

Canada and America: Missile Defense and the Vows of Military Integration

By [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)
Global Research, February 23, 2005
19 February 2005

Region: [Canada](#)
Theme: [Militarization and WMD](#)

Prime Minister Paul Martin says “no” to Star Wars.

Canada will not participate in the controversial Missile Defense Shield.

“[The Americans] were told we will not participate.” “It is a firm ‘no.’” This statement communicated to news agency was apparently made at the NATO Brussels meeting on the 22nd of February.

Martin is to confirm the government’s stance in a House of Commons session on the 24th.

Meanwhile, his ambassador designate to the US, Frank McKenna, in a contradictory statement, has “spilled the beans”.

According to Frank McKenna, Canada’s participation in the controversial BMD is a “done deal”. It’s de facto. It was part of a negotiation process initiated two years ago.

“We’re part of it now and the question is what more do we need?” said McKenna.

“There’s no doubt, in looking back, ... that the NORAD amendment has given, has created part, in fact a great deal, of what the United States means in terms of being able to get the input for defensive weaponry.”

What Ambassador McKenna is hinting at, without revealing the substance of US-Canada negotiations (behind closed doors), is that NORAD is a defunct military body.

NORAD has essentially been scrapped. While it still exists in name. in practice, it has been integrated into US Northern Command and Canada has become a de facto member of NORTHCOM under the auspices of an illusive transitional military body called the Bi-national Planning Group (BPG). The latter is an appendage of NORTHCOM, located at the Petersen Air Force base in Colorado.

The Vows of Military Integration

What we are dealing with is a “military marriage’ characterized by the integration of the two countries’ command structures.

Missile Defense is part of “the vows” of this “military marriage”, something which nobody in Canada wants to talk about.

This military marriage has certain underlying obligations and commitments.

If Canada accepts to join NORTHCOM and integrate US command structures, it not only “promises to cherish” Star Wars, it also becomes an official member of the Anglo-American military axis, integrated by Israel (unofficially) and Australia.

Canada thereby becomes a pro-active partner in America’s ongoing military adventure, including Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine, Iran, North Korea and beyond, not to mention the preemptive use of nuclear weapons in conventional war theaters directed “against rogue enemies and terrorists”.

Shortly prior to the Bush-Martin meetings in Ottawa in November 2004, it was decided to extend the Binational Planning Group arrangement until May 2006. In other words, what is really at stake is the process leading up to a formal announcement of Canada’s accession to NORTHCOM, prior to the May 2006 cut-off date.

The Binational Planning Group

Meanwhile, under the BPG, which defines Canada’s “engagement” prior to its military marriage with America, the vows have, so to speak, already been consummated. In practice Canada is already a de facto member of NORTHCOM.

In a comprehensive report prepared shortly before the Bush-Martin talks last November, the BPG made recommendations on:

” how the two countries’ militaries can work together more effectively to counter these [terrorist] threats. In many cases, ... the recommendations will involve formalizing cooperation already taking place on an informal basis.”
(Statement of BPG spokesman, US Department of Defense Information, November 3, 2004)

In other words, Canada would not even have the choice of saying yes or no to the controversial missile defense program, which is part of NORTHCOM’s mandate.

In an article published last November entitled [Is The annexation of Canada part of the US military Agenda](#) , we reviewed in detail, the substance of this bi-national military integration and its implications for Canada. (<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO411C.html>)

Ottawa has been quietly negotiating a far-reaching military cooperation agreement, which allows the US Military to cross the border and deploy troops anywhere in Canada, in our provinces, as well station American warships in Canadian territorial waters.

This redesign of Canada’s defense system is being discussed behind closed doors, not in Canada, but at the Peterson Air Force base in Colorado, at the headquarters of US Northern Command (NORTHCOM).

The creation of NORTHCOM announced in April 2002, constitutes a blatant violation of both Canadian and Mexican territorial sovereignty. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld announced unilaterally that US Northern Command would have jurisdiction over the entire North American region. Canada and Mexico were presented with a fait accompli. US

Northern Command's jurisdiction as outlined by the US DoD includes, in addition to the continental US, all of Canada, Mexico, as well as portions of the Caribbean, contiguous waters in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans up to 500 miles off the Mexican, US and Canadian coastlines as well as the Canadian Arctic.

NorthCom's stated mandate is to "provide a necessary focus for [continental] aerospace, land and sea defenses, and critical support for [the] nation's civil authorities in times of national need."

Ambassador McKenna is confirming the existence of a fait accompli with regard to Canada's participation in the controversial Missile Defense program. His statement also suggests that the Canadian government has deliberately misled Canadians regarding its participation in the Missile Defense program.

With regard to military negotiations, McKenna knows what is happening behind the scenes. He was on the board of directors of the Carlyle Group together with Bush Senior and Frank Carlucci (The bin Laden family were investors in Carlyle until 9/11).

Carlyle, is the leading private equity investor in the aerospace and defense industries in the US and Canada. It plays a key role in the formulation of US defense and foreign policy. It has a vested interest in Canada's integration into NORTHCOM.

Canada's War Economy

Public debate on the BMD has been used by Prime Minister Paul Martin to divert public attention away from the more fundamental issue of North American military integration. The latter implies Canada's acceptance not only of Star War, but of the entire US war agenda, requiring significant hikes in Canada's defense spending. The latter are intended to fuel the military-industrial complex. Canada's defense contractors are supportive of this process.

In Canada's February 2005 budget, released on the day following PM Paul Martin's categorical "No" to the Missile Defense Program, an additional 12.8 billion dollars (Cn) (over the next five years), has added to Canada's spiraling defense budget. The stated objective is to "burnish the country's credibility as a global peacekeeping partner".

Canada has also committed itself to supplying more troops in the US led war.

Canadians are led to believe that this spiraling defense budget is earmarked to refurbish the country's conventional military hardware.

A more careful examination, however, reveals that a large part of these projected outlays in defense spending will be channeled to Canadian weapons producers, many of which are affiliates of US defense conglomerates, upon Canada's accession to NORTHCOM. Among major players in Canada's defense industry are General Dynamics (Canada), Bell Helicopter Textron (Canada), General Motors Defense, CAE Inc, Bombardier, SNC-Lavalin Group, etc.

(For further details see <http://www.cdia.ca/public/index.asp?action=profiles> , see also Project Loughshares at <http://www.ploughshares.ca/CONTENT/MONITOR/mond02i.html#Table%201>

Needless to say, this shift into a war economy will contribute to growing poverty and unemployment.

The channeling of billions of tax dollars towards military spending will contribute to the decline of the civilian economy.

The resulting austerity measures, which hit civilian programs will lead to a major contraction in transfer payments to Canada's provinces, exacerbating an ongoing crisis in health services, education and public infrastructure.

Read Detailed Report:

[Is The Annexation of Canada part of the US Military Agenda](http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO411C.html) by Michel Chossudovsky (<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO411C.html>)

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#), Global Research, 2005

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)

About the author:

Michel Chossudovsky is an award-winning author, Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal, Editor of Global Research. He has taught as visiting professor in Western Europe, Southeast Asia, the Pacific and Latin America. He has served as economic adviser to governments of developing countries and has acted as a consultant for several international organizations. He is the author of 13 books. He is a contributor to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. His writings have been published in more than twenty languages. In 2014, he was awarded the Gold Medal for Merit of the Republic of Serbia for his writings on NATO's war of aggression against Yugoslavia. He can be reached at crgeditor@yahoo.com

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those

who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca