

Canada is Aiding and Abetting the Most Ambitious, Weapons Development Program in World History

By Richard Sanders, Editor, *Press for Conversion!*

Reports about the death of “missile defence” in Canada have been greatly exaggerated. In fact, Canadian aspects of this weapons development program are not only alive and well, they have never been stronger.

Despite Prime Minister Paul Martin’s supposed “no” to “missile defense,” Canada is *still* very deeply involved in numerous efforts to design, develop, test and deploy a variety of technological systems that are absolutely essential to U.S.-led “missile defense” weapons programs.

Canada’s participation has included a great variety of practical contributions to the task of furthering this controversial American scheme.

Despite a constant barrage of government statements and commercial news stories to the contrary, the Canadian government, its armed forces and key players in Canada’s military export sector have – for many years – been busily engaged in this costly effort to enhance the precision of a whole slew of existing U.S. weapons systems and to create some new ones as well.

Canadian connivance in this so-called “missile-defense” project certainly *did not* come to an end on February 24, 2005, when the Canadian government formally announced that it was saying “no” to U.S. requests to join the program. Nor will Canada’s longstanding allegiance to this U.S. plan be halted at any time in the foreseeable future.

Before there is even a slight chance of slowing down, let alone stopping, Canada’s collusion in this deadly scheme, citizens will need to at least be aware that their government, industries, scientific institutions and armed forces are indeed *still deeply involved*. At this point, however, the public has innocently accepted at face value the false news that the Canadian government listened to Canadians and decided to reject participation in “missile defense.”

This state of ignorance is terribly unfortunate. For the few Canadi-

ans still struggling to oppose their country’s involvement in “missile defense,” it is tragic that so many people were successfully duped into believing that their country was never really involved. What’s more, most Canadians have even swallowed the government’s fraudulent declaration that it has taken a firm stand committing this country to oppose *future* participation in the troublesome and widely-despised U.S. weapons program.

No, no and no! Canada is more committed to NORAD and NATO than ever and will continue to take part in their “missile defense” operations. In fact, with the government’s recent promise of a massive increase in military spending, DND will more-than-likely strengthen the country’s already substantial contributions to these two military alliances.

Such Canadian hypocrisy in supporting these military pacts is not new.

How will the Liberal government's supposed “no” to “missile defense” actually effect Canada's very real, longstanding and deep integration in this massive, weapons buildup that threatens global security?



On March 16, 2005, NATO announced that it was developing its own “missile defense” weapons system. NATO says these weapons will be ready by 2010 to protect its troops deployed in war.

“No” Means “Yes”

So, if Canada is still deeply involved in “missile defense,” what was the real meaning of Martin’s resounding “no”? How will his “no” actually effect Canada’s very real, longstanding involvement in this massive, weapons buildup that threatens global security?

NORAD and NATO

Now that the Canadian government has “said no” to “missile defense,” will it withdraw from treaty organizations like NORAD and NATO that are both openly committed to the development and use of “missile defense” weapons systems? Or, will Canada now demand that NORAD and NATO halt their involvement in these plans? Or, will Canada remain within these military alliances but refuse to partake in their “missile defense” efforts?

Although Canada claims to be a neutral force opposed to nuclear weapons, it has maintained a “seat at the table” of these alliances even though they blatantly rely on the ability to threaten, wage and “win” nuclear war. And so it is now, with “missile defense.”

While Canada pretends to eschew “missile defense,” it contributes money, troops, infrastructure and Canadian territory to two major military alliances that closely embrace and promote this weapons program. In fact, through these two military pacts, Canada is itself very much involved in trying to make “missile defense” a functioning reality as quickly as possible. (For more on NORAD see “Canada Requested ‘Missile Defense’ Role in NORAD,” pages 10-21. The next issue of *Press for Conversion!* will focus, in part, on Canada’s contribution to NATO “missile defense” activities.)



Corporate Contracts

Now that the Canadian government has "said no" to "missile defense," will Canadian companies, that have been profiting from "missile defense" weapons-related business, now be told to termi-

nate such contracts? Or, alternatively, will Canada's military exporters be stopped from pursuing future "missile defense"-related business?

No and no! Canadian firms will be allowed to proceed with all their existing "missile defense"-related contracts. And, the government will not place any im-

pediments in the way of Canadian companies that wish to extend such contracts. Neither will the government discourage any efforts made by Canadian corporations to pursue additional contracts linked to "missile defense."



Foreign Affairs
Canada

DFAIT

Now that Canada has "said no" to "missile defense," will the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) now stop helping Canadian companies that are chasing after lucrative "missile defense" contracts?

No! In fact, Pierre Pettigrew, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, has made it very clear that the Canadian government is not actually opposed to the American decision to build "missile defense" weapons systems. He has also clearly stated that he "would be very pleased" if Canadian companies can land such contracts. (See "Pettigrew says Canada Open for 'Missile Defence' Business," on page 18.)

What is so-called "Missile Defense" Really All About?

This U.S.-led scheme for the design and development of new and improved weapons systems, has been sold to the public, the media and politicians as a noble effort to create a "missile shield." The stated objective of this "shield" is to protect people from missile attacks launched by terrorists or rogue states.

Don't believe it! Even the phrase "missile defense" is just part of the pretense being used to rationalise the spending of hundreds of billions of dollars on new and improved arsenals that will function just as easily for offensive purposes as defensive ones. The idea that such a missile system could protect nations let alone whole continents and their populations, is simply ludicrous.

So-called "missile defense" is, in reality, a huge undertaking to improve upon existing missile technology and to generate new generations of weapons. It is, in fact, by far the grandest and most-expensive weapons-development initiative in world history. It encompasses numerous, multi-billion-dollar efforts that are

"Missile defense" is a massive effort to improve existing missile technology and to create whole new generations of weapons. It is the grandest and most-expensive arms-development initiative in world history. The term "missile defense" is part of a scheme to rationalise spending hundreds of billions of dollars on arsenals that will function at least as easily for offensive purposes as for defensive ones.



now spawning the creation and advancement of land-, sea-, air- and space-based weapons systems.

At the extreme cutting edge of this massive, weapons advancement program is an effort to perfect the tracking and targeting functions of ballistic missile systems. To push this technology forward, the military has cleverly set for itself the task of solving the most difficult targeting scenario imaginable. It is working on the problem of hitting one ballistic missile with another one. This is the military equivalent of skeet shooting, whereby hunters practise their shooting

skills by firing at flying disks flung into the air by machines. By making their targets smaller and faster than can currently be accurately hit, the military has created for itself a challenge that is specifically designed to improve the tracking of targets as well as the control of weapons fire.

If a missile can successfully target and then hit another missile, the technology that is developed to perform this task can be used to fire missiles at virtually any imaginable target. There is absolutely no reason why such improvements to weapons technology will have to be used for defensive purposes alone. Neither would such new tech-

Industry Canada

Now that the Canadian government has "said no" to "missile defense," will Industry Canada (IC), discontinue its generous disbursement of grants and non-repayable loans to domestic military corporations, including those that design, build, test, maintain and operate "missile defense" systems?

No! The government has not given any indication whatsoever that public monies will now be prohibited from flowing through such IC programs as Technology Partnerships Canada, which has generously financed Canada's military industries, and into the bank ledgers of private corporations currently engaged in "missile defense."

nology be limited to shooting down incoming missiles.

Once a tracking and targeting technology has been created or improved there is no going back. These new weapons systems, although supposedly developed under the auspices of creating a "missile defense shield," will be put to use in whatever roles the military and its war-planners see fit. This newly-created technology will simply supplant existing missile systems and they will, of course, be used to aid in the waging of future wars, whether offensive or defensive.

Although "missile-defense" technology was never really intended to defend a "homeland" population from attack, it can and is now being used, in a very limited way, to protect localised areas during battle. This so-called "Theater Ballistic Missile Defense" (TBMD) is used to allow the forward-deployment of weapons and troops, particularly aboard warships. The idea is that TBMD allows frigates, destroyers and aircraft carriers, to protect themselves from attack during war. This allows naval forces to launch the array of missiles, fighters and bomber warplanes that are so essential to the waging of modern, air warfare. This is the very real and immediate purpose behind the rush to develop so-called "missile defense" technology.

The term "missile defense" was cleverly put forward as a means of deflecting opposition. Who could be



Government R&D

Now that Canada has "said no" to "missile defense," will the Canadian government at least stop paying the salaries of scientists, engineers and technicians that it employs at the National Research Council as well as at half a dozen Defence Research and Development Canada laboratories across the country? For years, these government agencies have been paying their scientists to work on programs that directly assist the U.S.-led "missile defense" weapons development program.

No! These Canadian government

against defending our population from a missile attack? The term puts opponents of "missile defense" into the trap of appearing to be either traitors or enemies. The carefully-selected euphemism serves, therefore, as a linguistic shield to protect and disguise a huge, weapons development scheme that would not otherwise be endorsed by the public, or even by many politicians and the media. For these reasons, deceptive terms, such as "missile defense" and "missile shield," should be placed in inverted commas and efforts should be made to make it clear that these terms actually refer to a massive, weapons-development program.

To be successful, the peace/anti-war movement's struggle to counter the development of "missile defense" weapons systems must be waged on many fronts. One important endeavor is to control the language used to define what we stand for and what we are up against. Opposition to "missile defense" is obviously not based upon any desire to allow deadly missiles to rain down upon our cities. One reason to oppose "missile defense" is that it is a pretext for the advancement of offensive weapons systems that will be used to fight aggressive wars. Opposing so-called "missile defense," is therefore an integral part of the greater struggle against war and the institutions of war that have always sought to improve upon the latest weapons available to them.

agencies, will continue their multi-billion-dollar efforts to preserve Canada's position as a global leader in the creation and improvement of many types of weapons technologies, including those crucial to the so-called "missile defense" program.



Canadian Space Agency

Now that Canada has "said no" to "missile defense," will the Canadian government stop the export of Radarsat data for "missile defense" uses? After spending hundreds of millions in tax dollars on Radarsat I, the world's most advanced commercial satellite, the Canadian government, through the CSA, handed over ownership and control of this satellite, and its ground stations around the world, to Vancouver's MacDonald Dettwiler and Associates (MDA). At the time, MDA was owned by Orbital Sciences Corp., a U.S. military company that is among the top producers of missiles used in so-called "missile defense" tests. Data from Radarsat is highly coveted by the U.S. military, including core agencies responsible for "missile defense." Canadian citizens also paid hundreds of millions for Radarsat II, only to have it privatised as well, once again to MDA. Will the government take any steps whatsoever to ensure that the data from these satellites is not sold to the U.S. for "missile defense" purposes?

No and no! Not only has the Liberal government given away the public ownership and control of Radarsat I and II, then-Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy and U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright signed an agreement in June 2000, to ensure that Radarsat II data would be available for U.S. military use. The Liberal government has even refused to allow NDP

and Bloc Quebecois MPs to view the documents which transferred these billion-dollar satellites to MDA, claiming that to do so might jeopardise the company's commercial interests. (Stay tuned for more on MDA and Radarsat in an upcoming *Press for Conversion!*)



DND and TBMD

Now that the Canadian government has "said no" to "missile defense," will DND abandon efforts to equip Canadian warships with the latest technology to enable their interoperability with U.S. Navy's "missile defense" systems?

No! The many additional billions of dollars assigned to DND in the latest Liberal-government budget will only ensure that the military's much-desired acquisition and upgrade programs will continue to equip Canada's warships so that they will be even better able to participate in multinational deployments of U.S. and NATO forces that use fledgling "missile defense" weapons systems.



Canada Pension Plan

Now that Canada has "said no" to "missile defense," will the Canada Pension Plan now stop forcing millions of Canadian workers to invest their retirement savings in the world's top designers and producers of "missile defense" weapons systems?

No! Canadian, U.S. and European companies that are now engaged in this work will continue to receive massive investments through the CPP. Just as Canadians are forced to invest in hun-

dreds of the world's largest corporations that seek to profit from ongoing conventional wars, we can also be assured that our hard-earned savings will still being funnelled into the bank accounts of companies at the forefront of the "missile defense" scheme.

Coalition of the Willing

Now that the Canadian government has "said no" to "missile defense," is there evidence of *any kind whatsoever* that it will take *even the smallest action* to stop *even one* of the existing forms of Canadian complicity in "missile defense," or to prevent future participation in this massive, weapons program?

No! Notwithstanding Canada's completely symbolic "no" declaration, this country has more fingers deeply embedded in the "missile-defense" pie than any other nation besides the U.S.. Canada's role goes above and beyond the parts played by those governments that have actually been open enough to officially admit their endorsement of the "missile defense" project, namely, Australia, Britain, Israel, Japan and South Korea.

There are so many practical and meaningful ways that the Canadian government has found to express its real, ongoing and deep commitment to "missile defense," that the mere utterance of a two-letter word, "no," is completely insignificant at best.

Since the function of this phony declaration was to deceptively cover up a trail of Canadian complicity in "missile defense," their "no" should never have been dignified with a congratulatory response. On the contrary, the government should be chastised for lying. Would we praise a criminal for *saying* he was innocent? Or a junk-food manufacturer for saying their products were healthy? Of course not. So, why praise Canada's government for saying it will not join the "missile defense" club when we know it is already a member?

"Canada-as-Cover"

Some argue that although Canada may be involved in "missile defense" programs, this practical participation is inconsequential. All the U.S. *really* wanted, they argue, was Canada's moral backing. These theorists contend that Canada's "no," although largely symbolic, is a substantial example illustrating Canada's independent and sovereign foreign policy.

Such arguments assume that the U.S. did not actually need any practical Canadian help on the design, construction, testing or deployment of "missile defense" systems. According to these arguments, Martin's rejection was a major blow to the U.S. because all the Americans *really* needed from Canada was a political cover behind which they

could develop their offensive new weapons systems. This "Canada-as-cover" hypothesis postulates that Canada's global visage is so glowingly positive that it could even have been used to successfully mask America's vast and destabilising, new weapons project.

On the surface, this line of reasoning may seem to have some merit.

However, the premise falters because it is directly contradicted by at least two important realities that should not be ignored:

- (1) Canada's practical help has actually been in great demand by the U.S. military establishment for many decades and it is actually indispensable to a wide variety of U.S. weapons programs, including the push to develop a wide array of "missile defense" weapons systems.
- (2) The U.S. has repeatedly shown itself to be quite prepared to take raw, unilateral actions, even if they are immoral, illegal, ultraviolent and extremely unpopular on the global stage.

Now, let's examine how these two realities directly contradict the "Canada-as-cover" argument.

Now that the Canadian government has "said no" to "missile defense," is there evidence of *any kind whatsoever* that the Canadian government will take *even the slightest action* to put a stop to *even one* of the many existing forms of Canadian complicity in "missile defense"? (Answer: No!)

(1) Canada's Practical Help is Highly Coveted:

The unfortunate reality is that the U.S. really *does* need Canada's help in designing, building, maintaining, operating, deploying and using "missile defense" systems. Besides providing NORAD with access to about 55 radar stations along the western, northern and eastern frontiers of Canada, and besides Canada's multibillion-dollar fleet of warships used in U.S.-led, NATO "missile defense" exercises, and besides data from Canada's Radarsat satellite system, and besides Canada's government-funded military scientists whose creative genius is used to solve difficult problems encountered when trying to make "missile defense" systems a reality, there is also the fact that

Canada is home to many world-class weapons industries that are of tremendous value to American "missile defense" ambitions.

Let's focus for a moment on Canada's corporate contributions. If the U.S. were somehow magically denied use of high-tech Canadian military components, then many if not most of their major weapons delivery systems (i.e., bombers and fighter planes, warships, main battle tanks, nuclear submarines and field artillery weapons) would instantly cease to function.

Even though the Canadian public has managed to cultivate a blissful ignorance of this reality, the U.S. military-industrial complex knows better. That's why, every year, the U.S. buys billions of dollars worth of Canadian-made military equipment. Canadian and

U.S. military industries are all part of one indivisible unit, referred to as the "North American Military Industrial Base." As such, Canadian military products are treated as if they were made in the U.S.. And, many of these Canadian companies are owned by U.S. parent companies anyway.

For many decades, thanks to generous subsidies from Liberal and Conservative governments alike, Canadian military corporations have been able to produce some of the world's most-advanced, military products for export to the U.S. at rock-bottom prices. Recall that military and energy-related businesses are the only two economic sectors legally exempt from subsidy restrictions by Canada-U.S. trade agreements. This means that Canadian taxpayers subsidise domestic corpora-

As this issue of *Press for Conversion!* demonstrates, Canada is deeply embedded in the "missile defense" project through a variety of corporate, government and military connections. However, this Canada's input has gone almost completely unnoticed by the Canadian public. When Canada begged its way into an enhanced "missile defense" responsibility through the NORAD-treaty change of August 2004, it should have dawned on Canadians that their government was inextricably tied to the controversial "missile defense" weapons program. However, the significance of this additional dimension to Canadian collusion still did not register in the country's collective consciousness. And now, since Martin's supposed "no" to co-operation on "missile defense," Canada's multifarious connections to this weapons development program are off the public radar screen more than ever before.

Clearly, a major share of the responsibility for this ignorance lies with the mainstream, corporate media. Deliberately or not, the country's media companies have managed to keep Canadians largely in the dark. For years, the central question, around which the entire domestic, "missile-defense" debate revolved was "Should Canada *become* involved?" This question directly contradicted the reality that Canada was *already* embedded in "missile defense." Even after the August-5 change to NORAD, the media repeatedly used this misleading question as the underlying framework for discussing the issue. This circumvented the opportunity for open, meaningful debate about Canada's real role in this U.S.-led weapons program.

In general, corporate journalists have shied away from investigating the many ways in which Canada has been ab-



sorbed in the "missile defense" scheme. Not only have dozens of Canadian "missile defense" subcontracts been studiously ignored, the support received by these companies through government financing and in-kind scientific R&D assistance has been left virtually unexplored.

It's not as if Canadian connivance in "missile defense" is that well hidden. Almost all of the information unearthed for this and upcoming issues of *Press for Conversion!*, is available online at corporate and government websites. It's really just a matter of looking for clues and piecing the evidence together. The media's presentation of Canada as a "missile-defense" virgin is symptomatic of the broader Canadian naïveté regarding this country's real position as a major global military spender, arms exporter and war-fighting nation. Because reporters are part of mainstream society and subject to the overwhelming cultural bias imposed on them by the "Canada-as-Global-Peacekeeper" mythology, they did not think to even look for Canadian "missile-defense" connections. (See "Peace Mythology Underlies Canadian State of Denial" on page 9.) Not knowing, for example, that Canada is the number-one foreign supplier of indispensable military hardware used in dozens of major, U.S. weapons systems, is a serious handicap for any journalist covering "missile defense"-related issues.

So, even in the face of tremendous Canadian complicity in "missile defense," the media successfully managed to focus public discussion on the irrelevant and highly-deceptive question of whether or not Canada should take the plunge and say "yes" to America's so-called "missile defense shield."

tions that supply military hardware to meet America's ravenous needs for war materiel.

Those who ignore or belittle Canada's contribution as a major supplier of military goods to the U.S., display a profound lack of awareness about the real capacity of Canada's military-industrial sector. Neither should we downplay the importance of the Canadian government's highly-developed, scientific R&D agencies and their pivotal role in supporting domestic military corporations that are engaged in important "missile defense" work.

The "Canada-as-cover" hypothesis illustrates the seductive power of Canada's "Global-Peacekeeper" mythology. For one thing, it fails to acknowledge that Canada's military industrial base is of tremendous importance to the U.S.. In addition, this hypothesis puts inordinate emphasis on the value of Canada's wonderful reputation as a peacekeeper. However, no matter how wonderful this global perception of Canada may indeed be, it could never be pleasantly bloated enough to disguise the offensive reality of America's "missile defense" weapons program.

This issue of *Press for Conversion!* presents only some of the numerous examples of Canadian technologies that are crucial to various "missile defense" weapons systems. Hopefully, by presenting this information to the Canadian public we can help to dispell the uninformed notion that Canada has nothing to offer "missile-defense" weapons development, other than the use of its good name as convenient cover behind which the U.S. can hide its gargantuan, weapons program.

(2) Rogue Superpower Needs No Cover:

The second reality neglected by the "Canada-as-Cover" argument, is that the U.S. is a rogue superpower. Its government has repeatedly proven, beyond a shadow of doubt, that it is content to act alone on matters perceived as crucial to its national or economic secu-

urity. Examples of this are legion. It is useful in this regard to cite the work of Richard Du Boff, professor emeritus of economics at Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania, and Edward Herman, professor emeritus of finance at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.

In an article, called "In its Unilateralist Disregard, U.S. is the Real 'Rogue State,'" these scholars recall that

"Since it obliterated Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 – cities, not military targets – the U.S. has bombed 18 countries and invaded still others, with no declaration of war."²

They go on to point out many other examples too numerous to mention here. It is, however, worth listing a few recent cases of the U.S. government's willingness to stand alone:

- Consider Bush's declaration in March 2001 that the Kyoto Protocol was 'dead' – all because it might harm the U.S. economy. Bush separates himself from the global consensus based on his reading of U.S. interests alone. His stance coincides with

the oil industry, not with the real interests of the American people.

- The U.S. has withdrawn from the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty, gutting this landmark arms control accord to the dismay of virtually every country in the world.
- The U.S. has not ratified the Comprehensive (Nuclear) Test Ban Treaty signed by 164 nations....
- This country rejects the Land Mine Treaty, concluded in Ottawa in 1997 and signed by 122 countries.
- This country was also the only nation to oppose the U.N. Agreement to Curb the International Flow of Illicit Small Arms, in July 2001.
- The U.S. rejects an International Criminal Court because [its military] personnel might become subject to its jurisdiction.
- The U.N. is treated the same way: When the U.S. can get the Security Council to do what it wants – say, bomb Iraq in 1991 – it goes that route.
- If not, as with its invasion of Panama in 1989, it simply disregards the U.N. or uses its veto."³



Artist unknown: This buff Uncle Sam was found on a fundamentalist Christian website <www.informationgospel.net> The "peace leaf" was added for this issue of *Press for Conversion!*.

Peace Mythology Underlies Canadian State of Denial

The public's state of denial about Canadian complicity in the U.S.-led "missile defense" weapons development program is understandable. The corporate media have consistently failed to inform Canadians about the many ways in which government, industry and the armed forces are actually involved in what they so often euphemistically refer to as the "missile defense shield."

This media blind spot is symptomatic of a much broader state of denial in Canada. It is part of a generally-accepted, social delusion that practically defines this country's cultural personality. This national daydream is the mythology of "Canada the Global Peacekeeper." Many Canadians use this fabricated illusion as a lens through which to perceive themselves and to inflate their significance as a powerful force for peace on the global stage.

Under the rubric of this prevailing mythology there is an underlying set of well-cultivated, but erroneous, misbeliefs. For example, it seems that most Canadians, including those working in the media, generally believe that:

- ◆ Canada's military spending is low,
- ◆ Canada's armed forces are severely underequipped,
- ◆ Canada's military is mostly doing UN peacekeeping missions, and
- ◆ Canada has a negligible military-industrial complex.

This list of well-worn, but inaccurate, self-images has all-too-often lead Canadian comedians to unfairly joke about the sagging prowess of their country's armed forces. Now, Canadian funny-men (and women) have yet another mistaken impression to add to the material in their standup routines:

- ◆ Canada is not now, nor has it ever been, a member of the "missile-defense" weapons club.

This latest corollary to Canada's self-congratulatory "Global Peace-maker" myth, will be debunked in this, and future issues of *Press for Conversion!* Very little of the data exposed here has previously been presented to the Canadian public. However, if this information was made public, it would help to disassemble some of the unfounded

assumptions about this country's Liberal party, government institutions, corporations and armed forces.

This task however will be especially difficult because many Canadians do not realise that their country even *has* a military industrial complex, let alone that Canada consistently ranks within the world's top-ten exporters of major, conventional weapons.³

In the process of exposing Canada's entanglement in the business of "missile defense," it will also be seen that Canadian involvement spans numerous government departments, publicly-funded crown corporations and scientific research agencies. Through these bodies, the Canadian government has amply, but very stealthily, demonstrated to its friends in the U.S. administration that this country is, in fact, profoundly committed to "missile defense." The Liberal government has generously funding many scientific research and development projects that were explicitly designed to create and perfect "missile-defense" technologies.

And, as if this wasn't enough, Canada's own military has acquired a taste for "missile defense." The Department of National Defence has been acquiring expensive, weapons technology for its multibillion-dollar frigates that is specifically-designed to allow Canada's Navy to play an important, supportive role in U.S. "Theater Ballistic Missile Defense" (TBMD) engagements during future wars.

Canada's Navy has also participated in several annual NATO training exercises, called CAESAR. During these exercises, the naval fleets of several NATO countries have come together to practise working as a fully-integrated team in order to assist the U.S. Navy in its use of TBMD weapons systems.⁴ Besides providing its specially-equipped frigates, Canada's niche within these "missile-defense" drills has been to hand over use of the country's world-class, publicly-funded Radarsat satellite and its ground stations. (Future issues of *Press for Conversion!* will contain detailed exposés on the Canadian Navy, CAESAR and Radarsat.)

These and other ongoing Canadian examples of complicity in so-called "missile defense" will continue, whether the Liberals or the Conservatives are

able to form the government. As long as there is a majority of seats between these two corporate parties, Canada's ongoing role in "missile defense" will remain an unfortunate reality.

Anyone who thinks that the Liberal government is against "missile defense," or even that it is generally a force for peace on the global stage, is operating under a major delusion.

With regards to foreign policy issues in general, and anti-war issues in particular, it is delusory to think that siding with the Liberals is strategically useful because it avoids a Conservative government. History has proven that when elected, both parties deliver relatively similar policies. The main difference between the two is how they are publicly perceived. Because the Liberals have so-effectively forged a pro-peace image, it is much easier for them to get away with promoting pro-war policies. This makes it doubly difficult for anti-war activists trying to oppose the Liberal's pro-war efforts. Faced with the Liberal's pseudo-peace facade, activists must spend much of their time just trying to cut through the deceptive smoke-screen of lies that surround government policies. At least with the Conservative's warmongering, it is relatively undisguised.

Voters concerned with these issues should keep in mind that only two parties in Parliament have ever actually opposed "missile defense," the Bloc Québécois and the New Democrats.

References

1. Richard Du Boff and Edward Herman, "In its Unilateralist Disregard, U.S. is the Real 'Rogue State,'" *Philadelphia Inquiry*, February 27, 2002.
www.commondreams.org/views02/0225-02.htm
2. Ibid.
3. *SIPRI Yearbook: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2004.
www.sipri.org/contents/armstrad/Chap12YB2004.pdf
4. Stephen J. Bond, "Coalition Aerial Surveillance and Reconnaissance: the CAESAR project," *Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin*, January-March 2003.
www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0IBS/is_1_29/ai_97822086