

Future of North America: Vancouver 2010, Coronation of the North American “Community”

By [Andrew Gavin Marshall](#)

Region: [Canada](#), [USA](#)

Global Research, March 15, 2008

14 March 2008

Introduction:

The year 2010 will mark a very important date for all people living within Canada, the United States and Mexico. The often-cited Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) document, in conjunction with the Mexican Council on Foreign Relations and the Canadian Council of Chief Executives (CCCE), titled “Building a North America Community,” serves as the blueprint for the objectives of the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP). The three above-mentioned “interest” groups make up the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America, who produced the report, in which they state, “The Task Force’s central recommendation is establishment by 2010 of a North American economic and security community, the boundaries of which would be defined by a common external tariff and an outer security perimeter.”¹

Vancouver, British Columbia, will be hosting the 2010 Olympics. A 2006 “Report to Leaders” regarding the SPP states as one of its “Security Initiatives”, to “Develop and implement joint plans for cooperation on incident response, and conduct joint training and exercises in emergency response.” As a “Key Milestone”, they recommend to “Initiate planning within 6 months (December 2005) for a preparedness exercise to be conducted in advance of the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver/Whistler.”² A Vancouver daily newspaper reported on March 5, 2008, that “Canada, U.S. and Mexico are planning a massive joint military exercise in April 2009 “to focus on terrorist events that could affect [the] 2010 Olympics,” according to Public Safety Canada documents released to 2010 Watch via access to information.”³

As the march towards 2010 accelerates along with the march towards the “North American Community,” Vancouver will be subject to the establishment of a police state to provide “security” for the Olympics. In essence, Vancouver 2010 will mark the coronation of a “new” form of governance for North America, anointing a crown upon a regional bureaucracy and its corporate controllers, removing power from the people of each of the three nations.

The Vancouver 2010 Olympics are being overseen by the Minister of International Trade, David Emerson. Previously, David Emerson was former Prime Minister Paul Martin’s Minister of Industry, and when he signed the Security and Prosperity Partnership in 2005, Emerson became an official SPP Minister. He was also the CEO of Canfor Corporation, Canada’s largest softwood lumber producer.⁴

On November 5, 2003, before Paul Martin became Prime Minister, the Canadian Council

of Chief Executives (CCCE) issued a letter which stated, "Making the case that North American economic integration is irreversible and that continental security is indivisible, the President and Chief Executive of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives (CCCE) has urged Paul Martin to take the lead in forging a new vision for North America." They further outlined their "North American Security and Prosperity Initiative," outlining what was to become the SPP. Among those who attached their names to this document include the Executive Committee of the CCCE, of which David Emerson was a member at the time.⁵

Clearly, the CCCE is very much involved with the Olympics, and just happen to be the driving force in Canada behind the SPP, in conjunction with the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) in the US.

Police State Vancouver:

In 2005, an article in the *Georgia Straight* began by presenting a hypothetical situation to the reader, "If a group like al-Qaeda wanted to make a really sensational splash, it might try to disrupt the 2010 Winter Olympics opening ceremonies at BC Place Stadium. Crashing that event would guarantee a global audience, especially if Queen Elizabeth or Prince Charles were in the building at the time." The article continued, "Sound ridiculous? Not according to Peter St. John, a security expert and academic who gives confidential briefings on terrorism to police forces," saying Vancouver is a top "candidate" for a terror attack, and "that back in 1991, St. John predicted in a U.S. television interview that terrorists would one day crash airliners into two high-rise office buildings in New York City."⁶

In 2006, Vancouver's Police Chief Jamie Graham said, "public cameras would help in the Vancouver Police Department's contribution to the War on Terror, before he went on to dismiss critics warning of privacy invasions with the usual corker, 'If you're doing nothing wrong, you've got nothing to hide'." The article continued in stating, "The new police-installed anti-terrorism-juiced cameras won't be your garden-variety, convenience-store set-up, but instead will be a centralized web of digital recorders linked to sophisticated computers running facial recognition software."⁷ The *Province* reported that, "Vancouver cops want surveillance cameras installed along Granville Mall to help them round up the rowdies."⁸ It was further reported in 2006 that, "Vancouver police say the city's downtown entertainment district is turning into a battle zone and are asking for surveillance cameras to help deter rowdy behaviour."⁹

Also in 2006, Vancouver began to test "a new police car-mounted device that automatically scans licence plates," and that, "The new device uses a series of tiny cameras mounted on the squad car to automatically scan every licence plate it passes — up to 3,000 plates an hour — and checks the number against the police database."¹⁰ It was again reported that, "At the May 17, 2006 meeting of the Vancouver Police Board, Former Chief Jamie Graham was given the green light by Board members to develop a business plan for the installation of surveillance cameras in a number of downtown neighbourhoods. The cameras cost a minimum \$20,000 each and can be as more than five times that figure depending on the specific technology used."¹¹

In July 2007, the *Georgia Straight* reported that BC's transit system, TransLink, "has approved a budget of almost \$4 million to install "security cameras and video recording equipment" on the region's bus fleet," and has "estimated the annual cost for the CCTV system at \$470,000."¹² Another police state program was put on hold for a while, as the *Georgia Straight* reported in 2007, "Plans for a state-of-the-art security system that would

link bars and nightclubs throughout Vancouver's downtown area have been put on hold." The "new system would link individual security systems digitally so that information on unruly patrons could be shared from one establishment to another," and that already, "Many bars on and around Granville scan patrons' IDs and take their picture upon entrance." Further, "According to a City of Vancouver administrative report, the mandate for ID scanners in bars originated in a May 2003 agreement between BarWatch and the Vancouver Police Department."[13](#)

In 2007, it was reported that, "IndigoVision has won a prestigious contract for TransLink in Vancouver, Canada to upgrade the 880 camera CCTV system on SkyTrain, the world's largest automated light rapid transit system."[14](#) An area adjacent to the metropolitan Vancouver area, Langley, was reported to be considering installing CCTV [Closed Circuit Television] at a bus loop.[15](#) Another article reported that, "A San Diego company is meeting with TransLink officials in Vancouver today to present new anti-terrorist technology, including bomb-sniffing ticket machines," and that the company, Cubic, "developed a system that detects traces of explosives on the hands of transit users." Further, Cubic's Vice President stated, "there is enough time to install the anti-terrorist system on the Canada Line before the Vancouver 2010 Olympics," and that, "He said Cubic developed the explosives-detecting machines in 2004 and tested them in Baltimore the following summer with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security."[16](#)

Another *Province* article began by asking, "Will video surveillance cameras outnumber TV cameras at the 2010 Olympic Games?" Some of the "pervasive" and "sophisticated" technology that can be expected to be seen at the Olympics include, "Computers [that] can be used to hook up videos with facial recognition software, information from social networking sites and even data gleaned from hotel bookings," and the article quoted a University of Victoria professor as stating, "mega-events like the 2010 Olympics attract extensive security measures that remain in place afterwards."[17](#)

In preparation for the Olympics, the RCMP has created the Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit (ISU), which is responsible for security during the Olympics and "is led by the RCMP and consists of members of the RCMP, Vancouver Police Department, West Vancouver Police Department and the Canadian Forces."[18](#)

In 2005, *CBC* reported that during the run-up to the Canadian elections, "Conservative Leader Stephen Harper was back on the campaign trail this week, promising to beef up military presence in major cities to respond to emergencies," and that, "If he's elected Jan. 23, Harper said, territorial battalions made up of 100 regular troops and 400 or more reservists would be stationed in Vancouver, Calgary, Regina, Winnipeg, the Toronto area and other major metropolitan areas." Further, Harper also "said Canada currently does not have the capacity to respond to crises in its own back yard, especially in British Columbia."[19](#)

The Province reported in 2008 that, "Some 267 people have died in police custody or in police-involved deaths in B.C. from 1992 to 2007, with 53 involving Vancouver police," and that, "Of the 267 deaths, 28 are listed as "First Nations," which Ward points out is more than 10 per cent of the total, although aboriginals form less than four per cent of the B.C. population."[20](#)

The *Vancouver Sun* reported on internal documents which revealed that, "Vancouver police regularly use Tasers to subdue people who are unarmed and non-violent, according to

internal reports released by the force,” and the “VPD [Vancouver Police Department] published on its website details of the about 150 times officers drew their Tasers from 2002 to early 2007.” The internal documents further revealed that, “in a number of cases, police used the Taser as soon as someone displayed a ‘fighting stance’ or simply to get a non-violent suspect to do what they were told.”[21](#)

There is the now-infamous case of Robert Dziekanski, a Polish immigrant, who was “Dazed and confused after more than 15 hours of travel, unable to communicate in English and scared because he couldn’t find his mother,” and then was subsequently “jolted by a taser just 24 seconds after being confronted by police in Vancouver International Airport,” then he was tasered again, and ultimately he was killed.[22](#)

North American Homeland Security Integration:

After September 11, 2001, the Bush administration created the Department of Homeland Security in 2003, and in December of 2003, “Prime Minister Paul Martin announced the creation of the Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Portfolio under the purview of the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada (PSEPC).” This department includes “the RCMP, CSIS [Canadian Security Intelligence Services], National Parole Board, Canada Firearms Centre, Correctional Service of Canada, and the Canada Border Services Agency. It also comprises three review Agencies: the RCMP External Review Committee; the Office of Correctional Investigator; and the Commission for Public Complaints against the RCMP.”[23](#) In effect, it is centralizing control over a wide range of departments. Also interesting to note is that the RCMP will report to the same individual as the Commission for Public Complaints against the RCMP. But I’m sure that’s not a conflict of interest.

In January of 2005, the *CBC* reported that, “A Vancouver man has won an out-of-court settlement from the RCMP after an incident in which he says he was illegally searched by an American police officer.” The incident occurred when “David Laing was driving on a highway near Hope, B.C., when he was pulled over by a man with a heavy Texas accent,” who then told Laing that “it was a British Columbia road check. And he asked [Laing] for [his] driver’s licence and [his] vehicle registration.” The article quoted Laing as saying, “I’m being pulled over and given directions by an American who won’t identify himself.” It just so happened that Laing was also a police officer in Vancouver, and so he “refused to let the officers search his car. Under Canadian law, police officers don’t have the right to perform that kind of search.” The *CBC* further reported that, “The American was a Texas state trooper working with a member of the Hope detachment of the RCMP.” After giving Laing a ticket for having two different addresses for his insurance and registration, “a different RCMP officer and Texas trooper stopped his car, decided he was driving under the influence of marijuana, and searched his vehicle and two-year-old son,” and “The police found no drugs and despite saying he was impaired just moments earlier, let him go.”[24](#)

The report then went on to explain that “The Texas state troopers were in B.C. as part of an exchange program with the RCMP to spot and stop drug traffickers. Called Pipeline Convoy, the program involves training officers to detect people who are lying or trying to hide things from police.” Further, “The RCMP settled with Laing out of court when he threatened to sue for unlawful detention. But the Mounties defend the search, saying Laing looked suspicious because his eyelashes were fluttering and his eyes were flashing.” The BC Civil Liberties Association stated that, “Laing’s case presents a series of concerns – from using unreliable profiling techniques to a wrongful vehicle search, not to mention using an

American police officer to pull over Canadians.”

On October 5, 2006, the *CBC* reported that, “Public Safety Minister Stockwell Day acknowledged Thursday that U.S. agents conduct investigations in Canada but said all are done according to Canadian law.” Elaborating, “Day was responding to a report regarding an internal FBI audit that shows U.S. agents are carrying out investigations without the approval of the Canadian government.” The internal FBI audit “says the FBI has given agents in its Buffalo field office clearance to conduct “routine investigations” up to 50 miles into Canadian territory.” Further, “The most recent audit by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s inspector general, done in 2004, documents the growth of FBI operations in Canada since 2001.” The article continued, “As well as the reference to “routine investigations” inside Canadian territory it also says that about 30 per cent of FBI agents crossing the border to work in Canada failed to get ‘country clearance.’ In other words, they didn’t get Canada’s approval,” and “The inspector general’s report documents 135 unapproved FBI crossings and says there is no sign the crossings will stop.”²⁵ It’s especially interesting to note that the FBI is a *domestic* agency, meaning that it is to operate within the US, not outside. Unless, of course, the FBI now sees Canada as within its *domestic* mandate. But not to worry, after all, Stockwell Day said it was legal. Although, he failed to identify what law is being *obeyed* by having foreign agents sneak across our border, without government approval (or knowledge) on unspecified and largely unknown missions. If that’s considered *legal*, Stockwell Day can be considered a Canadian patriot, upholding the rule of law and preserving and protecting the freedoms and rights of all Canadian citizens. Neither seem very plausible to me.

An RCMP press release in 2006 reported that, “To effectively combat cross-border criminal activity, Canadian and American law enforcement are taking an international and integrated approach to their investigations.” This culminates in what they call, “Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETs),” which comprise “the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), the United States Customs and Border Protection/ Office of the Border Patrol (CBP/OBP), the United States Department of Homeland Security Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and the United States Coast Guard (USCG).” Further, “IBET agencies share information and work together daily with other local, state and provincial law enforcement agencies on issues relating to national security, organized crime and other criminality transiting the Canada/US border between the official Ports of Entry.”²⁶

North American Military Integration:

As the civil “security” departments were being formed at the same time in Canada and the US, to allow for a smooth process of centralization and integration, the military aspects of Canada and the US were being formed, as “on 17 April 2002, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld announced that the American Unified Command Plan (UCP) was being updated to include a new regional command – Northern Command (NorthCom).” NorthCom “was given responsibility for the continental United States, Canada, Mexico, portions of the Caribbean and the contiguous waters in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans up to 500 miles off the North American coastline.” Though Mexico did not sign on to NorthCom, Donald Rumsfeld boasted that it has “all of North America as its geographic command.”²⁷

On May 6, 2002, a speech was delivered to senior military officials in Canada’s Department of National Defence titled, “Canada-U.S. Defence Relations, Asymmetric Threats

And The U.S. Unified Command Plan,” in which it was stated that after 9/11, “both countries decided to create a Great-Lakes/Saint Lawrence Seaway Cross Border Task Force. The aim of this Task Force is to target illicit traffic of people and goods across the maritime sector of the Northern Border. Agencies involved in this Task Force are numerous (DoD, USCG, FBI, Justice State, US Customs, the Canadian Coast Guard, RCMP, the Ontario and Quebec Provincial Police, CF Navy, DFAIT, etc.).” It was further stated that, “NORTHCOM’s area of interest will be North America, including Mexico, the Continental US and Canada, with a 500 nautical mile air and maritime zone of responsibility.”[28](#)

In 2006, the Bi-National Planning Group (BPG) released its final report, in which they states, “The Bi-National Planning Group (BPG) was established in December 2002 through an exchange of Diplomatic Notes on enhanced military cooperation between the Governments of Canada and the United States.” The Bi-National Planning Group’s “mandate covered a critical period in the evolving defense and security relationship of the United States and Canada, a time during which both countries responded to the new threat environment after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.” It further states that, “It conducted reviews of existing Canada-U.S. defense plans and military assistance protocols; drafted new bi-national contingency plans to respond to threats, attacks and other major emergencies in Canada or the U.S.; analyzed information sharing practices; designed and participated in exercises and joint training; and established coordination mechanisms with relevant Canadian and U.S. Federal departments and agencies.”[29](#)

The report states that, “The goal should be to achieve the level (although not necessarily the form) of cooperation that now exists in NORAD *in all other domains*. [Emphasis added]” It calls for a Canada-US “Comprehensive Defense and Security Agreement” which would include, among other things, “Development of deliberate plans for the joint and combined defense and security of North America as well as bi-national civil support; Conduct of seamless bi-national information sharing; Conduct of joint and combined training and exercises; [and] Development of coordination mechanisms, including agreements among the military stakeholders and the homeland security and foreign policy communities.”[30](#)

It later states as a recommendation, “With respect to the movement of Canadian and US military personnel across the border for military operations, including military-to-military support to civil authorities, Foreign Affairs Canada, US Department of State, Canada Command, US Northern Command, border agencies and other appropriate military and civil entities should work together to ensure processes are in place to fully address cross-border movement legal issues prior to deployment.”[31](#)

It was reported by *The Vancouver Sun* on February 23, 2008, that, “Canada and the U.S. have signed an agreement that paves the way for the militaries from either nation to send troops across each other’s borders during an emergency, but some are questioning why the Harper government has kept silent on the deal.” Further, “Neither the Canadian government nor the Canadian Forces announced the new agreement, which was signed Feb. 14 in Texas,” but, “The U.S. military’s Northern Command, however, publicized the agreement with a statement outlining how its top officer, Gen. Gene Renuart, and Canadian Lt.-Gen. Marc Dumais, head of Canada Command, signed the plan, which allows the military from one nation to support the armed forces of the other nation in a civil emergency.” The article then quoted Canada Command spokesman, David Scanlon, as stating, “If U.S. forces were to come into Canada they would be under tactical control of the Canadian Forces but still under the command of the U.S. military.”[32](#)

This is a really amazing exercise in Orwellian double-speak, as he is saying that US forces in Canada would be under the *tactical* control of Canadian Forces, meaning under a degree of *direction*. Yet, at the same time, in the same sentence, he states that they will still be under the command of the US military. However, since the integration of Canada's military structure with that of the US is so far advanced, with NORAD, NORTHCOM, the Bi-National Planning Group, etc., indeed there will be Canadian officials giving directions, as they are placed within the "integrated" military structures. But the structure itself is under command of the United States.

The Canadian Department of National Defence issued a press release regarding the Civil Assistance Plan mentioned above, which permits the use of Canadian and US militaries in each country, in which they quoted US Air Force General Gene Renuart as saying "This document is a unique, bilateral military plan to align our respective national military plans to respond quickly to the other nation's requests for military support of civil authorities." Canadian Air Force Lieutenant-General Marc Dumais, commander of Canada Command, was quoted as saying, "The signing of this plan is an important symbol of the already strong working relationship between Canada Command and US Northern Command."[33](#)

Further, the same press release went on to report that, "The [Civil Assistance] plan recognizes the role of each nation's lead federal agency for emergency preparedness, which in the US is the Department of Homeland Security and in Canada is Public Safety Canada. The plan facilitates the military-to-military support of civil authorities once government authorities have agreed on an appropriate response." In other words, in the event of an emergency in Canada or the US, Homeland Security and Public Safety Canada would give directions of which the respective militaries would then enforce. In the event of an "incident" in Canada or the US, a North American Military-Security State will be firmly enshrined over our countries. But I guess that's what George Bush means by "spreading Democracy".

The press release went on, "US Northern Command was established on October 1, 2002, to anticipate and conduct homeland defence and civil support operations within the assigned area of responsibility [i.e., North America] to defend, protect, and secure the US and its interests [i.e., North America]." It is especially telling that NORTHCOM refers to all of North America as the US' "interests", whereas, as a Canadian, I was under the impression that Canada was the "interest" of Canadians. Further, "Canada Command was established on February 1, 2006, to focus on domestic operations and to offer a single point of contact for all domestic and continental defence and security partners." The end of the press release notes that, "The two domestic commands established strong bilateral ties well before the signing of the Civil Assistance Plan. The two commanders and their staffs meet regularly, collaborate on contingency planning and participate in related annual exercises."

North American Terror Drills:

A recent report on plans to practice a terrorist-response drill in Vancouver to be conducted by Mexico, Canada and the US in April of 2009, revealed that the drill will be "led by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, [and] is code-named TOPOFF 5. Canadian troops were among the 15,000 participants involved in last October's TOPOFF 4 in Portland, Ore., Phoenix, Ariz. and Guam." Stockwell Day was quoted as saying, "Exercises provide unique training opportunities to strengthen our ability to deal with potential emergencies." The article then went on to report, "An undated Public Safety Canada report said up to \$22.8 million was needed to fund emergency management, counter-terrorism, cyber security and

critical infrastructure protection exercises, 'leading to a trilateral full-scale exercise prior to the Vancouver Olympic Games in 2010, as outlined under the Security and Prosperity Partnership'." Chris Shaw of 2010 Watch was quoted as asking, "Does it mean that if the American forces are training with Canadian forces that they are going to be positioned here in Canada during the period of the Olympic Games?"[34](#)

According to Homeland Security's website, "Top Officials (TOPOFF) is the nation's premier terrorism preparedness exercise, involving top officials at every level of government, as well as representatives from the international community and private sector. Thousands of federal, state, territorial, and local officials engage in various activities as part of a robust, full-scale simulated response to a multi-faceted threat." The first TOPOFF exercise was conducted in May of 2000, and since Homeland Security did not exist then, it was conducted by "the Department of Justice, the Department of State, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)," and "The primary goal of the exercise was to improve the capability of government officials and agencies, both within the United States and abroad to provide an effective, coordinated, and strategic response to a terrorist attack." TOPOFF 2, conducted in May of 2003, was led by Homeland Security, in which "Participants in Seattle faced a simulated radiological dispersal device (RDD) attack, while those in the Chicago faced a biological attack." Further, "The exercise engaged 8,500 responders and top officials from the United States and Canada - the first international partner to participate."[35](#)

TOPOFF 3, conducted in April of 2005, continued to evolve and included an increased focus on bolstering international and private sector participation, terrorism prevention activities, risk communication and public information functions, and long-term recovery and remediation issues." This exercise included "Over 10,000 participants, including responders and officials from Canada and the United Kingdom, [who] responded to a simulated chemical attack in New London, Conn., and a biological attack in the state of New Jersey." TOPOFF 4, conducted in October of 2007, in Portland, Oregon, Phoenix, Arizona and the US territory in Guam, as well as with individuals in Washington D.C., "built on past lessons learned while adding new goals, including: an increased level of coordination with U.S. Department of Defense exercises to combat global terrorism, closer cooperation with the private sector, an expanded emphasis on prevention, a deeper focus on mass decontamination and long-term recovery and remediation issues." It included the participation of "the governments of Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom."

TOPOFF 4 was the "biggest terrorism exercise ever staged nationally," which started with "a fictional "bang" from an imaginary "dirty bomb" to test the emergency response of local, state and federal agencies." A local Portland news outlet reported that, "The scenario also features simulated dirty bomb attacks in Arizona and Guam to evaluate the ability of federal agencies to manage multiple sites and will involve officials from the top levels of government, including the Defense and Homeland Security departments."[36](#)

Terror Drills in a "War on Terror" Context:

Why are drills and war games so important to discuss? The answer lies in the precedent of the events that have occurred in conjunction with drills and war games in the past. According to *Cooperative Research*, at 6:30 in the morning on September 11, 2001, NORAD began conducting a drill called Vigilant Guardian, which was "an exercise that would pose an imaginary crisis to North American Air Defense outposts nationwide." An emergency drill was scheduled at 8:00 am in the WTC South Tower on the 97th floor. Another exercise

called Global Guardian, was being conducted by the US military and was based around the premise of a nuclear war. Before 9:00 am, New York's Office of Emergency Management, whose offices were in WTC Building 7, the *third* building that collapsed into its own footprint on 9/11 (and wasn't hit by a plane). The exercise was to be conducted with FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency), and the exercise was based around a biological terror attack in New York City. The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), whose personnel were drawn from the CIA, had scheduled an emergency exercise for 9 am in which a plane was crashed into a government building. There were many other exercises and dozens leading up to 9/11, which revolved around events eerily like those that occurred on 9/11. The war games and drills also served to confuse all the honest government employees who reportedly thought that the events they were seeing take place were actually part of the exercises.³⁷ Because of all of these drills and war games, the United States defenses weren't able to respond to the attacks with normal procedures, and therefore helped facilitate the attacks.

On July 7, 2005, during the 7/7 London bombings of three subway trains and a double-decker bus, Peter Power, a director of Visor Consultants reported to BBC that, "At half past nine this morning we were actually running an exercise for a company of over a thousand people in London based on simultaneous bombs going off precisely at the railway stations where it happened this morning, so I still have the hairs on the back of my neck standing up right now."³⁸

It is important to monitor military drills and war games because they can often be used as a cover for the actual events taking place. In this context, the TOPOFF exercise that will take place in Vancouver in April of 2009 must be subjected to closer scrutiny and the government must reveal more details of their "exercise".

Terror, "Deep Integration" and Martial Law:

Terrorism and the process of "deep integration" of Canada, the US and Mexico are not unrelated and separate concepts. In fact, there is a very close relationship between the two. On February 12, 2008, the *Financial Post* ran an op-ed in which the author stated, "The crisis of Sept. 11, 2001, provided [a perfect opportunity](#) to seize the moment to re-imagine the border," and pursue a process of deeper integration between Canada and the United States.³⁹

Robert Pastor, an American academic who was one of the lead authors of the "Building a North American Community" report, and one of the principal individuals driving the process towards further integration, told a Spanish-language magazine that, "The 9/11 crisis made Canada and the United States redefine the protection of their borders," and that, "What I'm saying is that a crisis is an event which can force democratic governments to make difficult decisions like those that will be required to create a North American Community." Elaborating, he stated, "It's not that I want another 9/11 crisis, but having a crisis would force decisions that otherwise might not get made."⁴⁰

On December 1, 2002, the *Washington Post* reported that, "The Bush administration is developing a parallel legal system in which terrorism suspects — U.S. citizens and noncitizens alike — may be investigated, jailed, interrogated, tried and punished without legal protections guaranteed by the ordinary system." The article explained that this "parallel" legal system would include, "indefinite military detention for those designated "enemy combatants," liberal use of "material witness" warrants, counterintelligence-style

wiretaps and searches led by law enforcement officials and, for noncitizens, trial by military commissions or deportation after strictly closed hearings.”[41](#)

In 2003, the *Washington Post* reported that, “A federal appeals court today ruled that the government has properly detained an American-born man captured with Taliban forces in Afghanistan without an attorney and has legally declared him an enemy combatant.”[42](#) The *Post* then reported in 2005 that, “A federal appeals court yesterday backed the president’s power to indefinitely detain a U.S. citizen captured on U.S. soil without any criminal charges,” and that, “such power is essential to preventing terrorist strikes.”[43](#)

Commenting on the Military Commissions Act of 2006, Yale law and political science professor Bruce Ackerman wrote in the *Los Angeles Times* that the legislation “authorizes the president to seize American citizens as enemy combatants, even if they have never left the United States. And once thrown into military prison, they cannot expect a trial by their peers or any other of the normal protections of the Bill of Rights.” Further, it states that the legislation “grants the president enormous power over citizens and legal residents. They can be designated as enemy combatants if they have contributed money to a Middle Eastern charity, and they can be held indefinitely in a military prison.” Not only that, but, “ordinary Americans would be required to defend themselves before a military tribunal without the constitutional guarantees provided in criminal trials.” Startlingly, “Legal residents who aren’t citizens are treated even more harshly. The bill entirely cuts off their access to federal habeas corpus, leaving them at the mercy of the president’s suspicions.”[44](#)

Senator Patrick Leahy made a statement on February 2007 in which he discussed the John Warner Defense Authorization Act of 2007, saying:

Last year, Congress quietly made it easier for this President or any President to declare martial law. That’s right: In legislation added at the Administration’s request to last year’s massive Defense Authorization Bill, it has now become easier to bypass longtime posse comitatus restrictions that prevent the federal government’s use of the military, including a federalized National Guard, to perform domestic law enforcement duties.

He added that, “posse comitatus [is] the legal doctrine that bars the use of the military for law enforcement directed at the American people here at home.” The Bill is an amendment to the Insurrection Act, of which Leahy further commented, “When the Insurrection Act is invoked, the President can — without the consent of the respective governors — federalize the National Guard and use it, along with the entire military, to carry out law enforcement duties,” and that, “this is a sweeping grant of authority to the President.” Also, “In addition to the cases of insurrection, the Act can now be invoked to restore public order after a terrorist attack, a natural disaster, a disease outbreak, or — and this is extremely broad — ‘other condition’.”[45](#)

Given that the press release for the Orwellian-titled “Civil Assistance Plan” stated that the commanders of NORTHCOM and Canada Command, the two signatories to the “Assistance” Plan, both “collaborate on contingency planning” on a “regular” basis, it is necessary to take a closer look at such “contingency” plans. On May 9, 2007, the White House issued a press release about the National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD) 51, also known as the “National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive.” This directive:

[P]rescribes continuity requirements for all executive departments and agencies, and

provides guidance for State, local, territorial, and tribal governments, and private sector organizations in order to ensure a comprehensive and integrated national continuity program that will enhance the credibility of our national security posture and enable a more rapid and effective response to and recovery from a national emergency.

The document defines “catastrophic emergency” as, “any incident, regardless of location, that results in extraordinary levels of mass casualties, damage, or disruption severely affecting the U.S. population, infrastructure, environment, economy, or government functions.” It explains “Continuity of Government” (COG), as “a coordinated effort within the Federal Government’s executive branch to ensure that National Essential Functions continue to be performed during a Catastrophic Emergency.” Further, this directive states that, “The President shall lead the activities of the Federal Government for ensuring constitutional government. In order to advise and assist the President in that function, the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism (APHS/CT) is hereby designated as the National Continuity Coordinator.”[46](#) So essentially, in time of a “catastrophic emergency”, the President, whomever that may be, takes over total control of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government in order to secure “continuity”. In essence, the Presidency would become an “Executive Dictatorship”.

The Oregonian reported in 2007 that Oregon Congressman Peter DeFazio, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, asked the White House to see secret documents related to NSPD 51 that were not released in the press statement, and he was denied “the right of reviewing how [the White House] plan to conduct the government of the United States after a significant terrorist attack.”[47](#)

The *San Francisco Chronicle* reported on February 4, 2008, that, “Beginning in 1999, the government has entered into a series of single-bid contracts with Halliburton subsidiary Kellogg, Brown and Root (KBR) to build detention camps at undisclosed locations within the United States. The government has also contracted with several companies to build thousands of railcars, some reportedly equipped with shackles, ostensibly to transport detainees.” Further, “the KBR contract is part of a Homeland Security plan titled ENDGAME, which sets as its goal the removal of ‘all removable aliens’ and ‘potential terrorists’.”[48](#)

KBR, once a subsidiary of Dick Cheney’s former company, Halliburton, has been involved with and related to [many very nefarious events](#) in recent history, including the Rwandan genocide, Congo civil war, NATO wars on Bosnia and Kosovo, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and even getting the contract to build attachments to the Guantanamo prison camp. KBR’s contract from Homeland Security was revealed in a press release which stated the contract, “provides for establishing temporary detention and processing capabilities to augment existing ICE Detention and Removal Operations (DRO) Program facilities in the event of an emergency influx of immigrants into the U.S., or to support the rapid development of new programs,” and that, “The contract may also provide migrant detention support to other U.S. Government organizations in the event of an immigration emergency, as well as the development of a plan to react to a national emergency, such as a natural disaster.”[49](#)

Given the close relationship between the events of 9/11 and the speeding up of North American integration, it is very significant that much of the integration is focused around military responses to “catastrophic emergencies”, which would undoubtedly further accelerate the process of integration. However, given the laws, contracts and directives put in place by the US, in the event of a “catastrophic emergency”, any vestige of democratic

institutions in North America would cease to exist.

Concluding Remarks

Vancouver in 2010 will be a very interesting time. Terror drills will be conducted in Vancouver in April of 2009 in preparation for the Olympics, as Vancouver turns itself into a police state while the military and security structures of Canada and the United States are merged together to form a North American Military-Security State, all under the auspices of the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP). Laws such as the Military Commissions Act and Defense Authorization Act are reason enough for Canada to not merge with the United States on this level, but when taking into account NSPD 51 (National Security Presidential Directive 51) for "Continuity of Government" and the contracts for KBR to build "detention camps", it is, in fact, in Canada's national security interests to immediately cease and undo what integration has already been undertaken.

Much like how China's emergence into the modern world community is to be marked by their 2008 Olympics, the 2010 Olympics in Vancouver will not mark Canada's show of pride in the world, but will mark the coronation of the North American "Community", eventually to become a Union. I use the word "coronation" deliberately, as a coronation is a ceremony upon where a monarch is given regal powers and the crown is placed on their head. Given the structure that is being set up for the North American "Community", the amount of power being taken away from the people of North America and into the hands of a few out-of-control elites makes the comparison apt to placing the crown upon a monarch.

It's a sad state of affairs when one loses their freedoms and rights, not through a valiant fight to keep them, but through secret agreements, quiet discussions, deceitful laws and worst of all, mass apathy on the part of the public. It's time to speak up, speak loud, and take our countries back while we still have what remains of them, and most importantly, while we still have the freedom to speak.

NOTES

1 CFR, *Building a North American Community*. Independent Task Force on the Future of North America: May 2005, page 17: <http://www.cfr.org/publication/8102/>

2 SPP, *Security Priorities*. Report to Leaders: August 2006, page 27:

<http://www.spp-ppsp.gc.ca/progress/reports-en.aspx>

3 Bob Mackin, *Three Amigos at 2010 Winter Olympics?* 24 Hours: March 5, 2008: <http://vancouver.24hrs.ca/News/2008/03/05/4909016-sun.html>

4 Office of the Prime Minister, *The Honourable David Emerson*. August 14, 2007:

<http://pm.gc.ca/eng/bio.asp?id=4>

5 CCCE, *Paul Martin Urged to Take the Lead in Forging a New Vision for North American Cooperation*. North American Security and Prosperity: November 5, 2003: http://www.ceocouncil.ca/en/view/?document_id=38

6 Charlie Smith, *2010: It's the terror, stupid*. The Georgia Straight: August 11, 2005:

<http://www.straight.com/article/2010-its-the-terror-stupid>

7 Kevin Potvin, *Police state looms as Vancouver engages in the War on Terror*. The Republic of East Vancouver: May 25 to June 7, 2006, Issue 139:
http://www.republic-news.org/archive/139-repub/139_kevin_potvin_police.htm

8 John Colebourn, *Cops pushing for Granville Mall cameras*. The Province: November 8, 2006:
<http://www.canada.com/theprovince/news/story.html?id=f80cd85a-ef87-48d0-9329-525ac8b0a47c>

9 Todd Battis, *Vancouver eyes surveillance cams to deter drunks*. CTV News: November 12, 2006:
http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20061112/vancouver_cams_061112/20061112?hub=CTVNewsAt11

10 Chad Skelton, *1 in 50 drivers 'commits crime' on roads*. The Vancouver Sun: November 9, 2006:
<http://www.canada.com/vancouvernews/news/story.html?id=ce551444-9953-4049-a327-bb743a0676bd&k=64749>

11 VPSN, *Surveillance*. Vancouver Public Space Network:
<http://vancouverpublicspace.ca/index.php/campaigns/surveillance>

12 Carlito Pablo, *CCTV coming to a bus in your neighbourhood*. The Georgia Straight: July 26, 2007:
<http://www.straight.com/article-102933/cctv-coming-to-a-bus-in-your-neighbourhood>

13 Travis Lupick, *Big Brother Bar Hops*. The Georgia Straight: July 19, 2007:
<http://www.straight.com/article-102067/big-brother-bar-hops>

14 IndigoVision, *Vancouver's SkyTrain to Use IndigoVision's Surveillance Technology*. SecurityInfoWatch.com: January 24, 2007:
<http://www.securityinfowatch.com/article/article.jsp?id=10376&siteSection=385>

15 Matthew Claxton, *Bus loop camera pondered*. Langley Advance: January 29, 2008:
<http://www.canada.com/langleyadvance/news/story.html?id=58fdf41d-6352-4856-a973-0d2788e46650>

16 Damian Inwood, *Bomb-detecting technology knocks on TransLink's door*. The Province: February 8, 2008:
<http://www.canada.com/theprovince/news/story.html?id=7fc6466a-3a36-4cbd-9b08-d198c8f883b1>

17 Kent Spencer, *2010 Winter Olympics' security cameras to be studied*. The Province: February 26, 2008:
<http://www.canada.com/theprovince/news/story.html?id=ff476cb9-82b2-4d72-a912-bb7032d5bff7&k=6921>

18 RCMP, *Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit*. RCMP in BC:

<http://bc.rcmp.ca/ViewPage.action?contentId=235&siteNodeId=51>

- 19 CBC, *Harper pledges to boost military presence in cities*. CBC News: December 28, 2005:
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/story/2005/12/28/harper-military051228.html>
- 20 Suzanne Fournier, *267 cop-related deaths in B.C. over past 15 years*. The Province: January 25, 2008:
<http://www.canada.com/theprovince/news/story.html?id=707223ef-cf82-4c1e-832c-90e547cd4dd0&k=75086>
- 21 Chad Skelton, *Police say they use Tasers on non-violent people*. The Vancouver Sun: March 8, 2008:
<http://www.canada.com/vancouvernews/news/westcoastnews/story.html?id=35f7b04b-953f-44dd-8001-29708d1c59c3&k=84373>
- 22 Mark Hume and Sunny Dhillon, *Questions hang over taser death*. The Globe and Mail: October 26, 2007:
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20071025.wtaser1026/BNStory/National/home>
- 23 Public Safety Canada, *Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada: Year One*. Archive: December 13, 2004:
http://ww2.ps-sp.gc.ca/publications/news/2004/20041213_e.asp
- 24 CBC News, *Cop wins RCMP settlement after highway search*. CBC: January 28, 2005:
<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2005/01/28/texas-bc050128.html>
- 25 CBC News, *U.S. investigations on Canadian soil done within the law: Day*. CBC: October 5, 2006:
<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2006/10/05/fbi-border.html>
- 26 RCMP, *Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETs) 2006 Joint Cross-Border Operations*. RCMP: August 23, 2006:
http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/security/ibets_success_e.htm
- 27 Philippe Lagassé, *NORAD, NorthCom, and the Binational Planning Group: The Evolution of Canada-US Defence Relations - Part 1*. CASR: July 2003:
<http://www.sfu.ca/casr/ft-lagasse1.htm>
- 28 DND, *Canada-U.S. Defence Relations, Asymmetric Threats And The U.S. Unified Command Plan*. Speeches: May 6, 2002:
http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/newsroom/view_news_e.asp?id=1004
- 29 BPG, *The Final Report on Canada and the United States (CANUS) Enhanced Military Cooperation*. Bi-National Planning Group: March 13, 2006, page 3:
www.hsdec.org/downloads/BPG%20Final%20Report%20signed%2006-03-13+.pdf
- 30 BPG, *The Final Report on Canada and the United States (CANUS) Enhanced Military Cooperation*. Bi-National Planning Group: March 13, 2006, page 5:
www.hsdec.org/downloads/BPG%20Final%20Report%20signed%2006-03-13+.pdf

31 BPG, *The Final Report on Canada and the United States (CANUS) Enhanced Military Cooperation*. Bi-National Planning Group: March 13, 2006, page 39:

www.hsdec.org/downloads/BPG%20Final%20Report%20signed%200603-13+.pdf

32 David Pugliese, *Canada-U.S. pact allows cross-border military activity*. The Vancouver Sun: February 23, 2008:

<http://www.canada.com/vancouver/news/story.html?id=ba99826e-f9b7-42a4-9b0a-f82134b92e7e>

33 National Defence, *New Bilateral Civil Assistance Plan established*. Canadian Department of National Defense: February 26, 2008:

http://www.dnd.ca/site/community/mapleleaf/article_e.asp?id=4175

34 Bob Mackin, *Three Amigos at 2010 Winter Olympics?* 24 Hours: March 5, 2008: <http://vancouver.24hrs.ca/News/2008/03/05/4909016-sun.html>

35 Homeland Security, *TOPOFF: Exercising National Preparedness*. TOPOFF: February 21, 2008: http://www.dhs.gov/xprepresp/training/gc_1179350946764.shtm

36 Eileen Sullivan, *'Dirty bomb' terror exercise set for Portland*. KGW: October 4, 2007: http://www.kgw.com/news-local/stories/kgw_100307_news_terror_exercise_portland.13446f742.html

37 Cooperative Research, *Military Exercises Up to 9/11*. Complete 9/11 Timeline:

http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/timeline.jsp?timeline=complete_911_timeline&before_9/11=militaryExercises

38 Michel Chossudovsky, *7/7 Mock Terror Drill: What Relationship to the Real Time Terror Attacks?* Global Research: August 8, 2005:

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=20050808&articleId=821>

39 Michael Hart, *Canada Blew It*. The Financial Post: February 12, 2008:

<http://www.nationalpost.com/opinion/story.html?id=302151>

40 WND, *North American Union leader says merger just crisis away*. World Net Daily: December 15, 2006:

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=53378

41 Charles Lane, *In Terror War, 2nd Track for Suspects*. Washington Post: December 1, 2002:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&contentId=A58308-2002Nov30¬Found=true>

42 Tom Jackman, *Court: U.S. Can Hold Citizens as Enemy Combatants*. Washington Post: January 8, 2003:

http://www.prisonplanet.com/court_us_can_hold_citizens_as_enemy_combatants.html

43 Jerry Markon, *U.S. Can Confine Citizens Without Charges, Court Rules* Washington Post:

September 10, 2005:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/09/09/AR2005090900772.html>

44 Bruce Ackerman, *The White House Warden*. Los Angeles Times: September 28, 2006:
<http://www.law.yale.edu/news/3531.htm>

45 Patrick Leahy, *Statement Of Sen. Patrick Leahy On Legislation To Repeal Changes To The Insurrection Act*. February 7, 2007: <http://leahy.senate.gov/press/200702/020707.html>

46 The White House, *National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive*. Office of the Press Secretary: May 9, 2007:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/05/20070509-12.html>

47 Jeff Kosseff, *DeFazio Asks, But He's Denied Access*. The Oregonian: July 21, 2007:

<http://www.commondreams.org/archive/2007/07/21/2678/>

48 Lewis Seiler and Dan Hamburg, *Rule by Fear or Rule by Law?* The San Francisco Chronicle: February 8, 2008:

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/02/04/ED5OUPQJ7.DTL>

49 KBR, *KBR Awarded U.S. Department of Homeland Security Contingency Support Project for Emergency Support Services*. Press Releases: 2006 Archive, January 24, 2006:
http://www.kbr.com/news/2006/govnews_060124.aspx

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Andrew Gavin Marshall](#), Global Research, 2008

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Andrew Gavin Marshall](#)

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

