44 30mm main gun.

Testing on the CCV contenders began in August 2011, with a variety of tests conducted at both CFB Valcartier, Quebec, and at the esteemed American facility in Aberdeen, Maryland. Up against the two Nexter VBCI models were the BAE Systems Hägglunds CV90 (tracked infantry fighting vehicle) and the General Dynamics Piranha 5 (wheeled infantry fighting vehicle).

In late March of this year, the three CCV bidders were called to Ottawa and notified that all four of the submitted vehicle designs had failed to meet the requirements.

While DND procurement officials had hoped to work through the discrepancies with the cooperation of industry, the fairness monitor presiding over major defence projects ruled that it was too...
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late to effect a bid repair. As a result, a request for proposal (RFP) for the CCV has been re-issued and the competing companies will have to start the whole process again from scratch.

At the time of publication, it had not been formally revealed as to which vehicle design had failed in which category of the testing, but insiders believe it was not one common shortcoming.

Reportedly, there was difficulty for some vehicles in mobility, others with protection and another had a firepower/accuracy problem. The companies who were deemed non-compliant following the initial testing will have the opportunity to decide whether or not the new RFP will offer a lower standard requirement, or if their vehicle’s design deficiency can be overcome in a subsequent competition.

The restarting of the process will also allow other potential bidders to get back on board. The cost to compete in this process is not inconsequential, given that for each model submitted, the company had to submit two vehicles for testing — one of each design was then “tested to destruction” at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds.

For Nexter, which had two separate variants entered, this meant providing the Canadian government with a total of four VBCIs. (This would have amounted to close to a $20 million investment with no guarantee of a sale.)

While the name Nexter Systems is relatively new in international defence circles, the company was in fact born out of a major restructuring of the French government-owned GIAT armament firm back in 2005. Although still state-owned, Nexter was able to decrease considerably the size of its workforce and, as a result, has become increasingly competitive in the export market. Tracing back the GIAT lineage to 1764, the Nexter legacy as a weapon manufacturer predates the rule of Napoleon Bonaparte in France.

Primarily producers of main battle tanks, artillery, armoured vehicles and ammunition, Nexter (GIAT) has produced a number of 105mm light artillery pieces which remain in Canadian service.

Although this may seem like a small foot in the door of the Canadian and North American markets, Nexter views their relationship with Canada as that of an existing customer.

Naturally, a successful bid in the CCV competition would result in a much-expanded connection between Nexter and Canadian industry. Even though the RFP calls for an initial purchase of just 108 vehicles (with an option for an additional 30), Nexter has partnered with Canadian companies that would produce, assemble and maintain the VBCI fleet throughout the duration of its entire service life.

The timeline schedule required to produce the 108 CCVs (once under contract) is an ambitious 24 months. As a result of the relatively short duration of this construction phase, Nexter representatives have sought out Canadian firms that already possess certain capabilities — such as being able to weld the vehicle’s thick aluminium panels — rather than trying to develop them from scratch. Approximately 43 Canadian companies have been shortlisted by the Nexter team to produce various components for the VBCI. The major assembly will be done by Bombardier, with Prévost producing the power plant and driveline (under license from Renault). Both of these companies are based in Quebec, but Raytheon Canada (Calgary) will provide the long-term service support should the VBCI enter into Canadian service.

To date, France is the only nation fielding the VBCI. So far, they have taken delivery of over 300 vehicles from a total order of 630 units. The vehicles were first deployed operationally in 2008 and have seen service in Kosovo, Lebanon and, most notably, Afghanistan.

As with most NATO allies, the battlefield lessons learned led the French army to make minor expedient alternations to their in-theatre VBCIs. These modifications are now being incorporated into the new production VBCIs to further improve their survivability against rocket-propelled grenades and IEDs.

With part of the Canadian criterion for selecting a design for the CCV being that it must be battle-proven, the Nexter VBCI certainly scores well in that regard.

In 2010 the VBCI was regularly used in combat missions by French infantry regiments. During Operation PROMISING STAR in the fall of that year, this 8x8 wheeled vehicle outperformed expectations in the Tagab valley because of its multifunctionality and ability to manoeuvre in rough terrain. (FRENCH ARMY)
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EYE ON INDUSTRY

Ottawa company provides protection solutions for Canada’s vehicles

by Scott Taylor

When Canadian combat soldiers first deployed into Afghanistan in 2001 they were equipped to wage a conventional war, not a long, protracted counterinsurgency campaign. As it soon became evident that improvised explosive devices (IEDs) constituted the greatest threat, the Canadian military hastily sought solutions to provide additional protection to their armoured vehicles.

One of the instrumental defence contractors who took a lead role in these modifications was Engineering Office Deisenroth Canada (EODC), a division of the internationally renowned IBD Deisenroth of Lohmar, Germany.

Established in Canada in 2001, EODC was able to quickly respond to the demands of the Afghan theatre with the provision of protection solutions for the Canadian Forces. More than 300 Canadian Light Armoured Vehicles (LAV) have been provided with add-on armour by EODC over the past decade, with many of them being retrofitted in Kandahar by EODC employees deployed to the forward NATO base.

One of the EODC specialties is the Modular Expandable Armour System (MEXAS), which is designed to enhance the maximum ballistic protection of existing vehicle types. This has since been developed into the more expansive Advanced Modular Armour Protection (AMAP) program, which is not a single modification, but rather a series of potential protection enhancements.

To best understand this concept, one needs to imagine four concentric circles representing four hierarchal defence goals (see diagram on page 12). Like an onion, it has many layers.

“Don’t be seen” is the first objective, at the outer extreme. To reduce the visibility of the armoured vehicle, EODC has designed a system known as Advanced Modular Protection – Signature Management (AMP–SM). It includes a variety of measures aimed at minimizing a vehicle’s thermal footprint, silhouette and radar detection.

The second level of protection follows the “Don’t be hit” mantra. Defensive measures at this stage include an Active Defence System (AMP–ADS), which can detect and counter an incoming projectile before it strikes.

If that fails, it is the “Don’t be penetrated” level of protection. In this category, the AMAP has a whole range of solutions aimed at defeating ballistic threats, mines, IEDs and shaped-charge explosives, along with additional roof protection to defeat proximity projectiles.

Should the EODC enhanced armoured vehicle still be penetrated, the last line of defence lies in the “Don’t be killed” objective. To facilitate this, AMAP offers both mine protection seats and a custom-designed, interior liner system to protect the vehicle’s crew.

During the CANSEC 2009 show in Ottawa, IBD and its daughter company EODC introduced the Evolution Concept for armoured infantry fighting vehicles (AFVs) and armored personnel Carriers (APCs). Originally, the Evolution Survivability Concept was developed for the Main Battle Tank Leopard 2A4. It provides a balanced broadband protection against the full spectrum of today’s threats in theatre with minimum weight. This concept has now been tailored to medium armoured vehicles such as AFVs and APCs. The Evolution Concept is generic and can be applied on a wide range of vehicles. In Canada they are mainly targeting the upcoming CCV and TAPV programs. (courtesy IBD)
BRINGING CANADIAN SOLDIERS SAFELY HOME

SURVIVABILITY, PERFORMANCE AND MOBILITY PROTECT FROM THREATS ON THE ASYMMETRIC BATTLEFIELD

The Canadian Army requires a modern armoured vehicle that provides greater survivability, mobility and versatility to operate in changing conflict environments.

The Textron Tactical Armoured Patrol Vehicle (TAPV) improves upon our combat-proven Armoured Security Vehicle used by the U.S. Army in Afghanistan and Iraq and now being adopted by the Afghan National Army. With advanced ballistic and blast protection and unsurpassed off-road and urban maneuverability, the TAPV offers advantages that will carry our soldiers safely home. Crew protection, mobility, performance and payload flexibility make the TAPV a game-changing solution built for use by the Canadian Army for the next 25 years.

The Textron TAPV solution is further strengthened by a dedicated Canadian team: Rheinmetall Canada, Kongsberg Protech Systems and EODC. Through our new Ottawa facility and application of world-class technologies and processes, the Textron Systems team is positioned to deliver the most advanced armoured patrol vehicle on time and on budget; and continue our support of Canadian soldiers for years to come.

For additional information, please visit http://texrontapv.ca.
With Canada’s current fleet of medium sized logistics trucks reduced to a rusty useless heap too dangerous to operate in the demanding environments frequented by Canadian soldiers, the long awaited replacement of the MLVW should be just around the corner.

Throwing their hat into the ring, Navistar Defence teamed with TATRA in 2010 to create the ATX8, an impressive eight-wheeled vehicle, as an answer to Canada’s modern demands on its military transport capabilities. Navistar Defence is an affiliate of Navistar International Corporation, a U.S. based military vehicle manufacturer which has supplied vehicles to the U.S., Canadian and UK militaries.

By teaming with TATRA Navistar was able to bring over 80 years of military chassis technology experience to the design of the ATX8. The Tatra Tactical Chassis Technology brings with it an independent suspension system that allows each wheel to move independently to maintain the best tire-to-ground contact. Even with that flexibility, the superstructure is capable of hauling up to 21,000 kg. Optional body variations include a remote-operated crane that is ideal for recovery missions. (Photo courtesy Navistar Defense)

Navistar Defence’s standard military pattern truck does the job it’s built to do.
A key component and MVP for Canada’s Northern Search and Rescue Team

The Viking Twin Otter has been operating in the Canadian Arctic for over 40 years, utilized for Search & Rescue, transport and Ranger support roles for the Canadian Forces’ northern operations.

Because of its rugged reliability and ease of maintenance, the purpose-built Viking Twin Otter aircraft has become an essential member of Canada’s Search and Rescue team; with the ability to operate from water, snow, tundra or tarmac, the Twin Otter is a first responder in any operating environment.

The Government of Canada outlined defending Canada as its primary role in the “Canada First Defence Strategy,” including protecting citizens and exercising Canada’s sovereignty. This calls upon the replacement of Canada’s fixed-wing search and rescue fleet; the first responder in search and rescue and constant staple for missions in extreme arctic environments, the Viking Twin Otter has already been proven as the obvious choice for northern-based Search and Rescue.

Equipped with electro-optical and infrared sensor packages, the new Viking Twin Otter Guardian 400 will continue the campaign that the legacy de Havilland Twin Otters began forty years ago, protecting Canadians with a Canadian-built product, right here at home.

PROUDLY DESIGNED, MANUFACTURED AND MAINTAINED IN CANADA.
21,000 kg, and still providing incredible resilience against twisting and bending in the chassis.

Any vehicle capable of transporting that much weight must have a significant power plant and the ATX8 is no exception. Powered by the Navistar MaxxForce D12 engine, the ATX8 puts out 1,453 lb-ft of torque at 1,000 RPM from the 450 horsepower engine. That power pushes the ATX8 up to a top speed of 115 km/h. Helping to provide that substantial torque and speed is an Allison 4500SP six-speed automatic transmission which also allows the ATX8 to maintain a road range of 1,100 km.

As with any military vehicle power is a must, but so is flexibility. Military vehicles, just like the soldiers that use them need to be able to adapt to the mission, even on the fly. It is very apparent those requirements were taken into consideration when the ATX8 was on the drawing board.

Given the size and power of the vehicle the ATX8 is home to some surprising bells and whistles one would expect in a much smaller, non-military vehicle. Perhaps the most impressive of these qualities is the ability to alter the chassis height. Even while on the move the operator of the ATX8 has the ability to alter the ride height as the terrain changes and new obstacle come into sight. For adapting to the unexpected in a combat role, this ability is incredibly important. Even with the best route-recon, unexpected changes to conditions can often bring large logistics convoys to a crawl. With the flexibility provided by the ATX8 those concerns are limited by the strength and maneuverability of the vehicle.

As Canada has experienced with the current fleet of logistics vehicles serving the mission in Afghanistan, it is important to have a vehicle that can endure the rigors of a combat environment. To that end, the cab of the ATX8 is specifically designed with the knowledge and expectation that vehicles deployed to highly volatile and war torn regions will require an added element of protection in the form of aftermarket armor upgrades.

With the unpredictability of deployments, it is important that any vehicle Canada purchases be able to operate in any environment. The ATX8 has proven it has that ability. With the ability to operate in ambient temperature between -32 and +49 degrees Celsius, there are few operating environments where the ATX8 doesn’t find itself right at home. And with the on-board HVAC system, the soldiers operating the vehicle will also be kept safe and comfortable as they move goods and equipment to where they are needed most.

Of course the ATX8 has to be a vehicle capable of quickly deploying around the world in support of military and humanitarian operations. To that end, the dimensions of the ATX8 still allow the vehicle to be loaded onto a C-130 Hercules. Soldiers used to loading and unloading logistics vehicles will also appreciate that the ATX8 is supported by a rear mounted hydraulic crane capable of lifting up to 5,500 kg.

Navistar’s global parts and services network will be utilized to provide maintenance and support to the ATX8. That local support will allow Navistar and Tatra to meet the requirements of Canada’s Industrial and Regional Benefits Policy. The IRB requires companies awarded defence contracts to place business in Canada at an equal value to the contract awarded.

Navistar has been producing military vehicles since World War I. Under the original name of International Harvester, the company was quickly pressed into action to support the war effort. During World War II the company once again took up the effort, switching the entirety of its commercial operations to the production of M-series trucks for the U.S. Marine Corps and Navy.

Tatra is one of the oldest vehicle manufacturers in the world. Based in the Czech Republic, Tatra has been producing vehicles since 1850. Only Daimler and Peugeot are older.
Every day, Raytheon customers undertake vital missions across air, land, sea, space and cyberspace. Our mission is to provide innovative, integrated technologies across these domains to ensure customer success and deliver a true operational advantage, mission after mission.
In recent years Canada has witnessed the need to have the ability to deploy quickly in response to natural disasters and humanitarian crises in addition to maintaining operations in Afghanistan.

Around the world, in the last several years, countries have had to mobilize in support of natural and man-made disasters, often with international support. Canada has always played an important role as a first responder, deploying assistance groups from the military, RCMP, and other organizations — both government and civilian — to operate in nearly impossible environments, facing extreme obstacles.

Often, as part of deploying forces and personnel to inhospitable zones, it is necessary to have the ability to quickly establish both command and control as well as a base of operations.

In order to meet the demand of nations and militaries needing the flexibility required by the uncertainty many of these situations present, Marshall Land Systems has created a suite of options designed to meet the requirements of any event civilian responders or the military may find themselves thrown into.

Marshall Specialist Vehicles, a part of the Marshall Land Systems Group, has designed modular units that can operate as anything from command and control centres to medical and laboratory systems.

Based out of fully integrated containers, MSV’s solutions are already in use around the world with Deployable Medical Systems already meeting UK, Norwegian and European regulations for health care. Medical facilities can even include full X-ray capabilities and a mobile CT scanner. Every aspect of a hospital is taken into account including laboratories, a central sterile supply department, power and maintenance, and even a kitchen.

In addition to medical facilities, the MSV design can also provide advanced laboratory capabilities, including forensic facilities, with an integrated capacity for evidence storage. Given the modern state
of warfare as seen in environments such as Afghanistan, maintaining evidence and providing the capability for forensic exploitation is an important requirement for the creation of a credible justice system as well as for intelligence operations.

When dealing with any humanitarian crisis, more than highly deployable field hospitals and laboratories are needed. Advanced command and control is also crucial to achieving mission success in any environment.

The modular design offered by MSV allows for deployable workspace environments that meet the functional requirements of any mission. Even in cases where advanced capabilities for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance are a requirement, MSV provides the resources for ground control systems and intelligence centres that can be in place and ready for operations soon after hitting the ground.

With the current nature of warfare and the need to adapt quickly to humanitarian crises of any scope, quick-response units are always looking for a means to be faster and more agile, while also increasing operational functions. The ability to deploy modular self-sustained working environments quickly provides an immeasurable level of force multiplication that cannot be overstated.

During any humanitarian or disaster response mission, important administrative operations are always needed. Whether supporting embassies as they seek to help citizens contact loved ones back home, or assisting hospitals as they try to reunite the injured with their families, the often-unseen administrative tasks of a mission are absolutely vital.

With the capabilities provided by MSV, the ability to operate fully functional administrative support as part of a command and control mission allows responders to have the impact they hope their dedication to the mission will achieve.
Anne-France Goldwater is known to the Quebec television audience as L’Arbitre, a francophone version of Judge Judy. This year, she was chosen as one of the panellists for the Canada Reads competition, which seeks to determine this year’s ‘must-read’ work of non-fiction through a process of debate and elimination.

Ms. Goldwater is an able debater; opinionated, defensive and quite colourful in her description of the authors who penned her book’s competition. A small media storm broke over the CBC when she used some of that colourful language to describe Carmen Aguirre, author of Something Fierce: Memoirs of a Revolutionary Daughter, which gives an intimate portrait of her teenage years in the Chilean resistance movement.

“Carmen Aguirre is a bloody terrorist. How we let her into Canada, I don’t understand,” professed Ms. Goldwater when asked by host Jian Ghomeshi to sum up the authors being debated. Naturally, after uttering the ‘T’ word, everyone’s PC alarms sounded and she was asked to clarify her statement.

“Once a terrorist, always a terrorist, that’s for sure,” was Ms. Goldwater’s response to those who questioned her strong assessment of Ms. Aguirre’s anti-Pinochet proclivities.

Plenty of people have weighed in on whether or not Ms. Goldwater spoke too harshly of Ms. Aguirre’s actions in an oppressive regime and of Canadian immigration policies. What hasn’t been examined is why people chose to react to the terrorist label with feeling instead of understanding of that word’s use or misuse.

Ask the average Canadian to describe a terrorist and, depending on their respective life experience, they will likely paint a vague picture of a bearded man in a cave brandishing a rocket launcher or a distraught traveller with C-4 explosive strapped to his chest attempting to board a plane. These impressions have been branded into our collective consciousness as the status quo of what defines a terrorist. But the method of warfare defined as terrorism was being practiced long before September 11, 2001 — we are just more comfortable using the term now.

The question remains of how a tactic that employs surprise attacks on civilian populations has morphed into a label for a group. Our man-on-the-street definition of a terrorist would likely also include a wider group known simply and universally as The Terrorists.

It helps to start with historical perspective. The earliest known organization to use aspects of a modern terrorist organization was the Zealots of Judea. Known to the Romans as sicarii, or dagger-men, they carried on an underground campaign of assassination of Roman occupation forces, as well as any Jews they felt had collaborated with the Romans. Their motive was the uncompromising belief that they could not remain faithful to the dictates of Judaism while living as Roman subjects. The belief that one is more pure and enlightened than those they stand against is a common sentiment among ‘terrorists’ throughout history. Eventually, the Zealot revolt became an open war, and they were ultimately besieged and committed mass suicide at the fortification of Masada.

The Assassins were the next group to show recognizable characteristics of terrorism, as we know it today. A breakaway faction of Shia Islam called the Nizari Ismailis adopted the tactic of murdering enemy leaders because the cult’s limited manpower prevented open combat. In light of this we find another common tenant among terrorists — their use of subterfuge due to their relatively small numbers. Their tactic of sending a lone assassin to kill a key enemy leader at the certain sacrifice of his own life (the

Working in small groups, they used the tactic of sending a lone assassin to kill a key enemy leader at the certain sacrifice of his own life, thereby inspiring fearful awe in their enemies. (FROM ASSASSINS CREED, UBISOFT)
Killers waited next to their victims to be killed or captured) inspired fearful awe in their enemies.

Even though both the Zealots and the Assassins operated centuries ago, they are relevant today. First, forerunners of modern terrorists in aspects of motivation, organization, targeting and goals. Secondly, although both were ultimate failures, the fact they are remembered hundreds of years later demonstrates the deep psychological impact they caused.

From the time of the assassins in the late 13th century to the 18th century, terror and barbarism were widely used in warfare and conflict, but key ingredients for terrorism were lacking. It was not until the rise of the modern nation state after the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 that the sort of central authority and civil society that terrorism attempts to influence began to form. Communications were inadequate and controlled, and the causes that might inspire terrorism (religious schism, insurrection, ethnic strife) typically led to open warfare given the fractious nature of society. By the time kingdoms and principalities became nations, they had sufficient means to enforce their authority and suppress activities such as terrorism.

The French Revolution provided the first uses of the words “terrorist” and “terrorism.” Use of the word “terrorism” began in 1795 in reference to the Reign of Terror initiated by the Revolutionary government. The agents of the Committee of Public Safety and the National Convention that enforced the policies of “The Terror” were referred to as “Terrorists.” The French Revolution provided an example to future states in oppressing their populations. It also inspired a reaction by royalists and other opponents of the Revolution who employed terrorist tactics such as assassination and intimidation in resistance to the Revolutionary agents. Such extra-legal activities as killing prominent officials and aristocrats in gruesome spectacles started long before the guillotine was first used.

During the late 19th century, radical political theories and improvements in weapons technology spurred the formation of small groups of revolutionaries who effectively attacked nation-states. Anarchists espousing belief in the “propaganda of the deed” produced some striking successes, assassinating heads of state from Russia, France, Spain, Italy and the United States.
However, their lack of organization and refusal to cooperate with other social movements in political efforts (one of the inherent flaws in anarchism) rendered anarchists ineffective as a political movement. In contrast, communism’s role as an ideological basis for political terrorism was just beginning, and would become much more significant in the 20th century.

Another trend in the late 19th century was the increasing tide of nationalism throughout the world, in which the nation (the identity of the people) and the political state were finally combined. As states began to emphasize national identities, peoples that had been conquered or colonized could, like the Jews at the time of the Zealots, opt for assimilation or struggle. The best-known nationalist conflict from this time is still unresolved — the multi-century struggle for Irish nationalism. Nationalism, like communism, became a much greater ideological force in the 20th century.

The terrorist group from this period that serves as a model in many ways for what was to come was the Russian Narodnya Volya (People’s Will). They differed in some ways from modern terrorists, especially in that they would sometimes call off attacks that might endanger individuals other than their intended targets. Other than these bizarre acts of mercy, we see many of the traits of terrorism here for the first time: clandestine, cellular organization; impatience and inability for the task of organizing the very people they claim to represent; and a tendency to increase the level of violence as pressures on the group mount.

Nationalism intensified during the early 20th century in the wake of two world wars. It became an especially powerful force for the subject people of various colonial empires. Although dissent and resistance were found in many colonial possessions, and sometimes resulted in open warfare, nationalist identities became a focal point for these actions committed against the authorities and those who served them. Ethnicity also became a major factor in the rise of instability. The ‘us and them’ arguments that warranted the violence against certain groups within the context of the nation state made the act of terrorism a common practice.

The ‘total war’ practices of all combatants of WWII provided further justification for the ‘everybody does it’ view of the use of terror and violations of the law of war. The desensitization of people and communities to violence that started in World War I accelerated during WWII. New weapons and strategies that targeted the enemies’ civilian population to destroy their economic capacity for conflict exposed virtually every civilian to the hazards of combatants. The major powers’ support of partisan and resistance organizations using terrorist tactics was viewed as an acceptance of their legitimacy. It seemed the civilians had become legitimate targets, despite any rules forbidding it.

The modern terrorist with which we have become so familiar was born in the bipolar world of the Cold War. Relatively minor confrontations took on significance as arenas where the superpowers could compete without risking escalation to full nuclear war. Warfare between the East and the West took place on the peripheries, and was limited in scope to prevent escalation. During the immediate post-war period, terrorism was more of a tactical choice by leaders of nationalist insurgencies and revolutions. Successful campaigns for independence from colonial rule occurred throughout the world, and many employed terrorism as a supporting tactic. When terrorism was used, it was used within the framework of larger movements, and coordinated with political, social and military action.

The age of modern terrorism might be said to have begun in 1968 when the Popular Front of the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) hijacked an El Al airliner en route from Tel Aviv to Rome. While hijackings of airliners had occurred before, this was the first time that the nationality of the carrier (Israel) and its symbolic value was a specific operational aim. Also, a first was the deliberate use of the passengers as hostages for demands made publicly against the Israeli government. The combination of these unique events, added to the international scope of the operation, gained significant media attention. The founder of PFLP, Dr. George Habash observed that the level of coverage was tremendously greater than battles with Israeli soldiers in their previous area of operations. “At least the world is talking about us now.”

Another aspect of this internationalization is the cooperation between extremist organizations in conducting terrorist operations.
The Military Families Fund: Myth vs. Reality

by Michel W. Drapeau & Joshua M. Juneau

The Military Families Fund (MFF) is a charity that, over the past five years, has raised millions of dollars from ordinary Canadians to help military families who, according to their website, “often face unforeseen and immediate needs that have resulted due to conditions of service.” As we understand it, this charitable trust is administered agreeably by the Canadian Forces Personnel Support Agency (CFPSA), a mixed organization made up of military and civilian staff that delivers morale and welfare programs to retired and serving members of the regular force and the reserves, CF families, DND civilian employees and RCMP personnel.

Funding from the MFF is granted in two stages. Firstly, base and wing commanders, on recommendation from a commanding officer, are entitled to release up to $5,000 in emergency funding for unforeseen and immediate needs. Once this is secure, as part of the second stage, an application may be made to one of the Military Resource Centres that are also located on Canadian bases.

This begs the question: how does a widow of a deceased CF member living in a community not served by a base or wing (say in Gaspé, Sarnia or Prince Rupert) who is in urgent need of financial assistance obtain access to the MFF charity? On the surface, the Military Families Fund seems a very noble and worthy cause; however, with an annual budget of approximately $20 billion provided by Parliament to the defence establishment, the creation of such an ad hoc fund raises many questions, notably:

- Is a $20 billion federal annual allotment to the Department of National Defence insufficient to provide for the full spectrum of care for military families? Really?
- Why do military families, who sacrifice so much to contribute to the safety of the nation, often fall into such peril requiring

The Military Families Fund was created in 2007 to help military families with short-term emergencies and also provide long-term support. The MFF allows CF leadership to meet the special-case needs of CF members and their families with speed and flexibility not always available through the traditional programs. In its first four years of existence, the MFF received $5,099,000 in donations. According to the 2011 annual report, the Fund has disbursed $1,825,000 ($1,775,000 in respect of cases and $50,000 in overhead) since its inception and supported 609 military members and their families. The fund continues to grow through the generous contributions of Canadians, corporations and other organizations, adding a new vehicle to support Canadian Forces members and their families.

The Military Families Fund:

The Military Families Fund was created in 2007 to help military families with short-term emergencies and also provide long-term support. The MFF allows CF leadership to meet the special-case needs of CF members and their families with speed and flexibility not always available through the traditional programs. In its first four years of existence, the MFF received $5,099,000 in donations. According to the 2011 annual report, the Fund has disbursed $1,825,000 ($1,775,000 in respect of cases and $50,000 in overhead) since its inception and supported 609 military members and their families. The fund continues to grow through the generous contributions of Canadians, corporations and other organizations, adding a new vehicle to support Canadian Forces members and their families.
assistance from a charity versus publicly funded organizations either at the federal or provincial level?

• Why is it necessary for the military to appeal to the public for emergency funds to care for our military families? Shouldn’t their pleas not be addressed to Parliament?

• If such an appeal to our civilian brothers and sisters is incapable to provide comfort and assistance to our military families, what happens if the monies collected are insufficient to meet the needs? Alternatively, what happens if the monies collected exceed the demonstrated needs?

There are also other issues of accountability that cause us concern. For example:

• How many millions of dollars have been raised in the MFF’s five-year existence? The latest estimate is $9 million.

• The current MFF Executive Committee, which is administering these funds, is made up of three retired generals and five civilians. Military spouses and non-commissioned members have been excluded from this committee. Are any of these individuals really in tune with the economic challenges and problems facing military families in need?

• The Executive Committee meets only once annually. How much oversight can you provide if you meet only once every twelve months?

• Members of the Executive Committee are paid a $1,000 per diem for attendance at each meeting of the committee or sub-committee and at the rate of $150 per hour for “administrative functions related to their executive functions.” This means that the funds must pay a minimum of $8,000 (plus travel and accommodation expenses) each day the Executive Committee meets. Money which does not in any way help military families. Seems to us that, in keeping with the overused slogan “Caring for our own,” that many retired senior officers and non-commissioned members or their spouses would be most honoured to play this role on a pro bono basis to ensure that all the monies collected be distributed to needy military families.

• What accountability, if any, is being made to ordinary Canadians as to the uses of the collected funds and expenses charged to the MFF?

OUR EXPERIENCE

In operating a legal firm that provides services to military members and families, it is our practice that, in cases where we perceive that emergency funding is needed, we direct our clients to the Canadian Forces Integrated Personnel Service Center (IPSC), which may also refer them to the Military Families Fund for assistance.

However, truth be told, our experience is more one of frustration than satisfaction. Consider the following four case examples where the Military Families Fund has denied funding. We have changed the names to protect the privacy of each person.
CASE NO. 1
With the unusually warm spring temperatures this year, Corporal Abbie Johnson, a reservist in between contracts, woke up one morning to find her ground floor apartment flooded under two feet of water. Her home insurance company refused her claim because her flood coverage was limited to “broken pipes” and not “acts of God.” Abbie instantly found herself in a position where she had no clothes, no food, no furniture, a young family and no home. We directed her to the IPSC to inquire for emergency funding from the Military Families Fund, who state as their mandate to, “assist military families faced with unforeseen and often immediate needs.” She was informed by a financial advisor there that “reservists are not a priority on the list.” This did not qualify as an “emergency” to which the Military Families Fund was willing to react. Next!

CASE NO. 2
As a second example, last year we were called by Mrs. Alice Cornersmith, a widow of an Afghanistan veteran whose sudden death was attributable to service. Alice and her family were having difficulty dealing with the death of Corporal Cornersmith, and felt that some professional counselling could help them through this most difficult and sensitive time. We directed Alice to the Military Families Fund, who under the direction of former chief of defence staff, General Rick Hillier, stated that: “When our families call out for help, we must be able to answer that call immediately.” In a reply letter received ten weeks later, we were informed that the MFF was unwilling to help. Alice was directed to bereavement services and the nearest IPSC – which was located hundreds of miles away from her residence in central Ontario. We can only assume that, according to the Military Families Fund, this was not a family in immediate need. Next!

CASE NO. 3
As a third example, consider Mrs. Helen O’Malley, who also lost her husband, also an Afghanistan veteran, and who has three university-aged children. Mrs. O’Malley, living on a widow’s pension, was having difficulty making ends meet, maintaining her mortgage payment, car payments, and university tuition for her children. Helen appealed to the Military Families Fund for emergency funding while she worked to downsize her home and get her affairs in order. Her request was denied, and she was directed to the Hero’s Fund. This family was also not worthy of funding from the Military Families Fund. Next!

CASE NO. 4
Finally, just this year, recruit Jack Stinson — who is paid at the level of private and living in married quarters on base — and his newly pregnant wife with serious health problems, noticed a serious health decline in both himself and his wife. In response, he paid to have an independent air quality assessment done on his public married quarters. The results were not favourable, and so, for fear of his health and that of his family, Jack appealed directly to the Military Families Fund for temporary accommodation while the
According to the figures released by DND, if Canada had 100,000 troops, there would have been 29.4 suicides in 2011. A rate of 29 suicides per 100,000 people is high enough to rank in the top five countries in the world and almost as high as South Korea, where suicide is the number one cause of death for people under the age of 40.

A statement released on the Department of National Defence website and echoed by Defence Minister Peter MacKay and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence Chris Alexander, claims that the military suicide rate is actually lower than the civilian rate, and that the increase in suicides for 2011 does not prove an upward trend in troops taking their own lives.

Even when comparing the civilian population by age to a comparable age group for the Canadian Forces, the suicide rate among troops is still double the civilian rate. The 2008 civilian suicide rate for Canadians between the ages of 20 and 54 is just over 14 per 100,000. At 29.4 per 100,000, the CF number is shockingly high.

Even when comparing the civilian population by age to a comparable age group for the Canadian Forces, the suicide rate among troops is still double the civilian rate. The 2008 civilian suicide rate for Canadians between the ages of 20 and 54 is just over 14 per 100,000. At 29.4 per 100,000, the CF number is shockingly high.

The only civilian rate higher than that experienced by the military in 2011 is that of men over the age of 90, who experienced a rate of 33.1 in 2008 according to Statistics Canada.

In the House of Commons on May 4, Alexander asserted: “The suicide rate within the Canadian Forces remains lower than that in the Canadian population in general. It has not risen, even over the course of 10 years in Afghanistan.”

The increase in suicides comes despite increased mental health screening and awareness programs implemented in 2009.

Statistics released by DND to the Toronto Star indicate there were 31 attempted suicides in 2011 in addition to the 20 Canadian Forces members who died.

According to information released by DND, the spike in suicides witnessed in 2011 is unique, with 13 being the most suicides experienced by the military in any year since 1995.

In the wake of the suicide rate spiking in 2011, David Pugliese reported in the Ottawa Citizen plans for DND to cut the medical professionals tasked with suicide prevention and monitoring post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). According to Pugliese’s May 3 article, the union representing civilian support staff has been told the Deployment Mental Health Research Section is being shut down as a cost-saving measure.

Lieutenant-General (ret’d) Romeo Dallaire, now a Liberal senator, has himself admitted to attempting suicide four times since the mission in Rwanda left him experiencing PTSD.

“One suicide it too many and we have too many every year,” Chief of Defence Staff General Walt Natynczyk said during a Senate defence committee hearing.
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DND officials told the House of Commons public accounts committee that Parliamentary Budget Officer Kevin Page has his F-35 Joint Strike Fighter budget numbers all wrong, and the Auditor General is wrong too. The committee heard from defence officials claiming Page’s estimate of a total cost of $29 billion is wrong.

Defence Department Deputy Minister Robert Fonberg insists DND’s estimated cost of $15 billion is more accurate, given the difficulty in projecting costs and specifically operating costs at this stage in the development of the Joint Strike Fighter.

Fonberg also criticized Auditor General Michael Ferguson for his testimony to the committee, saying he “got it wrong” when discussing the budget.

In the same hearing, commander of the Royal Canadian Air Force, Lieutenant-General André Deschamps, maintained that he is still preparing for the eventual purchase of the F-35. According to Deschamps, the F-35 remains the only aircraft that will meet the needs of Canada as other militaries are advancing technologies and building their own “fifth-generation” jets.

“Currently, from an air force perspective, we are focused on delivering a transition to the F-35,” said Deschamps.

In the following days, Page defended his budget for the F-35 to committee and the media.

“I see actually no logic as a budget officer to use 20 years when we know that the real life cycle is going to be 30 years, potentially more,” said Page.

In a brief media availability outside the committee hearing, Page affirmed he believes the government wanted Canadians to believe the JSF cost less than the budget circulating internally.
DND STILL PURCHASING THE F-35
A report tabled before the House of Commons in early May by the Defence Department reveals the government has no intention of pursuing aircraft other than the F-35 to replace the aging fleet of CF-18s.

As reported by The Hill Times on May 14, Treasury Board Secretary Tony Clement tabled the report which projects the first of the F-35 fleet will be in Canadian hands in 2017, one year later than planned in the same report last year.

The new plans come as reports out of the U.S. have increased the projected cost to Canada for the Joint Strike Fighter to $45 billion over a projected 30-year lifespan.

The apparent recommitment to the F-35 also comes on the heels of weeks of backpedaling and messaging as a result of an Auditor General’s report strongly criticizing both DND and Public Works for the lack of due diligence surround the JSF procurement process.

“No decision has been taken. We are awaiting, as recommended by the Auditor General, the response to his concerns with regard to various issues,” Associate Minister of Defence Julian Fantino told a session of Committee of the Whole on May 9.

CHANGE AT THE TOP IMMINENT?
 Rumours have started circulating about a possible replacement for Chief of Defence Staff Walt Natynczyk, and when the new CDS could take over for the soon-to-be-retiring general.

With reports suggesting Natynczyk could exit his post as early as the end of June, a long list of potential replacements has been bandied about as the military looks for a new leader to carry the guidon.

Some of those mentioned include Vice-Admiral Paul Maddison, commander of the RCN; Lieutenant-General Stu Beare, commander of CEFCON; and Lieutenant-General Tom Lawson, who is currently serving as the deputy commander at NORAD.

With the combat mission in Afghanistan now replaced by a less robust training presence, the choice for CDS could be seen as indicative of a new state of mind and a new strategy within DND.

At this time no date has been provided for Natynczyk to step aside, though he himself replaced General Rick Hillier on July 2, 2008 and so a summer change of command ceremony is likely.

In June 2008, outgoing General Rick Hillier (right) and soon-to-be Chief of Defence Staff General Walt Natynczyk were spotted on Parliament Hill. As the last change of command for the CDS took place in July 2008, rumour has it a new CDS could be appointed as early as June. (CP/DAVID MCCORD, DND)

REDUCED COMMITMENT IN AFGHANISTAN
Beginning in July 2012, the Canadian Army will be sending up to 100 fewer trainers to the mission in Afghanistan. Operation ATTENTION, Canada’s component of the NATO Training Mission–Afghanistan (NTM-A), provides for training and professional development services to the Afghan national security forces. This is the CF’s third major mission contribution to multinational operations in southwest Asia, following Op ATHENA (2003 – 2011) and Op APOLLO (2001 – 2003).

Since the combat operation was concluded in July 2011, Canada has pledged to commit up to 1,000 trainers to increase the professionalism of the Afghan army prior to the projected NATO pullout date of 2014. Canada presently has approximately 900 personnel deployed to Afghanistan at NATO training centres in Kabul and Mazar-i-Sharif.

The nucleus for the current contingent was drawn from the ranks of the 2nd Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment whose home station is CFB Gagetown in New Brunswick. However, when this group is replaced by members of the Royal 22nd Regiment (Vandoos) later this summer, the number of trainers is expected to drop below 800.

One of the reasons for the reduction is that, in the past few years, the Afghan National Army has been rapidly increased to a strength of over 300,000. Now that the ANA ranks are full, the emphasis will switch from that of quickly training basic recruits in quantity, to the careful development of unit skills and quality professionalism. That will, by its nature, require less manpower.

Since the regular forces first deployed to Afghanistan in January 2002 (a small group of JTF2 special forces soldiers were deployed in October 2001), Canada has seen a total of 158 soldiers killed and more than 2,000 wounded and injured during the campaign.

ACUTE PILOT SHORTAGE
While Canada is poised to begin taking delivery of 15 new Chinook heavy-lift helicopters next month, a crippling shortage of trained aircrew means that even if Boeing delivers them all on time, it will take until June 2017 before the Royal Canadian Air Force will have the fleet fully operational. Earlier this year, the commander of the RCAF, LGen. André Deschamps, briefed a Senate committee on the fact that Canada has had to recruit foreign pilots (mostly British RAF) to assist with the training of new pilots.

NEW ARMoured Vehicles
In a bizarre news story last month it was reported that DND has contracted the German manufacturing firm FFG to produce a total of 13 Armoured Engineer Vehicles (AEVs) based on existing Leopard 2 chassis. This project was announced as part of the overall land vehicle modernization program in 2009. However, when the details were finalized, DND did not issue a press release. Instead, they simply posted a notice on the government supply website MERX stating that a $105 million contract had been signed.

On this very same day Defence Minister Peter MacKay issued a whole series of procurement announcements involving much lesser six-figure, five-figure and even piddling four-figure contracts (the smallest was a $5,943 purchase of new barricades for a Montréal armoury).

When the vehicle purchase was discovered, MacKay vehemently denied there was anything remotely deceptive about this contract only being posted on the MERX site.

What MacKay could not explain was why the acquisition of these 13 AEVs would have been listed as a purchase of “vehicular power transmission components.” Nothing deceptive about that.

In June 2008, outgoing General Rick Hillier (right) and soon-to-be Chief of Defence Staff General Walt Natynczyk were spotted on Parliament Hill. As the last change of command for the CDS took place in July 2008, rumour has it a new CDS could be appointed as early as June. (CP/DAVID MCCORD, DND)
Battle of Stoney Creek

The first casualty of war is always...
On the 27th of May, 1813, American forces under the command of Major-General Henry Dearborn attacked Fort George and the Town of Newark at the mouth of the Niagara River. In a daylong battle British forces under the command of Brigadier-General John Vincent were driven from the Niagara Region, first falling back on Beaver Dams, then back to a position at Forty Mile Creek, what is now modern-day Grimsby, Ontario.

In a rare night battle, confusion and disorder reigned supreme. While the smaller British force was driven from the field, the Americans were unaware that they had won the upper hand. Their tactical victory was thus nullified by a strategic withdrawal.

In June 2011, re-enactors gathered to recreate the Battle of Stoney Creek, which took place in the night of June 6, 1813 in present-day Hamilton, Ontario. The British launched a surprise nighttime attack against the much larger 3,500-strong American force that had settled down for the night at the Gage farm. About 700 regulars of the 8th and 49th Regiments of Foot, under LCol John Harvey, stopped the American advance and allowed the British to reestablish their position in Niagara. Hundreds of soldiers died in the intense 40-minute battle. (SHARON MATTHEWS-STEVENS, HAMILTON TOURISM)
how they set up their camp. Gage’s farm was on high ground, so the Americans’ leading regiment made the first camp in a low area beside Stoney Creek, while the rest of their regiments camped along the road leading east, back to Niagara. There was neither master plan nor control of the camp as each regiment was simply allowed to camp wherever it stopped. This led to confusion later on as neither Chandler nor Winder, nor any of the regimental commanders knew exactly where all of their units were located. Vincent sent his deputy assistant adjutant general, Lieutenant-Colonel John Harvey, to reconnoitre the American position and report on the state of the American camp. Harvey recommended a night attack against the front of the American position. While not intended to bring the Americans to a major battle, this battle was intended to disrupt the American army and buy time for the British to withdraw and continue their retreat.

Modern armies, equipped with special night-fighting equipment, spend a great deal of time training for night actions. For armies of the early 18th and 19th centuries, the night was not viewed as a friend and fighting was to be avoided if at all possible. Command and control was far too easily lost and units could become intermixed and disoriented; this could then lead to higher instances of death by friendly fire. This, however, was a risk the British were prepared to take.

Beginning on June 5th the British Army, now numbering just over 1,700 along with all its supporting artillery, marched on to the farm of Richard Beasley — what is the present-day location of Dundurn Castle in Hamilton — and set up camp. While this position was tactically a good one, as it had a narrow frontage and looked like a long finger with Burlington Bay on one side and Cootes Paradise on the other, it could still be out-flanked by the road that ran along Burlington Beach from the King’s Head Inn to the old Joseph Brant farm, in present-day Burlington, Ontario.

Evidence suggests that Brigadier-General Chandler intended to use this road to cut off the British rather than directly assault Vincent’s narrow front. Vincent’s intention was to rest his army for a few days then fall back on Kingston to resupply and refit surrendering the Province to the Americans. Both armies where now camped 8 miles from each other — well within striking distance, with the Americans occupying Gage’s farm in the Village of Stoney Creek on the 5th of June.

James Gage’s large farmhouse was a principal stopping-place for many who travelled by land between Niagara (Niagara-on-the-Lake) and York (present-day Toronto). However, his farming activities and reception of visitors were interrupted by the War of 1812, during which he and his son Andrew served with the 5th Lincoln Militia. In June 1813 the British arrived and occupied James’s house as a barracks. As a result, the adjoining farms of James and his uncle William Gage would become the scene of the decisive battle of Stoney Creek.

While American forces were strong and outnumbered the British, clues as to their training and discipline may be gleaned from the Gage House was used by the American army as its headquarters on June 6, 1813. The monument in the background is one of two commemorating the decisive Battle of Stoney Creek. (MICHAEL HURLEY)
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would later play a role in confusing the attacking British regiments.

As dusk fell Lt. Colonel Harvey, whom Vincent placed in command of the assault, formed his attack units from companies of the 1st Battalion of the 8th (King’s) Regiment of Foot and the 49th of Foot. Vincent had asked for support from the Grand River First Nations, who politely refused, feeling that the British were a losing proposition. They had even gone as far as to send quiet peace feelers out to the American Army.

With Vincent and his command staff accompanying the attack force, the British quietly slipped off Burlington Heights and at 2330 hours moved on the American camp.

A number of myths have come out of this battle, which may or may not have some ring of truth. One is how a local farmer, 19-year-old Billy Green, obtained the American Army’s password from his brother-in-law, Isaac Corman, then led the British to the American camp and killed the first U.S. sentry with a sword or bayonet. Another tells how Lieutenant James FitzGibbon walked through the American camp disguised as a farmer selling butter and obtained the needed password and countersign in addition to noting the layout of the American camp. No matter how the British got the password and countersign, this feat allowed them to quietly approach the American camp, the pickets being somewhat lack in their duties.

The British deployed for action with the King’s 8th while the 49th deployed into an extended line on either side of the Queenston Road to the west of the camp. However, just as the British were approaching, 2nd Lt. Ephraim Shaler of the 25th U.S. Infantry Regiment was returning to the first camp and reported hearing a sentry cry out as he was being killed.

It was now about 0220 hours on the 6th of June. And as the old military maxim goes, the first casualty in war is the plan, and things began to unravel for the British.

Vincent and his staff let out a cheer that was picked up by the 49th of Foot as they stormed the American campfires, killing or capturing the American cooks. This brought the British attack to attention of the American 25th Infantry, which began to engage the attackers, firing muskets loaded with buckshot. The 5th, 16th, and 23rd Infantry came down and re-established their former position to the left of the Queenston Road, with Captain Towson’s artillery opening fire on the advancing British. In the British lines, command and control quickly began to break down as repeated attacks where driven back and casualties began to stack up.

In battle, it’s the little things and individual actions that can change the course of events; many times they are unconnected but end up adding or taking away from the whole. Brigadier-General Winder ordered the 5th U.S. Infantry to protect the left flank, which opened a gap and exposed Towson’s battery. Brigadier-General Chandler sent his staff officers off with orders and rode forward to investigate. Chandler was somehow knocked out by a fall — he later claimed that he became unconscious when his horse either fell or was shot — and was out of action for a time.

British Major Charles Plenderleath understood the importance of the centre of the American lines and realized that the breaking British formations needed relief in order to withdraw. Without orders, Plenderleath led a suicidal charge in the teeth of Towson’s battery with troops from FitzGibbon’s light company and seized

*Soldiers of a British Regiment of Foot gather round and await their orders from their commanding officer during a re-enactment of the Battle of Stoney Creek in Hamilton, Ontario.* (HAMILTON TOURISM)
the American guns and centre of the U.S. line. Chandler, who had
by then regained consciousness, stumbled into the position and
started giving orders to the British thinking they were American
soldiers. Chandler was taken prisoner and quickly followed by
Winder, who had also gone forward to investigate.

Command then fell to U.S. Cavalry Colonel James Burn, who
led a charge of Dragoons. In the darkness and confusion, he was
fired on by his own forces as American units blundered into one
another in the disorganized camp, blazing away at one another
thinking they where the enemy.

As dawn broke Harvey ordered the battered British to fall back
to Burlington Heights with their prisoners and two captured guns.
After a quickly held council of war the Americans, under command
of Colonel Burn, decided to withdraw back to Grimsby after
burning their provisions and tents.

For the British the cost had been heavy with 23 killed, 136
wounded, 52 captured, and three missing. One of the missing was
Brigadier-General John Vincent, who was later found wandering
seven miles from the battlefield minus his horse, hat and sword,
believing that his forces had been completely destroyed and without
any explanation as to what happened to him.

As the British on Burlington Heights were in the process of
hurriedly packing up their camp after the night battle, word came
to them that the Americans were pulling out of Stoney Creek, much
to their surprise. Later that afternoon Vincent pushed forward and
occupied the former American camp.

At Grimsby the retreating Americans where met by reinforce-
ments under the command of Major-General Henry Dearborn’s
second in command, Major-General Morgan Lewis. But once again
fortune intervened.

On the 29th of May the British naval squadron from Kingston
under the command of Governor General Sir George Provoost and
Commodore James Yeo attacked the American naval base at Sackets
Harbor. Although this would end as a British defeat, it nevertheless
led the Americans to destroy a large quantity of their much-needed
naval stores. This action pulled the American naval squadron back
to their base at Sackets Harbor and gave control of Lake Ontario
back to the British.

With the Provincial Marine threatening Major-General Lewis’s
lines of communication and supply as well as bombarding the
American camp at Grimsby, the Americans withdrew back to
Newark and Fort George. The British quickly advanced from
Stoney Creek and skirmished with the Americans between the 7th
and 10th of June. They occupied the abandoned American camp
and put to good use the large stocks of tents, arms and supplies
the Americans had failed to destroy.

With the victory at Stoney Creek, control of Lake Ontario, and
withdrawal of the U.S. forces back to Fort George, local militias
and the Grand River First Nations suddenly rediscovered their
zeal for support of the British cause and turned out in force. The
British reoccupied Beaver Dams and pushed units forward into
the Niagara Region.

This set the stage for the next round on the Niagara Frontier
in the later half of 1813, and saw the War of 1812 become more
vicious as both armies began to take retribution for burning and
looting on both sides of the border.

By the end of the war, the Gages had suffered extensive losses
of crops, flour, whiskey, livestock, timber and fencing as a direct
result of American and British depredations during the war. He
would eventually receive monetary compensation in 1823 for the
losses. The Gage residence is now a museum known as Battlefield
House, and the farm a park.
Every year, on or around the 30th of July, there is a memorial parade at the Canadian Army Cadet Training Centre in Valcartier, Quebec. The parade is held on that day to commemorate the six cadets who lost their lives and another 54 who were wounded while undergoing training with the M-61 hand grenade 38 years ago. This is a brief account of the events that transpired on that day and reveals how a series of mistakes contributed to such a huge tragedy.

According to the Royal Canadian Army Cadet training calendar, the cadets of “D” Company were to receive a class on explosives safety on that Tuesday afternoon, July 30, 1974. This would be followed by the padre’s hour. On that fateful day, it was decided to hold the lesson in 12 Platoon’s barracks. The decision to move indoors and use the barracks as a classroom was made because weather reports had called for overcast skies with a possibility of rain.

To make room for more than 130 cadets attending the lecture and the two Regular Force instructors, the bunk beds were all moved to the back of the large room. Moreover, in order to squeeze everyone in the makeshift classroom, the cadets were cramped together and asked to sit on the floor.

Captain Jean-Claude Giroux, the instructing officer, and his assistant, Corporal Claude Pelletier, proceeded to speak about the dangers of unexploded ammunition and munitions. They also started pulling various dummy munitions out of a box, showing the cadets what these various munitions actually looked like. After they showed and spoke about each one, they passed it to the cadets who circulated them around the room.

In a statutory declaration to police, obtained recently under the Access to Information Act, Giroux, a regular force officer in charge of the explosives section at the base, recalled one cadet asking him if there was any danger of an explosion; he reassured him there was none. So the cadets proceeded to examine and tinker with the grenades they were given.

The irony of this lecture, according to the former Platoon Commander Lieutenant Gary Katzko, was that this lecture was intended to make cadets more aware of the danger of discarded explosives and ammunition they might stumble upon in the field during the camping phase of their training. But this field training had actually
Katzko later stated that, as Giroux’s lesson on explosives was running a little late, he was thinking about stopping the lecture so that the cadets could attend the padre’s hour. As he was debating as to whether or not he should stop the lecture, an explosion rocked the base. One of the supposed dummy grenades had exploded.

Investigations later revealed how live grenades had been unintentionally placed with dummy munitions. It was discovered that some 19 green-coloured M-61 live grenades had been left after a live-fire grenade range practice a few days earlier and placed in a too-small box. Because the cardboard box could not adequately hold all of the live grenades, two grenades inadvertently fell out of the small box in the back of the truck during the drive back from the firing range. One grenade was put back in the box with the rest of the live green-coloured grenades; the other was left in the truck, which also held a box containing blue-coloured dummy grenades.

Upon return to base at the end of the trip, no count was made to ensure that all 19 grenades were accounted for. As a result, nobody noticed or remarked that one of the live green-coloured grenades was missing or that a green grenade had been mixed in with the blue.

Eventually, this box of dummy munitions arrived at the cadet barracks. It appears as though both instructors assumed that the lone green-coloured grenade in the box was a dummy grenade like the blue ones. After all, all of these grenades were found in the same training ammunition box.

So it was that a live grenade came to be passed around to the cadets along with the dummy munitions. Each of the cadets took turns examining the artillery pieces before passing them on to the next cadet.

When Cadet Eric Lloyd received the green-coloured grenade he pulled the pin while holding the lever squeezed in the safe position. He replaced the pin and should have passed the grenade to another cadet. Instead, he decided to pull the pin once more. This time he placed the grenade between his legs with the lever pointing out and pulled the pin. The lever sprung and the fuse was struck. Some four seconds later, the grenade exploded killing Cadet Eric Lloyd and the five other cadets closest to him: Yves Langlois, Pierre Leroux, Othon Mangos, Mario Provencher, and Michel Voisard. Another 54 cadets seated around Cadet Eric Lloyd were injured in the blast.

A coroner’s inquest into the incident revealed several startling facts which the coroner classified as: “… apathy or detestable routine seem to have fostered a climate of negligence and carelessness.” The officer responsible for the lecture, Capt. Giroux, was deemed criminally responsible in the investigation. Surprisingly, the only people entitled to compensation for their suffering were the regular and reserve military personnel as the cadets were not covered by the pension regime because they were not serving members of the Canadian Forces or part of the public service at the time.

The surviving cadets and families of those who lost their lives in this tragic incident are supposed to take solace in the fact that there now stands a memorial plaque affixed to a boulder at the former site of the barracks. Those visiting the area will also find a monument at the head of the parade square with the names of the cadets who had been killed that summer.

This article is dedicated to the memories of the six cadets who died on that fateful day: Yves Langlois, 15 years old, Pierre Leroux, 14 years old, Eric Lloyd, 14 years old, Othon Mangos, 14 years old, Mario Provencher, 15 years old, and Michel Voisard, 14 years old.

This article was written in conversation with Gerry Fostaty, the author of a book on this incident titled As You Were, and with Charles Gutta, the chair of “D” Company Cadet Camp in 1974.
ON JUNE 6, 1944, THE LARGEST amphibious invasion in history took place on the coast of Normandy in France. The previous night 5,000 ships carrying 131,000 Allied soldiers had sailed into position. Also during the night, 23,000 more troops had landed by parachute or glider. With the dawn, the soldiers at sea would begin to land on five beaches. The 3rd Canadian Infantry Division and 2nd Canadian Armoured Brigade would land on Juno Beach. On either side of the Canadians, British troops would set down on Gold and Sword beaches. To the west of Gold Beach, Americans would storm ashore at Omaha and Utah beaches.

Code-named Operation OVERLORD, the Allied D-Day landings would mark the beginning of the end for Hitler’s Nazi empire. In August 1942, a small raid was attempted at Dieppe. Most of the troops involved were Canadian. This raid on the small French resort town was a disaster. Hardly any soldiers got beyond the beaches. Total casualties were 3,367. This included 901 killed and 1,946 taken prisoner. These losses were all suffered in just nine hours.

Dieppe proved to the Allied planners that they were a long way from ready to invade France by crossing the English Channel. Yet they also knew that this was the best path of approach. But before an invasion could take place, they needed to build up a huge army in England. They also needed a vast armada of ships and much special equipment.

In the meantime the war went on. The Allies landed American and British troops in French North Africa on November 8, 1942. This led to the eventual defeat of the German Afrika Korps on May 12, 1943. The struggle in North Africa had raged for 32 months. The Allies kept the pressure on Germany by invading Sicily on July 10, 1943. Included in this invasion force was 1st Canadian Infantry Division and 1st Canadian Armoured Brigade. Sicily fell after hard fighting on August 17. Less than three weeks later, the Allies jumped from Sicily onto the Italian mainland. Canadian, British and American troops started marching north into boot-shaped Italy. They faced bitter resistance from German troops, who had hurriedly occupied the country when the Italian government surrendered to the Allies days after the Allies landed on the mainland.

For a short time the Allies had hoped it might be possible to defeat Germany by advancing through Italy into the heart of Europe.
British Prime Minister Winston Churchill called this an attack on Europe’s “soft underbelly.” It was soon clear that the underbelly was anything but soft. And that it would take years of slogging to get from Italy to Germany.

The date of June 6 was selected because of the way the moon affected the levels of incoming tides. At this point in the monthly moon cycle the tide was considered perfect for putting soldiers, tanks, artillery and vehicles ashore. If the invasion did not proceed on that day, it would have to be delayed for months. Despite a storm, the weather was deemed acceptable. And so, in the predawn hours of June 6, 1944, about 14,500 Canadians were aboard ships off Juno Beach. With the dawn, they would storm ashore. This is the story of what happened on the day forever to be known as D-Day.

Charles and Elliott Dalton stood together. They looked toward the Normandy coast. There was nothing much to see. Well inland, a predawn glow indicated that the sun would soon rise. But it would be hidden behind thick clouds. Stormy weather had made for an uncomfortable night as the invasion ships had closed on the French coast. The seas remained rough. Larger ships rolled heavily in the waves. Smaller craft tossed about like corks.

Ashore, flames rose from where shells or bombs had started fires. More than 5,000 ships stood off the coast. Many were destroyers, cruisers, monitors, gunboats that fired explosive rockets, and battleships with huge guns. All had started firing toward the coast at 0500 hours. Bombers had also swooped overhead and dropped tons of explosives. The intention was to destroy the German fortifications guarding the five beaches.

At dawn, thousands of Allied soldiers would begin storming ashore. Americans would land on two beaches — Omaha and Utah. The British aimed at beaches code-named Sword and Gold. These were on opposite sides of the Canadian beach. Juno was a long stretch of sand running from Courseulles-sur-Mer, east past Bernières-sur-Mer, and on to St. Aubin-sur-Mer. Three summer resort towns being torn apart by shells and bombs.

Charles tried to say something meaningful. Elliott also searched for right words. Suddenly Charles groaned in his mouth and pulled out a stubby denture. He chewed it overboard.

“What did you do that for?” Elliott asked.

“If I’m going to die, I don’t want to have that damned thing hurting me,” Charles snapped. He was so tense that his teeth were grating, and the denture had rubbed the gum raw. Charles hated...
Les Buissons to Buron: 3 kms, 30 days, 1,000 casualties

by Bob Gordon

After battling their way ashore on D-Day, Canadian soldiers faced stiff resistance from the fanatical SS Hitlerjugend Division.

At midnight on Tuesday, June 6, 1944 the staff at 3rd Canadian Infantry Division headquarters had reason to be well satisfied. On D-Day, Canadian forces met with tremendous success. Although they suffered more than 1,000 casualties, Canadian commanders could take that that was only half of those predicted. The spectre of a second Dieppe had been laid to rest. Although no Allied force reached its D-Day objective, the 3rd Division’s 8th Brigade advanced inland further than any of the amphibious invaders.

The 9th Canadian Infantry Brigade (CIB) — comprised of the Highland Light Infantry of Canada (HLI), the North Nova Scotia Highlanders (NNSH), and the Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Highlanders — along with the 27th (Sherbrooke Fusiliers) Canadian Armoured Regiment, all in reserve, had been able to land unmolested by the late morning. The 9th Brigade established its HQ in Basly, three kilometres south of Juno Beach. During the night the brigade passed through the assault troops and prepared to continue the Canadian advance to Carpiquet airfield, its D-Day objective.

On the other side of the hill, following a period of hesitation and confusion, the 12th SS Panzer Division (Hitlerjugend) received orders to proceed to the Caen area early on June 6. The division, organized in three kampfgruppen (combat formations most employed by the German Wehrmacht), set off just before dawn. The delay meant that the division had to make the move during the day and Allied fighter-bombers savaged the march columns.

That evening meeting with the commanders of the 21st Panzer Division and 716th Infantry Division, SS-Standartenführer Kurt Meyer, commanding officer of the 25th Panzer Grenadier Battalion, the reconnaissance battalion of 12th SS Panzer Division, described the harrowing journey of his kampfgruppe: “I have been on my way to you for about eight hours; I lay a good four hours in roadside ditches because of air attacks. The division’s marching columns are suffering serious losses in men and material.”

Regardless, Meyer was optimistic and fully supported plans for his division to counterattack the Allies the following day. Conceived in 1943 in the wake of the Stalingrad debacle, elements of the 12th SS Panzer Division were about to enter combat for the first time in their short history. Their opponents, the 9th CIB, were also about to encounter the enemy for their first time.

On the morning of June 7, the only element of the Hitlerjugend that was in position to respond to the Allied invasion was Meyer’s kampfgruppe. According to Meyer, it was composed of two companies of the 2nd Panzer Battalion that consisted of approximately 50 Panzerkampfwagen (PzKw) IV, 12 self-propelled guns of the divisional artillery’s 3rd Battalion, and his 25th Panzer Grenadier Battalion.

Meyer established his forward command post in the Abbaye...
d’Ardenne, northwest of Caen. The tower of the abbey gave Meyer a clear view over the Mue valley to the west as well as north to the coast and the Allied invasion fleet beyond. He could also see his kampfgruppe moving into position on the reverse slopes on the east side of the Mue valley. From left (south) to right (north), on a line running northeast from the Bayeux-Caen highway and the railroad embankment running alongside it south of Franqueville to Cambres north of Caen, the 3rd, 2nd and 1st Battalions of his 25th Panzer Grenadier Regiment deployed. Concentrated on his left, the PzKfw IVs of the 12th SS Panzer Regiment supported the grenadiers.

Meanwhile, the 9th Brigade prepared to renew its advance on Carpiquet airfield, which was due west of Caen, just south of the Bayeux-Caen highway. Allied plans called for its quick capture and conversion into an airfield, thereby permitting air force units to provide close support to the Allied armies in Normandy without the time and fuel wasted in flights from airfields in southeastern England.

At 0740 hours on June 7, the North Novas, with supporting units under command, attacked south from Villons-les-Buissons. They were to advance through the hamlets of Buron, Authie, Franqueville and Carpiquet to the airfield south of the town.

Major J.D. Learmont of the North Novas commanded the vanguard. He led C Company, the carrier platoon under Captain E.S. Gray, two detachments of 3-inch mortars and an assault section of pioneers from the North Novas. Also under his command were the Stuarts of the Sherbrooke Fusiliers reconnaissance troop, a carrier platoon armed with Vickers machine guns from the Cameron Highlanders of Ottawa. A troop of M10 tank destroyers from the 105th Anti-Tank Battery and two flail, mine-clearing tanks from the Royal Armoured Corps completed Learmont’s vanguard.

Following abreast from left to right were B and A Companies of the North Novas riding on the Sherman tanks of B and A Squadrons of the Fusiliers. In reserve, D Company of the North Novas rode on C Company’s Shermans.

By 1150 hours regimental HQ received reports that objective ‘Ale’ (Buron) had been occupied. At 1230 ‘Danube’ (Authie) was reported captured, although it remained under mortar and artillery fire. A few minutes later the Stuarts of the reconnaissance troop reported they had entered ‘Eve’ (Franqueville). The leading elements of the attack could see the hangars of Carpiquet airfield and seemed to be encountering only limited resistance from the remains of the 716th Infantry Division.

Despite optimism at brigade HQ, the seeds of disaster had already been sown. The cruiser HMS Diadem was to provide fire
support to the brigade. However, when the Royal Navy Forward Observation Officer (FOO) attempted to net in and order a fire mission on St. Contest to suppress the mortars taking their toll on the troops in Authie, he was unable to make contact with the cruiser. Contact was not restored until two radios from knocked out tanks were wired together late in the afternoon. The North Novas’ War Diary notes simply: “faulty communication made it impossible to obtain it [naval fire] in time.”

At the same time, divisional artillery was unable to offer supporting fire as it was engaged in moving forward to new gun positions. Moreover, when it arrived at its new position it discovered that they were under mortar and machine-gun fire from an uncaptured German radar station located near Douvres-la-Delivrande. The Sherbrooke Fusiliers’ War Diary, with remarkable restraint, does not mention the issue until the following day, June 8: “SP Artillery has now moved into position behind us and can lay down supporting fire when called by the FOO who is with us. This was one feature which was sorely missing yesterday.” Throughout the battle the Canadians at the sharp end had no supporting fire available.

Significantly, the 9th Brigade was also on the extreme left of the Canadian advance. Unbeknownst to them, the 185th British Infantry Brigade on its left flank had been unable to advance alongside them. Their attack on the morning of June 7 had been weak, poorly coordinated and, ultimately, unsuccessful. In consequence, the very success of the Canadian advance left them with a long, exposed and vulnerable left flank.

The divisional historical officer’s summary of interviews with Capt. (A/Major) A.J. Wilson and Carrier Platoon CO Capt. (A/Major) E.S. Gray acknowledged this fundamental problem: “Comms between divs at this time were not effective and, in consequence, locations of flanking forms were most uncertain. It is evident that the isolation of the 9th Cdn Inf Bde’s thrust accounts for its vulnerability.”

This exposed flank ran directly in front of Meyer’s as-yet-undetected tanks and grenadiers. From his vantage point in the tower of the Abbaye d’Ardenne, Meyer watched the entire drama unfold. “My God! What an opportunity! The tanks were moving right across the front of the II/SS-Panzer Grenadier Regiment 25!” Meyer wrote in his autobiography. “The enemy only seemed concerned with the airfield; it was right in front of him. He already controlled it with his weapons. He did not realize that destruction awaited him on the reverse slope.”

The Canadian axis of advance coupled with Meyer’s deployment could not have been more advantageous to the 12th SS. The 3rd Battalion waited as a blocking force behind the railroad embankment south of Franqueville. The 1st and 2nd Battalions were northeast of the 2nd, on reverse slopes overlooking the exposed Canadian flank.

Divisional orders called for an attack at 1600 hours. Meyer ordered strict fire discipline and, seizing the opportunity, decided to attack with the 3rd Battalion as soon as the Canadian advance made contract with their positions. Once the 3rd Battalion had overrun the vanguard and reached Authie, the 1st and 2nd Battalions would fall on the Canadian flank.

The Stuarts reported they reached Franqueville shortly before 1400 hours. A and C Companies of the North Novas were digging in north of Authie. At approximately 1400 hours Meyer ordered the 3rd Battalion to open fire. Captain Gray ordered his carriers forward to support the Stuarts in Franqueville, but all three sections were driven back by mortar fire.

The North Novas’ War Diary records the fate of the vanguard: “It was too late for the vanguard to withdraw to the battalion position so they decided to fight it out in front of Authie. Captain F.L.C. Fraser, who was with the leading elements, took command of the situation and hastily organized the defence, taking the Brownings from three knocked-out tanks and a [Vickers] machine gun from the platoon commander’s carrier of the Cameron Highlanders of Ottawa, who had become a casualty.” That night only one Stuart of the Recce Troop answered roll call.

Simultaneously, grenadiers supported by tanks appeared along the ridge on the Canadian flank as far north as St. Contest, driving west towards Authie and Buron. The leading platoons of C Company were isolated in Authie and attempts to reinforce them were beaten back by artillery and mortar fire. A and B Companies, along with the remaining platoons of C Company, were dug in around Buron. D Company was dug in 200 metres north of Buron around the road to Villons-les-Buissons.

German infantry infiltrated D Company’s positions, rounded up prisoners as the Canadians ran out of ammunition, and isolated the troops in Buron and Authie. Subsequently, German infantry overran Buron and the only Canadians to escape to the battalion
fortress at Les Buissons did so alone or in twos and threes, creeping through the waist-high grain.

While the infantry fought for control of the various hamlets and the orchards adjacent to them, the Shermans and M10s engaged the attacking Pzkfw IVs in a frenzied struggle across the grain fields. Confusion reigned as the inexperienced Canadian tankers and their equally inexperienced opponents engaged in their first combat operation.

In after-action reports the Fusiliers frequently stated that they had engaged Tigers and Panthers. It can be categorically stated that there were no Tigers in Normandy on June 7, and it is highly unlikely that there were Panthers intermingled with the Pzkfw IVs of the 2nd Panzer Battalion. In the chaotic battle that swirled across the fields and through the orchards of the Mue River valley, erroneous reports of Tigers and Panthers are hardly surprising.

After-action reports filed by every troop of the Fusiliers reported collisions between friends and enemies, unexpected encounters and engagements at close range, and heavy casualties on both sides. A shortage of high explosive ammunition and a consequent inability to engage infantry and anti-tank guns were frequently noted.

Sergeant T.C. Reid’s after-action report for 2 Troop, C Squadron, is illustrative: “Suddenly, out of the blue, we got it. I, myself, felt a jolt in my tank, looked back and found my blanket box shot through. The next shot unseated my LO [loader-operator] Tpr Galley, and then I saw what was hitting us … Their third round went through my engine and quickly after that they struck Lieut. Maclean’s and Lieut. Steve’s [tanks] almost simultaneously.” In the span of a few minutes, 2 Troop had lost all three of the tanks it took into action on June 7.

Squadrons and troops became intermingled in the melee. Consider Lieutenant Thomson’s disjointed account of events: “Seeing that I was the only one standing still firing I decided to take cover in a small hedge off to our right. We started for the woods

As many as 156 Canadian prisoners of war are believed to have been executed by the 12th SS Panzer Division (the Hitler Youth) in the days and weeks following the D-Day landings. In scattered groups, in various pockets of the Normandy countryside, the soldiers were taken aside and shot. A total of 20 Canadians were executed near Villons-les-Buissons in the Abbaye d’Ardenne (pictured above), a massive collection of medieval buildings — including an early Gothic church and several farm buildings — encircled by walls and surrounded by grainfields. This was where Kurt Meyer, commander of the 25th Panzer Grenadier Regiment (of the 12th Panzer Division), had established his headquarters. The Abbaye d’Ardenne was liberated by the Regina Rifles shortly before midnight on July 8, 1944.
and the next time I looked around five of our tanks were on fire.” He continues: “A tank came from behind the hedge running wild and no one showing out of it was making straight for my tank. We pulled hard right and ran up on a stump and near upset the tank.” Thomson’s battle ended when a mortar explosion jammed the turret and blew the turret hatch closed, knocking him unconscious.

Carrier Platoon CO Captain Gray deduced the fate of A Company on the basis of a concentration of tank tracks: “The tracks of the tanks which circled about and through their posn behind the hedge suggested that they were probably overrun.” Eventually, in mid-afternoon, the Sherbrookes were forced to join the North Novas in withdrawing to the brigade fortress. By the end of the day both sides had lost more than two dozen tanks each. In the sparse language of the Fusiliers’ War Diary: “This day will long stand out in our memory.”

Late in the afternoon a renewed infantry and armour assault forced the Germans out of Buron, but the assault companies were so weakened they were ordered to withdraw to the brigade fortress before nightfall. The 25th Panzer Grenadier Regiment reoccupied Buron during the night.

Meyer’s counterattack drove the Canadian forces back to their start line. By the end of the day, the Fusiliers had lost 28 tanks and the North Novas had suffered 242 casualties. For the North Novas it was to be the highest single-day casualty total in the entire war. Despite the casualties the attack was stopped cold, gaining no ground.

However, the 12th SS was unable to exploit its tactical victory. The other units of the division were still only trickling into the area. Additionally, on 12th SS Division’s right, the 21st Panzer Division had offered only limited support. Hopes to convert the tactical victory into a sustained drive to the sea, thereby forcing a wedge between Juno Beach and Sword Beach (British) to the east.

A point that compels reconsideration is the role of the 3rd British Infantry Division (BID) on the Canadian left flank. As noted earlier, its inability to advance lies at the core of the tactical circumstances. On the operational level, there were also profound consequences.

It was not only tactical problems that prevented the 3rd BID from vigorously supporting the drive south to Caen. It had received orders to detach significant forces from the drive south toward Caen and redirect them 90 degrees, changing the axis of advance to the east. Their objective was now Pegasus Bridge, to support the airborne troops holding it. The units on the Canadian flank had wheeled left and were hurriedly marching away from them. However, it is unclear if the 3rd Canadian Infantry Division was informed of this order. If the 21st Panzer Division had attacked aggressively they would have caught the British infantry disorganized and vulnerable or already absent. The panzers and grenadiers would have advanced into a vacuum. The tactical victory that Meyer was unable to grasp might have been theirs if the 21st Panzer had aggressively attacked the beachhead alongside the 12th SS on June 7. The speculation remains unresolvable.

Another month was to pass before the Canadians succeeded in advancing the two kilometres from Villons-les-Buissons to Buron. The 9th Brigade settled into a routine of patrolling and escorting engineers laying mines. The Sherbrooke War Diary includes a hand-drawn map of minefields between Les Buissons and Villons-les-Buissons by the 16th Canadian Field Company on the night of June 9/10.

A series of photographs taken on June 20 by Lieutenant Ken Bell of the Canadian Army Film and Photo Unit (CFPU) show troops milking goats, collecting eggs, and indulging in the local spirits. Will Bird’s regimental history reported that one company absconded with the CO’s milk cow and dined on steak the next night. Infantry were taken on tours of the beachhead to observe the build-up.

The casualty toll was small, but daily German mortars and snipers caused unpredictable and randomly fatal casualties. “It was very sunny on the afternoon of the 24th but the shells kept falling around and one rendered the C Company’s ‘dining-room’ quite obsolete,” the regimental history reports. D Company of the North Novas’ sister regiment, the HLI, nicknamed their ‘home’ in the cider-orchard south of Villons-les-Buissons, Shelldrop Farm. Reports of men missing and wounded during the period were also common.

This relatively bucolic existence came to an end on July 8. The 9th Brigade attacked Buron again, this time led by the HLI. Their assault was one small part of Operation CHARNWOOD, Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery’s push to finally capture Caen and the Carpiquet airfield, the Canadians’ original D-Day objective.

Their opponents, still the 12th SS, were under-strength but had four weeks of front-line experience. In contrast to the grenadiers, who were dug in around the village, the battle for Buron was the Highland Light Infantry’s first battle. At Bloody Buron (the title of the HLI’s regimental history), the HLIs suffered 262 casual-

Private F.L. Galvert and Lance-Corporal Gooding of the Highland Light Infantry of Canada milking a goat in France, on June 20, 1944. For the HLI the true point of the blade would be felt a few weeks later when they would be sent in to Buron for their second battle. It would be the costliest one-day loss in the war for the regiment. (LT KEN BELL, DND, LAC, PA-133117)
ties, 20 more than the North Novas a month earlier; and like the North Novas, this was the HLI’s highest single-day casualty total in the war. Sixty-two were killed, and the CO and 199 others were wounded in the second battle of Buron.

The attackers went in at 0730 hours, across a kilometre of open fields, in broad daylight. The plan called for the assault Platoons to reform in an anti-tank ditch a few hundred metres north of Buron, before the final assault on the stone buildings of the hamlet. Again, the Sherbrooke Fusiliers were detailed to accompany the infantry.

The attack began well. The artillery barrage forced the defenders to remain in their dugouts. However, the barrage lifted as the attackers reached the anti-tank ditch. Intelligence had reported that the anti-tank ditch was unmanned; the reports were wrong, however, and assaulting it proved costly. Major Durward remembered that it had “a lot of dug-outs off it and a lot of fanatical lads in that ditch.” Lt Campbell recalled, “hard hand-to-hand fighting with the 12th SS Panzer Grenadiers – bayonet, knife and bare fist.”

Once the Canadians had cleared the anti-tank ditch they re-formed for the final assault. Anticipating this tactic, German mortars were pre-ranged on the anti-tank ditch and machine guns were emplaced to enfilade its length. This fire decimated the attackers and frustrated attempts to organize a coordinated assault. Forming up at the start line, Sergeant Kelly was one of a 37-man platoon under command of a lieutenant. Leaving the anti-tank ditch to assault the village he led a band of 14 men as he was now the highest-ranking survivor of a platoon that had already lost 60 per cent.

Regimental Intelligence Officer Lt Campbell recorded in the War Diary that the anti-tank ditch “was 12 ft wide and 15 ft deep ... the Coy’s came under a hail of MG fire and ran into enemy DF arty and mortars called down on the ditch as soon as it was overrun.” He later recalled: “We lost about half of our assault rifle companies in the first two hours.”

Ragged groups of Canadian infantry infiltrated Buron. The remainder of the day they fought at close range, from house to house. The German defences were anchored in the orchards south of the village, and while entering Buron, the infantry advanced over the detritus of the previous battle. This included brewed up Shermans and, according to Major RD Hodgins, “if you stumbled over something or jumped into a slit trench for cover ... it really brought things out in the open regards war.” Casualties continued to rise, as the village was not secured until late in the afternoon.

Inevitably, the fighting was particularly vicious. The HLI knew the North Novas had been bled white in this same location and by these same troops. They had also heard the rumours rampant that the earlier battle had been followed by the murder of Canadian prisoners. For their part, the grenadiers had been told to expect no quarter from the Canadians as a result of their treatment of Canadian POWs a month earlier.

Bitterly, Buron was to sting the North Novas one more time. In reserve during the assault, they moved forward and formed up in the anti-tank ditch north of Buron once it was cleared. Protected from direct fire, they remained under the observant eyes of the 12th SS, who still retained an observation post in the tower of the Abbaye d’Ardenne. As they waited to advance they were subject to a mortar barrage that caused numerous casualties.

Late in the afternoon LCol Petch called an O Group (Order Group) in an excavated area in the town centre that the Germans had previously used as a vehicle park. Again, anticipating Canadian actions, German artillery and mortars were pre-ranged on the site. A single round struck during the O Group and decapitated the regiment. Lieutenant C.W. Sparks was dead, “a cigarette hanging from his mouth,” and three signallers were also killed. “We were just getting on with the O Group when ‘Bang!’ Something landed close to me and I was hit by dirt, but it sprayed shrapnel on the rest of them. I was the only one not wounded,” Lt Campbell recalled.

The HLI had fought and won its first battle, but the costs had been horrific. Only two officers in the rifle companies and only one member of the HQ group, the intelligence officer Lieut. Campbell, remained. The figure exceeds 300 when the casualties of the accompanying armour, again the 27th Sherbrooke Fusiliers, are included.

On D-Day the officers of 9th CIB probably gave little heed to Buron, one of many villages midway between the intermediary objective, Oak, and the ultimate objective, the Carpiquet airfield. Buron remains a quiet village, not yet swallowed by the post-war suburbs of Caen. There are small memorials to the Fusiliers and the HLIs in the central square. A few hundred metres north of Buron, at ‘Hell’s Corners’, there is a plaque commemorating the 9th Brigade. Buron is quaint but unmemorable, unless one recalls that in 30 days in the summer of 1944 almost 1,000 Canadians were killed, wounded, captured or murdered fighting to liberate this small Norman hamlet.
Murder in Normandy

by Thom Gordon

Canadian soldiers were shocked and dismayed to discover that murderous SS troopers had executed unarmed prisoners

As the Canadian positions in Authie were overrun and the German troops moved towards Buron, the soldiers of the 9th Company, 3rd Battalion, 12th SS Panzer Division began rounding up prisoners. Major J.D. Learmont, the commander of 9th Canadian Infantry Brigade’s vanguard, recalled his captors as “wildly excited and erratic” when he testified at Kurt Meyer’s war crimes trial.

Private Lorne Browne was the first man killed. Browne and Lance Corporal W.L. McKay were together when the Germans overran the Canadian positions. McKay was fading in and out of consciousness when an SS trooper ordered the two wounded men out of their trench. Before Browne could respond, the trooper forced him down with his boot and bayoneted him repeatedly.

Constance Raymond Guilbert, a resident of Authie, witnessed the murder of another two unarmed Canadians as he observed the battle from his home. Private William Nichol was one of these troopers. Wounded in the leg during the battle for Authie, Nichol was awake and aware, but unable to move. Noticing him, a German officer beat the Canadian to death and fired a gratuitous round into his body.

While the Canadians were being rounded up, eight men from the North Nova Scotia Highlanders’ C Company were segregated from the others. In this group were Cpl Thomas Davidson and Privates John Murray, Anthony Julian, and James Webster. The Germans ordered the men to remove their helmets and shot them. To add to the Canadians’ humiliation, the German troopers dragged some of the bodies out onto the street. A German Panzerkampfwagen (Pzkfw) IV tank, driving through Authie towards the front, briefly joined the mayhem, grinding their bodies into the road.

Since time immemorial murders directly after battle have been tragically common. It is understandable that a soldier would have trouble giving quarter to an enemy who has killed his friends and comrades. However, the killing was far from over. In the next 24 hours over 50 Canadian prisoners would be murdered, far away from the battle in time and space.

The prisoners were formed up, and marched through Buron and Authie toward the German rear. Their movement was hurried by the belated British naval bombardment. The column proceeded at double time, and any prisoners that could not keep up were...
Shot. While they were moving through Authie, six men were taken out of the column and unceremoniously executed. Another four men, including a medic and his patient, were killed before Major L.M. Rhodenizer convinced the escorts of his column to stop the killing.

Unfortunately, German troops on their way to the front proved to be just as merciless. With the encouragement of their officer, another nine men were left dead by the side of the road. With minds akin to the murderous infantry, a support truck with Red Cross markings swerved into the column, striking three prisoners. Witnesses testified that the German troopers drove away; they shook their fists and jeered at the troopers. Contrary to procedure, when the column arrived in Cussy they were marched towards the 25th Regiment’s HQ at the Abbaye d’Ardenne rather than 3rd Battalion’s.

The Canadians’ arrival on the grounds of the abbey provided a brief period of rest. After the prisoners’ pay books were taken and they were more thoroughly searched, they were allowed to smoke cigarettes and talk amongst themselves. The Canadians became suspicious when a group of Feldgendarmen began asking for volunteers. When none of the men raised their hands, the Germans selected ten of them at random and escorted them into the abbey. These men included Lieutenant Windsor, Corporal Joseph MacIntyre, Privates Ivan Crowe, Charles Doucette, James Moss as well as Troopers James Bolt, George Gill, Thomas Henry, Roger Lockhead and Harold Phillip. All belonged to the North Novas and the 27th Canadian Armoured Regiment (Sherbrooke Fusiliers).

The 10 selected men remained behind while the rest of the prisoners were formed up and marched toward Bretteville-sur-Odon. Private Hollis McKeil was also left behind at the abbey. McKeil had been seriously wounded in the fighting near Buron and could not be moved.

The fates of these men have only been loosely determined based on the examination of the bodies and indirect testimony. It is assumed that each man was briefly interrogated before he was led into the dark garden of the abbey and dispatched. The first six were killed with blows from a cudgel, but their assassins soon tired of the effort and the last five were shot in the head.

Hours after the battle, Captain Walter Brown, chaplain of the Sherbrooke Fusiliers, Lieutenant W.F. Grainger and Lance Corporal J.H. Greenwood, also of the Fusiliers, set out to visit a wounded officer recuperating in Les Buissons.

They had gotten lost between the lines when an SS patrol came upon them. As they attempted to surrender, the patrol opened fire. Greenwood was killed, Grainger was severely wounded and Chaplain Brown was taken prisoner. Later, Grainger regained consciousness and managed to drag himself back to the jeep and escape. He was unaware of Brown’s fate.

Weeks later, the chaplain’s body was discovered not far from the ambush site by members of a British armoured unit. It was discovered that he had been killed with a single bayonet thrust to
the heart. Although there was no witness to the chaplain’s death, it can easily be assumed that his captors killed him.

On June 8, a group of seven prisoners who had evaded capture the day before were brought to the Abbaye d’Ardenne. Jan Jesionek, a German conscript, watched as Privates Walter Doherty, Reg Keeping, Hugh MacDonald, George McNaughton, George Millar, Thomas Mont and Raymond Moore of the North Novas were led into a stall adjoining the abbey.

Later, as Jesionek was repairing a motorcycle in the abbey’s courtyard, he witnessed as each man was called by name and escorted through the archway to the abbey’s garden. After each name was called, the man would shake hands with his comrades and walk proudly towards the garden. When he entered, a German NCO would put a bullet in his head. This was repeated until all seven soldiers lay in a heap inside the entrance to the garden.

In total, 58 Canadian prisoners were killed after the fighting around Buron and Authie on June 7, 1944. Eleven of the murders occurred in the moments directly after the battle, 27 were committed in transit to the rear, and the last 20 were carried out with brutal precision, far from the battlefield. The soldiers of the 12th SS did not discriminate between soldier and prisoner, armed or unarmed. Ultimately, the 12th SS in Normandy would murder over 150 Canadian prisoners.

Kurt Meyer, commanding officer of the 25th Panzer Grenadier Regiment, and eventually of the 12th SS Division, was found responsible for these deaths at a post-war trial. He was given a death sentence that was commuted to life in prison. Meyer served five years in Dorchester Penitentiary, in New Brunswick. He was transferred to a British military prison in Werl, West Germany in 1951 and released on September 7, 1954. He died of a heart attack in Hagen, Westphalia on December 23, 1961, on his 51st birthday.
JUNE 6 1944 - 4 AM.
THE INVASION FLEET STEAMED TOWARDS JUNO BEACH.

TROOPS ABOARD HMCS PRINCE HENRY LISTENED TO THEIR FINAL BRIEFING BEFORE GOING ASHORE.

SOLDIERS CLAMBERED DOWN ROPE LADDERS FROM THE TROOP TRANSPORT SHIP AND BOARDED A LANDING CRAFT.

SOME OF THE SOLDIERS GOT SEASICK AS THE LANDING CRAFT BOBBED OVER THE ROUGH SEAS TOWARDS JUNO BEACH.
JUNE 6 1944 - 7 AM.

German artillery opened fire on the landing craft as they neared the shore.

Get ready boys!

Go!

Go!

Go!

At Bernieres-sur-Mer, the Queen’s Own Rifles faced intense gunfire as they waded towards the shore.
FORCED OUT INTO NECK-DEEP WATER, AND CAUGHT IN WITHERING MACHINE GUN FIRE FROM THE SHORE, THE QUEEN’S OWN LOST 65 MEN IN THE FIRST FEW MINUTES OF THEIR ATTACK.

AFTER THEY DESTROYED A BUNKER DEFENDING THE BEACH ...

... THE QUEEN’S OWN ADVANCED ON THE CHATEAU.
A door was blasted open!

June 6 1944 - 8:27 AM.

The Queen's Own were the first Canadians to free territory in France. Over 100 soldiers died in sight of the chateau before it was captured.

With the beachhead established, Fort Garry Horse Regiment tanks were unloaded.

Engineers built a special ramp to allow the tanks to climb up and over a defensive seawall built by the Germans.

June 6 1944 - 9:15

The Queen's Own Rifles liberated Bernieres-sur-Mer. The French civilians welcomed the Canadians with cheers and wine.
So you think you know your military history? Well, think again!

Each month we publish questions to test your knowledge as part of our At Ease feature, a collection of military trivia and humour. The answers to the quiz are tucked away on another page in this issue. Good luck! Your input is welcome! Please send your stumpers to Les Peate c/o this magazine.

1. I had a Webley .38” pistol in Korea and ran out of ammo. Could I use a Canadian substitute?
2. Could an 81mm mortar use a 3” mortar bomb?
3. What happened to Gary Cooper’s Hershey Bar?
4. In which war was Gary Cooper’s movie For Whom the Bell Tolls set?
5. Which British regiment, with an Australian title, served in the War of 1812?
6. What was the significance of Fort Eban Emael?
7. How many Canadian squadrons served with the RAF in WWII?
8. How many different nationalities were represented in General Alexander’s forces in the battle for Cassino?
9. What happened to the U.S. Navy fleet engaged in manoeuvres in the Pacific in April 1940?
10. Who is the intrepid aviator?
A Korean War veteran was recently laid to rest in the United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Busan, South Korea. The ashes of Private Archibald “Archie” Lloyd Hearsey were conveyed by his daughter, Debbie Hearsey and grandson Solomon Kakagamic to Korea, to be buried in the grave of his brother, Joseph William Hearsey, who was killed in action in October 1951. The national level ceremonies for accepting the ashes into Korea with highest honour were arranged by the Ministry of Patriots and Veterans Affairs, under direction of the Minister, Honourable Park Sung Choon.

On October 13, 1951 a young PPCLI soldier, Archie Hearsey, was reunited in Korea with his brother, Joseph, who had joined up previously. Sadly, it was their last meeting as Joseph died of wounds received in action, that same night.

Archie himself passed away in June 2011. He had expressed a wish for his ashes to be interred alongside his brother’s remains in the United Nations Cemetery in Busan, South Korea, where 378 other Canadians who died during the war are also buried. Thanks to exhaustive efforts by a number of influential individuals, his request was finally granted — a “first.”

In April 2012, 77 Canadian veterans took part in the annual revisit to Korea, sponsored by the Korean Ministry of Patriot and Veterans Affairs. This year they were accompanied by Archibald Lloyd Hearsey’s daughter, Debbie, her son, and her father’s ashes. In Vancouver, a memorial ceremony was conducted, with Senator Yonah Martin, a good friend of Korean War veterans, and who played a significant role in the arrangements.

On arrival at the Inchon airport, the party was met by a South Korean multiservice guard of honour, and the ashes were reverently carried by a Korean marine and transported to the Korean National Cemetery in Seoul. It is here that the ashes of 6,000 fallen Republic of Korean soldiers are interred. Archie’s ashes were placed reverently on the altar in the sacred shrine and remained there for three days. It is the first time that a non-Korean has been so honoured.

Then the delegation moved to Busan where, despite a heavy rainfall, the brothers were finally united. The interment was attended by a number of dignitaries, including South Korea’s Minister of Patriot and Veterans Affairs Park Sung Choon, Canada’s ambassador to Korea David Chatterton, and military attaché Colonel Jacques Morneau.

The aftermath: The event was front-page news in Korea, and a South Korean news team is currently in Canada visiting the area of Ignace, Ontario (the Hearsey home) to interview relatives. Sadly, I recently read in the local obituary column that William Gallinger, a former PPCLI member who had helped escort his old comrade on his last trip to South Korea, passed away on the 11th of May.

TRAGEDY AT PETAWAHA

On May 8, 1968 members of The RCR and 2 Signals Squadron participated in what was expected to be an uneventful parachute jump. The soldiers were dropping from a Buffalo aircraft for the first time. They exited well, and all appeared in order. Then disaster struck.

Undetected by ground monitors, a strong crosswind was blowing from west to east between the aircraft’s altitude and the Mattawa plain drop zone (DZ). Instead of landing safely in the DZ, 22 of the 26 parachutists were blown into the nearby Ottawa River. There was only one rescue boat. Seven of the jumpers died.

Each year a memorial service is held in...
Petawawa to remember MWO Riddell, WO McDonald, and Cpl Chiswell (The RCR), and Corporals Field, Knight, Clement and Miesner of 2 Signals Squadron.

NO APPEAL, VETERANS HOPE
A federal court has ruled that the clawback of Pension Act payments from recipients of SISIP (Service Income Security Insurance Plan) is “not contractually justified.” This affects about 6,000 veterans and service personnel receiving SISIP benefits. (In the case of 100 per cent disability and unfitness to continue to serve, this should amount to 75 per cent of a service member’s highest military pay.) The Pension Act payments, through Veterans Affairs, are awarded for pain and suffering. Veterans advocacy groups are urging DND not to appeal this ruling.

THE OMBUDSMAN AND VRAB
The Veterans Ombudsman has just released a report and a few statistics come to mind. Of a total of 140 appeals against Veterans Review and Appeal Board (VRAB) decisions, in 60 per cent of the cases the board were found to have erred or have been unfair to the veteran.

Half of the decisions were overturned, with a further 35 per cent on appeal. The report cites specific cases. However, space does not permit me to include these, but they can be accessed by going to the Veterans Ombudsman’s website at [http://ombudsman-veterans.gc.ca/reports-rapports/vrab-tacra-03-2012-eng.cfm](http://ombudsman-veterans.gc.ca/reports-rapports/vrab-tacra-03-2012-eng.cfm).

VRAB acting chair James McPhee assured us that action will be taken within 30 days as of May 7.

I have mixed feelings about the VRAB. From a personal point of view, they served me well (I received a courteous hearing and positive results). Having (hopefully) assisted many veterans with problems over the years, I have heard good and bad reports on the board. Unfortunately, those who are satisfied with their treatment tend to keep quiet, while those with a complaint (which I admit, may be justified sometimes) get the publicity. My main gripe is that the VRAB has too few ex-military members — one is supposed to be “judged by his peers” and I consider my peers to be veterans!

FOCUS GROUPS
In an attempt to determine veterans’ needs and concerns, Veterans Affairs is establishing a number of veterans focus groups, presumably with a view to obtaining their input. The aim is “to measure level of knowledge and understanding of VAC programmes.”

Due to limited financial resources, meetings will be confined to Halifax and Edmonton (for matters affected by the New Veterans Charter) and Saint John, Montreal and Winnipeg for others. Groups of veterans not in receipt of VAC services and those who are receiving services will apparently meet separately. I am surprised that only veterans who left the service after 2002 are eligible. What’s wrong with old sweats?

For information, I suggest you contact the programme director, Colleen Salterman at 902-566-8912.

WHERE WERE THE VETERANS?
The Royal Canadian Naval Memorial
was duly unveiled in Ottawa last month by the Ottawa River. A suitable representation of serving naval members was present, and the impressive monument was launched in navy fashion by an ex-WREN smashing a bottle of champagne at its base. But where were the navy veterans?

I asked a number Korean war RCN veterans how they enjoyed the ceremony, and found that they had been neither notified nor invited, and a number of other naval veterans’ associations had been “missed out.”

To be fair to Veterans Affairs, the event was organized by the National Capital Commission.

ANIMALS IN WAR

The “Animals in War” memorial project recently received a boost. Peter Chung, head of EMANTA Corporation, has just donated $40,000 to the project. His comments are worth repeating:

“Being born in Korea at the end of the Korean conflict (sic) I grew up with a very acute awareness of the value of the sacrifices made by veterans ... as they fought to defend our liberty and freedom. I have always considered animals used in conflicts as veterans, too, and rightfully they deserve to have similar recognition.”

The project is still $90,000 short of its July 20 objective. I intend to kick in a few bucks in memory of a mine-detecting dog that I escorted in the Samichon area. Other vets and their friends may also wish to do so.

For more information contact Lloyd Swick at (613) 228-8914 or by email at info@aiwdedication.ca.
Military books

Since retiring from the Canadian Forces in 1992, Colonel Michel Drapeau has literally been rewriting the book on military justice. The result is both powerful and provocative.

In their new 1,900-page tome on the military justice system, Justice Gilles Létourneau and professor Michel Drapeau have created an unmatched reference manual suitable for any practitioner or student of military law. Military Justice In Action: Annotated National Defence Legislation is a unique text in the scope and breadth in which it addresses every aspect of the justice system that regulates the Canadian Forces.

While Military Justice In Action has no difficulty standing on its own as a comprehensive text, the book is also meant to serve as a companion to the pair’s 2006 publication Canadian Military Law Annotated, itself a 1,300-page work outlining the legislation governing Canadian forces.

Canada’s military justice system can be confusing in its nuances as it strays from the Criminal Code of Canada and other tenets of civilian law that establish Canada’s common law tradition. Létourneau and Drapeau have managed to address both the shortcomings and the strengths of the military system without pretension or bias in a manner that is both readable and promotes debate.

Each annotation throughout Military Justice In Action provides an astounding level of historical and legal context in describing how modern military law came to be. Without that historical and legal context, it’s easy to understand how service members and legislators alike could become overwhelmed with the complex relationships in Canadian law that keep the military in good standing domestically and abroad.

Létourneau and Drapeau deftly argue that, in many aspects, the National Defence Act and other military legislation that predates the Charter of Rights and Freedoms infringe upon the rights of soldiers and, as such, there is a need to modernize the military justice system to bring it into compliance with the charter.

“By the very nature of the discipline required of any military, there will inevitably be some disparities between the common law and the military law. Despite the absolute wording of the Constitution, there are still many disparities between Canada’s common law tradition and its military law tradition, which flow from the partial application of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to the National Defence Act. Obviously, all effort should be made to ensure that these disparities are minimal,” state Létourneau and Drapeau.

Without the significant work poured into creating Military Justice In Action, the debate over the modernization of Canada’s military justice system would be lacking an informed and powerful voice in addressing the rights of soldiers as they dovetail with the necessity for good order and discipline.

“The idea is that you shouldn’t be treated more harshly or more softly because you’re in the military,” Drapeau told the news website www.canoe.ca.

“The authors are to be congratulated for having accomplished what can only be described as a highly welcome tour de force,” said Lt. Gen. (ret’d) Richard Evraire in the Canadian Military Journal.

Military Justice In Action: Annotated National Defence Legislation is available from Carswell for $113.

~ review by Blake Hurdis
Redcoated Ploughboys is about the formation, fighting history and dissolution of the Upper Canada Incorporated Militia, one of Canada’s militia units during the War of 1812. This book is all about the war and the Incorporated Militia — a corps of men drawn from every walk of life and social stratum. It has a clear and simple writing style, and conveys lots of facts in a way that does not confuse the reader. In all, Redcoated Ploughboys is a perfect book for the 1812 war enthusiast, or anyone interested in Napoleonic era warfare.

Though the focus of Redcoated Ploughboys is mainly on this small militia unit in the midst of a huge conflict, author Richard Feltoe manages to hold the reader’s attention with a clear and concise way of writing. This war re-enactor and museum curator is the first author who has made me understand, in plain language, the intricacies of Napoleonic warfare without laying on thick the military jargon and half-understood tactics.

The book goes through the battles of each division of the militia units, looking at the battles they individually fought and documenting it well. A lot of the important battles of 1812 are examined — from the Battle of Lundy’s Lane in 1814, the Battle of Chippewa, to the Siege of Fort Erie. Each of the battles is told through the story, but also through diagrams and old maps, which work to make the tactical aspects of fighting a little easier to understand for the reader. The numerous old photos and paintings of the period also build on the atmosphere that the book fosters of an old 19th century colony fighting for its life.

A lot of the books that have to do with Canada’s side of the War of 1812 like to make a lot of connections from modern-day Canadians to the brave colonists who fought in that war. They like to flaunt their miniscule connection to these ancestors, and almost take credit for their achievements; but Redcoated Ploughboys does not do that. In fact, for an account about a small group of roughshod militiamen, this book remains very objective and unbiased. As far as I could tell, Canadians, British or Americans were not portrayed in a light better than anyone else’s. Not the most significant achievement, but one that I thought was noteworthy.

Though the subject of the book is a bit narrow, it is actually worth a read. With its clear and easy reading style, and its method of visibly explaining the battles, Redcoated Ploughboys is a good book for novice historians of the War of 1812. ~ review by Alex Davis

Norad and the Soviet Nuclear Threat is about two countries working together in the defence of North America, during the long Cold War of the 20th century — from the close but sometimes rocky relationship between the U.S. and Canada, to Canada’s radar defence lines, and the hundreds of aircraft and dozens of U.S. and Canadian air force squadrons that worked to deter an attack on North America by the Soviet Union. It is a knowledgeable narrative that can be an entertaining and sometimes nostalgic read.

In NORAD and the Soviet Nuclear Threat, author Gordon A.A. Wilson reviews several different topics surrounding the entity that is NORAD, but tends to keep the focus centred on Canada’s air commitment to the organization. He gives a brief but entertaining history of the Cold War, and provides a timeline of important events. He talks about the history of air defence in Canada, commenting on the might of Canada’s air force during WWII and its rapid decline to a pre-war state in the years following. Wilson talks about NORAD’s many headquarters and bunkers, built to survive a nuclear attack by the Russians, the air exercises conducted by American and Canadian pilots to prepare for the eventuality, and even speaks about how radar and electronic warfare works.

This is a very up-to-date and detailed book, with numerous facts, dates, names and numbers to fill the pages. It also has a number of black and white and colour pictures of aircraft training for NORAD, as well as pictures of the bases and numerous important events of the Cold War. Though with all this information and detail, the story leaves a little to be desired, with sometimes ponderous and confusing sections where the numbers and facts blur together. The chapter titled “Radar and Electronic Warfare” reads like a technical manual intended for a complex machine and is a bit of a quagmire in an otherwise steadily moving story.

Other than the technical jargon about radar and electronic warfare and the sea of facts that the story floats in, the book has some quick-witted and thought-provoking pieces to it. In his discussion about Canada’s first attempt at acquiring the CF-105 Avro Arrow supersonic jet fighter to defend North America, Wilson likens this past procurement to Canada’s modern-day attempt to procure the F-35 stealth fighter. He talks at length about the issue, making connections between the F-35 and the Arrow, which was suddenly scrapped by the Canadian government in 1958 amid much controversy. Wilson ends the book with an epilogue, talking about how relevant NORAD is in today’s world, and what the extensive defence system does to protect North America in the present.

As far as books go, NORAD and the Soviet Nuclear Threat is not what you want for a light read. But if you are into books about the Cold War or about the air force, this paperback will have you occupied for days on end. ~ review by Alex Davis
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Since most advanced technical armaments require a fair bit of lead time, Canada would essentially have to be continually planning for the next offensive military intrusion, given that this seems to be the preference of our tough, no-nonsense, intrusive political leadership.

Here is where the law of good intentions comes into play. I feel that often the lack of an offensive capability acts as a deterrent to rash, poorly thought-out decisions. If you have the capability, the more likely you are to use it.

A national dialogue is needed as to the use of Canada’s military power. [The French statesman George] Clemenceau once said: “War is too important to be left to generals.” Well, perhaps it’s time to say: “War is too important to be left to politicians.”

Personally, I would like to see the return of the Blue Helmet. Peter [MacKay] could still get his photo ops sitting in an observation post rather than in a mock-up of a billion-dollar toy.

Selina G.
Edmonton

WHO ARE WE REALLY DEFENDING?
By the time the last of our new fleet of warships hits the water, it will already be outdated and the first will be long overdue for a refit. Why not start manufacturing war materials and vehicles here, in Canada, rather than in a mock-up of a billion-dollar toy.

The Second World War went a long way towards ending the Great Depression. Why not let armament manufacture end our current debt and deficit and unemployment problems?

But in reality, do we need any armed forces at all? The last time our army was called upon to actually defend our sovereignty was in the War of 1812. Everything since has been running defence for other nations and now we’re simply a puppet or lapdog for Uncle Sam and we do his bidding without thought for the good of our own nation or its armed forces.

Harry Fletcher
New Brunswick

MILITARY FAMILIES FUND
bureaucracy made arrangements for him and his family. He also asked for emergency financial assistance to handle his added living expenses. His spouse wrote directly to the chief of the defence staff, not once but three times. Incredibly, Jack was directed to the Royal Canadian Legion. Apparently, having a pregnant (and sick) wife living in a mould-infested PMQ does not fall under the mandate of the Military Families Fund either.

CASE NO. 5
We can report one successful claim from the fund. In 2010, a client of ours, Mrs. Nicole Duffy, reported to us that, after their son’s death, while his car was being stored on base, it was damaged. The Military Families Fund paid for the repairs to the car prior to its return, as part of their dead son’s estate. According to the Military Families Fund, we suppose, this damaged car meets the requisite “emergency” needed to draw from their millions of raised monies.

CONCLUSIONS
In establishing this charity, General Hillier stated that, “When our families call out for help, we must be able to answer that call immediately and substantially.” Furthermore, the Military Families Fund promotes itself as “agile” and “responsive” and that it is a way to “help Military Families within hours of being advised of need … [in] short-term emergencies [and] long-term support.”

We are unaware how they are striving to meet this objective.

In fact, our perception is that the Military Families Fund, a charity that raises funds by drawing on the heartstrings of the civilian population, industry, veterans and serving members, is lacking in its mandate. A charity should not be left to function without a modicum of accountability. If Corporal Johnson, Mrs. Cornersmith, Mrs. O’Malley or Recruit Jack Stinson do not qualify as military families in need, who does? Though we were happy when Mrs. Duffy’s son’s car was repaired, is this really the ends that generous donors have in mind when giving money to the Military Families Fund? We think not.

Especially given the lack of accountability, the Military Families Fund could be regarded as more of a military “slush” fund. There is no overt problem with this, but let’s rename it so. Collecting millions of dollars on the pretense of helping military families in need, and then indiscriminately distributing these funds, is, in our opinion, not quite straight, open and candid with donors.
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Cooperative training between Palestinian groups and European radicals started as early as 1970, and joint operations between the PFLP and the Japanese Red Army (JRA) began in 1974. Since then, international terrorist cooperation in training, operations and support has continued to grow and continues to this day. Motives range from the ideological, such as the 1980s alliance of the Western European Marxist-oriented groups, to financial, as when the IRA exported its expertise in bomb making as far afield as Colombia. Unlike the anarchists of the 19th century, these groups could cooperate globally and thrive through the exchange of knowledge and skills.

The largest act of international terrorism occurred on September 11, 2001 in a set of coordinated attacks on the United States of America where Islamic terrorists hijacked civilian airliners and used them to attack the World Trade Center towers in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C.. Other major terrorist attacks have also occurred in New Delhi (Indian Parliament attacked); Bali (car bomb attack); London (subway bombings); Madrid (train bombings) and the recent attacks in Mumbai (hotels, train station and a Jewish outreach centre). The operational and strategic epicentre of Islamic terrorism is now mostly centred in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

The use of terror by governments and those that contest their power remains poorly understood. While the meaning of the word terror is clear, when it is applied to acts and actors in the real world it becomes confused. Part of this is due to the use of terror tactics by actors at all levels in the social and political environment. Is the Unabomber, with his solo campaign of terror, a criminal, terrorist, or revolutionary?

Can he be compared to the French revolutionary governments who coined the term terrorism by instituting systematic state terror against the population of France in the 1790s, killing thousands? Are either the same as revolutionary terrorist groups such as the Baader-Meinhof Gang of West Germany or the Weather Underground in the United States.

This begs the question, is a car bomb on a city street and a jet fighter dropping a bomb on a tank both acts of terrorism? If so, then the eventual conclusion of this argument would mean that any military action is simply terrorism by a different name. This is the reasoning behind the famous phrase “One man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.” It is also a legacy of legitimizing the use of terror by successful revolutionary movements after the fact. The most common theme throughout terrorism’s entire history is that it has been defined by the power structures the terrorists oppose.

While Anne-France Goldwater may be guilty of lacking nuance in her debating method, she has illustrated perfectly the way language falls short in describing the actors known as ‘terrorists’. This is a label that has been attributed to the likes of Menachim Begin, Nelson Mandela, Henry Kissinger and many others who have benefited from language’s fluidity and slid from being understood as terrorists to statesmen.

Answers to the trivia questions on page 63:
1) Yes, but 9mm ammo would not extract and I’d have to tap out the casings with the cleaning rod. 2) Yes. We tried it with a “bootleg” 81mm mortar but there was a loss of accuracy. 3) In the film Wings fledgling pilot Cooper left a half-eaten chocolate bar before taking off, saying that he would finish it when he returned. Any war movie buff knows that such a move was fatal! 4) The Spanish Civil War. 5) The 103rd Foot (New South Wales Fencibles) was a ragtag outfit, in large part drafted from convicts. (This group was also noted for mutiny during Captain William Bligh’s (the very same HMS Bounty guy) governorship of NSW.) Many of them deserted to the enemy. 6) The Belgian fort, supposedly the world’s strongest, was captured by German glider-borne troops in a quarter-hour in May 1940. 7) Forty-two Canadian squadrons served with the RAF. 8) Sixteen nationalities: Palestinian Jews, Poles, French, Moroccans, Greeks, Senegalese, Italians, Algerians, Ghurkas, Brazilians, Indians, South Africans, Canadians, New Zealanders, British and Americans. 9) After the exercises, President Roosevelt ordered the fleet to remain in Hawaii. They were still there on December 7, 1941. 10) General Erwin Rommel was a competent amateur pilot and occasionally flew personal recce missions.
Exclusive daily news and extensive defence coverage. Look forward to our upcoming Embassy Defence Policy Briefing coming out on November 28.
Misinformation and duplicity leave Canadians confused and suspicious. There is no doubt that our fleet of CF-18s needs to be replaced. However, buying airplanes in a fog is deceitful and dangerous.

Some clear thinking from the Harper Conservatives would be greatly appreciated.

... CONT’D FROM PAGE 14

Allied nations. Instead of just buying older Boeing or Lockheed technology, perhaps we should think outside the box and get involved with the Eurofighter, which is a premier air superiority aircraft, that is still being evolved to multi-role.

Aerial combat tactics will also evolve, and radar-based target acquisition (that is active and emitting) will likely be replaced by passive detection (infrared, electro-optics, and radio/electronic chatter tracking). This would play to the strengths of a variety of aircraft and sensor systems. Think … If you emit, you will get hit!

Instead of the Eurofighter, the four countries (Japan–Australia–Canada–South Korea) could produce the JACK-fighter. Perhaps even JAACK-fighter if the Americans are looking for a new generation alternative to the Joint Strike Fighter. Please withhold your disbelief; the Yanks took the British Harrier technology and made it their own.

... CONTINUED FROM PAGE 16

The Honourable John McKay P.C., is the Liberal Member of Parliament for the riding of Scarborough—Guildwood in Ontario. A native of Scarborough, he was first elected in 1997 and has been subsequently re-elected five times. Between 2003 and 2006 he served as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, helping to oversee the tabling of two consecutive balanced budgets. Mr. McKay is currently the Critic for Defence for the Liberal Party of Canada and also serves as the Vice-Chair of the Canada-U.S. Inter-Parliamentary Group.

A CF-18 is refueled in the air during a training exercise. Entering CF service in 1982, the 30-year-old Hornet jet fighter has undergone various upgrades, including one in 2002 that was supposed to extend the plane’s life until 2017 – 2020. (Pte Laura Brophy, DND)

An American F-15E Strike Eagle launches heat decoy missiles during a close-air-support mission. Aerial combat will continue to evolve over time, becoming more and more technical in nature. (U.S. Air Force)

An American F-35 strike fighter, QF-35A, performs a flight test for the U.S. Air Force at Edwards AFB, Calif. QF-35A is a version of the F-35 and is lethal against targets. (U.S. Air Force)
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programs such as the long-awaited project to acquire 1,500 standard military pattern (SMP) trucks. Originally announced in 2006, the SMP project has been dogged by delays.

In December 2011, companies that had been pre-qualified for the project were told that the SMP requirements had been changed and bidding would be re-opened. Industry officials say the changes now make it difficult for a 6X6 truck to win, putting the emphasis on the acquisition of an 8X8 vehicle.

The reason for the change was the increase in armour protection for the truck cab, according to industry representatives. The amount of armour the army wants put so much weight on the front axle that an 8X8 truck configuration is needed.

In addition, the army has a need for new sidearms for its personnel as well as a rifle for the Canadian Rangers. The new Canadian Ranger Rifle will be a robust bolt-action hunting rifle with minor customization so that it can fire both commercial .308 Winchester and 7.62 x 51mm NATO ammunition, according to the Canadian Forces. There is also a need for a general service pistol (or GSP). Approximately 10,000 pistols will be purchased to replace the aging 9mm Browning Hi-Power.

Both projects have already run into some delays but are expected to proceed.

Small arms firms, such as Colt Canada, will be displaying a full range of their products at CANSEC 2012. Colt Canada is the Canadian government’s “Small Arms Centre of Excellence” and is expected to play a role in any new weapons procurement.

In addition, R. Nicholls Distributors is a CANSEC favourite, attracting large numbers of soldiers with its displays of a variety of weapons and accessories at the show, including the Heckler and Koch line as well as firearms from Sako, Ruger and SigArms.

Other products promoted by the company include weapon-mounted acoustic gunshot detection systems and an integrated gunshot detection vehicle version, which could be used on the CCV and TAPV. It has also highlighted in the past the Sagem thermal and day sight for machine guns and 20 and 25mm cannons.

Other firms such as Nammo promote their ammunition, grenades and shoulder-launched weapons for potential army customers. Nammo has expanded its presence in Canada since it expects the Canadian Forces to be a key customer in the coming years (Nammo Canada Inc. in Ottawa was established in February 2009). Three years ago the firm was awarded a contact to provide Canada with M72 A5s.

As well, Saab has its line of anti-aircraft and anti-armour weapon systems for ground forces that it highlights at CANSEC.

Radios, computers and helmet-mounted displays for the individual soldier will also be promoted as various firms pursue the Integrated Soldier System Project. The ISSP is designed to provide the soldier with a suite of equipment that includes weapon accessories, electronic devices, sensors, individual equipment and operational clothing.

A request for proposals (RFP) has been issued to acquire up to 6,624 integrated suites of equipment over a four-year period. The procurement also includes a field performance evaluation by Canadian soldiers. The contract award is expected to be announced in December 2013, according to Public Works.

Other firms, such as NGRAIN of Vancouver, are promoting the training they can provide to the Canadian Army through its virtual task trainers (or VTTs). The Canadian Forces School of Electrical and Mechanical Engineering (CFSEME) selected NGRAIN to address the training requirements for the LAV III, including system orientation, procedural training, and diagnostics training.

On a more basic level, the army is acquiring approximately 2,200 new field heaters to replace five legacy models and has turned to NGRAIN for training materials in that regard. NGRAIN will provide interactive training through virtual task trainers that will help reduce skill-fade and improve soldiers’ understanding of the internal components, as well as the associated maintenance procedures, the firm notes.

In brief, the companies exhibiting at CANSEC 2012 will be able to showcase their products to those who will decide on the future procurement of the Canadian Forces — and to the men and women in uniform who will ultimately be using them.

A variety of weapons dot the landscape of CANSEC, grabbing the attention of many former and currently serving soldiers. A common theme for defence manufacturers is extending the survivability of the soldier with high-tech improvements in equipment. (Darcy Knoll, ESPIRIT DE CORPS)
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Canada’s effort in the Libyan war had in fact come in under budget.

“As of October 13, the figures have us well below [$60 million]; somewhere under $50 million.”

All of that premature gloating might explain why the final tally was quietly buried in a report tabled in the House of Commons last week. It turns out that total expenditure for the Libyan operation cost Canadian taxpayers $347.5 million. If one subtracts the normal operating expenses — such as salaries, etc. — the incremental cost still amounts to roughly $100 million — or double that which MacKay initially boasted to the taxpayers.

Ironically, if one factors in the additional month of combat operations that was required beyond the Rideau Institute’s initial projection, the think-tank’s prediction, which MacKay dismissively maligned, was only off target by two percent.

In preparation for our eventual victory in Libya, on October 2, 2011, more than three weeks before hostilities ended, the Privy Council Office authorized the expenditure of $396,000 for DND to stage a victory parade.

That spectacular event was held on November 24, complete with marching bands and a flypast that included more aircraft than we had put into the skies over Libya. Once again, when the final bills were tabulated, the actual cost of the spectacle was $850,000 — an amount far in excess of that originally budgeted.

Spokesmen for MacKay explained to journalists that such flypasts and parades are all good training for the troops and aircrew, regardless of the expense. A similar rationale was used to explain the $32,000 cost of sending a military search and rescue helicopter to pluck MacKay from his fishing lodge in July 2010.

A difference in accounting principles indeed.
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