

Canada as a Global Citizen: Canada's International Military Commitments

Open September 6 - October 3, 2016

The nature of international security has changed dramatically in recent years - since the end of the Cold War and since 2001. Security threats increasingly come from non state-actors. How prepared is Canada to address international security in the 21st century?

Subject Matter Experts

[Anessa Kimball](#)

Associate professor & Director of graduate studies
Université Laval, Department of political science

[Caroline Leprince](#)

Associate fellow
Raoul-Dandurand Chair of Diplomatic and Strategic Studies

Preliminary Discussion: What should Canada's future commitment look like? Lead or support?

Discussion Overview

The nature of international security has changed dramatically in recent years - since the end of the Cold War and since 2001. Security threats increasingly come from non state-actors. How prepared is Canada to address international security in the 21st century?

[Caroline Leprince](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • August 9, 2016 at 08:06 pm

À un moment où le gouvernement réfléchit au rôle que jouera le pays sur la scène internationale, il semble que les engagements militaires internationaux du Canada ne cessent de se multiplier : terrorisme au Moyen-Orient, résurgence de la Russie dans les pays baltes, réengagement du Canada dans les missions de paix. On s'attend des Forces armées canadiennes qu'elles soient prêtes à intervenir partout et en tout temps. Compte tenu des ressources limitées avec lesquelles doivent composer les Forces armées canadiennes, quelles sont les priorités selon vous qui devraient être privilégiées dans la stratégie de défense du Canada?

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • August 10, 2016 at 09:58 am

Not only should we discuss what priorities to emphasize in CDN defense strategy but also what should be CDA's decision-making criteria for joining missions/operations with NATO or other allied coalitions? Given limited resources, what types of defense diplomacy and where are the most useful at this juncture?

• Post Awarded 5 DR

[Karen Everett](#) • August 11, 2016 at 02:53 pm

Caroline and Anessa, I imagine it is not an easy decision for the government to make when determining where our limited military resources are spent - there is a lot going on in the world! I wonder how much of our military strategy aligns with our non-military foreign policy priorities and what happens if there is a conflict of interest between them, or if there is a conflict between our priorities and those of our allied coalitions? How can these differences be reconciled or accommodated?

[William Innes](#) • August 17, 2016 at 10:31 pm

The recent seemingly nostalgic search by government for a return to the historic role of Canada in PKO seems to fly in the face of the Lack of recent global success in negotiating the peace to keep. This seems to suggest:

0 There is an opportunity for us to provide diplomatic leadership in bringing our history of Mutual Accommodation to improving the peacemaking processes of institutions like the UN. 0 Rather than be driven by yesterday's model of PKO we should continue to be willing to step up to the challenge of peacemaking and peacekeeping wherever we find coalitions of the willing which serve our national interest.

What would it take for us to provide leadership in Global peacemaking processes?

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • August 23, 2016 at 10:43 am

Karen Everett wrote on August 11:

Caroline and Anessa, I imagine it is not an easy decision for the government to make when determining where our limited military resources are spent - there is a lot going on in the world! I wonder how much of our military strategy aligns with our non-military foreign policy priorities and what happens if there is a conflict of interest between them, or if there is a conflict between our priorities and those of our allied coalitions? How can these differences be reconciled or accommodated?

Karen, Given my recent participation in the national defense review, it is clear one of the priorities of the government is being a credible and reliable alliance partner. Canada is also dedicated to participating in activities necessary to restore international stability in key regions of the world. This is really a question about how much Global Affairs and National Defense can get along as much as anything else.

[Olivier Fraysse](#) • August 24, 2016 at 06:52 pm

Given the military expenses than Canada can afford, it will be better to focus on peacekeeping and helping stability in various parts of the world. Canada should not have offensive forces and focus more on the diplomatic aspects. Canada is one of the rare places in the world where community can leave together, where our children can play outside with no fear. This is where Canada must play : supports population but showing to the population how to live and not only survive.

[Bob Ghosh](#) • September 6, 2016 at 01:24 pm

It's important to understand that the label UN Peacekeeping does not dictate the force package that Canada will deploy. Lessons have been learned about how rules of engagement are written and explained to the troops. Clarity about the capacity to defend oneself became a part of the Bosnia deployments by the ISAF deployments. Deploying a force capable of defending itself has also been

learned. The idea that the UN blue beret or helmet will automatically be respected by all parties is no longer assumed. When we look at the new focus on peace keeping we should look at previous deployments for lessons but should expect the force deployed to be different.

- Post Awarded 5 DR

[Should Canada be a Peacekeeper or a Peacemaker?](#)

Discussion Overview

Canadians have often thought of themselves as peacekeepers yet over the past two decades, Canada's role as a peacekeeper has declined. Increasingly Canada contributes less and less to peacekeeping missions and instead devotes resources to peacemaking missions which often involves engaging in combat to bring peace.

[Caroline Leprince](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 6, 2016 at 06:48 pm

Dans les années 1990, le Canada fournissait à son plus fort jusqu'à 3000 Casques bleus aux missions de paix de l'ONU. Cet effort n'est pas négligeable considérant que le Canada, avec moins de 1% de la population mondiale, fournissait plus de 10% des Casques bleus sur le terrain. Or les missions de l'ONU ont profondément changé au cours des deux dernières décennies. Désormais, les opérations de maintien de la paix ont lieu dans des environnements beaucoup plus risqués qu'auparavant.

Si le Canada décide de se réengager dans les missions de paix de l'ONU, l'un des principaux défis sera de réconcilier les souvenirs qu'ont gardés les Canadiens de l'époque des Casques bleus avec les réalités auxquelles les missions de l'ONU sont maintenant confrontées. Est-ce que la population canadienne sera prête à soutenir des missions plus robustes d'imposition de la paix?

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 6, 2016 at 08:08 pm

Despite persistent Canadian involvement in peacekeeping, contemporary peacekeeping missions take place in increasingly hostile regions of the world. Are Canadian military resources best allocated to peacekeeping or should Canada work towards training other states to undertake peacekeeping?

[Karen Everett](#) • September 7, 2016 at 08:57 am

Caroline, you mention our memories of past peacekeeping efforts and how global realities have changed, suggesting a shift to peacemaking. Anessa, you ask if we should focus more on training than performing peacekeeping ourselves. I wonder how the rise of asymmetrical threats and non-state actors over recent years will influence and contribute to the decisions our government will have to make with regards to future peacekeeping decisions?

[Heather Nicol](#) • September 7, 2016 at 03:23 pm

Karen you raise a interesting question. We need to understand what the new threat environment actually means for our military resources. How would direct Canadian involvement in peacekeeping make a difference in either case - that is to say with asymmetrical or non-state actors? What are the fundamentally different resourcing issues? More importantly, what are we expecting to gain from all of this - is it a question of meeting a moral imperative or a question of displaying competence in a new global environment? I think there is a difference between the two and that needs to be considered.

[Caroline Leprince](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 7, 2016 at 08:53 pm

Karen Everett wrote on September 7:

Caroline, you mention our memories of past peacekeeping efforts and how global realities have changed, suggesting a shift to peacemaking. Anessa, you ask if we should focus more on training than performing peacekeeping ourselves. I wonder how the rise of asymmetrical threats and non-state actors over recent years will influence and contribute to the decisions our government will have to make with regards to future peacekeeping decisions?

Effectivement, les opérations de maintien de la paix ont profondément changé. Aujourd'hui, on s'attend à ce que les Casques bleus réussissent à imposer la paix durant des guerres civiles et qu'elles protègent la population civile des mouvements insurrectionnels. L'Afrique est devenu le continent dans lequel 86% du personnel affecté aux 16 opérations de maintien de la paix est déployé. Avec des mandats toujours plus ambitieux dans des pays où la guerre fait rage depuis des décennies, il faut certainement se demander si certaines missions ne sont pas vouées à l'échec dès leur début.

[Caroline Leprince](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 8, 2016 at 09:05 pm

Heather Nicol wrote on September 7:

Karen you raise a interesting question. We need to understand what the new threat environment actually means for our military resources. How would direct Canadian involvement in peacekeeping make a difference in either case - that is to say with asymmetrical or non-state actors? What are the fundamentally different resourcing issues? More importantly, what are we expecting to gain from all of this - is it a question of meeting a moral imperative or a question of displaying competence in a new global environment? I think there is a difference between the two and that needs to be considered.

Nicol, Je crois qu'en plus de tenir compte de l'environnement il est important d'évaluer si les conditions nécessaires à la réussite d'une mission de paix sont présentes. Deux conditions semblent avoir un impact majeur sur la réussite d'une mission: l'implication d'une grande puissance et disposer d'une force de frappe suffisamment grande pour être dissuasive. C'est ce qu'a constaté la professeure Martin-Brûlé qui a examiné 11 missions de paix en Afrique de 1990 à 2009. Avec l'annonce récente du ministre de la Défense qui s'est engagé à déployer jusqu'à 600 Casques bleus en appui aux opérations de maintien de la paix, il sera intéressant de voir si la mission choisie respectera ces conditions. Selon vous, dans quel pays le Canada a-t-il le plus de chance de s'engager?

[Felix Leblanc](#) • September 11, 2016 at 02:33 am

Pour ma part deux points semblent d'une importance considérable lorsqu'il est question de l'implication du Canada comme gardien de la paix au sein des Nations-Unis. Premièrement, il est important d'avoir à l'esprit que depuis Lester B. Pearson l'idée de gardien de la paix est un symbole fort qu'ont les Canadiens de leur culture stratégique. Deuxièmement, il est aussi important de considérer quel est le véritable intérêt du Canada à renouer avec ce symbole qui fut complètement mis de côté par le gouvernement précédent. Ainsi, ces deux points m'amènent à proposer deux hypothèses. La première est que bien que le gouvernement Liberal illustre son intention de vouloir renouer avec une culture stratégique plus Pearsonienne, sa contribution demeure relativement marginale si nous posons les nombres en perspective et que nous prenons en compte la nouvelle dynamique internationale post-guerre froide. Prenons pour commencer les 600 soldats, cela représente 0.5% des 119 620 forces de maintien de la paix qu'ont à leur disposition les Nations-Unis pour mener à bien 16 missions. Ce qui est à mon avis d'autant plus marginal si nous prenons compte de la situation internationale qui n'est plus bipolaire, mais bien plus multipolaire. En effet, le Canada n'a plus la possibilité de faire pencher la

balance du simple fait de son aura de bienveillance et de neutralité, les conflits sont beaucoup plus complexes. Tel un ordinateur utilisant une technologie binaire que nous pourrions comparer à une technologie quantum (dont la complexité il faut l'avouer ne semble pas faire peur à notre premier ministre). Pour continuer, le financement de 450 millions de dollars, est qu'en-t à lui tout aussi marginale, car si nous prenons le dernier budget des Nations-Unis, celui-ci est de 8,27 milliard de dollars ce qui implique que notre contribution passerait de 3% à environs 5% du budget total. De surcroit, de façon un peu moins sérieuse, 450 millions de dollars représentent seulement 80 millions de plus que le prix de construction du centre Vidéotron de Québec, un centre multisport qui accueillera peut-être un jour une équipe de hockey de la NHL. Ce qui nous permet tout de même de mieux contextualiser un tel montant qui à première vue semble assez important. Ainsi, au regard de ce très bref examen, découle ma seconde hypothèse qui propose de placer cette politique davantage comme un outil dans l'obtention d'un siège au conseil de sécurité des Nations-Unis que d'une réelle conviction à pouvoir avoir un impact suffisamment significatif pour changer la donne d'une ou plusieurs des 16 missions entreprises par cette institution. En somme ma question serait la suivante qu'elle est le réel intérêt pour le Canada d'avoir ce siège au Nations-Unis aux égards des questionnements précédemment soulevés, une équipe de hockey ne serait elle pas plus attirante ?

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 12, 2016 at 10:15 am

Félix raises some interesting points. Is Canada, as a country, ready to invest the \$ necessary to play on the big stage? Canada wants to contribute and participate actively in the international system, but with limited resources what is its "real" affect? What constitutes a significant commitment by Canada to a mission/operation?

[Caroline Leprince](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 12, 2016 at 09:55 pm

En mars dernier, le Canada a effectivement fait connaître officiellement son intention de briguer un siège temporaire au Conseil de sécurité des Nations Unies pour 2021-2022. Justin Trudeau a promis que le réengagement passera par une plus grande participation du Canada au sein des missions de paix de l'ONU et par l'adoption d'actions concrètes pour démontrer que le pays mérite un siège au Conseil de Sécurité. Comme les élections auront lieu à l'automne 2020, le Canada aura peu de temps pour redorer son image. Quelles autres actions le Canada pourrait-il poser, selon vous, pour gagner de la crédibilité auprès des Nations Unies?

[Olivier Fraysse](#) • September 13, 2016 at 12:30 pm

Anessa Kimball wrote on September 12:

Félix raises some interesting points. Is Canada, as a country, ready to invest the \$ necessary to play on the big stage? Canada wants to contribute and participate actively in the international system, but with limited resources what is its "real" affect? What constitutes a significant commitment by Canada to a mission/operation?

I will be cynical : what is the ROI for each more \$ that Canada will have to spend ? at a certain level, Canada is a small country (in term of Population), so should it invest a big amount per capita ?

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 14, 2016 at 12:42 pm

Olivier Fraysse wrote on September 13:

I will be cynical : what is the ROI for each more \$ that Canada will have to spend ? at a certain level, Canada is a small country (in term of Population), so should it invest a big amount per capita ?

The challenge is thinking about ROI as something economic or tangible. ROI could manifest itself as policy influence, formal consultation before decision-making or perhaps future policy coordination - in short soft power may be the only thing CDA gets in return.

[William Innes](#) • September 14, 2016 at 12:49 pm

As many have pointed out, the opportunity for meaningful peacekeeping is being overwhelmed by the reality that there is less peace to keep; and the notion that the use of military force alone can be effective in making peace seems to defy logic.

Canada's legacy (ex First Nations) of mutual accommodation has enabled it to peacefully forge a successful country through significant economic, geographic, and cultural differences. This experience is exceptional in today's world. This legacy may have much more global weight in providing leadership to negotiating the conditions for peace; than in providing our minimal share of the military forces necessary to contain the conditions where peace does not exist.

At the very least there is an opportunity for our military commitments to peace making/keeping to be complemented by a serious diplomatic effort through the UN for Canada to lead a better process for finding the accommodations necessary to establish the conditions for peace. What better claim to a seat at the UN table!

[Karen Everett](#) • September 14, 2016 at 04:50 pm

I agree that diplomacy and peacekeeping need to compliment each other. However, things can get complicated if a conflict involves non-state actors. I am curious what others think about starting diplomatic relations with these groups – is there the potential for peace or would this legitimize these actors? Is there an opportunity to do peacekeeping/making in new and different ways that reflect the evolving threat environment?

[Jérémy Legault](#) • September 16, 2016 at 04:33 pm

Anessa Kimball wrote on September 6:

Despite persistent Canadian involvement in peacekeeping, contemporary peacekeeping missions take place in increasingly hostile regions of the world. Are Canadian military resources best allocated to peacekeeping or should Canada work towards training other states to undertake peacekeeping?

La question soulevée ici est fort pertinente. À mon avis, le maintien de la paix devrait se décliner sous deux angles. Premièrement, il est évident que des situations exigent une réponse militaire immédiate pour éviter la catastrophe. Nous avons qu'à penser au génocide rwandais de 1994 qui s'est déroulé sur une période de temps plutôt restreinte. Dans ce cas, former des forces locales et leur acheminer les ressources nécessaires auraient coûté beaucoup trop de vies humaines, en plus du fait que l'administration rwandaise se rapprochait beaucoup de l'anarchie. Ce genre de conflit nécessite une action rapide et directe et je crois que le Canada a le devoir d'y répondre en tant que défenseur de la paix depuis l'ère de Lester B. Pearson. Cependant, dans d'autres conflits, le Canada devrait plutôt opter pour de la formation militaire et policière afin d'en arriver à la paix. Le cas de l'Irak actuelle image bien le tout à mon avis. Avec la montée de l'État Islamique, on voit plusieurs États occidentaux entrer dans le

conflit directement en réalisant des interventions sur le terrain et des frappes aériennes. Il est de notoriété publique qu'une force étrangère qui combat sur un territoire est majoritairement considérée comme hostile par la population. Les Irakiens vont toujours avoir une méfiance envers les Occidentaux, considérant les déboires de la guerre d'Irak de 2003, et ce, même s'ils sont là pour combattre un ennemi commun. La meilleure solution ici serait de donner les moyens aux Irakiens afin qu'il en viennent eux-mêmes à éradiquer l'État Islamique. Depuis quelques mois, les États-Unis et le Canada s'efforcent de former les Peshmergas à cette fin et les résultats sont probants; l'EI perd du terrain. De plus, ce revirement de situation redonne confiance aux citoyens envers leurs soldats. On parle donc d'un 2 pour 1. Je crois que le Canada devrait intervenir de la sorte dans plus de conflits armés afin de préserver la paix. Considérant que le Canada possède un bon capital humain militaire en terme de savoir, mais des ressources plutôt limitées. Nous devrions donc mettre nos connaissances militaires et de maintien de la paix à la disposition des peuples en conflits plutôt que de débarquer en tentant de résoudre la crise à leur place... le tout en faisant parfois plus de mal que de bien.

[Caroline Leprince](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 20, 2016 at 06:43 pm

Dans son discours à l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies aujourd'hui, Justin Trudeau a réaffirmé le réengagement du Canada dans les opérations de maintien de la paix. Selon vous, quelle expertise pourrait offrir les Forces armées canadiennes aux missions de paix des Nations Unies?

[William Innes](#) • September 20, 2016 at 08:39 pm

Karen Everett wrote on September 14:

I agree that diplomacy and peacekeeping need to compliment each other. However, things can get complicated if a conflict involves non-state actors. I am curious what others think about starting diplomatic relations with these groups – is there the potential for peace or would this legitimize these actors? Is there an opportunity to do peacekeeping/making in new and different ways that reflect the evolving threat environment?

It seems to me that the art of peacemaking is a learnable process, like many other complex processes which respond to deliberate strategic thinking. (One of those is whether/how to involve non-state actors) It is clearly within the mandate of the UN to own "peacemaking" and the process which is involved. I see a real opportunity for Canada with its history of accommodation to lead an effort by the UN to develop the best practices in peacemaking. These would transcend individual conflicts and serve a discipline in bringing the best possible thinking and experience to any conflict situation. It seems dangerous folly for us to send Canadian forces into situations like Mali without any evident commitment to a process of creating the conditions for the peace which we could keep.

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 27, 2016 at 03:31 pm

William Innes wrote on September 20:

I see a real opportunity for Canada with its history of accommodation to lead an effort by the UN to develop the best practices in peacemaking. These would transcend individual conflicts and serve a discipline in bringing the best possible thinking and experience to any conflict situation.

While there may be an opportunity, I am not sure other actors in the system perceive Canada as a credible peacemaker in the current context. Its lack of access to the highest level of the decision making when it comes to international peace and stability, a seat on the UNSC, is one sign. Canada was not even

asked first or second to contribute the battalion in E. Europe - it was actually fourth on the list. These are not good signs for Canadian potential.

[William Innes](#) • September 27, 2016 at 07:48 pm

Anessa Kimball wrote on September 27:

While there may be an opportunity, I am not sure other actors in the system perceive Canada as a credible peacemaker in the current context. Its lack of access to the highest level of the decision making when it comes to international peace and stability, a seat on the UNSC, is one sign. Canada was not even asked first or second to contribute the battalion in E. Europe - it was actually fourth on the list. These are not good signs for Canadian potential.

An interesting reflection of the reality that our diplomatic and military positioning are interdependent.

What role should Canada play in fighting the Islamic State?

Discussion Overview

At this time, Canada is involved with US-led military action in the middle east in an effort to dismantle the Islamic State. Canada has contributed the use of its fighter jets and some special forces members on the ground to these efforts. However, the Trudeau government has ended the contribution of Canada's jets.

[Caroline Leprince](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 24, 2016 at 10:37 pm

Le gouvernement Trudeau a clairement énoncé en février 2016 sa stratégie pour lutter contre l'État Islamique en Irak et au Levant. L'engagement militaire du Canada dans le cadre de l'opération Impact se concentre davantage sur la formation des forces de sécurité irakiennes ainsi qu'à offrir une aide stratégique aux quartiers généraux. Ces efforts s'accompagnent d'un volet humanitaire pour aider la population syrienne touchée par la crise ainsi que d'initiatives diplomatiques pour renforcer la sécurité et la stabilité dans la région. Selon vous, le fait d'adopter une approche concertée aide-t-elle à mieux répondre à ces environnements complexes? Quelles mesures additionnelles le Canada pourrait-il prendre pour atténuer la crise en Syrie et en Irak?

Does NATO still matter?

Discussion Overview

Canada has been a NATO member since the emergence of the organization in 1949 and has participated in a number of NATO-led operations, including those in Afghanistan and Libya. Yet the organization was essentially created in a Cold War context to combat a different series of international tensions? Can it still matter in the 21st century?_2

[Caroline Leprince](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 6, 2016 at 07:35 pm

Alors que depuis 1991 on croyait que la Guerre froide était terminée, il semble de plus en plus qu'une guerre d'influence soit en train de ressurgir entre les forces soviétique et atlantique. Pourtant, plusieurs experts ont affirmé depuis 2001 que les menaces à la sécurité internationale venaient des acteurs non étatiques (terrorisme international, mouvements insurrectionnels, réseaux criminels transnationaux).

Peut-être cela a-t-il contribué à sous-estimer les risques associés à l'occurrence d'une guerre plus traditionnelle entre États? Croyez-vous que l'opération Reassurance, à laquelle participe le Canada, en Europe de l'Est ait un effet dissuasif sur les actions de la Russie dans la région?

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 6, 2016 at 08:24 pm

NATO remains relevant for Canadian security as well as stability in Europe given Russian incursions in Ukraine and Georgia over the last decade. Russian challenges to the territorial status quo have not only put NATO on alert but have also led to a planned deployment of several battalions in the Baltic states. Canadian involvement in this collective defense opportunity marks the first time significant numbers of CDN troops return to European soil since leaving Germany in the 1990s. Given the need to engage Russia constructively, should Canada try to open a greater security dialogue about the Arctic in this context and seek an independent voice? Or would Canada's interests be better leveraged in the context of NATO or other multilateral engagement with Russia?

[Olivier Fraysse](#) • September 6, 2016 at 08:38 pm

First question we should ask is what is the purpose of NATO now? It sounds more and more like just an extension of the USA army force than a real organization, at least from my point of view. Given the fact that it was first a way to defend the western Europe against USSR, I am not sure its purpose is still valid now, at least in the way it is defined.

[Karen Everett](#) • September 7, 2016 at 08:59 am

Anessa Kimball wrote on September 6:

NATO remains relevant for Canadian security as well as stability in Europe given Russian incursions in Ukraine and Georgia over the last decade. Russian challenges to the territorial status quo have not only put NATO on alert but have also led to a planned deployment of several battalions in the Baltic states. Canadian involvement in this collective defense opportunity marks the first time significant numbers of CDN troops return to European soil since leaving Germany in the 1990s. Given the need to engage Russia constructively, should Canada try to open a greater security dialogue about the Arctic in this context and seek an independent voice? Or would Canada's interests be better leveraged in the context of NATO or other multilateral engagement with Russia?

Anessa, this is an interesting and complex issue that you raise. On the one hand, Canada is looking to lead a NATO deployment in the Baltic region and on the other is considering reopening diplomatic channels with Russia, particularly in the Arctic. With regards to your question, would it depend on whether the politics of the Arctic are viewed as separate from other security issues (ex. NATO) and can then be leveraged to lead to larger discussions around regional stability in the Baltics? Is it possible for Canada to effectively engage Russia in both capacities?

[Heather Nicol](#) • September 7, 2016 at 03:34 pm

Anessa and Karen I agree that the Arctic is a critical case in point. Currently the most successful international dialogue in the region (Arctic Council) is moderated in part by a process which chooses to leave security off the agenda - deliberately so. The focus instead has been upon environmental security and social development. This allowed Canada and Russia to engage in international dialogue even at the lowest point of Canada-Russia relations under the previous Harper Government. This suggests to me that NATO is still extremely relevant, but not everywhere and for all security purposes. Knowing which

kinds of tools to use - i.e. soft or hard security measures - and distinguishing the when and where is important.

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 8, 2016 at 11:30 am

Olivier Fraysse wrote on September 6:

First question we should ask is what is the purpose of NATO now ? it sounds more and more like just an extension of the USA army force than a real organization, at least from my point of view. Given the fact that it was first a way to defend the western Europe against USSR, I am not sure its purpose is still valid now, at least in the way it is defined.

I would say NATO still has a role to fulfill in Europe. It's role was never to protect North America, rather to ensure the transatlantic link. In Europe, NATO is needed now more than ever as Russia is increasingly disrespecting the territorial status quo. Moreover, the UN's incapacity to act when needed has placed NATO "next at bat" with respect to crisis response.

[William Innes](#) • September 14, 2016 at 01:15 pm

The realities of global security seem to dictate that a threat in Europe is in effect a threat to Canada. For that reason it seems to me that Canada is well served by having a seat at the Nato table. However it also seems that : -- the European economies are most directly affected and now more able to shoulder more of the cost for their collective defense. -- Given the absolute obligations of Article 5, we need to be cautious about Nato mission creep. On balance I would like to see Canada become more active in finding solutions between threatening parties as a complement to our military response. A case in point might be the Ukraine. There would seem to be ample historic circumstances to justify the differences which exist in eastern Ukraine. Do we seriously think that the tension of the current status quo is a long term solution? Could Canada not play a more active role in bringing the parties together to find the accommodations which will be necessary for long term stability?

[Anessa Kimball](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • September 21, 2016 at 08:01 am

William Innes wrote on September 14:

Do we seriously think that the tension of the current status quo is a long term solution? Could Canada not play a more active role in bringing the parties together to find the accommodations which will be necessary for long term stability?

No one believes the current SQ is a durable solution but Ukraine is NOT a NATO member, only a PfP member so NATO's role as an intermediary via the NATO-Russia Council has been limited. Though recent efforts suggest the Council may have a role to play, though probably not in the Ukraine case. Canada could be using defense diplomacy to build stronger links with Ukraine, beyond training military troops which it currently does in an agt with the US & UK. Canada should support rule of law programs and propose initiatives to build civilian/military relations.