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The Group of 78

The Group of 78 is an association of Canadians committed to Canadian leadership in global stewardship and a progressive Canadian foreign policy based on the pursuit of peace, justice and global survival.

The Group grew from an initiative in 1980 when several concerned and distinguished Canadians crafted a statement on how Canada could contribute to the building of a peaceful, secure world. In November 1981 that statement, Canadian Foreign Policy in the 80s, was sent to Prime Minister Trudeau. It was signed by 78 Canadians – a group of 78. The statement set out three inter-related objectives:

- removal of the threat of nuclear war
- mobilization of resources to achieve a more equitable international order
- strengthening and reform of the United Nations and other global institutions

That began a dialogue between the Group of 78 and the Canadian government. Members of the Group made their views known about new issues in international relations and their implications for these central and universal objectives. While these objectives remain valid, the world to which they apply has changed. As a result, after celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary in 2005, the Group decided to re-examine its core statement of principles, its objectives and its operations. Two major conferences in 2007 led to the adoption of a new statement of principles of Canadian foreign policy: Global Stewardship: Awakening Canada’s Commitment to the World. A call was issued to Canadians and their government:

*We call on Canadians to commit to the world with moral integrity, energy, enthusiasm and investment unparalleled in our history. We call on Canadians to demand that these principles guide our policies, at home and abroad: Justice, Peace, Survival.*

Further, it identified concrete core objectives for Canadian foreign policy:

- Renew multilateralism
- Eliminate weapons of mass destruction
- Make a reality of human security
- Prevent armed conflict
- Protect the environment
- Promote and protect human rights
- Create a fair, democratically accountable international trading system
- Ensure effective development assistance
- Support and strengthen responsive and accountable governments.
Activities

The Group holds an annual foreign policy conference each September to deliberate on key issues and to formulate recommendations to government. In recent years, the themes addressed included the Middle East in the framework of international law, security and human rights in Canadian foreign policy, the struggle between democracy and globalization and lessons from the armed intervention in Afghanistan.

The Group also holds monthly presentations, open to the public, on a wide range of topics. Recent speakers have addressed Ukraine – global and Canadian response, redefining state sovereignty, the world trading system, climate change, directions for an alternative Canadian foreign policy, slavery and human trafficking in Canada and around the world, and Gaza as an existential threat to Israel. These sessions provide background and insight for participants and reinforce the Group’s public engagement and advocacy work. Periodically the Group convenes other special events, often in cooperation with other civil society organizations.

Through its Board of Directors, the Group produces positions on topical issues and recommends policy and actions for the Government of Canada to consider in its conduct of foreign policy.

The Group invites all like-minded Canadians to join it in pursuing these objectives.

Membership

The Group of 78 is open to individuals who identify with and are committed to the principles of the Group.

Contact Details

To join the Group of 78, or to learn more about its ongoing activities and aims, please contact:

Nandini Sarkar, Executive Secretary

Group of 78
244 – 211 Bronson Avenue
Ottawa, ON K1R 6H5
Tel. +1 613 230 0860
Email: group78@group78.org   Web: www.group78.org
Introduction

The Conference

On the centenary of the outbreak of World War 1 The Group of 78 and Project Ploughshares were pleased to organize this conference that took place at the Canadian War Museum to reflect on whether and how policy-makers, diplomats, civil society and the armed forces today can help reduce the incidence of armed conflict and reinforce the foundations of a more stable, peaceful world. Historians cast light on the events preceding, during and following the war. Others drew attention to how our world is similar, where it diverges, and the development of multilateral institutions and international law to avoid war and build human security.

Our aim in convening this conference was to bring together historians and commentators from civil society, the diplomatic and military communities to consider the “Great War” in relation to issues of contemporary international peace and security. What could we learn from World War 1 to prevent armed conflict in our day, strengthen the tools of diplomacy and peace-building, inhibit the innovation of increasingly destructive weaponry, and reduce the stockpiles of costly weaponry?

There can be no greater tribute to those who suffered and died in World War 1 than to learn from their experience, and strive for a more peaceful world.

The Report

This report captures the essential discussions at the conference, including the summaries of the rich presentations from the speakers and panelists and the conclusions and recommendations distilled from the dialogue.

The conference Conclusions and Recommendations are available in French translation on the Group of 78’s website www.group78.org, as well as audio recordings of the full presentations. The website also contains this report in electronic form, other conference materials, plus reports from previous policy conferences and information on Group of 78 activities and views.

The Group of 78 invites feedback from readers on the substance of the material provided in this report and on other items on its website.

I would like to convey my personal thanks to everyone connected with this successful conference – our partners and sponsors, the presenters and participants – for their kind cooperation and enthusiastic engagement.

Roy Culpeper
Chair, Conference Organizing Committee

Note: The views expressed in this report are those of the individual speakers and of the Group of 78 and do not necessarily reflect the views of sponsors supporting the event.
Group of 78 Annual Policy Conference, Ottawa, 26 – 28 September 2014

Conclusions & Recommendations

The following recommendations and conclusions were adopted by the final plenary session of the Group of 78’s annual policy conference to provide advice to Canadians and policy makers and as a contribution to ongoing public discourse. The conference included a range of presentations and discussion by over 100 participants with a strong interest in international affairs and Canadian foreign policy.

Conference speakers and participants included historians of World War I, and experts from the diplomatic community, from the military, from academia, from peacebuilding civil society organizations, and some from nations then opposing Canada and its allies—Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Ottoman Empire (Turkey).

While many lessons for enhancing peace and human security in our day were drawn, it was always with the general qualification that: “history rhymes but does not repeat itself”.

The discussion of lessons to be learned from the tragic carnage of WW1 must begin by acknowledging the overwhelming – and blindingly obvious – lesson that war, once unleashed, sets in motion forces that are often all but impossible to control, such that its ultimate costs - human, social, political, economic, environmental - may far outweigh the value of the objectives sought by the victors. The pre-war build-up of militaries and the web of alliances in place both contributed to the war lasting far longer than most people foresaw. Indeed the supreme irony of “the Great War” was that the “war to end all wars” led to a peace treaty that bore within it the seeds of the next, even more terrible, war.

For all of these reasons the lessons that we have drawn from the conference discussions focus primarily on the overriding need to establish mechanisms, institutions and rules to allow differences to be resolved by peaceful means. At the same time, it is worth noting at the outset, that there were also a few unintended consequences of that war which, especially with the wisdom of hindsight, should be considered as positive, including:

- Increased egalitarianism after the war both in the military and in society, in part as a reaction to the front line experiences of the war.
- A greater concern for social justice and labour rights reflecting the strong demands of returning soldiers for a “better world” - and even enshrined in the Versailles Treaty.
- Increased acceptance of women’s participation in military, economic and public life, strengthening the suffrage movement after the war.
- In Canada the conscription crisis ended the two party monopoly of federal politics, opening the door to the creation of the United Farmers of Ontario and related political movements that provided the roots of the CCF and NDP.
- A certain strengthening of national sentiment although it cannot really be said that Canada “came of age” in WW I, or at Vimy Ridge. In fact, if anything, the conscription crisis deepened division, and the tragic losses of the war fueled very negative views of the political leadership in many quarters. It was only many years later, in the 1930s during the erection of monuments, that the myth of a “nation emerging from war” grew.
I. Remembrance of WW1 - Recognizing and broadening how the story is framed

Conclusion

The official Canadian narrative has increasingly portrayed WW1 as the furnace in which glorious military victories like the one at Vimy Ridge forged a new, self-confident nation, but the truth is not so simple. Although the sacrifice, and frequent heroism, of the soldiers is indisputable, the glory of the victory and the unifying impact of the process were emphasized only long after the fact. Indeed, for more than a decade after the war most veterans, like most Canadians, remembered the war largely as a horrific, senseless, and ultimately indefensible, tragedy. It was only in the 1930s, as new war clouds gathered, that this conflict began to be increasingly portrayed as a gloriously nation-building event. Moreover, the claim that the war had been a unifying experience is also difficult to reconcile with the facts since French Canada was deeply alienated by the conscription crisis and the blatant discrimination against the French language within the army, Japanese Canadian volunteers were initially turned away on essentially racist grounds while Aboriginal Canadians who served in the military were nevertheless denied the vote for many years afterwards. Ultimately it is therefore vitally important to think critically about how we, as citizens, understand the war and to ask how, by whom and for what purpose that memory is being framed as it is.

RECOMMENDATION 1

National commemorative activities of WW1 in Canada should reflect not only the official version of the war as heroics and sacrifice, but also the diverse experiences of the various communities affected, including those from Quebec, Aboriginal peoples, marginalized ethnic communities such as the Japanese, and labourers and farmers. Care should be taken by Canada to commemorate the sacrifices of soldiers and civilians but not to glorify war itself.

Conclusion

The World Remembers 1914-1918 project focuses on the public commemoration of the individual names of all known Canadian (and other countries’) WW1 casualties, interactively challenging people to reflect on the humanity of those who died on all sides of the conflict. It seeks to move the viewer from lifeless statistics to thinking about the human beings to which they refer – a switch in consciousness of the viewer/participant. See http://www.theworldremembers.org/

RECOMMENDATION 2

Canadian civil society organizations should join with governments in supporting The World Remembers 1914-1918 project.
II. Multilateral Organizations

Conclusion

WW1 was spawned in a world of power politics in which the proliferation of alliances and bilateral treaties both heightened the risk of war and made peace more difficult. Once war had broken out, the ensuing peace process simultaneously sowed the seeds of the next war (because the reparations imposed by the Treaty of Versailles were effectively “unbearable”) and laid the foundations of a potentially more peaceful world (by creating a League of Nations based on certain internationalist principles). In the event the League failed because growing political and economic conflict and instability undermined the ability and willingness of nations to adhere to those principles.

RECOMMENDATION 3

For the prevention of future wars Canada and the wider international community should respect the internationalist principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and work towards sustainable peace and security and the elimination of chronic imbalances in the global economy. The United Nations and its regional organizations should therefore be properly funded and supported through expert participation to increase multilateralism’s reach and effectiveness. The evolution of new systems and institutions of multilateralism should therefore be supported to improve global governance and economic stability, including - where necessary - the continuing reform and improvement of the relevant United Nations organizations.

III. Truth and War

Conclusion

Advances in media-related technology since WW1 have created greater means of directly communicating the realities of war to the public. However, as long as information, knowledge and images are controlled by nation-states through direct censorship, embedding journalists, or otherwise restricting access, the public will be deprived of its democratic right to know. Journalists also need to be cognizant of the temptation to censor voluntarily or become cheer leaders and morale boosters for military action.

RECOMMENDATION 4

Canada should not restrict media access to war zones nor censor media coverage, outside of restrictions for bona fide security reasons, to increase transparency and knowledge of the actual state of a conflict for the Canadian public. Canada should encourage all avenues of information sharing and civil society participation in the analysis to assist in holding governments accountable. Guarantees for whistle blowers and journalists should be implemented.
Conclusion

The conclusion of WW1 set in motion a new world order that saw a revised colonial system, particularly in the Middle East, that has produced problematic repercussions ever since. WW1 also unleashed extreme ideologies that still have echoes today. The resulting alienation continues to fuel terrorism that is central to some of the worst current conflicts. Much of the appeal of the terror groups and organizations to disaffected individuals centres on a search for identity. Groups like al Qaeda and ISIS have successfully used sophisticated communications strategies and social media to recruit new members and propagate antipathy to Western culture and societies. Their narratives exploit genuine political grievances and use religion and identity as tools to sell their “solutions” to very real problems of inequality and exclusion that cannot be solved by military force. Western responses so far have privileged military action and have failed to offer meaningful alternative narratives.

RECOMMENDATION 5

To respond effectively to many contemporary conflicts, Canada needs to understand better the extremist ideologies, their attraction to adherents, and the process of domestic and foreign radicalization. Civil society and the public more generally need to be engaged in discussion on the explanation of terrorism and its response to it by our government and its allies. All parties need to recognize that military solutions in isolation from other strategies are not going to be successful and to craft broader, multifaceted solutions that include effectively addressing perceived causes and legitimate underlying grievances and the creative use of social media.

IV. The Costs of War

Conclusion

The high cost of borrowing by states to prosecute the Great War intensified the Great Depression little more than a decade later. Payment for military expenditures does not have an accompanying revenue stream to pay back the debts incurred, unlike public investments in infrastructure and goods and services that enhance production. The industrialization of warfare in WW1 over an extended period required massive borrowing. Medical services for injured veterans and support to survivors of killed soldiers were inadequate and increased the suffering of WW1 well beyond 1918. Vets were stiffed on pensions, medical expenditures and other benefits where possible because Canada was bankrupt.

RECOMMENDATION 6

Canada should clearly indicate the true intergenerational costs and other consequences of prosecuting a war and honestly communicate it to its citizens who ultimately pay those costs in higher taxes or decreased services.
RECOMMENDATION 7

Considering that genuine political grievances underlie most violent conflicts and that many of the world’s most acute non-traditional security threats cannot be addressed simply by the military application of force, Canada should rebalance its allocation of resources from defence to enhance the reach and effectiveness of diplomacy, development assistance and extending human security (the absence of fear and want) to conflict zones to support jobs, education, political participation and democracy, social equity and conflict prevention.

V. Political Control of the Military, and Citizen Control of the Politicians

Conclusion

In the complex web of alliances and secret treaties struck in the years before the war, leaders seemed to take decisions to mobilize automatically and civilian control of military decisions appeared to slip from view. Civil society voices of restraint were ignored by politicians or censored and outlawed. War should not be left to the generals, and the decision to go to war should not be left only to the politicians!

RECOMMENDATION 8

Canada should respond to the concerns of, and encourage dialogue with, Parliament and citizens and civil society organizations before engaging in combat missions or taking the country to war. Given the role that military alliances play in restricting the ability of individual nations to rethink their war decisions, every effort must be made to ensure that there is sufficient parliamentary debate on and oversight of alliance decision-making processes.

NOTE - The 2012 Group of 78 conference (on Afghanistan) recommendations on the decision to go to war are referenced in the Appendix on Page 15.

VI. Human Rights and Dissent

Conclusion

There were challenges to support for the war by adherents of the historic peace churches (which had government promises of exemption) and others who invoked individual decisions of conscience for exemption from military service. They were met by a society and government that viewed obligation to support the war as a duty of citizenship and this view led to the denial of voting rights, coercion, loss of freedom and censorship. Women who had a son or husband in military service received the franchise while other women did not. All these rights were increasingly recognized and advanced because of the experience of dissenters during WW1.
RECOMMENDATION 9

Canada should respect and reinforce, rather than retract or restrict, the human rights of its citizens even when facing real or perceived threats to its national security, including respect for conscientious objection from military service and the right to dissention and public debate on the merits of military or security engagements.

VII. The Role of Civil Society

Conclusion

The harsh measures against internal dissent enacted in WW1 have their contemporary application in measures to counter-act terrorism. Degrading human rights protections is costly for democracy and the diverse communities affected, reduces transparency, and is, in the end, counter-productive. In WW1 there were different points of view among women and women's organizations on peace and support for the military effort. In some countries civil society actually turned citizens and identified minority groups against each other, in support of oppressive state surveillance measures. Harsh internal war regimes made divisions worse in societies, breaking down community and increasing fear.

RECOMMENDATION 10

Canadian citizens and civil society organizations should be actively encouraged and welcomed into government policy making processes on international peace and security and Canada's response to these crises. Further, Canada should actively promote the voices of women and other marginalized communities in these debates, recognizing that there will not necessarily be a singular or monolithic point of view.

RECOMMENDATION 11

Canada should recognize and support the important potential of local civil society organizations at home and abroad in seeking non-violent resolution to socio-economic and political conflicts that can give rise to war.

VIII. Was the war avoidable? Could it have been stopped sooner?

Conclusion

Whether WW1 was avoidable, and if it could have been stopped earlier, is still the subject of historical debate. The war did not stop earlier because neither side could achieve their real goals outright and neither could stand down despite the horrific and continually mounting costs. They could not admit that the terrible losses were for nothing. In effect both sides kept pressing
for continuing combat. Participation in military alliances also greatly impeded the ability of individual nations to withdraw. War by way of accident acknowledges a complex human crisis of historical proportions with no actor able to stop the momentum to mobilization until it is too late. The world stumbled into WW1.

The characteristics of contemporary wars reinforce the need to analyze conflicts critically before intervening to determine causes of the violence and the ambiguous or vague goals of non-state actors in primarily intra-state conflicts. For example, some actors initiate conflicts, not for military victory, but to gain a seat at negotiations.

**RECOMMENDATION 12**

The decision to engage in military intervention by Canada should be made only after exhausting diplomatic avenues and alternatives. *(See also the appended recommendation on the "Basis for and terms of Foreign Military Intervention" from the 2012 Group of 78 conference.)*

**RECOMMENDATION 13**

At the conclusion of hostilities effective reconstruction and reconciliation for all of the states party to the conflict should not be dismissed or abandoned but generously provided with assistance to rebuild as part of a broader strategy of reconciliation to prevent future wars.

**IX. Innovations of War – New Military Technologies and Disarmament**

**Conclusion**

It was generally held at the beginning of WW1 that it would be a decisive and fast war because of the lethality of the weaponry, but stand offs at sea and dug in positions on land prolonged the war. WW1 marked the introduction of industrial war with bigger destroyers at sea and guns on land. It became a challenge of sustaining weapons production, paying for them largely through borrowed funds, and keeping troops and citizens fed. It was not the huge battleships that decided the war at sea, but the British blockade. It became a war, in part, of economic attrition.

Post-war there were some advances in arms control, for example to restrict production of new battleships because of mutual need to slow military spending, but restrictions on submarines never took hold because of their low cost and the advantages they gave to smaller powers.

The chemical weapons regime required a century of diplomatic negotiation, beginning in the 19th Century, to ban chemical weapons and yet the regime today is not perfect or universally observed. The effort must be constant with resources for verification and the isolation of spoilers who do not observe their commitments. Still, it has made the world safer even in its imperfect
state. (The marks of success of a disarmament treaty are: universality, comprehensive coverage, clarity, resiliency, verification, and accountability.)

The ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross) 2011 resolution on the humanitarian implications of the possession and use of nuclear weapons has sparked subsequent international consultations in Norway, Mexico, and in December 2014 in Vienna to advance steps to make nuclear weapons illegal and create an instrument such as a nuclear weapons convention to eliminate them. This may initially require moving forward without the participation or agreement of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and the other four nuclear weapons states, and developing reinforcing and complementary mechanisms outside the stale-mated Conference on Disarmament and the crucially important but stalled Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty process.

RECOMMENDATION 14

Canada should constructively engage in international arms control and disarmament efforts through: sustained commitment to the successful completion of negotiations for agreements or treaties, contributing the necessary resources and expertise to the implementation and ratification processes of agreements, and building sustainability by drawing on representatives from science, academia and civil society organizations. Further, the international community, including Canada, should take deliberate precautions to ensure that the introduction of new military technologies do not lead to new arms races and increased insecurity. In particular Canada should make nuclear disarmament a high priority.

RECOMMENDATION 15

Canada should apply the lessons of recent successful international arms control and disarmament processes, including land mines, cluster munitions, and the Arms Trade Treaty, to outlaw and eliminate all nuclear weapons.

Note: The Conference Conclusions and Recommendations are also available in French translation on the Group of 78 website at www.group78.org.
Appendix

From the 2012 Group of 78 Conference Report: Armed Intervention - Lessons from Afghanistan

The coercive use of force, in the absence of a credible political framework to build peace, is far more likely to fuel conflict and the extremism underpinning it, than to defeat it.

Canada’s foreign policy must remain firmly grounded in our steadfast support of the UN Charter and of international law in general, of diplomatic peacemaking and of negotiated compromises embedded within comprehensive, ethically defensible and sustainable peace settlements. Canada’s political and military decision makers must keep foremost in their minds the acute limitations of, and risks inherent in, foreign military intervention. Military intervention, outside a clearly defined peacekeeping context, must be invoked only as a last resort, when Canada’s national security is directly threatened.

Canada should establish a clear policy guiding decisions on whether to participate with military forces in international security assistance operations (variously called peacekeeping, peace support, stabilization and security assistance operations). This policy should include:

1. an international legal framework for intervention based on a UN mandate;
2. a UN-led and broadly agreed political framework for the intervention, ideally in the form of a comprehensive peace agreement or, at a minimum, an agreed negotiating framework to this end;
3. clear Canadian objectives, benchmarks and timelines for Canadian participation; and
4. timely public and parliamentary debate and full transparency in regards to the policy and its application in a specific case, in all phases of the intervention – that is, before it is begun, during the engagement and after its termination.

Canadian participation must also be based to the maximum extent possible on a comprehensive understanding of the situation, including not only the geo-political and security dimensions, but also the socio-economic and cultural aspects and the root as well as proximate causes of the conflict. Deep respect for local culture, customs and codes of conduct must also guide Canadian participation, within the overarching framework of respect for international law.

Recommendations

Accordingly, we call on the Canadian government to advocate at the UN, within NATO, in the capitals of non-NATO participants in ISAF and generally within the international community, to encourage the immediate establishment of a UN-facilitated comprehensive peace process.

Afghanistan Civil Society, including women’s groups, has a vital consultative role to play in designing the negotiating framework and the range of issues it will address as well as building support for this process among Afghans in general. We call on the government of Canada to assist Afghan Civil Society in contributing to such a comprehensive peace process.
Keynote Address Summary:
The Great War 1914-1919: The Political Consequences for Canada

Desmond Morton, Founding Director of the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada

Historian Desmond Morton presented the opening keynote address of the conference, outlining the political, economic and social impact that World War I had on Canada. Prof. Morton challenged the notion that the war was a positive, nation-building experience by providing a critical view of the war’s legacy 1) resulting from the impact of conscription on Quebec and national unity in Canada, and 2) its disastrous economic impact on Canada. Further, WW II grew directly from the provisions of the 1919 Treaty of Versailles and the failure of the international community to follow the principles embedded in the League of Nations.

The war effort exacerbated tensions between English and French Canada. No special considerations were made for French-speaking soldiers. Only one of 48 Canadian battalions — the Royal 22nd or Van Doos — was based in Quebec; Quebecois thus had a 1-in-48 chance of joining a battalion in which French was spoken. French-speaking soldiers who couldn’t understand their commanders were disciplined for not following orders.

After the introduction of conscription in 1917, Quebec experienced sporadic outbursts of riots and demonstrations. Police and soldiers had to be mobilized to Quebec to keep the peace. Quebecers felt forced to fight what was, in their view, a “British War.” Arguing that the “scars of conscription are still visible on the face of our confederation,” Prof. Morton credited decades of almost unbroken federal Liberal government following World War I to Quebec’s anger at its treatment during the war by the Conservative/Unionist government.

The economic impact of WW I was disastrous for Canada, leading directly to the Great Depression that began in 1929. As a young country, Canada had invested heavily in nation-building infrastructure in the years before the First World War, accruing significant public debt. The war interrupted Canada’s ability to pay its existing loans, and forced it to take out further loans from private sources on Wall Street, creating additional public debt. Victory Bonds raised critical funds, but had to be repaid with interest.
Following the war, the creation of cemeteries and memorials, in addition to social supports and pensions for returning soldiers incurred further expense. Prof. Morton indicated that Canadians’ feelings of entitlement increased with their expectations of enjoying the fruits of peace. New consumer demand for items such as personal vehicles increased household and private debt. An era of protectionism in the United States also contributed to Canada’s descent into depression in 1929.

Morton contrasted the largely negative legacy of WW I with the post-WW II era of prosperity for Canada. The pay-as-you-go approach in WW II avoided a buildup of public debt. But any claim that WWII was good for Canada is countered by the tremendous loss of life and the dawn of the era of nuclear weapons.

During the discussion period the question was posed: Could WW I have been avoided? Prof. Morton resisted speculation of ‘what ifs’, yet argued that the imperial expansionist postures of both the British and German empires made it difficult to prevent the war. Another question asked about Quebec’s aversion to the war as a “British war” when France was involved. Morton recounted that while some Quebecois enlisted for that reason, they were deployed to Bermuda. The Canadian government demonstrated a complete disregard for Francophone desires or interests; those from Quebec who wanted to serve were not respected or given power or influence.

When Woodrow Wilson brought the United States into the Great War in 1917, he did so on the argument that his Fourteen Points would prevent future such wars. Leaders of the original alliance against Germany insisted on a vengeful Peace with reparations and territory torn from Germany as had happened to France in its 1870 war with Prussia. That gave Hitler an audience for his claim that Jews and Socialists had betrayed Germany in 1919 and were responsible for the devastating postwar devaluation of the mark.

French Canada rewarded the Conservatives for their behaviour by voting solidly Liberal to keep them out of power for most of the 20th Century. During many of those years, Quebeckers elected a very conservative provincial government under Maurice Duplessis.

To this day we don’t really know for sure how many French Canadians enlisted since enlistment documents deliberately made no record of a recruit’s mother tongue. When the Minister of Militia, Sam Hughes, ignored the mobilization plans prepared by his staff, he took personal charge of recruiting policy, choosing the men who would recruit battalions and forcing them to compete for men by ordering as many as four battalions to find men in the same military district and by naming colonels who lacked any experience in managing such an enterprise, and often rejecting the advice of local militia staff officers. Meanwhile, Ontario voters continued their struggle to drive French-language schools out of the province and their newspapers denounced Quebeckers as cowards and traitors. Despite the massive powers it exercised under the War Measures Act of 1914, the Borden government did nothing to protect Quebeckers from these slanders and consequently allowed Canada to become bitterly divided in the midst of a so-called nation-building war.

Note: the full text of Professor Morton’s presentation and an audio recording are available on the Group of 7 web site www.group78.org.
Panel 1: Efforts to Stop the War

Was WW1 avoidable?

Summary of Presentations

Chair: John De Chastelain: Retired Canadian general and diplomat; former head of the International Commission on Decommissioning in Northern Ireland

Panel:
Amy Shaw: Historian; Associate Professor, University of Lethbridge
Holger Afflerbach: Historian; Professor, University of Leeds
Ernie Regehr: Senior Fellow in Arctic Security, Simons Foundation, and Research Fellow at the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies at Conrad Grebel University College, University of Waterloo

In his introductory remarks John De Chastelain commented that no one knew at the time what would happen when WW1 started. There was a complex system of alliances in place that triggered wider participation. Many of these alliances and their attending commitments were secret. It is very much in doubt if WW1 was a just war. The Shoah (Holocaust) makes the Second World War undoubtedly just.

Amy Shaw – Pacifism in WW1

Pacifist internationalism was well regarded and supported prior to WW1, including in Canada. Religious organizations in particular supported it. “The air is so full of pacifism.” But the peace movement in Canada experienced near collapse after WW1 started. Why? Socialist and liberal movements in Canada were weak. Canadians wanted to prove their commitment as a faithful colony in the British Empire.

The collective rights of society took precedence over individual rights. People had the responsibility to fulfill the duties owed to their government. Society emphasized collective unity to fight against the perceived enemy and sacrifice for the nation. Thus people who refused to go to war for reasons of conscience were viewed as outliers. Everyone had a duty to fight for the nation.

When conscription was enacted in 1917 it allowed for conscientious objection (CO) status. With the exception of members of the historic peace churches (Mennonites, Friends/Quakers, Dunkers/Brethren), which had historic promises on entry to the country to be exempt from military service, those who claimed CO status were primarily a disorganized minority of men. Examination of their treatment at the time focuses on issues of religious dissent and minority religious rights, and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

When Conscription was introduced by the Borden administration in the 1917 Military Services Act, it provided for exemptions from military service on the basis of health, employment and religion. Churches whose members were not exempted included Jehovah’s Witnesses and Plymouth Brethren.

Two members of the Plymouth Brethren wrote to the Prime Minster that they believed no one had right to take someone’s life under any circumstance. But they were willing to serve their
country by other means with all their powers. They asked for open grounds for exemption, but didn’t get it.

Arguments against exemptions claimed that military service built citizenship, created equality among citizens and advanced democracy. COs were put in a difficult spot; they were accused of selfishness and cowardice. Their claims for exemption on religious grounds were countered with arguments that war and military service were expressions of religious devotion.

COs were disenfranchised. Citizenship and the right to vote were connected to sacrifice made in defence of country. Women, who were not universally enfranchised until much later, were given the right to vote if a family member were serving in the military.

Tribunals were established unsystematically to deal with claims for CO exemption. In one case, Arthur Bourgeois used biblical quotations to defend his decision not to join the military. The tribunal countered with its own biblical citation: Jesus used force to drive away the money-changers in the Temple.

COs' claims challenged prevailing views of citizens' rights and responsibilities. When do you obey the state and when must you disobey it? When in a democratic society is it acceptable to assert individual rights over civic duty?

Holger Afflerbach – Was WW1 avoidable?

Afflerbach started by saying that in Britain a lecture always starts with a joke; in Germany it starts with an apology.

July 1914 was perhaps the most complex crisis in human history. Historians disagree on whether WW1 was avoidable and on why it did not end earlier. Explanations for the war tend to fall into two camps:

1) Intention – Germany wanted to become a world power and so pushed for war.

2) The big mistake – Complex circumstances and alliances meant that the war was an accident waiting to happen.

Why didn’t the war end earlier, considering the staggering human and material losses that were experienced from the start? In four years 9 million people died—9,000 people per day!

1) The intentional explanation - Germany wanted to be the hegemonic power and therefore would not stop.

2) The big mistake – Both sides were waiting for the other to break down and stop.

Further reasons that the war went on for so long:

- Political pressure on leaders: So many people had already died and sacrificed on both sides that it was difficult for leaders to end the war without being able to point to tangible gains.
- Coalition politics: It was very difficult on both sides to get all the partners on the same page to stop the war. The alliances got bigger and more unwieldy as the war progressed. Every state that entered an alliance received promises, but meeting the promises became increasingly difficult.
- Strong national cohesion: Political leadership was supported in continuing to prosecute the war even as human and financial costs mounted.
- Regime change: London and Paris were convinced that the Prussian military machine had to be dismantled, which was equivalent to requiring regime change (a term not used at the time) in Germany. As a result, when Germany made a peace offer in December 1916, it was rejected. Negotiations with Germany were rejected in July 1917 because Britain and France wanted nothing less than complete victory.

Ernie Regehr – Lessons from contemporary armed conflicts

Drawing on the Project Ploughshares Armed Conflicts Report data (1987 – 2013) and the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, Ernie Regehr described the nature of contemporary warfare and how wars end.

Looking at the data for armed conflicts for the period 1989 – 2014 indicated the following:

- 35 wars under way in 1989
- 64 new wars begun since end of Cold War, or about 2.5 per year
- 99 wars in this period
- 6 interstate conflicts (between two or more countries)
- 93 intrastate conflicts (civil wars, internal insurgencies)
- 70 of these 99 wars ended during the same period
- 29 wars, all intrastate, continue today
- 17% decline in the total number of wars from 1989

How did these wars end?

- 14% ended through decisive action on the battlefield, and of these:
  - 6%: the government prevailed over insurgents
  - 8%: insurgents prevailed over the government
  - 50% ended with negotiated settlements
  - 36% of conflicts dissolved

The outcomes of the past quarter century of wars highlight the inability of armed force to bring political conflict to decisive conclusion. Most wars are fought to hurting stalemates and then are turned over to negotiators to find political solutions that would have been available before the war began. One lesson of contemporary war therefore is that governments that respond to political dissidence with force face very long odds – in only 6 percent of such cases were dissidents actually defeated. Hence this judgment by General Sir Rupert Smith (The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World. London, 2006, p. 4): In the post-Cold War period military actions have been a succession of campaigns “that have in one way or another spectacularly failed to achieve the results intended, namely a decisive military victory which would in turn deliver a solution to the original problem, which is usually political.”

Wars start because of grievances, struggles over identity (ethnic, tribal, religious and overlapping identity complexes), the ready availability of arms, and the lack of alternatives means of managing or addressing the conflict. Hence, another lesson of current wars is that to prevent wars, political and economic attention needs to focus on addressing grievances, healing identity conflicts, controlling the arms that fuel them, and mounting forums and negotiating tables as alternatives to the resort to force.
Panel 2  Innovations in War
Could the proliferation of new lethal weapons of mass destruction have been prevented?

Summary of Presentations

Chair: Marius Grinius: Former Canadian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the UN and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva

Panel: Roger Sarty: Historian; Research Director, Wilfrid Laurier University Centre for Military, Strategic and Disarmament Studies
Gordon Vachon: Senior Consultant to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) on on-site inspection operational procedures
John Siebert: Executive Director, Project Ploughshares

Roger Sarty - 1914-1918: Dashed Dreams of Decisive War

New weaponry available at the beginning of WW 1 gave the impression that war in the new industrial age would be quick and decisive. Modern battleships with "monster guns" would be formidable in battles at sea. New high-powered and light artillery would result in the rapid conclusion of war on land. The extraordinary cost of these weapons and the impact of their use would force a quick resolution of war. Because the heavy economic costs of producing and using these weapons could lead to social upheaval if war were prolonged, war would be resolved within six months.

However, the conventional wisdom proved false. At sea, British and German battleships remained far apart from each other instead of engaging in decisive battles. The concern about battleship vulnerability to other new weapon capabilities, such as torpedoes and mines, created a state of paralysis. High-powered, quick-firing artillery unleashed the instinct to dig. The resulting trench system prevented quick or decisive battles. Ironically, the staggering economic costs created not social upheaval, but growing support on the home front to continue the war effort.

Further consequences resulted from these innovations in war. When ammunition stockpiles were used up in two weeks, national governments institutionalized the production of munitions to satisfy demands. Britain created the Department of Munitions and Canada established the Imperial Munitions Board. It became a war of economic attrition. Extensive naval fleets were required to move supplies. German attacks on supply ships brought the United States into the war in 1917.

After the war, successful disarmament and arms control efforts were put in place. For example, the development of large, expensive battleships was stopped, when many states decided that they could not afford them. But efforts to control the production of submarines didn’t work; submarines were cheap, easy to produce in large numbers, effective, and seen as useful by many countries. Arms control processes depended on political and economic factors and calculations.

Gordon Vachon – WW1 and Chemical Weapons: Before and After

Gordon Vachon emphasized that arms control and disarmament agreements require continuous and consistent commitment at all stages of negotiation and implementation. To be
effective they require resources as well as expertise on the part of those countries that have an interest in their successful implementation. Five important characteristics of successful arms control and disarmament treaties were identified:

1. Universality: All the major players must be involved.
2. Comprehensiveness: Loopholes must be addressed and closed.
3. Clarity: Ambiguities need to be avoided during negotiations, if possible; otherwise they can cause trouble later.
4. Resilience: The agreement must be able to withstand conflict over its provisions and implementation.
5. Verification and Accountability: Resources must be available to provide confidence in treaty implementation and ensure that perpetrators of agreement violations will be held accountable.

The proliferation of use of chemical weapons during WW1 could have been prevented, to an extent, if the participants in the 1899 Hague Declaration process to abstain from the use of projectiles carrying chemical weapons had taken the declaration seriously. The refusal of the United States to adhere to the declaration weakened it, and the other powers involved were too preoccupied with the actions of adversaries to continue to adhere to the declaration.

The use of chemical weapons was of no particular concern to the major powers at the time. No country believed that these weapons would have a significant role in warfare. It was only in April 1915, when the Germans first used large-scale chemical weapons on a battlefield, that countries began to pay attention. Wind, not projectiles, caused significant casualties by carrying a cloud of gas over the battlefield. From that point onwards, a chemical arms race – in terms of types of chemicals and types of means of delivery – took over.

The 1925 Geneva Protocol sought to ban the use of chemical weapons in war. The agreement lacked clarity, with no clear definition of “war.” States were still permitted under the Protocol to produce and maintain a stockpile for retaliatory purposes. It was not until 1993, almost a century after the Hague Declaration, that the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) prohibiting chemical weapons altogether was achieved.

The CWC prohibits the development, production, use, and stockpiling of chemical weapons. While it is not perfect, it has proven to be robust, with chemical weapon stockpiles and production facilities being destroyed. There are areas of contention that have arisen and should be addressed, such as the use of incapacitating agents by states. To address such challenges, expertise and commitment are necessary.

Canadian Government commitment to arms control agreements has dissipated in the last decade, and Canadian expertise in verification processes has been allowed to atrophy.

John Siebert

New technologies have unintended and unforeseen consequences. As Dr. Sarty demonstrated, the actual effects of the new weapons used in WW1 were at odds with their intended effects. The impact of new technologies cannot be determined in advance.

When veterans of WW1 returned home and revealed the horrific physical damage caused by gas attacks, they shocked the conscience of the public and started the momentum to ban certain classes of weapons.
The massive humanitarian cost and large-scale loss that would result from the use of nuclear weapons is currently creating new momentum for complete nuclear disarmament. Unfortunately the nuclear weapons-holding states continue to resist measures to make these weapons illegal.

Recently some classes of conventional weapons have been made illegal and banned by treaties that did not contain the five characteristics of arms control treaties listed above. The Ottawa Treaty banning anti-personnel mines and the Oslo Treaty banning cluster munitions were ratified without the initial agreement of major powers to their provisions. But these treaties provided moral suasion. They represent important advancements in international law and norms that delegitimize the use of such weapons and isolate and shame “spoilers.” The world is better off as a result.

No arms control agreement is perfect. Mechanisms for ongoing review and revision need to be spelled out in the treaty, and built into monitoring and implementation. Civil society has increasingly taken the leadership role in prodding states to support arms control treaties, including the recent Arms Trade Treaty. By undertaking bottom-up campaigns that engage the conscience of the public and moving forward with the treaties, even without the support of major powers, the global community of the willing has been able to limit the use and damage of cluster munitions and landmines. Thus, a campaign to ban nuclear weapons on the basis of their humanitarian impact should move forward, even without the involvement of major world leaders.

Discussion

A question was asked about the current institutional framework on which arms control and disarmament agreements are negotiated; one participant wondered if it was time to change it. Roger Vachon agreed that there were indeed many barriers created by the various institutions involved in arms control and disarmament agreements, including the consensus rule in traditional forums such as the Conference on Disarmament, which has been hamstrung for over a decade without an agreed agenda. However, it was noted that negotiations take time and we should not be too discouraged by this fact. John Siebert mentioned that while leadership may have to emerge from new places, an agreement that goes outside of the framework could lose certain important aspects found within the current arms control regime. Marius Grinius added that, although challenging, it is crucial to have a dialogue with representatives from the military, academia, the sciences, and NGOs to create positive change that can overcome national self-interest.

In fact, the panelists frequently stressed the importance of working with multiple stakeholders to secure arms control and disarmament agreements. For example, Roger Vachon noted that in negotiating the CWC, it was necessary to work with the military as well as diplomats. To close loopholes it is essential to have scientists as well as those involved in the defence sector and foreign affairs working together to create coherent and effective policy.
Keynote Address Summary:  
The World Remembers: A Canadian & International WW1 Centenary Project

R.H. Thomson: Canadian Actor and Arts Activist

Remembering WW1, and how we remember WW1, is of critical importance. How is the memory framed and who makes that frame? Memory is not objective. It is continuously built and rebuilt. Frames help give meaning and understanding to major events and can change over time.

For example, initially WW1 was remembered and recorded in Canada as a story of heroism, sacrifice and glory. As the 1920s and 1930s progressed, soldiers’ letters and journals revealed the horror and disaster. Since the 1960s there has been a more balanced assessment of mistakes made and lessons learned.

With the centenary of WW1 upon us, we need to rethink how we remember WW1. If the war is remembered not in unity around in the world, but in separation, then divisions are enforced. Therefore, memory of the past has important implications for the future of our relationships.

The World Remembers project is attempting to change the way we remember by honouring the past together and recognizing the equality in loss of all sides. We must remember that every mother and child that lost and grieved a loved one are equal, regardless of where they were in the world. Significantly, we also need to remember the actual names of those that fought and died in WW1. One death is a tragedy; 100,000 deaths are statistics. How do you move people so that it is personal rather than data? How do you move from information to thinking, which is a switch in consciousness of the viewer/participant?

To date (September 2014) eight of 28 WW1 combatant nations have agreed to participate in and contribute to the project: Germany, France, the UK, Turkey, Canada, Belgium, the Czech Republic and Ireland. In 2014, the project will show the names of more than 200,000 people who lost their lives in 1914. The names of the dead from different WW1 armies will be publicly displayed together on public buildings. This accentuates the core of the project: to remember together and to remember everyone. As R.H. Thomson remarked, the project is an accessible and inexpensive way to re-engage the interest of students and the general public in issues relating to WW1.

However, there are still challenges facing The World Remembers project. For example, 20 of the 28 countries that were approached have not agreed to participate. Limited funding and access to data create barriers.

During the discussion Thomson noted the potential for the project to provoke deep thinking and reflection on the individual and personal losses of WW1. We need to distance ourselves from narrow, “neatly” framed stories and embrace the broad and ambiguous. For example, instead of focusing on the narrow political narrative of Vimy Ridge, we could instead refocus on the more complex story of the Japanese Canadians who fought in WW1 and became decorated soldiers, only to be interned in Canada during WWII. The strongest stories are those that are complex.

[See website http://www.theworldremembers.ca/]
Panel 3  Civil Society and WW1
How was the war fought—or resisted—on the home front?

Summary of Presentations
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Kara Dixon Vuic - Women, War, and Peace: American Women in the Great War

The role of American women in resisting and supporting the war effort during WW1 is complex. This period included a significant surge in public, political action by and for women at the height of the suffrage movement. Many prominent women’s organizations were established as women’s role in public life expanded. In this context women’s actions and reactions in relation to the war were not unified. Maternal politics were used to support opposite positions to war. A mother’s love for her children was used to support peace and to refuse to give children up to war service. But mothers as patriotic citizens were also urged to encourage their sons to join the military. Women still view war and the military from these two perspectives today.

Certain women’s organizations during WW 1, most notably the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), chose to focus on peace as their priority. Others chose to rally their efforts around suffrage and used women’s support for the war as justification for the government to support women’s right to vote. However, this was not always a clear divide. Many female pacifists were also vocal in the suffrage movement. They argued that women’s right to vote should be based only on the fact that women are people and not on their support for the government’s war efforts.

Maternal politics also played an important role in shaping women’s reactions to WW1. Women activists within the peace movement perpetuated the idea that women’s maternal instinct and capacity to be mothers made them oppose the war. Women’s love for their sons would not allow them to be sent off to war. In turn, the government argued that good mothers raised their sons to be soldiers. Volunteer efforts were portrayed as innately maternal to appeal to women and the military was depicted as a kind of extended family. However, many women resisted this maternal image. For some, this involved active involvement in the war to gain status, independence and empowerment. The war was a chance to prove that women were equal to men.
In the 20th century military service was viewed as the primary way of conferring citizenship and equality. This is important to remember when considering women’s involvement in the military during WW1 and since. Moreover, maternal politics continue to influence how women frame their peace activism, as well as military service. Some women refute war because of their identity as mothers, and some women join the military to provide for their children. Divisions among women in the United States persist, as both those within the military and within the peace movement identify as feminists, but have different goals. The past is therefore a reminder of how women’s responses and experiences to the same issue are highly varied.

Tamara Scheer - A Factor of Constant Concern: Habsburg Civil Society during World War One

Civil society in the Habsburg Empire was highly diverse during WW1. The Empire was multiethnic, with three parliaments and multiple political parties that were divided along national, regional and ideological lines. The diversity of voices within the Empire spoke of potential threats from multiple sources. As a result, emergency laws and orders to report those who could threaten the Empire were put in place prior to 1914.

Surprisingly, there was little or no resistance to the Empire’s involvement in WW1. Nevertheless, heavy censorship and martial law were imposed on civil society. These harsh measures caused a breakdown of community and shaped civil society’s actions during the war. Certain ethnicities were seen as unreliable or suspicious, and people frequently accused one another of being disloyal to the regime. War caused everyone to be afraid for themselves and of others.

The fear of war and the harsh actions of the Empire caused chaos in civil society. The importance of transparency in times of crisis, and knowing what is going on during wartime are important lessons. It is important to promote understanding to prevent the breakdown in community exhibited in the Habsburg Empire.

Jamie Swift

Just as WW1 had changed and shaped the lives of American women and civil society in the Habsburg Empire, it also changed Canada in profound ways. Although civil society played an important role in fostering this change, it is often left out of Canada’s official narrative on the war. The current Canadian government’s narrative on WW1 portrays the Canadian war effort as a struggle for freedom and democracy, and as the birth of a nation “forged in fire.” However, the struggle for democracy in Canada was initiated by civil society during the war, when the status quo was questioned and transformed.

In 1914, Canada was an undemocratic place in many ways. Women, Aboriginals and persons of colour lacked fundamental rights; the needs of the privileged were prioritized over the needs of the majority. Canadian social movements fundamentally challenged this. As an unintended consequence of the war, these movements made major gains in democratizing Canada. Women with relatives in the war gained the right to vote; this tentative step forward would lead to bigger gains for the women’s suffrage movement after WW1.
Furthermore, politics began to change. For example, farmers began mobilizing after the government broke its promise to exclude them from conscription. Significantly, in 1919, the United Farmers of Ontario formed a majority coalition government in Ontario with labour support. This opening up of the political process was a significant moment in Canadian history. Thus, WW1 was the birth of a nation, but in a way that contrasts with the patriotic, official Canadian narrative.

The national narrative on WW1 shapes Canadians' image of war and can shield militarism from criticism. The stories that are not told are those of the struggles fought, and gains made, by civil society to promote democracy and freedom in Canada. It is important to challenge this mythology of Canada as a “warrior nation” and to focus on the stories that are not part of the current official narrative.

Discussion

The panelists, in different ways, focused on the role of civil society during WW1 and how the politics at the time influenced this role. However, they also discussed how civil society itself can play an important role in shaping politics and society. One participant asked how these insights into civil society's roles and actions during WW1 can help us to understand how to avoid war and promote peacemaking now. Ms. Vuic responded that, while the issue is complicated, we can learn lessons about civil liberties and different motivations for going to war. For example, we could look at better ways to achieve social security outside of military service. Mr. Swift added that it is important to question the way in which our official narratives depict wars of the past.

Another participant raised the point that in today’s world of increased military spending and engagement, effective resistance is becoming less visible. The panelists mentioned how currently it is becoming more difficult to see the actual human costs of war. For example, military interventions are being fought with mercenaries, Special Forces and drones instead of “boots on the ground.” Therefore, opposition is less likely. Ms. Vuic mentioned that it is important for people to realize that the cost of war is not experienced equally, especially in terms of class. We need to ask ourselves who is bearing this cost, because it is not often visible. Metta Spencer concluded the discussion by emphasizing the need to recognize the importance of civil society. To advance peace and democracy, and increase the resistance to war, participation in civil society organizations by independent citizens should be encouraged. The autonomy and freedom of civil society organizations must be supported for peace work to be effective.
Keynote Address Summary: Paradoxes of Vimy Ridge

Ian McKay: Historian, Queens University

The official story of the birth of a nation in blood and fire at Vimy Ridge can be referred to as Vimyism. It encapsulates the myth of how Canadians fought wars, always for freedom; war brought unity; soldiers are always heroes. But in the 1930s veterans of WW1 told the story of slaughter and tragedy.

In January and February 1934 The Toronto Daily Star provided saturation coverage of over 370 images from the war to its 175,000 daily readers: “Canada’s Epic Story Told in Official War Photographs.” There was a risk of showing these pictures, pushing the envelope of decency, showing damaged and dead bodies, ruin and destruction.

Gregory Clark wrote the captions for the photos. He spent three years in the trenches as Major Clark, and fought at Vimy Ridge. There is much irony in Clark’s representations of the war – and here he reminds us of Paul Fussell’s comment in his unmatched classic study of the cultural impact of the First World War, The Great War and Modern Memory -- that war is always ironic, because it is always worse than you thought it would be. The photos showed war’s cruelty, its primitivism. There are almost no references to heroics. Clark saw the declaration of war as the occasion of national mourning. You need to stop anti-war sentiment in the bud because you never know where it may lead. The photos also demonstrated a shared humanity of the Canadian and German soldiers – articulating, in a sense, an early statement of transnational humanism. Both Germans and their erstwhile opponents shared a human suffering.

The Daily Star’s rivals -- Telegram and Mail and Empire -- denounced the photo spreads as an experiment that no one would want to keep in a scrap book. They then started publishing similar images because of their popularity. The Daily Star responded to public demand by extending the series. The Toronto School Board made the images available to its schools.

Letters to the editor were almost uniformly favourable, almost half the letters coming from Canadian Legion branches. Women wrote in about the anguish of the war. There was no romanticization of the war. War in modern times is a threat to society. War is a vast technically modern industry in which pomp and circumstance have no role. A desire was expressed to fight to prevent going back to war welling up from the hearts of widows and veterans. This war and any form of Christianity were incompatible. There was a mass movement in the 1930s to reinforce anti-war feelings and check a resurgent militarism. Anti-profiteering and anti-armament sentiment was strong. The question was asked: Why not establish rehabilitation programs rather than statues and cenotaphs?

The Daily Star pictures contradicted all those who said that peace, nationalism and unity were born at Vimy. Vimy produced destruction and extended imperialism. War is not glory. Teach the next generation what to expect in war. As one soldier wrote: he would rather shoot his three brothers than see them go to war. The paradox of Vimy as a contemporary symbol of martial nationalism is that, for Canadians much closer to the event than we are, it meant that warfare under conditions of modernity involved indiscriminate violence and mass slaughter. It is a lesson that, in today’s celebrations of martial glory, we are consistently being urged to forget.
The interwar generation had learned something about modernity and war. They had learned that modern warfare bears no resemblance to the chivalric battles of old. Contemporary Canada is suffused with stirring and romantic images of the First World War – many of them in the Citizenship Guide every new Canadian is expected to master. Yet Vimyism – the idea that Canada was born on the banks of Vimy Ridge, and to the soldiers of Vimy we owe our independence, freedom and democracy – was not something articulated by many of the actual veterans of the War whose far different opinions were captured in the newspapers of the 1930s. At a time when martial nationalism is re-organizing public memory in Canada, and set to orchestrate vast state pageants bearing witness to Vimy – stage a Vimypalooza, one might say – will there be time to listen to the contrasting accounts of the many men and women who felt the war had been cruel and futile?

**Panel 4  Memory and War**  
*Was truth the first casualty of WW1, and must it always be thus?*

**Summary of Presentations**

**Chair:** Peggy Mason: President, Rideau Institute, former Canadian Ambassador for Disarmament

**Panel:** Jeff Keshen: Historian, Dean of Arts, Mount Royal University  
Nicole Schwarz-Morgan: Political Scientist, Professor Emerita, Royal Military College of Canada  
Ira Basen: CBC Radio Producer and Author

**Peggy Mason**

It is important for the public to be informed about war, and to know who sets the frame for our understanding of it. Do we even know the frame exists?

**Jeff Keshen**

Through the examination of several wars, it is clear how government-sponsored propaganda and media evolved in their relationship with each other. While it has been true that truth is the first casualty in war, there is hope that it will not always be so.

World War I saw the institutionalization of propaganda departments and significant censorship by governments. Eyewitness accounts were controlled and vetted by government authorities, and the media was instructed to present the war effort in favourable terms. Eager to cooperate and demonstrate its support of the war, the media also censored itself, depicting the war effort as overwhelmingly positive and removing any upsetting matter, such as dead bodies. Overall, the nation’s goals against the “evils” of the world were more important than individual’s right to accurate information.

In Canada government propaganda was used, for example, to encourage growing more food and to buy victory bonds. Censorship was harsh on dissenting voices. Sacrifice was glorified.

In contrast, the media mostly maintained its independence in Vietnam. The inability of the U.S. government to control media representations of the war aided the effectiveness of the anti-war movement. At the same time, government and military authorities learned their lesson, and in
successive conflicts have been very intentional in controlling access to information and the war narrative.

Nicole Schwartz-Morgan

WW1 was a war between collapsing empires. Propaganda was institutionalized by states. Today the “war of words on the web 3.0” describes modern wars as a battle between competing narratives, and not just of military might. In Iraq, the “brilliant metaphor” of “War on Terror” was employed by President Bush to create fear and mobilize the nation in support of the 2003 Iraq intervention. While there was an overwhelming amount of misinformation used to justify the war, the success of the “War on Terror” metaphor created mass support in the U.S.

Al Qaeda and similar groups such as ISIS are good at shaping perceptions on the web and through the use of social media. “They are not crazies.” They appeal to disaffected youth. The demographics of the Middle East show 60% of the population is 15 years old or younger. Carpet bombing will never address this security threat. We must understand the psychology behind ISIS recruitment efforts. ISIS has mastered the ability to recruit youth through the web, and only through countering its ideology can it be removed from power.

Ira Basen

Must it always be that truth is the first casualty of war? Social media now makes this less likely. Governments don’t want citizens to know the gruesome truth of war, or the public would be less likely to support it. The relationship between governments and the press from World War I to today has changed. While Vietnam represented the golden age of independent war reporting, government authorities reaffirmed their control of the war narrative by restricting access (Gulf Wars) or co-opting the press (Afghanistan) through embedding journalists. The creation of Al Jazeera is a most important development.

The emergence of social media and “citizen-based journalism” has brought hope that the truth about war is not monopolized by nation states. For example, soldiers now frequently write their own blogs, similar to family letters in WW1, but now public to the whole world. Also, citizens, independent journalists and alternative media actively present world events through the web and social media in ways counter to both government officials and mainstream media. While these alternative narratives cannot always be verified, they do represent challenges to the official narrative, and force citizens to consider carefully the claims of both government and media sources, whether mainstream or alternative.

Discussion

In discussion, the role of the whistleblowers was an additional theme raised. Panelists commented on the severe risks whistleblowers undertake, and the social ostracism that too often results. However, as the rise of social media continues, there may be a growing opportunity to aid and encourage whistleblowing. Lastly, the final theme discussed was the inadequacy of media coverage on Canada’s involvement in Afghanistan, which largely amounted to cheerleading. Few reporters have any knowledge of Canada’s military, despite the fact it represents $18 billion in annual federal spending.
Panel 5: Ending the War, Failure of the Peace

Why could WW1 not be ended sooner?
Will the UN overcome the critical weaknesses of the League of Nations?

Summary of Presentations

Chair: Paul Heinbecker: Former Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations, Distinguished Fellow, Centre for International Governance Innovation

Panel: Walter Dorn: Professor of Defence Studies, Royal Military College of Canada and the Canadian Forces College
Mustafa Aksakal: Historian, Georgetown University, Washington, DC
Alistair Edgar: Political Scientist, Wilfrid Laurier University, Executive Director, Academic Council on the UN System (ACUNS)

As chair, Paul Heinbecker framed the discussion by stating that humanity was living in a golden age; never before have people been richer, healthier, safer, or more connected. These points can be traced back to the formation of intergovernmental organizations on a global scale, first with the League of Nations and eventually the United Nations.

After the abject failure of the League of Nations, peace-building efforts after WWII would learn from the League’s failures. In doing so the UN has become the platform and standard for the rules of international relations and international engagement. Following the UN’s inception in 1945 the world has seen a 24-fold drop in all forms of war, in both intra-state and inter-state conflicts. Furthermore, because the UN has lasted for nearly seven decades, it has overcome the lack of staying power that crippled the League of Nations.

Walter Dorn

There can be no greater tribute to those who gave their lives in WW1 than to learn from their experiences.

Woodrow Wilson, at the end of WW1, accurately predicted that the scale of warfare would only expand in the future. The weapons used in war today would become the toys of tomorrow. Millions died in WW1, while tens of millions died in WWII.

Advances in the lethality of weaponry are so staggering that the arms race is pitted against the human race. With the capability to now destroy the human race while humanity faces existential threats from disease and climate change, the focus must shift to the preservation of the human race. The precious resources we have must go towards humanity and not war.

The lessons of WW1 must be reconsidered. The rise of state militarism in the concert of Europe led to an uncontrollable status quo that contributed to the escalation of force. Militarists had the pride of their nations at stake and were not controlled by civilians.

While Wilson was initially neutral in thought and in deed, his policy position eventually shifted to “making the world safe for democracy,” a departure from previous enemy-centric approaches during times of war.
Four main lessons from WW1:

1. The greater an alliance entangles nations, particularly through secret treaties, the greater the disaster that will arise. Treaties need to be made public.

2. Give the loser a fair chance to rebuild. Instead of reparations, extend great help to restore functioning society and economy to the affected countries.

3. Make a genuine commitment to international institutions and norms. Nations must actually follow through and implement instead of just paying lip service.

4. Humanity needs a new system to further evolve global governance. Just as the League of Nations led to the UN, the UN could indeed lead to something greater.

Canada is one of the few international power brokers borne from the pen through an Act of the British Parliament instead of the sword. It is incumbent upon Canada to continue in this tradition and aid in peacekeeping the world over.

Mustafa Aksakal

War continues to wreak havoc even after hostilities end. Munitions abandoned in Gallipoli still managed to cut down innocent children well into the 1920’s and beyond. History is no less explosive in laying traps for the future than bombs in Gallipoli.

The debris of war can be physical and geopolitical in nature. Whether it is abandoned munitions in Turkey, Belgium, or Germany, or lasting strife as found in the Middle East, the full cost of a war extends well beyond the cessation of open hostilities.

The Ottomans entrance into WW1 was borne out of alliances. Its attempt to keep its empire solvent while reducing territorial losses was the catalyst for joining the side of Germany. Ultimately, this posturing compelled the Ottomans to join WW1 hostilities. However, the anticipated benefits of these alliances were never realized. Not only would the Ottomans and the Germans have had to win the war, but also the Ottoman Empire would have had to avoid all the fissures inflicted. The external stressors of WW1 are what would eventually render the Ottoman Empire obsolete.

Ironically, had the Ottoman Empire not aligned itself to enter WW1, the Empire might have fared better in the long run. WW1 served only to exacerbate poor living conditions and reverse the great cohesive progress made under the ruling prowess of the Ottomans. Unfortunately, the vacuum left by the Ottoman Empire was not replaced with anything durable, as the measures enacted in the Middle East were made to promote stability in Europe. Practically no consideration was given to the devastated Middle East -- “a side-show of a side-show” -- the effects of which still ripple today.

While not without larger criticisms, the current administration in Turkey has taken great strides to correct errors in Turkish/Ottoman history. Kemalist revisions and the limited Ottoman source materials available, due to extremely low literacy rates in the Ottoman Empire, have impeded historiography in the region. Nevertheless, Turkey has begun to dismantle its volatile political debris from the WW1 era, easing tensions amongst Armenian and Kurdish demographics at a state level.
Alistair Edgar

The critique of ineffectiveness leveled against the UN ultimately fails. Firstly, it is shortsighted. There are so many facets to the UN. There is the political UN, the professional UN, the UN of ideas, etc.

The political UN is more practical than the League of Nations and learned from its downfall. The UN gave more power to the larger actors. Importantly, the UN has learned to do what it can do and not do what it cannot do.

The UN learned that when there is no peace, there is no peace to keep. After Rwanda, Bosnia, and Somalia, the UN adapted and developed a mandate for the authority to use force. The current intervention in the Democratic Republic of Congo is a case in point.

The UN ultimately is a living construction that learns and adapts. The structure of the UN also enables its longevity, surpassing the mandate of the League of Nations. The UN of ideas is an important advocate for human security and development, as well as prevention, instead of just reaction.

Concluding Roundtable Summary:
What can we learn from WW1 to make the 21st century a century of peace?


Panel: Holger Afflerbach
       Mustafa Aksakal
       Tamara Scheer
       Daryl Copeland
       Ernie Regehr

What did we learn from WW1 to make world a safer place? The traditional 19th century opinion of ‘The Fatherland’ faced a watershed moment. The notion of “Dying for Fatherland” that was prevalent in 19th century Europe was abandoned except in its cynical or ironic uses. This was quite a political departure.

WW1 served as an exercise in the failure of our ability to accommodate shifting power. The only thing we ever learn is that we never learn. It is now more necessary than ever to learn from previous conflicts to prevent emerging and escalating conflicts. The key is to understand and evolve past these issues to address the big ones that humanity faces collectively.

WW1 was transformative in the Middle East and shaped how it is today. WW1 touched off civil war and mass traumas that lasted well into the 20th century. Understanding this period as the origin of contemporary problems is invaluable. Often times the region is described as having populations predisposed to violence, which is categorically untrue. What the denizens of the
Middle East have been subjected to for the past century is shortsighted Western policies of imperialism, colonialism, and interventionism. Organic growth in the region continues to be scarred from the consequences of WW1.

Conflicts are multifaceted and are by nature hard to understand fully for factors and igniters, especially when the WW1 alliances were so veiled and secretive.

Rather than apportioning specific blame, humanity should extract useful lessons. For instance in WW1 the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand caused events that spun out of control. When politicians default on their responsibilities as decision-makers, the result is handing their control over war to the military.

Regardless of the justifications used for war, all belligerents bear responsibility. Nations should unite not in military alliances, but rather in understanding that they should not be sending their sons and daughters off to war. This ideal is what has fostered peace in the European Union.

The role of the media must be considered, for instance, in the case of the Hapsburg Empire from the turn of the century up until 1914. Newspapers treated war like it was expected, yet people were surprised when armed conflict actually broke out. Bertrand Russell remarked that England was also happy for war.

WW1 gave us new technologies to build better weapons. Humanity has perfected the means to kill each other. What mankind has yet to do is wholly unite against non-traditional threats, whether that be climate change, diminishing biodiversity, resource shortages, or the challenge of managing the global commons. There are no military solutions to many of the threats which now imperil us all. Airstrikes are no remedy for a warming planet. Expeditionary forces cannot occupy the alternatives to a carbon economy. Garrisons and border guards are useless against the advance of pandemic disease. These sorts of issues are best addressed using the tools of diplomacy and development: dialogue, negotiation, knowledge-based problem solving and cooperative action in concert.

Framing a conflict as war will always leave a winner and a loser. However, it is what those parties choose to do, either in victory or defeat, which will shape the future. While the Americans won WW II, they have been a global leader in armed interventions during the second half of the 20th century. Conversely, Germany and Japan have adopted foreign policies centered on pacifism.

The frame of conflict analysis is always focused on why war happened or who was responsible. Perhaps our thinking should be the other way around: Why did the peace work before?

Credit has to be given for the prevention of large-scale wars since the end of the two World Wars of the 20th century. Diplomacy has identified conditions that would lead to war. Attention must be given to de-escalation and prevention. Nations must never stop talking; transnational cooperation needs to exist in good times and bad.

There exists a grotesque imbalance of resource allocations in major nations, as the lion’s share of resources fall to defence agencies and defence corporations. In the USA there are more soldiers in uniformed marching bands than there are diplomats. In any given year the budget increase alone that is afforded to U.S. defence exceeds the total budgets of the State Department and USAID combined. A major disparity between defence spending and spending on diplomacy and development of nearly 24:1 exists in the U.S., while Canada is 4:1, and the Nordics are 1:1.

Contemporary wars are primarily intra-state or civil wars and they emerge out of internal conflicts based a variety of social, political, and economic grievances and the failures of
national institutions in weak states to mediate effectively and respond to chronic grievances. Military force is incapable of mitigating these grievances or of forcing dissident movements, once they have gained the support of major communities and sections of the populations, to conform. Political accommodation is the only sustainable response, yet most states, even or especially weak states, are better prepared for mounting military responses than political responses. The result is long drawn out civil wars, even though they cannot be, and are not settled on the battlefield. Most wars today, in fact, have little in common with the circumstances and conditions of World Wars I or II.

Special attention must be afforded to the distinction between commemoration and glorification of war. Countries recently engaged in conflict or those nations that were plagued by conflict for decades regard war in a manner that contrasts with countries that have not had conflict waged on home soil in quite some time.

Did they all die in vain? Soldiers that perish on the battlefield and civilians that bear the brunt of a conflict will die in vain if the lessons learned from that conflict are not applied towards the future. If the conflict does not just lead to peace, but an understanding of how to sustain peace, then the victims of war will indeed die in vain. In the case of WW1, little was learned – and that led to WW II.

History does not create workable models for the future. What is clear is that war must be avoided at all costs. In the tradition of Bertha von Suttner, the first female to win the Nobel Peace Prize, she insisted that you never stop talking. Never give up. Meeting a person’s basic needs of food, water, shelter, and economic prospects contribute more to human security than any military force could. Security is not a martial art. Human security is the key. Freedom from fear and freedom from want.

Canada’s capacity to contribute and innovate when it comes to assisting humanity towards peace must be resurrected. Unfortunately in Canada today much of that capacity has been lost. Canada has moved away from internationalism and diplomacy, and renowned institutions and civil society organizations are among the casualties. As a result Canada is losing its established influence on the international stage.
SPEAKERS

Desmond Morton
Author and founding director of the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada

Desmond Morton was born in Calgary, Alberta on September 10, 1937, the son of a captain in Lord Strathcona’s Horse and a mother born of Loyalist stock in Saint John New Brunswick. He grew up with the constant changes of a soldier’s family life, graduated from le Collège militaire royal de St.-Jean in 1957 and from the Royal Military College of Canada in 1959. A Rhodes Scholarship sent him to Oxford for two years. He resumed his army career at Camp Borden in 1961 and at the Army Historical Section in 1963, retiring in 1964. He returned to England to earn a doctorate at the University of London for a thesis on political-military relations in post-Confederation Canada. The publication of the thesis helped establish his academic career and led to forty more books on Canada’s political, social, and particularly military history. In 1994, he retired as Principal of the University of Toronto’s Mississauga campus and accepted an invitation from McGill University to launch its Institute for the Study of Canada. He retired in 2006 as Hiram Mills Professor of History and has focused on writing a revisionist military history of French Canada which, he suspects, may challenge some conventional and cherished opinions about our past.

John de Chastelain
Retired Canadian general and diplomat, former head of the International Commission on Decommissioning in Northern Ireland

General John de Chastelain is a retired Canadian soldier and diplomat who is an expert in international conflict resolution. He graduated from the Royal Military College of Canada in 1960 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in history, served with the Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (PPCLI) in Canada and overseas, was twice appointed Canada’s Chief of the Defence Staff, and in 1993 was named Canada’s 19th Ambassador to the United States. After retiring from active military service in 1995, he was one of three international chairmen involved in the Northern Ireland Peace talks which led to the Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement of April 10, 1998. From 1997 to 2011 he served as a member and chair of the Independent International Commission on Decommissioning (IIDC), the body responsible for ensuring the decommissioning of arms by paramilitary groups in Northern Ireland.

He is also a member of the International Advisory Board for Peaceful Schools International. He is a director of the Forum of Federations and a member of the International Advisory Board for Peaceful Schools.

Honors received during his career include Companion of the Order of Canada, Commander of the Order of Military Merit, Companion of Honor (U.K.), Commander of the Order of St. John, and Commander of the Legion of Merit (U.S.).
Amy Shaw
Associate Professor, University of Lethbridge

Amy Shaw is an Associate Professor in the department of history at the University of Lethbridge. She is the author of Crisis of Conscience: Conscientious Objection in Canada during the First World War, and the co-editor, with Sarah Glassford, of A Sisterhood of Suffering and Service: Women and Girls in Canada and Newfoundland during the First World War. Some of her current work focuses on dissent in Canada against the Anglo-Boer War.

Holger Afflerbach
Professor of Central European History, University of Leeds

Professor Afflerbach studied Modern and Medieval history, Italian and German literature at the Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf and the Università degli Studi di Napoli. His PhD (a biography of the Prussian Minister of War and German Chief of Staff, General Erich v. Falkenhayn (1861-1922), was funded by a scholarship of the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation and supervised by Wolfgang J. Mommsen. Afterwards he started a major research project on international relations before 1914 (The Triple Alliance and European Great Power Politics, 1881-1915) which he completed as an Alexander-von-Humboldt-scholar in Vienna (1996-1998). He was awarded his Habilitation at the Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf in 1999 and later got an honorary professorship. From 1999 to 2002 he taught at the University of Düsseldorf, and won a major research grant from the Fritz-Thyssen-Foundation for research on Wilhelm II as Supreme Warlord during World War I. The result - a 1100 page edition - was published by the Historical Commission of the Bavarian Academy of Science. In August 2002 Dr. Afflerbach became DAAD Professor of Modern German History at Emory University in Atlanta. Among other things he organised a large international conference in 2004 on the outbreak of war in 1914 which was opened by President Jimmy Carter. He left Atlanta in 2006 after accepting his current position at the University of Leeds.

He has published six books – three monographs, one edition, and two edited volumes – 30 scholarly contributions to journals and books and around 70 shorter articles and research reviews.

His research interests include:

- The history of Europe in both World Wars, especially World War I with particular reference to late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German, Austrian and Italian history in a - European context
- International relations in Europe since 1870, especially between Bismarck and 1914
- History of War, especially in the 19th and 20th centuries

Ernie Regehr
Senior Fellow in Arctic Security for the Simons Foundation and Research Fellow at the Institute of Peace and Conflict at Conrad Grebel University College, University of Waterloo

Ernie Regehr, O.C., is a Senior Fellow in Arctic Security of The Simons Foundation of Vancouver and Research Fellow at the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, Conrad Grebel University College, the University of Waterloo. He is co-founder of Project Ploughshares and his publications on peace and security issues include books, monographs, journal articles, policy papers, parliamentary briefs, and op-
eds. Ernie has served as an NGO representative and expert advisor on numerous Government of Canada delegations to multilateral disarmament forums, including the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and UN Conferences on Small Arms. In 1990-1991 he was Canada’s representative on the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Arms Transfer Transparency that led to the creation in 1992 of the UN Conventional Arms Register, and in 2001 he was an advisor to the Government of Kenya in the development of a regional arms control agreement on small arms known as the Nairobi Declaration. Visits to conflict zones, especially in East Africa, have included participation in Track II diplomacy efforts related to the conflict in southern Sudan, and he is on the Board of the Africa Peace Forum of Nairobi, Kenya. He is a former Commissioner of the World Council of Churches Commission on International Affairs, where he was active in developing the WCC’s position on Responsibility to Protect. From 2008 to 2010 he was involved in three visits to Kabul (two with the Canadian “Pathways to Peace” project) to explore reconciliation opportunities and requirements.

Marius Grinius
Former Canadian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the UN and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva

Mr. Grinius is a distinguished diplomat. He joined the Canadian Foreign Service in 1979 after serving in the Canadian Army for 12 years. His early overseas postings include Bangkok, NATO in Brussels, and Hanoi. In 1997 he was posted back to Vietnam as Ambassador. In 2004 he was named Ambassador to South Korea and added accreditation to North Korea in 2005. In 2007 Marius was posted to Geneva as Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations and the Conference on Disarmament. He returned to Ottawa in 2011 for an appointment to the Department of National Defence as Director General International Security Policy. Marius retired in 2012 after 45 years of service to Canada.

Roger Sarty
Professor of History, Wilfrid Laurier University, Research Director, Laurier Centre for Military, Strategic and Disarmament Studies

Ph.D. (University of Toronto), M.A. (Duke University), B.A. (University of Toronto) After serving as Senior Historian at the Department of National Defence, Dr. Sarty moved to the Canadian War Museum, where, as Deputy Director, he headed historical research and exhibition development for the new museum building that opened in 2005. Dr. Sarty moved to Wilfrid Laurier University in 2004. He contributed to the official history of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and was a senior author of the two-volume official history of the Royal Canadian Navy in the Second World War.

John Siebert
Executive Director, Project Ploughshares

John Siebert became the Executive Director of Project Ploughshares in 2005. Founded in 1976, Project Ploughshares is the ecumenical peace centre of The Canadian Council of Churches. The work of Project Ploughshares includes research and policy development on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, outer space security, the control and reduction of conventional weapons including small arms and light weapons, peacebuilding with partners in the Horn of Africa and the Caribbean, and critical evaluation of Canada’s foreign and defence policy from a human security framework.
Prior to joining Project Ploughshares, John worked for several NGOs, including the national office of The United Church of Canada on human rights and indigenous peoples’ issues. From 1982-1986 John was a Foreign Service Officer with Canada’s Department of External Affairs and International Trade, which included a posting to the Canadian Embassy in Washington, DC, where he was Executive Assistant to Ambassador Allan Gotlieb.

Gordon Vachon
Senior Consultant to the CTBTO (Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization) on on-site inspection operational

From 1984 through to the present, Gordon Vachon has been involved in negotiating and/or implementing arms control and disarmament agreements (CWC, CFE, Open Skies, and the BTWC verification/compliance protocol (unsuccessfully, unfortunately), while with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade; as Head of the Inspection Review Branch with the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons; and, currently, as a senior consultant to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (future pending).

R.H. Thomson
The World Remembers: A Canadian & International WW1 Centenary Project

R. H. Thomson (Robert) has been one of the leading actors in Canada for the past 30 years, performing extensively on stage, television and film. He has earned Gemini, Genie, Dora and Merritt awards for his work, as well as the Gascon-Thomas Award, the Barbara Hamilton award for activism in the arts and the Order of Canada. He wrote and performed a solo theatre piece ‘The Lost Boys’ based on the 700 letters from his five great uncles who served in WW1.

Mr. Thomson has created many arts/history projects. In 2008, Mr. Thomson co-created and produced the international remembrance project Vigile 1914-1918 Vigil in London UK and seven Canadian cities. In 2010, he co-produced Canada 1914-1918 Ypres, a history and remembrance project involving 150 schools across Canada and the city of Ieper, Belgium. He is currently producing a multi-nation WW1 Centenary project called The World Remembers-Le Monde se Souvient that launched October 20th 2014 and will span each of the Centenary years until 2018.

Metta Spencer
Editor-in-chief of Peace magazine and Professor Emeritus of sociology at University of Toronto

Metta Spencer is Professor Emeritus of sociology, University of Toronto. For thirteen years she coordinated a program in Peace and Conflict Studies at the Mississauga campus. She is author of 11 editions of an introductory sociology textbook, Foundations of Modern Sociology, author of Two Aspirins and a Comedy: How Television can Enhance Health and Society; The Russian Quest for Peace and Democracy; and hundreds of articles. She is editor of Peace Magazine, was formerly president of Science for Peace, and is now vice president of that organization.
Kara Dixon Vuic
Associate Professor of History, High Point University, North Carolina

Kara Dixon Vuic is a historian of the twentieth-century United States whose research bridges the history of wars and militarization, the history of gender and sexuality, and social and cultural history. At High Point University (North Carolina), she teaches courses on war and society, women and gender, and social and cultural history.

Tamara Scheer
Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Social Science History, University of Vienna

Dr. Tamara Scheer is a lecturer at the Institute for East European History at the University of Vienna, Austria, and head of a research project that deals with multilingualism in the Habsburg army.

Jamie Swift
Co-author, Warrior Nation: Rebranding Canada in an Age of Anxiety and co-founder, PeaceQuest

Jamie Swift and co-author Ian McKay argue that Canadians are facing a campaign to change their country’s understanding of itself. This effort to conscript Canadian history is being managed by the state together with a coterie of academics and militarists. Warrior Nation (2012) is a work of sharp-eyed journalistic storytelling and authoritative historical scholarship that takes on fresh importance as we approach the centenary of World War I and the 150th anniversary of Confederation.

Jamie Swift is the author a dozen books of critical non-fiction and biography. In addition to the writing life, he works as a social justice advocate and teaches at the Queen’s University School of Business. He has contributed to many features on CBC’s Ideas and to various other print and broadcast media. He is a co-founder of Between the Lines Press in Toronto and has served with many civil society organizations.

Ian McKay
Professor of Canadian History, Queen’s University

Ian McKay has taught Canadian History at Queen’s since 1988. His research interests lie in Canadian cultural history; in the economic and social history of the Atlantic region of Canada in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with specific reference to working-class movements and to tourism; in the history of Canada as a liberal order; and in the history of both Canadian and international left-wing movements for socialism. Warrior Nation? Rebranding Canada in a Fearful Age, co-authored with Jamie Swift, was published in 2012.
Swift and McKay predict that the 1812 celebrations are “a mere prelude to sure-to-be-much-bigger-and-more-glorious commemorations in the next few years. The centenary of World War I looms large in the minds of militarists and the far right as they set about priming Canadians for the celebration of Vimy and all the rest. It will romanticize that ghastly spasm of ineptitude in the service of a Birth of a Nation story, all the while airbrushing out its incalculable costs.”

Peggy Mason
President, Rideau Institute, former Ambassador for Disarmament

In June 2014 Peggy Mason became President of the Rideau Institute, an independent think tank which engages in research and advocacy in support of a progressive foreign policy for Canada, with the UN, multilateralism and global leadership for peace as its cornerstones. Peggy Mason’s career highlights diplomatic and specialist expertise in the field of international peace and security, with a particular emphasis on the United Nations, where she served as Canada’s Ambassador for Disarmament from 1989 to 1995. Since 1996 Ms. Mason has been involved in many aspects of UN peacekeeping training, including the development of groundbreaking principles on the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former fighters, the reform of UN arms embargoes and the dramatic evolution of UN peacekeeping in the 21st century. As a regular trainer and exercise developer, she also brings the UN political/diplomatic perspective to a range of NATO and EU training exercises to help prepare military commanders for complex, multidisciplinary peace and crisis stabilization operations. From 2002-2012 Peggy Mason was a Senior Fellow at The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA) at Carleton University, where she lectured, participated in training for Iraqi and Kuwaiti diplomats and chaired the Advisory Board of the Canadian Centre for Treaty Compliance (CCTC). Since 2004 she has been Chair of the Board of Directors of Peacebuild, a network of Canadian NGOs engaged in all aspects of peace-building. She is a member of the Board of Directors of World Federalist Movement – Canada, a past Chair of the Group of 78 and is currently a member of the Executive Committee and Conference Planning Committee.

Jeff Keshen
Dean of Arts, Mount Royal University

The author of five books, eight edited books and more than twenty-five scholarly articles, Jeff Keshen is a historian of 20th century Canada, specializing in War and Society. Among his works, Propaganda and Censorship in Canada’s Great War was awarded the best book in non-fiction by the Writers Guild of Alberta. It was also shortlisted for the Humanities and Social Sciences Federation of Canada’s Harold Adams Innis Prize for the best book in the Social Sciences. Jeff Keshen’s book, Saints, Sinners and Soldiers: Canada’s Second World War (translated as Saints, Salauds et Soldats: Le Canada et la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale) was shortlisted for the Raymond Klibansky Prize for the best book in the Humanities—a prize awarded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Federation of Canada—as well as for the C.P. Stacey Prize for the best book in Military History. His teaching has garnered the University of Ottawa’s Excellence in Education Prize and the Government of Ontario’s Leadership in Education Award. Committed to service, he also received the Government of Ontario’s June Callwood Award for Volunteerism to recognize his work in creating and managing for six years the University of Ottawa’s Experiential Learning Service that placed up to 2000 students annually in volunteer placements connected to their coursework, a program that attracted more than $1.2 million in
foundation and government grants. Before starting as Dean of Arts at Mount Royal University in July 2012, he served as Chair of the Department of History at the University of Ottawa. He is also an adjunct professor in the Centre of Military and Strategic Studies at the University of Calgary.

Nicole Schwartz-Morgan
Professor Emerita, Royal Military College of Canada

Dr. Nicole Schwartz-Morgan is Professor Emerita at the Royal Military College of Canada where she has taught political philosophy and politics in the Department of Politics and Economics since 2001. It is the most recent stop in a rich and varied academic life spread over two continents, two cultures and several subject matter specialties. Her studies have included philosophy, anthropology, and public policy and administration. Much of her work has been the analysis of trends in economic and social conditions and their human response. Her current focus has been on the impact of globalization on human ecology, including individuals, the state and other organizations. This is acutely important for the ways that young adults are socialized in an increasingly disorderly world and is reflected in her research, co-authored with a French linguist and researcher (Mathieu Guidere) in Paris. Le Manuel de recrutement d’Al Qaida comprises hitherto unpublished texts translated from Arabic and an in-depth analysis of the circumstances and ideology that motivate such powerful commitment from recruits. In 2012 she published Haine Froide (ed. Le Seuil, Paris), a meticulous analysis of the construction of the ideology of blind growth starting with Ayn Rand to nowadays, which was a best seller in Quebec.

Ira Basen
CBC Radio

Ira Basen began his career at CBC Radio in 1984. He was senior producer at Sunday Morning and Quirks and Quarks. He has been involved in the creation of three network programs; The Inside Track (1985), This Morning (1997), and Workology (2001), as well as several special series, including “Spin Cycles”, an award winning six part look at PR and the media, that was broadcast on CBC Radio One in January/February 2007, and “News 2.0”, a two part exploration of news in the age of social media that aired in June 2009. He currently produces documentaries for the Sunday Edition on CBC Radio One.

Ira has written for Saturday Night, The Globe and Mail, The Walrus, Maisonneuve, Marketing.ca, the Canadian Journal of Communication, the Journal of Professional Communication, and CBC.ca. He is also a contributing editor at J-source.ca.

He has won numerous awards, including the Canadian Science Writers Association Award, the Canadian Nurses Association Award, the Gabriel Award, and the New York Radio Festival Award. His article “Citizen Uprising” was included in the book “Best Canadian Essays -2010”, and his article “Age of the Algorithm” was nominated for a 2011 National Magazine Award. Ira has developed several training programs for CBC journalists, including courses on short-form documentary making, “spin”, journalism ethics, and user-generated content, as well as a series of webinars on critical thinking.

In fall 2012, Ira was the CanWest Fellow in Media Studies at the University of Western Ontario. He is also on the faculty of the Masters of Communications Management program at McMaster University, where he teaches courses in communications ethics. He also teaches at Ryerson
University, and in the Media Studies program at the Scarborough Campus of the University of Toronto, where he teaches media ethics.

He is the co-author of the Canadian edition of *The Book of Lists* (Knopf Canada, 2005).

Paul Heinbecker

Distinguished Fellow, Centre for International Governance Innovation and
Inaugural Director of the Centre for Global Relations at Laurier University

Paul Heinbecker served as Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations in New York, Ambassador of Canada to Germany and Minister (Political Affairs) at the Canadian Embassy in Washington, as well as in more junior positions in Ankara, Stockholm and the OECD. In Ottawa, he has been Chief Foreign Policy Advisor to then Prime Minister Mulroney, Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet for Foreign Policy and Defence, and Assistant Deputy Minister for International Security and Global Affairs in the Department of External/Foreign Affairs. Paul was an architect of Canada’s human security agenda, helped negotiate an end to the Kosovo war, headed the Canadian delegation to the Climate Change negotiations in Kyoto and represented Canada on the UN Security Council. At the UN he was a leading opponent of the Iraq war, and an advocate of the International Criminal Court and the Responsibility to Protect.

Heinbecker graduated with an Honours BA from Wilfrid Laurier University (then called Waterloo Lutheran University) in 1965. He received honorary doctorates from Laurier in 1993 and St. Thomas University in 2007. He was named Laurier Alumnus of the Year in 2003 and an Alumnus of Achievement on Laurier’s 100th anniversary in 2011. He was also selected as one of the 50 top student athletes of the first 50 years of the CIS (Canadian Interuniversity Sport).

In 2004 he was appointed the inaugural Director of the Centre for Global Relations at Laurier and a Distinguished Fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation in Waterloo. A frequent commentator on radio and television, he has also written numerous newspaper and journal articles, authored “Getting Back in the Game: A Foreign Policy Playbook for Canada” and contributed to and edited several other books on international relations.

Walter Dorn

Professor, Royal Military College of Canada and the Canadian Forces College.

Dr. Walter Dorn is a Professor of Defence Studies at the Royal Military College of Canada (RMC) and the Canadian Forces College (CFC). He has also taught at the Pearson Centre and served as a Visiting Professional in the Office of the Prosecutor at the International Criminal Court (ICC) in The Hague. Dr. Dorn is a scientist by training, receiving his Ph.D. in Chemistry from the University of Toronto. His doctoral research focused on chemical sensing for arms control. At the Canadian Forces College he teaches officers of rank Major to Brigadier from Canada and over 20 other countries in the areas of arms control, foreign policy, defence policy, peace operations and international security. He has served with the United Nations Mission in East Timor, the United Nations in Ethiopia (UNDP project), at UN headquarters as a Training Adviser and as a consultant with the UN’s Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO).
Mustafa Aksakal
Associate Professor, Georgetown University

Mustafa Aksakal is the author of The Ottoman Road to War in 1914 (2008), a study of internal reasons for the empire’s decision to join the war on Germany’s side. His current book project, Ottoman Society at War, investigates military and civilian life during wartime in the empire’s final decade. Recently he held fellowships from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, and the American Council of Learned Societies. He teaches courses in Ottoman and Modern Turkish history.

Alistair Edgar
Executive Director, Academic Council on the UN System (ACUNS); Associate Professor of Political Science, Wilfrid Laurier University

Current research work includes transitional justice and conflict-to-peace processes in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Uganda and Kosovo; the political, legal, economic and social dimensions of post-conflict peace and reconstruction programs; sovereignty and humanitarian intervention as competing norms and practices in global governance; and Canadian and American foreign policy and defence policy.

Michael Enright

Michael Enright’s rich, varied and celebrated journalistic career has spanned 50 years, during which he has held key positions in Canadian media. He has hosted many of CBC Radio’s flagship programs; This Country in the Morning, As It Happens, This Morning and currently, The Sunday Edition. He was managing editor of CBC Radio News, and held editorial positions with publications such as Time and Quest magazines. At Maclean’s, he oversaw the magazine’s shift from a monthly to a weekly publication. He was a political writer for The Toronto Star and Washington correspondent for The Globe and Mail. He received a Southam Fellowship for Journalism in 1979, and studied Chinese history. In 2012, he was awarded an Honorary Doctorate from York University, and the Order of Canada. In 2014, he was awarded an Honorary Doctorate from Memorial University in Newfoundland.

At CBC Radio, Michael is the senior broadcast journalist chosen to host news specials on events such as 9/11, the Gulf War, the war in Afghanistan, the Quebec referendum, Canadian and U.S. elections. He travelled to Israel as it marked the 50th anniversary of the creation of the state, and to Ireland to report on the Referendum.

Michael’s fiercely intelligent broadcasting style is characterized by in-depth research, wide-ranging personal experience and a passion for justice. He is controversial and fearless (asking Radovan Karadzic “How’s the ethnic cleansing coming?””). His impish sense of humour brought us his unforgettable April Fool’s interviews with “Jimmy Carter” (“washed-up peanut farmer”) and “Mitt Romney” (“But what about the dog on the roof of your car?”) His passions include prison reform, medical pain relief and organ transplants, horseback and motorcycle riding, classical music, and advocating on behalf of the intellectually disabled.
Daryl Copeland
Author and consultant

Daryl Copeland, Senior Fellow at the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, is an analyst, author, educator and consultant specializing in the relationship between science, technology, diplomacy, and international policy. His book, Guerrilla Diplomacy: Rethinking International Relations, was released in 2009 by Lynne Rienner Publishers and is cited as an essential reference by the editors of Oxford Bibliographies Online. A frequent public speaker, Mr. Copeland comments regularly for the national media on global issues and public management, and has written over 100 articles for the scholarly and popular press. His work has appeared in many anthologies, as well as in the International Journal, World Politics Review, Foreign Policy in Focus, The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, Place Branding and Public Diplomacy, The Globe and Mail, Toronto Star, Ottawa Citizen, iPolitics, Embassy, The Mark and elsewhere. He was awarded the 2010 Molot Prize for best article published in Canadian Foreign Policy (“Virtuality, Diplomacy and the Foreign Ministry”, 15:2).

From 1981 to 2011 Mr. Copeland served as a Canadian diplomat with postings in Thailand, Ethiopia, New Zealand and Malaysia. During the 1980s and 1990s, he was elected a record five times to the Executive Committee of the Professional Association of Foreign Service Officers. From 1996-99 he was National Program Director of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs in Toronto and Editor of Behind the Headlines, Canada’s international affairs magazine. In 2000, he received the Canadian Foreign Service Officer Award for his “tireless dedication and unyielding commitment to advancing the interests of the diplomatic profession.” Among his positions at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) in Ottawa, Mr. Copeland has worked as Senior Intelligence Analyst, South and Southeast Asia; Deputy Director for International Communications; Director for Southeast Asia; Senior Advisor, Public Diplomacy; Director of Strategic Communications Services; and, Senior Advisor, Strategic Policy and Planning. He was DFAIT representative to the Association of Professional Executives (APEX) 2001-06.

Mr. Copeland teaches at the University of Ottawa’s Graduate School of Public and International Affairs and is Visiting Professor at the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna, the London Academy of Diplomacy (University of East Anglia, UK) and Otago University (NZ). Mr. Copeland serves as a peer reviewer for University of Toronto Press, the International Journal and The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, and is a member of the Editorial Board of the journal Place Branding and Public Diplomacy and the Advisory Board of the Canadian Foreign Policy Journal. From 2009-11 he was Adjunct Professor and Senior Fellow at the University of Toronto’s Munk School of Global Affairs and in 2009 was a Research Fellow at the University of Southern California’s Center on Public Diplomacy.

Mr. Copeland grew up in downtown Toronto, and received his formal education at the University of Western Ontario (Gold Medal, Political Science; Chancellor’s Prize, Social Sciences) and the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (Canada Council Special MA Scholarship). He has spent years backpacking on six continents, and enjoys travel, photography, arts and the outdoors.
PROGRAM

Friday, 26 September 2014
Barney Danson Theatre, Canadian War Museum

1:00 – 1:30 pm  Registration

1:30 – 2:00 pm  Welcome, Introductions, Purpose and Format of the Conference
Opening Ceremony/Welcome
Andrew Burtch, Canadian War Museum
Richard Harmston, The Group of 78
John Siebert, Project Ploughshares
Albert Dumont, Algonquin elder

2:00 – 3:00 pm  Keynote: Desmond Morton, The Great War 1914-1919: The Political Consequences for Canada

3:00 – 4:30 pm  Panel Session 1  Efforts to Stop the War
Themes:  Was WWI avoidable?
         Have we learned anything about war prevention and conflict resolution?
Chair:  John De Chastelain
Historians:  Amy Shaw, Holger Afflerbach
Commentator:  Ernie Regehr

4:30 – 4:45 pm  Break

4:45 – 6:15 pm  Panel Session 2  Innovations in War
Themes:  Could the proliferation of new lethal weapons of mass destruction have been prevented? Has the machinery of arms control and disarmament improved?
Chair:  Marius Grinius
Historian:  Roger Sarty
Commentators:  John Siebert, Gordon Vachon

6:15 – 7:00 pm  Witness – Canadian Art of the First World War and Transformations – A. Y. Jackson & Otto Dix: CWM exhibits, a tour
Speakers:  Laura Brandon, Melanie Morin-Pelletier, Canadian War Museum

Saturday, 27 September 2014
Barney Danson Theatre, Canadian War Museum

8:30 – 9 am  Registration/ Coffee and Tea

9:00 – 10:00 am  Keynote Speaker:  R. H. Thomson, Remembering WWI

10:00 – 10:15 am  Break
10:15 – 11:45 am **Panel Session 3**  
Civil Society and WW1

**Themes:**  
How was the war fought – or resisted – on the home front?  
What role can civil society play to strengthen peace and stability, and to end conflict?

**Chair:** Metta Spencer  
**Historian:** Kara Dixon Vuic, Tamara Scheer  
**Commentators:** Jamie Swift

11:45 – 1:30 pm  
**Lunch**

12:30 – 1:30 pm **Keynote:** Ian McKay  
Paradoxes of Vimy Ridge

1:30 – 3:00 pm **Panel Session 4**  
Memory and War

**Themes:**  
Was truth the first casualty of WW1, and must it always be thus?  
Uses and abuses of information in war, censorship and propaganda, war history, generating support for war

**Chair:** Peggy Mason  
**Historian:** Jeff Keshen  
**Commentators:** Nicole Schwartz-Morgan, Ira Basen

3:00 – 4:30 pm **Panel Session 5**  
Ending the War, Failure of the Peace

**Themes:**  
Why could WW1 not be ended sooner?  
Will the UN overcome the critical weaknesses of the League of Nations?

**Chair:** Paul Heinbecker  
**Historians:** Walter Dorn, Mustafa Aksakal  
**Commentators:** Alistair Edgar

4:30 – 4:45 pm  
**Break**

4:45 – 5:45 pm **Roundtable:**  
What can we learn from WW1 to make the 21st century a century of peace?  
PUBLIC FORUM moderated by Michael Enright, CBC  
Holger Afflerbach, Mustafa Aksakal, Tamara Scheer, Daryl Copeland, Ernie Regehr

*This Roundtable is designated as an event within the Ottawa Peace Festival http://ottawapeacefestival.blogspot.ca*

5:45 – 6:15 pm  
**Closing**

**Sunday, 28 September 2014**  
Atelier D, Canadian War Museum

9:00 – 10:30  
**Conference Summary Discussion and Wrap-up**

**Post conference**
- 10:30 – 12:00  
Atelier D, Canadian War Museum: **Group of 78 Annual General Meeting** (members only)

- Evening Event of Interest, South Minster United Church (tickets available at the registration desk)  
7:30 p.m. VERS LA FLAMME; Reminiscences of the Great War: A piano recital by Maxim Bernard
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