



Military News Digest  
from the RCAC Association

A service for the Corps  
and the wider military community  
Add/remove address: [dwwright@rcaca.org](mailto:dwwright@rcaca.org)

## MILITARY INTELLIGENCE

### **Senators Don't Pull Punches**

Senators say Canada shouldn't waste military resources on defending the Arctic, but should sign on to the U.S. ballistic missile defence program and double the amount of money it gives for foreign aid. A defence committee report also suggests that DND should get special procurement treatment, with MND empowered to spend up to \$500 million on equipment without going through the lengthy cabinet approval process. The committee charges there are dozens of examples of wasteful military spending across the country and urges Ottawa to abandon bases that have outlived their usefulness—naming Goose Bay in Labrador as the “poster boy” for waste by politicians trying to “buy votes rather than fulfilling a legitimate military mandate.” The report criticizes the decision not to participate in missile defence, concluding that an effective system has life-saving potential for hundreds of thousands and citing recent successful test in dismissing critics who say the system is unworkable. Senators reject the use of the military as the primary tool to defend the Arctic, proposing instead that security be handled primarily by other agencies, including an armed coast guard. “There is no serious threat to Canada through the Arctic,” the report says, adding that the chances of the Arctic itself being a military target are “ridiculously low.”

### **Top U.S. Brass Get Windfall**

The undisputed champions of compensation for 2007 appear to be the U.S. military's most senior 161 officers, whose lifetime compensation is about to get a pleasant jolt. In January, when most service members receive a 2.2 per cent basic pay raise—the smallest in 12 years—America's 36 four-star generals and admirals, and its 125 lieutenant-generals and vice-admirals, will see their basic pay climb by 8.7 percent. But more significant are changes in the way their retirement pay is calculated, which could see a four-star's pension jump by almost \$37,000 a year. The pay gains flow from a complex packet of changes that take into account federal civilian executive compensation, the introduction of discretionary increases above the normal 75 per cent multiplier, the removal of ‘caps’ on basic pay when calculating pension payouts and the implementation of a new 40-year pay chart that sets higher basic pay levels for members who have served more than 30, 34 and 38 years.

### **Pakistani Connection to Bombers**

Afghan security agents have arrested 17 people, allegedly trained in Pakistan, whom they believe planned to launch suicide attacks in Nangarhar, Kunduz and Kabul provinces. The would-be bombers told authorities they were trained in refugee camps near Peshawar and in the northwestern tribal region. Officials claim that Pakistan turns a blind eye to militant activity in its tribal areas and those fighters regularly stream across the border into Afghanistan, but Pakistan says the porous nature of the border makes it virtually impossible to seal completely. The government points out also that a deal with pro-Taliban militants was signed in September, when militants agreed to not carry out violent acts, fan extremism or send fighters into Afghanistan to attack local forces or foreign troops. A spokesman said 160 civilians have been killed and 500 wounded in 90 suicide attacks over the last two years and that most suicide attackers were Afghan, Pakistani or Chechen. He said there have been 72 suicide attacks since late March. Some 184 schools have also been destroyed this year, compared with about 145 that were attacked last year.

### **Princess Anne Visits Afghanistan**

The Princess Royal visited British troops in southern Afghanistan this week, the first member of the Royal Family to do so. Anne—who is colonel-in-chief of various regiments and units of the British armed forces—visited Kabul, Kandahar and the troubled southern Helmand province during her two-day tour. Beginning her visit at NATO's Kabul headquarters, she went on to meet officers and other ranks of army, navy and air force units. She also met with the Afghan president.

## **Former U.S. Marine Wins \$200M**

An Iowa couple who bought three Powerball tickets during a pit stop for soda have claimed a \$200M jackpot. Tim Guderian served in the U.S. Marines during the first Gulf War and works as an auto detailer. The couple chose to take the lump-sum payment, amounting to \$67.1M after taxes. According to officials, the odds of winning were about 140,000,000:1. The largest U.S. lottery jackpot is \$365M won in February.

## **U.S. Services Reorganize**

A new U.S. Army Sustainment Command has been launched, continuing the mission of the former Army Field Support Command to provide soldier support at the tactical level. In addition to sustaining, maintaining and accounting for materiel, ASC is responsible for managing pre-positioned stocks and two civil logistics programs. Emerging missions include equipment reset synchronization, distribution and materiel management services, contingency contracting and training equipment management. The ASC has seven deployable Army Field Support Brigades in strategic locations around the world: Iraq, Kuwait, Korea and Europe, and in the U.S. at forts Bragg, Lewis and Hood. Meanwhile, the USAF plans to create a new command for directing the service's numerous activities in cyberspace, a move intended to combat the ever-growing Internet prowess of terrorist groups. The notional 'Operational Command for Cyberspace,' would bring all activities under one umbrella to address the exploitation of low entry costs and the minimal technological investment needed to inflict serious harm. The air force warns that the military's increasing dependence upon network- and computer-based systems means that all aspects of war fighting could be hindered without an increased focus on cyberspace.

## **NLOS Cannon Unveiled**

The world got its first look at the Future Combat Systems (FCS) Non-Line-of-Sight (NLOS) firing platform last week. The NLOS cannon is the lead manned ground vehicle (MGV) of the U.S. Army's foremost modernization program—an integrated family of air systems and manned and unmanned ground systems connected by a robust network. The 155mm platform is the first step in developing NLOS cannon prototypes scheduled to begin testing in 2008. It will now undergo qualification of its ultra-lightweight cannon and breech in preparation for prototype testing. The platform, made of a combination of high-strength steel and aluminum, incorporates a cannon assembly that is 1,200 lbs lighter than the M-777 and has a fully automated ammunition handling system. The NLOS-C is the first of eight FCS manned ground vehicles with common chassis, parts and sub-systems. They will have a two-man crew station, lightweight band track and a hybrid-electric propulsion system that is expected to reduce fuel consumption by 10 to 30 per cent. The eight MGV variants are among the 18 networked systems that together will comprise FCS. A NLOS mortar firing platform is expected to be delivered for testing and qualification in spring 2007.

## **Millions Set Aside to Celebrate Victory**

Even as Americans are being urged to stay the course in the Middle East, Congress has put down a quiet marker in the apparent hope that V-I Day might be only months away. Tucked away in fine print of the military spending bill for last year was a \$20M item to pay for participation in a celebration in Washington to commemorate success in Iraq and Afghanistan. Not surprisingly, the money wasn't spent, but legislators have said, in effect, maybe next year. A paragraph written into the approved spending legislation allows the money to be rolled over into 2007.

[Opinion](#)

## **Time for a non-partisan Afghanistan policy**

**The Conservatives and Liberals are committed to the mission and cannot back out of it**

Douglas Bland | The National Post

The debate surrounding Canada's foreign policy and military commitment to Afghanistan has descended into partisan rhetoric. Canada needs political leadership from all parties aimed at building a consensus on a national strategy that policy planners and military leaders can use to guide their decisions over the next several years that we will be in Afghanistan.

All leaders will have to agree to the basic facts about Canada's Afghan mission. We have made a commitment as a country, and the UN and NATO don't care about our internal political squabbles. They understand our commitment only as Canada's commitment.

Jack Layton, and now Paul Martin, seem to believe that the situation and belligerents in Afghanistan are pliable and that the Canadian government can control all events in the field. Paul Martin reportedly is astonished that the war is not unfolding exactly as he says he was promised it would. Credible leaders understand that national policies are always subject to the enemy's ever-changing tactics.

Canada is now fully engaged in combat with two obvious options: meaningfully reinforce the status quo, or cut and run. But neither choice is practical. The first would eventually devour the tiny Canadian Forces, and the second would irreparably damage Canada's reputation in the international community. Instead, political leaders ought to find a national strategy that will maintain Canada's honour while allowing some respite from the difficulties of the military commitment to Afghanistan.

A Canadian political consensus could be built around three policies.

- First, Canada should demonstrate a unified resolve to build a strong UN coalition to fight Afghanistan's enemies on as many fronts as possible. Prime Minister Stephen Harper should engage the other party leaders in this diplomatic effort announced as a commitment to uphold the authority of the UN.
- Second, Canada should immediately rethink its humanitarian and developmental program. The "business-as-usual" approach centred on the Canadian International Development Agency must be replaced by a new ministry responsibility for a "whole-of-government" approach to meeting this essential program effectively. Party leaders should agree to a significant increase in program funding and appoint an all-party committee to oversee the program and policies to improve Canada's co-operation with national non-governmental organizations in Afghanistan.
- Third, the oft-criticized "high operational tempo" of the Canadian Forces is a problem, not because Canada has committed the Canadian Forces to too many missions, but because the government has not built an armed force to meet its appetite for dangerous undertakings. The Canadian Forces are not over-committed; rather, the very few people who are the Canadian Forces are over-committed.

A national strategy should include a plan to rapidly build military units to relieve the stresses building in the Canadian Forces and to provide resources for other missions that are in our future. In the meantime, the government should increase its effort to convince our NATO allies to develop a strategy for Afghanistan that would allow for the systematic rotation of NATO troops from "non-permissive" areas to more "permissive" areas in the country -- a strategy of fair burden-sharing in the alliance. The fact that there is no consensus on past decisions about Canada's strategy in Afghanistan is irrelevant now. The three themes described here might, however, provide an avenue toward a consensus for the future.

The Conservative government and the Liberal opposition could surely find common cause in both a diplomatic offensive and policies to build capable armed forces. Their respective policy platforms already support these ideas. A dramatic restructuring of Canada's humanitarian and development policies would as surely attract Jack Layton. The greater appeal of a national strategy for political leaders (though it may appear to be self-serving) might lie in the assumption that no party (except perhaps the Bloc Quebecois) wants to fight an election on the war.

The Conservatives and Liberals are committed to the mission and cannot back out of it, and the NDP might welcome a "policy out" because Mr. Layton has suffered a national black eye for calling for an arbitrary withdrawal from this UN-mandated mission. Better for all parties to settle the matter in the backroom, agree to ideas that each can support more or less and then clear the table to fight it out about the domestic issues that are already shaping the next federal election campaign.

Dithering over the war, finger-pointing at past decisions and entertaining secret hopes to use Canadian Forces casualties to win more seats in the next election will only make everyone look bad. Building a non-partisan policy in Afghanistan, on the other hand, might bring praise and votes to all.

*Douglas Bland is professor and chair of the defence management studies program at the School of Policy Studies, Queen's University*

Opinion

## **Long road back for our Forces**

Barry Cooper | The Calgary Herald

Last June, the Harper government began a military acquisition program to rebuild the Canadian forces, as ambitious as the Chretien government's was contemptuous and neglectful.

Even before the recent change in direction, Canada had a military procurement problem of impressive dimensions. Three large government reports over the past five years have produced nearly 150 recommendations to deal with a major problem: buying things for the Forces takes too long, costs too much and is open to continuous political interference.

Unfortunately, most Canadians see public policy, especially something as arcane as military procurement, as somebody else's business. Worse, the bureaucrats, both uniformed and civilian, who actually put the policy into practice, are determined never to share information with anyone, often including each other.

The procurement mess is a legacy of recent Liberal governments. Never forget: the purpose of a military is to fight and win wars. If an army can't do that, it won't be any good for peacekeeping. If the Forces were incapable of providing military security in Afghanistan, Canadian reconstruction teams would be slaughtered by the same people against whom they are fighting.

It is important to be clear about these home truths in order to see the procurement problem in all its glory. Because it takes more than 15 years actually to get a piece of equipment into service after Parliament has agreed to buy it, what the Government of Canada didn't do in 1991 hurts the Forces today.

As Alan Williams, the author of a new, "view from the inside" book on Canadian defence procurement put it, what the Department of National Defence "buys today determines what the CF can do tomorrow, which in turn largely determines Canada's future defence and foreign policy options."

Long before Canada sent troops to Afghanistan or the navy to the Persian Gulf, the problems associated with military equipment were well known to those who cared, both inside and outside the department and the Forces. The follies of the Sea King maritime helicopter even achieved the status of a public scandal. Williams explained how years of neglect have turned military procurement into a hot topic in Ottawa (relatively speaking) because of its sheer urgency. Everyone knew the chickens would eventually come home to roost. They are surely home now.

Moreover, it is clear how it has come to pass. Political negligence played its part, but as with most problems in Ottawa, from Adscam to the latest bit of sophistry from the commissioner of the RCMP, at its core is the ethos of bureaucracy: incompetence combined with a refusal to see a problem, admit responsibility or to undertake remedial action. The same virus that transformed the Mounties from a competent federal police into a brass-heavy bureaucracy with more concern for its precious image than catching bad guys has also infected DND.

In a normal world, the military would tell industry what they wanted their new equipment to do, and industry would go off and build it. Instead, DND issues lengthy and detailed technical instructions, which often are modified partway through. The Statement of Requirements, as it is called, for the light armoured vehicles currently in use runs to 760 pages.

It is also difficult for normal people to understand why Canada cannot use the same stuff available, say, as the Netherlands or the U.K. The reasons are clear. First, alone in the western alliance, Canada requires (except under unusual circumstances) competitive acquisition of military goods and services. No off-the-shelf purchases for our troops! This ensures lengthy political and bureaucratic scrutiny prior to placing an actual order.

Second, when a perfectly good piece of equipment is rejected, it is usually not because the product won't do the job, but because the "bid" of the company which makes it is found to be "non-compliant." The bid is bureaucratically defined; the product is an actual piece of equipment. Bureaucrats are comfortable only with bids. Third, not one but at least four departments along with two central agencies have turf-defending input into any major decision. No wonder the announced joint support ship will take 18 years to enter the fleet—if everything goes according to schedule.

The sorry procurement mess with which the Canadian Forces have had to deal has not made their job in Bosnia, the Gulf or Afghanistan any easier. It is yet another reason, if one were needed, why Canadians should be no less amazed than grateful for their accomplishments on our behalf.

*Barry Cooper is a professor of political science at the University of Calgary and a Fellow of the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute.*

## **Military justice revamped**

The Canadian Press News Agency

OTTAWA—The military's chief judge has announced sweeping changes to the Canadian Forces justice system, saying they will bring uniformed justice more in line with "Canadian values and legal standards." In his annual report, the judge advocate general says 52 of 57 recommendations made by a federal review have been accepted.

"The proposed amendments concerning the military justice system would strengthen the Canadian Forces as a vital national institution by enhancing the maintenance of discipline, cohesion and morale," Brig.-Gen. Kenneth Watkin writes in a report recently tabled in the House of Commons. "By making improvements in process and in substantive law, they will more closely align the military justice system with current Canadian values and legal standards and ensure its compliance with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms."

The changes will strengthen the independence of military judges by providing them with security of tenure until retirement and increase the system's timeliness and flexibility by creating a reserve force panel made up of part-time military judges. The new measures will modernize military sentencing; introducing absolute discharges, intermittent sentences, restitution orders and victim-impact statements. They will also for the first time require unanimous decisions by six-member courts martial panels. The panels, composed of a military judge and three or five servicemen and women, depending on the process, are currently required only to vote by majority to convict or acquit.

Critics have suggested the greatest problem with a majority-only vote is the diminished role of fact-finding during deliberations. "A reduction in deliberation could be seen to reduce the perceived accuracy of the verdict in the eyes of the public and the accused," writes Watkin. "Although majority votes may result in more expedient trials, the (federal review) suggests that the expediency issue is more than balanced by the need for safety of the verdict and fairness to the accused."

Watkin says reducing the possibility of wrongful convictions is "one of the most compelling arguments in favour of unanimity. A unanimous vote requires the panel of fact-finders to come to a complete consensus and therefore fosters greater analysis and deliberation. This amendment would enhance fairness and certainty of result."

## **DND secrecy 'becoming a farce'**

David Pugliese | The Ottawa Citizen

Defence Minister Gordon O'Connor has no intention of dealing with the wave of censorship that has seen his department classify as secret information ranging from the fact that Canadian commandos fought in the Second World War to the hourly cost of operating the military's VIP jets. Mr. O'Connor's spokesman, Etienne Allard, said it is up to Defence Department bureaucrats to manage the release of such government records to the public through the access to information law.

As part of its latest secrecy push, the Defence Department on Tuesday declared that releasing information showing that Canadians fought with the famed Devil's Brigade during the Second World War could harm national security. Additional details now being kept from the public are the costs to the department to run individual pieces of equipment, a list that ranges from electric snow blowers to forklifts. Information about the hourly cost of flying the military's Challenger jets, used to ferry politicians and bureaucrats, is also now secret. Such information had been available to the public through the access law up until 2004.

Lawyer Michel Drapeau, the author of a textbook on the access to information legislation, says Mr. O'Connor has the legal responsibility to do something about the new wave of secrecy. "This is becoming a farce," said Mr. Drapeau, a former military officer and author of the 2,800-page legal book, *Federal Access to Information and Privacy Legislation*. "You cannot argue for better accountability, which this government does, unless you have a strong Access to Information Act and have it applied rigorously."

The access legislation also details that a minister is responsible for the way the law is managed in his or her department. Mr. Allard said Mr. O'Connor is committed to openness and transparency, but he said: "At the end of the day, department officials make recommendations on severances and as a minister he doesn't interfere in the process."

Severances refer to information censored by Mr. O'Connor's department. In an examination of 23 access requests made to the Defence Department over the last 18 months, the Citizen found 87 pieces of information, now censored, had been previously released to the public or are still on government and Defence Department websites.

The access legislation allows Canadians to request government records for \$5 per request. Since the government has several dozen reasons it can employ to censor material, users of the law note few sensitive pieces of information are released. When in opposition, the Tories made ample use of the access law to obtain information on wrongdoing in the Liberal government. Now that the Tories are in

power, some critics argue they've dropped support for the access law and are trying to shut down the system.

## **'Peace of mind'; Senator Segal aims to protect reservists' jobs**

Brock Harrison | The Kingston Whig-Standard

They've been called Weekend Warriors and Senator Hugh Segal wants to make sure they've still got a job during the week if they go to war.

The Kingston Conservative senator is working to provide a measure of job security and peace of mind to Canadian Forces reservists who want to volunteer their services overseas, but are held back by concerns about keeping their civilian jobs. "Canada has yet to provide even the peace of mind for these men and women serving in Afghanistan, Bosnia, or elsewhere, that their jobs, their livelihoods and their ability to provide for themselves and their families will be intact upon their return home," Segal said in the Senate last week.

Employers who refuse to return a military reservist to his or her job upon returning from a tour of duty would be breaking the law, if Segal gets his way. Segal is calling for his colleagues' support in urging the Canadian government to reconsider a section of the Public Safety Act that was left out of the bill when it was adopted into law in 2004.

The section, which would amend the National Defence Act, obliges employers to hold the civilian jobs of reservists who are called to duty in an emergency, an instance that hasn't occurred since the Second World War. It was left off the bill at the time because it would have required extensive consultation with the provinces since job security is under their jurisdiction.

But Segal wants to go a step further. This time, he's asking that all reservists who serve on deployment be protected—those who are called to and those who volunteer. According to Segal, reservists are often faced with a troubling dilemma when contemplating whether to volunteer their much-needed skills with the Canadian Forces. "Do I serve my country or do I step back and not risk my current employment?" Segal said. "Unfortunately, some employers, including government employers, are less than enthusiastic about their employees' requests for unpaid leaves for training or overseas service purposes."

In Afghanistan, 13 per cent of Canada's 2,300-member contingent are reservists who volunteered their services, leaving their civilian lives, and jobs, behind.

Maj. Richard Gower, spokesman for the Canadian Forces Liaison Council, a military agency that advocates job security and protection for reservists, says reliance on reserves is on the rise with 23,000 able soldiers ready for action. "It's becoming more and more evident that there will be a greater call," Gower says.

With that greater demand comes the expectation that problems with civilian jobs will increase. Gower says the agency deals with about 100 such cases a year. "At this point, indications are that because reservists are volunteering in larger numbers, the numbers of cases we have will go up," he said.

The situation isn't unique to Canada, Gower added. Most NATO countries, including the United States, Britain and Australia are relying increasingly on reserve soldiers. "Reservists have become an integral part of international operations these days," Gower said.

Canadian Forces have operated under a "total force" policy in 1987, under which reservists are trained to the level of their regular force counterparts. This means civilians who sign up as reservists must complete six months of training to be considered on par with regular force troops. Couple that with a typical six-month tour of duty, and reserves are looking at a year of unpaid leave from their jobs.

Critics of the legislation say it opens the door to compulsory service and could make reservists unpopular in the workforce. That is, employers would be reluctant to hire civilian soldiers knowing they would be left with a staffing gap if the soldier chooses military duty. "There is an argument that maybe soldiers wouldn't get hired because they would leave, but there was a time when women of child-bearing age weren't [hired] either," said Rosemarie Brisson, a policy adviser for Segal. "Now we have maternity leave."

CFB Kingston's reserve unit, the Princess of Wales' Own Regiment, has a number of its soldiers working as police officers, teachers and in other civilian jobs, says spokesman Lt. Steve Dieter. He says employers have been "very supportive" of soldiers who request leaves for training purposes. "It's not

the same as going on deployment but it still shows employers recognize that the military part of a person's life is just as important as the civilian part," Dieter said.

The liaison council has instituted an annual awards program that recognizes Canada's most reserve-friendly companies. Windsor's Daimler Chrysler was named the most supportive company in Ontario in 2005. "It's the right thing to do," said Daimler spokesman Ed Saenz. "These people are making great sacrifices to protect our freedoms, and they deserve a level of accommodation for that."

## **The history DND won't let you see**

David Pugliese with files from Susan Mohammad and Chris  
The Ottawa Citizen with files from The Canadian Press

As part of its latest secrecy push, the Defence Department yesterday declared that releasing information showing that Canadians fought valiantly with the famed Devil's Brigade during the Second World War could harm national security.

The name of the First Special Service Force, better known as the Devil's Brigade, has been censored from all the records that outline which unit has the closest historical military links to Canada's existing commando unit, Joint Task Force 2. Also censored from the records, released to the Citizen under the federal Access to Information Act, are the locations where the Devil's Brigade fought in Europe in the 1940s.

The May 2002 records detail that the joint U.S.-Canadian Second World War unit "never met defeat in battle" and "accomplished the most difficult missions with an elan and proficiency that astonished all outside observers, including the Germans." It concludes that JTF2 should try to emulate the high standards of the unit whose name is censored.

But information that details the link between the Devil's Brigade and JTF2 has been put on the Defence Department website and previously released through other access to information requests. In 2003 media interviews, a JTF2 spokesman also acknowledged that the unit wanted to build strong historical links to the Devil's Brigade and at one point was considering establishing formal ties to the unit.

According to the Defence Department, revealing the words First Special Service Force would be "injurious to the conduct of international affairs, the defence of Canada or any state allied or associated with Canada or the detection, prevention or suppression of subversive or hostile activities." In addition, the name of the First Special Service Force and the locations where it fought were censored because such details are considered part of advice provided to government.

Numerous history books show the First Special Service Force was used in operations in the Aleutian Islands and later fought major battles in Italy. The unit also fought in France before being disbanded.

Canadian Devil's Brigade veteran Bill Story says withholding such information doesn't make sense. "It's idiotic," said Mr. Story, executive director emeritus of First Special Service Force Association. "You can't really censor history."

## **Canadian Armour Flown to Kandahar**

Department of National Defence



DND photo by Sgt Lou Penney

A Canadian *Taurus* armored recovery vehicle (ARV) makes its way across the tarmac at the Kandahar airfield after arrival Oct. 3 on a USAF C-17 *Globemaster III* transport aircraft. Weighing in at nearly 100,000 lbs the ARV will be used by electrical and mechanical engineers to recover *Leopard* tanks and other disabled vehicles which have bogged down or suffered a mechanical failure. The Canadian contribution in Afghanistan comprises about 2,000 soldiers, most of whom serve with Task Force Afghanistan at Kandahar airfield and Camp Nathan Smith in Kandahar city. Additional personnel are assigned to Kabul, various military headquarters, and civilian organizations.

## **General frets about home front Canadian commander worries that we 'are our own worst critics.'**

Mitch Potter, Middle East Bureau | The Toronto Star

It is the Canadian public and not the Taliban that is the greatest threat to peace and prosperity in Afghanistan, Canada's top military man on the ground told the *Star*.

In one of his most pointed political statements to date, Brig.-Gen. David Fraser, commander of NATO's eight-nation effort to put down southern Afghanistan's increasingly visible insurgency, said the weakest link in the mission is Canadians' tendency to seize on negatives and worry them to death. The formula for failure, Fraser said, is "our country not supporting the needs of the Afghans who are looking for a future. We need to see this through for as long as Afghans want us here."

Fraser told the *Star* the complexities of the challenge in volatile Kandahar and its neighbouring provinces, where Taliban attacks have surged over the summer, play directly into Canadian anxieties. But what many Canadians don't understand, he said, is that attacks are increasing for the very reason that NATO and the new Afghan government are gaining the upper hand and "the Taliban see their window of opportunity closing.

"The more success we have, the more they will attack. The further out we get into the hinterland, the more they come and attack us. And we have spread out far more this summer than ever we had in the past. And it's putting more pressure on the Taliban leadership as we go into their backyard. We're in Helmond province and we weren't there last year. We're in Shawali Khot and we weren't last year. We're now all over Zabul, which we weren't last year. And we've spread out in Uruzgon, with 1,000 more troops."

Canadians, said Fraser, tend to be "our own worst critics. We criticize absolutely everything. We will find the pimple in the navel and we'll say, 'My God, look at that pimple!' "But let's not be overly critical of ourselves. We're gaining momentum now. Let's put our shoulders behind it and get the work done."

Fraser, who will cede command of the 8,000-strong NATO force in southern Afghanistan next month, said he was never under any illusion of speedy victory when he assumed leadership of the mission eight months ago. "I felt I could make an improvement, but I did not believe I would declare victory. Anybody who says they can declare victory in a summer is naïve," he said. "The campaign to help build a nation will not be won this summer or next summer. It will take time. How much time? As long as it takes."

Fraser acknowledged the criticism of certain front-line combat troops, including several quoted yesterday in a *Star* report from the Panjwahi district west of Kandahar, where NATO believes hundreds of insurgents died in the recent Canadian-led Operation Medusa. He said that any soldier who lacks faith in the need to follow up the fighting with an all-out campaign to win over the loyalty of locals is simply not with the program.

"Those soldiers who criticize, they're seeing this much of the battle space," said Fraser, holding his hands close together. "My battle space is 220,000 square kilometres. And I tell you, this is about hearts and minds. This is about winning with an idea. Our fight is not with the people of Afghanistan—they are looking at both the Taliban and their government and wondering who to side with. So, when the Afghan government enters an area, our job is to make sure there is not just security but education, medical care and reconstruction. It's all about building. And what does the Taliban offer? Destruction. No building, just destruction."

Fraser, who has logged seven tours of duty during 26 years of military service, called Afghanistan "the most complex environment I've ever worked in. "I thought Bosnia was difficult. That was a walk in the park compared to this place. Because there, you only had three groups — Serbs, Croats and Muslims. "Here? You have a multitude of tribes, you have religion and you have the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan trying to create a marriage with a tribal system that's been around for thousands of years.



"And you have a population that is recovering not only from 25 years of fighting, starting with the Soviets. "They are recovering from a history of seeing so many people come through, going all the way back to Alexander the Great, people that haven't been altruistic in their motives."

Saying that "this is not a military mission any more," Fraser described the upcoming phase of the mission as one that will place far more emphasis on the efforts of the Canadian Provincial Reconstruction Team in Kandahar, a branch that has yet to deliver much in the way of visible improvements on the ground. "In any mission, it takes time to come up to speed and I think the PRT has done an awful lot. Can we do more? Absolutely. We have an insatiable appetite to do more for people who have absolutely nothing."

Drawing a direct link between Canada's ethical approach to the two world wars of the 20th century and the challenges of Afghanistan, Fraser called the recent battle in Panjwaii district "the reaffirmation of what Canada did in 1914. "It was one of the hardest things we've done for a very long time. Canada led the operation, NATO's biggest one ever, and successfully defeated the Taliban in this area. Canada did what was right and the cost was not insignificant."

Addressing critics who argue that a just cause alone does not guarantee victory, Fraser said Canadians should have the patience to let Afghans answer that question. "It is the Afghans' choice. If they don't want us here any more, all they have to do is stand up and say, 'Please leave. We don't think you can be of assistance.' But that's not the message I'm getting. "We're getting this right. We just have to persevere and stick it out."

When Fraser steps down in November, his departure will introduce the difficult personal legacy of having led the bloodiest Canadian campaign since the Korean War. He readily acknowledges the fact. "Every life given here, every soldier that is wounded and will live for the rest of his life with scars, either physical or mental, has to understand that what he or she did here this summer and this fall meant something," said Fraser.

"I go to that hospital every day when there is a soldier that is wounded. I go over there to console a soldier, I come away inspired by their commitment and their determination to say, 'I want to get back out there.'

"You know, polls be damned. With the men and women in this theatre and the support we get from the government, we're going to go through it. We're going to see it through."

## **Military wants a more fuel-efficient Humvee Pentagon makes an energy push**

By John Donnelly | The Boston Globe



A concept for a lighter model Humvee.

WASHINGTON -- The Defense Department wants a new Humvee. One of its complaints: The Humvee eats too much fuel. The vehicle, an icon of the military for about two decades since it replaced the World War II-era Jeep, gets as few as 4 miles per gallon in city driving and 8 miles per gallon on the highway.

The Pentagon wants a Humvee replacement that weighs 30 to 40 percent less and uses proportionately less fuel. Some armored Humvees weigh 5 tons. "It's what we must do," John Young, director of the department's defense research and engineering, said last week outside a congressional hearing. "We're looking at a design with lighter materials—titanium and carbon deposits—which still having armor protection," he said.

A retooled Humvee—the early design gives it a more aerodynamic look—is part of the Defense Department's push to save energy costs through alternative fuels, conservation, and more efficient vehicles, aircraft, ships, and submarines.

The Defense Department is the world's largest energy consumer. The department spends \$10.6 billion annually on fuel, or 97 percent of the federal government's use, and almost 2 percent of the entire country's use. Some in Congress say the department's reliance on foreign oil poses a major security risk.

Representative Steve Israel, a New York Democrat and a member of the Armed Services Committee, said he had asked the department recently to document its strategy for using less oil. He received a flow chart that showed \$500 million in annual expenditures overseen by more than a dozen agencies. "If we tried to do that to land a man on the moon, we'd be lucky to get a bus to Des Moines," Israel said of the Defense Department's lack of a concentrated effort to reduce fuel use.

But Representative Roscoe G. Bartlett, a Maryland Republican, said that while the military could be more aggressive, "they are doing more than anyone else—in the government or around the country... I don't think the country as a whole has any perception of the danger" of US reliance on foreign oil. Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, in a three-paragraph memo dated Dec. 14, 2005, to his deputy, Gordon England, said the department "should be doing all it can" to save energy. He questioned whether the department was doing enough, asking: "Who in the department is in charge?"

In response, England took charge. Rumsfeld also appointed Young and a former defense and energy secretary, James R. Schlesinger, to examine each military service's programs for ways to conserve energy. The search identified several initiatives that had been underway for years, including some programs that are currently credited with launching conservation efforts.

Last year, the Air Force won a "Green Power" award from the Environmental Protection Agency as the largest US purchaser of renewable energy. It accounted for 41 percent of the government's renewable energy purchases, by buying gas made from landfill refuse, and by wind and solar power. But two years ago, the EPA also gave the Defense Department a "national security exemption" that allowed it to use trucks that did not meet emissions standards for commercial trucks.

The department's most promising initiatives are mostly several years away from starting, Defense officials say. A Humvee replacement will not be ready for at least three years.

Last week, a B-52 bomber made two test runs using a synthetic fuel made with natural gas. In the future, the same type of fuel will be made with coal. While officials reported no problems with the new fuel, the cost brought looks of astonishment from members of Congress at a hearing last week: \$23 a gallon, almost 10 times the cost at the pump. Greg G. Jenkins, executive vice president of Syntroleum, a Tulsa, Okla., company that helped produce the fuel for the demonstration project, said that once the process was commercialized on a large scale, the cost of turning coal into a gas mixture would be less than \$3 a gallon.

Told of the price estimate, Michael Aimone, who helps oversee the Air Force's energy savings plans, said: "He said that? Put that in print. We don't know what the cost will eventually be." Aimone said the industry has promised that it could deliver 650 million gallons of synthetic fuel from coal by 2016. That figure would be roughly 25 percent of the Air Force's consumption.

Environmentalists, though, have criticized coal-based fuel, saying that it will produce as much carbon dioxide pollution as gas. Aimone argued that there would be a "marginal improvement in greenhouse gases," because coal-based fuel would not generate sulfur dioxide, but acknowledged that coal is far from clean.

The pressure for renewable energy sources is driven from the front lines. On July 25, Major General Richard Zilmer of the Marine Corps, who is in charge of the force in Anbar, Iraq, wrote a priority request, saying that his supply convoys on Iraq's roads were increasingly at risk. As much as 70 percent of the convoys are carrying fuel, according to studies. Zilmer wanted alternative-energy sources brought to his base, such as solar and renewable battery systems, as substitutes for fuel used to power generators.

The Pentagon also is taking note of the cost of delivering the fuel to far-flung areas of Iraq. James Woolsey, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency and currently an energy adviser to the

Defense Department, has estimated that getting gas to a tank in Iraq could cost as much as \$100 a gallon, considering the cost of supply lines, tanker vehicles, and protection of the tankers.

In Iraq, much of the discussion about the Humvee—the High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle—has been focused on ways to make it less vulnerable to roadside bombs. The vehicle was not designed with armor, and soldiers have attached sheets of metal and wood around the exterior to provide some extra protection. The Pentagon has ordered armor for all new Humvees.

Now, the Army is looking for new designs of light, medium, and heavy tactical vehicles that would put an emphasis on fuel economy without sacrificing protection. For the Humvee, the upgrades could include more energy-efficient power trains, including a hybrid-electric engine, and limiting the armor to the passenger compartment, according to Defense Department officials. Bartlett said that if the military finds greater fuel efficiency, "it can be introduced into the private sector, and that would be helpful to cargo shippers or anyone that moves around heavy things."