Canadian dead on Blue Beach at Puys between the beach and high sea wall (fortified with barbed wire), they made easy targets for MG34 machine guns.
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From the Editor’s Desk

Security is more than defence—among other things it includes the health of a nation’s financial markets. The ongoing financial crisis in Greece has negatively impacted the Euro region, the World’s financial markets and challenged the unity of the European Union (EU). Reliant on the EU to make up for Greece’s financial mismanagement, last month Greece failed to make a payment to its creditors and recently the country voted no to another bailout since the terms entail harsh austerity measures. On 12 July Greece’s government decided to accept the EU’s third bailout in five years rather than being expelled from the EU, changing from the Euro and reverting to the drachma. More worrying is the financial crisis in China that has in the past month seen the Asian markets drop to a 17 month low. In the past month the price of Chinese company shares has dropped 30 percent, roughly equal to $3.2 trillion U.S. dollars. These two crises have caused the World financial markets to slow so much so that our government has acknowledged that this is inhibiting Canada’s growth and the financial security of Canadians.

This issue features contributions from participants in the Conference of Defence Associations Institute (CDAI) Graduate Student Symposia—Rob Burroughs and William Buss, the winner of the inaugural Col. Peter C. Hunter Award given by our Institute at the 2013 Symposium held at RMCC.

From time to time this journal has examined the F-35 program and the procurement process in general. Mathew Preston examines the long history of the politicization of procurement that in many cases has been exacerbated by the military’s inability to clearly define the capabilities and requirements needed. He posits that when the need for a specific piece of equipment and weapon system is understood and accepted by the government, the procurement process can be effective.

It has been 73 years since the August 19th raid on Dieppe 1942. It is appropriate that we recognize this tragic but incredible event in our nation’s military history. William Buss examines the many factors that resulted in this fateful raid and argues that it could have been avoided.

Rob Burroughs introduces us to the concept of capability-based planning that replaced threat-based planning at the end of the Cold War and suggests that capability-based planning is an effective process to justify the essential requirement for a subsurface combatant capability.

Vincent Curtis reviews Sir Lawrence Freedman’s latest book “Strategy: A History”.

Colonel Chris Corrigan (retired) CD, MA
Editor and Chair of the Security Studies
A Case for Honesty: The Articulation of Strategic Purpose and the Procurement of the CF-104 and F-35

by Mathew Preston

The system of procurement in Canada, in fact in most countries, has never been divorced from politics. Politicization is further compounded when the need for kit is not articulated clearly. When there is a clear strategic use, and the Canadian public broadly accepts this, then procurement can be fast, effective, and only slightly over budget. Conversely, when there is an argument over the strategic need of an item, the procurement can drag on. This lesson is exemplified when the procurements of the CF-104 Starfighter and F-35 are compared. Plainly put, when the purpose of a specific piece of kit is outlined and known by both the government and military, the project can be dealt with in a quick and simple manner.

When the Avro Arrow was cancelled in 1959, the Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF) was given no other options than to buy American and to acquire nuclear capability. In 1957, the Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe, General Lauris Norstad, changed the strategic outlook for Allied troops stationed in Europe. In a speech in Cincinnati, Ohio, the General outlined that Soviet forces had reached a point where conventional forces would not be able to prevent them from overrunning Western Europe. The only way to stop the masses of the Red Army would be through the use of tactical nuclear weapons. The new strategic outlook coincided with Canada’s need to either refit the Air Division with replacements for the aging Canadair Sabres, or bring the Air Division home. By the late 1950s the European states were beginning to regain the ability to defend their air spaces alone, and as the Sabre was primarily an air superiority fighter there was little need for such a redundant capability at a cost to Canadians. The new tactical nuclear strike role proposed by NATO led to a debate over whether Canada should bring the Air Division home, disband it entirely, or reequip it with nuclear warheads. Cabinet was divided, as it usually was in the Diefenbaker years on matters of defence, but two events ensured that the Air Division would remain in Europe and the Sabre would be replaced with the Starfighter.

The first was the cancellation of the Avro Arrow. The coming of the “missile age” was the death knell for an aircraft designed as an interceptor. That, along with rising costs and delayed schedules—endemic in the vast majority of Canadian procurement projects—ended the project. When Diefenbaker announced to the House of Commons on 20 February 1959 that the Arrow was to be cancelled and all prototypes destroyed, he had inadvertently, at least to some, committed Canada fully to nuclear weapons. Because the most obvious replacement for the Arrow’s role was the nuclear-tipped BOMARC missile, the logic that this committed Canada to nuclear weapons was sound.

The second event occurred in 1959 as well. The Chiefs of Staff Committee decided that the European Air Division should take on the nuclear strike role, and General Norstad concurred. On 26 January 1959 General Charles Foulkes, Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff, relayed in a special meeting that the air defence role was better left to the Europeans and that Canada should accept the nuclear strike role.

In May 1959 General Norstad made a statement that caused a political firestorm in Canada, admitting to reporters that if Canada did not accept nuclear weapons in Europe, it would not be upholding its NATO commitments. The next month Cabinet decided that the Air Division would stay in Europe and had to be reequipped. The finalists were the Lockheed F-104 and the yet-to-be produced Grumman Super Tiger. Pilots preferred the Starfighter, but the brass was convinced that the Super Tiger would be the best for the job, and as it was still in development it would mean getting an aircraft that would be as new and up-to-date as possible. The total price of acquisition for eight squadrons of eighteen Super Tigers for the Air Division in Europe would be $445 million. It must be remembered that this was in the days before in-service support and lifecycle costs were factored into procurement estimates. Most importantly, though, Grumman offered no production sharing and limited industrial benefits if Canada were to purchase the aircraft.

Pilots favoured the Starfighter, second only to the also-considered F-4 Phantom in their top picks. Additionally,
the Starfighter was also being sold to the West German Air Force, meaning that theinterchanging of technicians and equipment would be easy, especially since the Air Division was stationed in Germany. The flyaway costs were cheaper at $420 million, although as the Starfighter entered production, its costs would rise as the airframe was "Canadianized." The Starfighter was chosen primarily because of the economic benefits offered. Canadair was awarded the licensing to build all but the first few aircraft, as well 121 sets of wings, aft fuselage, and tail assemblies as parts for the German and Dutch Starfighters. An additional 40 sets would also go to Lockheed for their production line in the US. Because the license for the Starfighter was transferred to Canadair, the United States Air Force (USAF) also ordered 140 fighters to supply Norway, Denmark, Greece, Turkey and Spain under the Military Assistance Program (MAP). Additionally, a large number of Canadian contractors were used in the supply chain.

As the production of the Starfighter became Canadianized, and a two-seater was added to the order, costs rose. Aside from adding the production of 22 two-seaters (the CF-104D), Orenda Engines, adding costs, built the engines in Toronto—which produced a superior product—and the cannon was removed for extra fuel. Additionally, because the RCAF would be using a high altitude interceptor for low-level ground attack, the Canadair CF-104 had optimized radar, instrumentation, and electronics. This increased the final cost for 200 single-seaters and 22 two-seaters from a quoted one million per plane to an average of $1.95 million per plane, almost doubling the original price. In the end, the total cost of acquisition was $464 million.

When on 20 February 1959 Prime Minister Diefenbaker announced to the House that the Arrow was to be cancelled, he also began the procurement process for the purchase of an aircraft capable of performing the nuclear strike mission. At the same time, he guaranteed that because of both NORAD and NATO commitments, Canada would have to buy American, because it had to be able to carry American nuclear weapons. This clear but unspoken reality meant that of those options that were not American, such as the Blackburn Buccaneer, were easily eliminated. This aided the speed with which the procurement was undertaken: when the speech cancelling the Arrow and confirming Canadian acceptance of nuclear weapons was made, it took four months for the internal competition to be held and a winner to be selected. On July 2, 1959, General Foulkes determined that the F-104 met the operational requirements and announced to the House that the aircraft would be purchased. This was announced only two days before it was decided that the RCAF in Europe would accept the nuclear strike mission. The purchase had been justified by clear strategic reasoning. Canada was to perform the nuclear strike mission and therefore the CF-104 was required for the RCAF. A clear logical train of thought.

There were grave political implications of the Canadian acceptance of American nuclear weapons—it created "a storm of controversy"—and would lead to greater political turmoil than simply the acquisition of a single weapons system like a fighter ever could. Despite this, there was little complaint about the fighter itself. The Air Chiefs had decided that in order to do the job that they were ordered to do, they needed the CF-104. Industrial benefits led to the Starfighter being chosen over the Super Tiger, but both aircraft were intended to do the same job, and were equally capable of doing such. The fact remains that the entire procurement was carried out with the knowledge that the fighter to be purchased was for a very specific job.

This clarity of vision is something that is lacking in the extreme in the case of the F-35 procurement. There is no doubt that the aging CF-18 fleet needs to be replaced as they near the planned retirement date of 2017. The procurement process was at least on the minds of some government officials as early as 1997, a rare instance of foresight. That was the year that Canada first got involved in the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) project by paying $10 million in order to be an Informed Partner during the competition held between Boeing and Lockheed Martin. Following the selection of the F-35, Canada paid another $100 million in 2002 to become a tier-three partner. This allowed Canadian companies to bid on contracts associated with the JSF, where they enjoy, as of 2006 at least, a 42 percent successful bid rate.

One of the issues which has caused a popular uproar has been the increasing cost of the F-35. Originally touted as a $9 billion purchase, estimates of the overall cost have varied widely. The government revised their numbers to include maintenance and personnel costs to about $18 billion, while the Auditor General (AG) has found that the number is closer to $25 billion. The biggest reason for the discrepancy in numbers is the personnel cost calculations. While these calculations can understandably vary depending on what numbers are used for calculation, largely the amount of years the aircraft is to be in operation and the associated maintenance costs, their should at some point be a harmonization of the numbers so that the purchase can be properly and fully explained to voters.

Fiscally, a second problem that has arisen is the changing cost not due to estimates but to cost overruns in the program. Plain and simple, the F-35 is an untested and in development fighter. The acquisition of the Starfighter over the Super Tiger avoided some of these troubles, but the Canadianization of the aircraft in part made up for them. As this is not an option for the Canadian F-35s, the aircraft will not face the Canadianization issue.

By far, the biggest mistake made in the procurement of the F-35 occurred in 2010 when the Conservative government under Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced the purchase of 65 fighters. Many actions have created a sense of mismanagement concerning the Next Generation Fighter procurement. The idea that no competition was held has proven to be the biggest political problem for the gov-
ernment. While the recent reset of the procurement will likely lead to a competition between the primary competitors (Boeing’s Super Hornet being the most likely candidate) it is highly unlikely that the F-35 will lose unless, of course, more weight is given during the competition to industrial benefits and speed of acquisition than to performance. This is what occurred during the acquisition of the Starfighter over the Super Tiger, although a distinguishing element is that the two aircraft were of similar performance capabilities, with the pilots preferring the Starfighter. For the F-35, it is relatively clear that the stealth and software capabilities of the JSF make it much more capable than its fourth generation competitors; what the real distinguishing factor is this: does Canada need these capabilities?

This question is what some authors have suggested is the issue holding up the purchase of the F-35. The high and changing price tag, the sole sourcing of the CF-18 replacement (an act which Canada had done recently with the C-17 Globemaster and the M-777 artillery piece to little complaint) and the politics of not holding an open competition are all secondary to the real issue. The strategic plans of Canada are not clear enough to allow for a proper discussion over what type of aircraft is needed, or, at least, there is no consensus on Canada’s strategic outlook. The issue as it stands is a debate over whether Canada needs a first rate stealth aircraft or not. While it can be debated whether stealth is the defining feature of the F-35, this has been the key point that detractors and proponents alike have used when defining the characteristics of the F-35. In addition, and this is what most detractors argue, stealth is used and has been used primarily on D-Day against an enemy that still has fully operational air defences. The strategic argument hinges primarily on this element.

Those who argue that a first strike capability is not needed illuminate Canada’s past usage of fighter aircraft. There have been two capacities in which Canada has used its aircraft: to intercept Russian bombers over the Arctic—a job previously limited to the Cold War but since 2007 an increasingly common mission—and to provide tactical ground support of NATO led campaigns, such as those in Libya and Kosovo. It can and has been argued that neither of those requires stealth, or, in fact, any of the advantages offered by fifth generation aircraft. The latter mission is being performed more frequently by Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and the former is not an air superiority role but simply one of interception. This has led commentators such as Michael Byers and Stewart Webb to argue for a stop-gap of legacy fighters and a build-up of Canada’s UAV capability until they have outclassed manned fighters altogether. The Tu-95 Bear, the primary bomber of the Russian Air Force, is over 50 years old and can easily be stopped by the current iteration of the CF-18, let alone any four-plus generation fighter that would be in competition to replace the Hornet.

The fallacy of their argument against the need for stealth in sovereignty missions in the North notwithstanding (any actual shooting war with the Russians would see not Bears but four-plus and fifth generation fighters being the opponent), it is an argument that is easy to sell to Canadian voters. Both UAVs and four-plus generation fighters such as the Super Hornet offered by Boeing would be much cheaper than a still-in-development F-35 fleet, and it would allow for a full-fledged competition both in terms of performance and industrial benefits. It would also mean a much different strategic role for the RCAF than a fully capable fifth-generation fighter would allow. This position was also argued by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, who viewed any expeditionary capabilities that Canada can have would pale in comparison with other allies, so money is better spent keeping the CF-18 fleet going and using the rest on UAVs and non-military ways of maintaining security such as increased presence of police and a larger government footprint. Without first-strike and air superiority capability, the RCAF would be relegated to a secondary role in all alliance-based operations, something that, in the view of authors such as Steven Staples, is not a bad thing and is in fact preferred.

On the other side, there is the argument that Canada should play a greater role in international, alliance-orientated missions, and an advanced aircraft would allow its military to do that. Also, if the F-35 were not purchased, then any work with allies would be limited as others adopt the aircraft and interoperability becomes an issue. Finally, Canada cannot rule out a major war occurring—Ukraine comes to mind—and the ability to deploy the RCAF in the air superiority role should not be abandoned. This view would look to the command of the Libyan mission being given to a Canadian general as an example that the ability to deploy a proper air expeditionary force gives Canada a more prominent seat at the table; only through acquiring next generation fighter technology can Canada maintain this position. As mentioned, if there is a real threat in the Arctic from Russian incursions then a fifth-generation fighter is necessary to maintain any chance against a numerically superior air force. There is also the deterrence factor of purchasing the best technology available, as well as the symbolism of having a fighter that is perceived as being the most advanced one available for export. This can be seen as the prestige that is afforded to a country with a strong armed forces when there is a spot at the table open for a middle power. The idea that buying the best available and most technologically advanced aircraft can also be seen, in a similar light to prestige, as enhancing Canadian diplomatic ties to the United States, a way to show that Canada will no longer free ride on American defence spending.

All the above reasons in favour of Canada’s purchase of the F-35 stem from a very specific strategic outlook for what role Canada should play militarily. It accepts that in order to have a higher profile role in the world, Canada should continue to take part in alliance-orientated missions such as Libya, Iraq and Ukraine, and that it would gain even more if it could participate in D-Day strike missions. Additionally, it accepts
that threats to Canada and the North American continent, primarily in the Arctic, are serious and cannot be countered with legacy fighters. Either way it is a clear strategic outlook concerning what kind of fighter Canada needs to replace its CF-18s, which, even to the F-35s harshest critics, need to be replaced very soon.

The strategic priorities of Canada and the lessons that can be learned from the CF-104 as applied to the F-35 is where the two tales meet. To say that there was a major argument in Canada over the acquisition of nuclear weapons for both continental and European defence would be an understatement, so the ‘clear strategic outlook’ may not necessarily be seen as clear as has been described above. But, that is not to say that the mission intended for the Starfighter was not well known or accepted by all policy makers. The election of 1963, and the fall of the Diefenbaker government and implosion of the cabinet earlier in the year was one of the few elections in Canadian history that was centered on defence. The fact that the Liberals under Lester Pearson won the election campaigning on the promise that Canada would fulfill its NATO commitments by accepting nuclear weapons shows that it was at the very least most Canadians accepted nuclear weapons for the Canadian Forces. Whether it was overwhelmingly popular or not, there was still enough support for the nuclear role to justify the acceptance of those weapons, including the tactical warheads for the Starfighter.

The nuclear issue is an extremely important one as it pertains to the Starfighter, but, as many authors have pointed out, the dithering over the nuclear issue was much less important to the military than it was to the civilian. As Raymond Stouffer has pointed out, when the military is left without political guidance, they will act as they see fit. 50 In the case of Stouffer has pointed out, when the military is left without political guidance, the ‘clear strategic outlook’ may not necessarily be seen as clear as has been described above. But, that is not to say that the mission intended for the Starfighter was not well known or accepted by all policy makers. The election of 1963, and the fall of the Diefenbaker government and implosion of the cabinet earlier in the year was one of the few elections in Canadian history that was centered on defence. The fact that the Liberals under Lester Pearson won the election campaigning on the promise that Canada would fulfill its NATO commitments by accepting nuclear weapons shows that it was at the very least most Canadians accepted nuclear weapons for the Canadian Forces. Whether it was overwhelmingly popular or not, there was still enough support for the nuclear role to justify the acceptance of those weapons, including the tactical warheads for the Starfighter.

The clear questions asked during the Sabre replacement procurement—Can the aircraft in the competition perform the mission of nuclear strike and reconnaissance? Which one does it best? Which one out of the best performers benefit Canadian industry best?—contrast strongly with those being asked today. Can the F-35 be used for air defence and denial? Air superiority? Are we planning another Libya or Kosovo? If so, can we use the F-35 for that as well? Do we need a stealth fighter to defend the Arctic? If not, can another aircraft do it? But, can that aircraft also perform a Libyan style intervention with the highest possible survivability? The questions are endless, and they show that when there is no focus, then there are problems with the acquisition, especially the politics behind it.

The CF-104 Starfighter acquisition provides a good comparison with the F-35 for a number of reasons. Primarily, as discussed, it filled a clear strategic need in the RCAF; the government and military accepted a mission and the Starfighter was needed to fill that role. Additionally, the Starfighter purchase was done in a highly polarized political environment, one caused primarily by defence issues. A minister had resigned, American generals denounced Canada publicly, and relations with the United States were souring, all due to nuclear weapons. This created a voting public that was hyper-aware of defence issues, suggesting that there would have been much
more awareness in the general public over the purchase of the CF-104 than there would be over other issues.

Admittedly, there is one problem with the comparison between the F-35 and CF-104 purchases. The CF-104 was bought during the Cold War, where there was one clear enemy. That does not exist today, although Russian bellicosity may change that. Nevertheless, Canada has outlined its primary goals for the RCAF. Number one is to defend Canadian and by extension North American air space. The second is to participate in United Nations or NATO expeditionary missions. While there is no clear enemy that the government can tell the voter that an aircraft is needed to defend against them, there is still a strategy in place.

There is a story at the turn of the century of Lord Fisher as the Royal Navy was building its finest new ship, HMS Dreadnought. When addressing the Committee of Seven about the kind of ship to be constructed, what size of guns it should have, Admiral Fisher responded “Strategy should govern the types of ships to be designed. Ship design, as dictated by strategy, should govern tactics. Tactics should govern details of armament.” When strategy is clear, it is much easier to get the platform that is needed, rather than the other way around. ✷

The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute or its members.
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Dieppe: An Avoidable Disaster

by William L. Buss, CD

The 1942 Canadian-led raid on Dieppe is perhaps one of Canada’s most widely-known military disasters during the Second World War, but was it avoidable? The fateful decision by Combined Operations Headquarters (COHQ) Commander, Lord Louis Mountbatten, to commit Canadian troops to a daylight, full-frontal raid on a well-fortified position has garnered criticism from many sources; military and civilian tacticians and scholars continually question whether or not the operation was authorized, and why the operation was not cancelled when many red flags were seen throughout the planning process. Many factors contribute to the dismal failure of this operation, including political and strategic pressure, a lack of air and fire support, a failure to maintain the necessary element of surprise, and poor planning. By outlining the results of the raid, as well as the precursors, this article will show that poor planning, a poor approval process and pressure from the Canadian, Russian and United States (US) governments were the main factors for the failure at Dieppe. The tactical issues during the execution phase of the raid were apparent to military planners before the raid took place and, at all phases of the raid, from planning to execution, there was ample opportunity to cancel the venture, meaning Dieppe was an avoidable disaster.

The amphibious raid on Dieppe, codenamed Operation Jubilee, was planned as a series of five attacks on a 10-mile frontage of the fortified beach and was launched on 19 August, 1942. The Canadian-led operation saw a force of close to 6,100 soldiers, of whom 4,963 were Canadian and 1,075 were British, launched into a pre-dawn action that started with the British No. 4 Commando (4 CDO) on Orange Beach I and II on time and destroying the Verengeville battery which consisted of six, 5.9-inch guns. The remaining two flank objectives, with the RRC under Lieutenant-Colonel D.E. Catto, and the South Saskatchewan Regiment securing a beachhead on Green Beach at Pourville (with the Queen’s Own Cameron Highlanders of Canada following on after the beachhead was established), the Royal Regiment of Canada (RRC) east of Dieppe at Puys (Blue Beach), and the British 3 CDO on the far-east flank at Yellow Beach I and II. The plan for the frontal assault was to have the Royal Hamilton Light Infantry (RHLI) on White Beach and the Essex and Kent Scottish Regiment (E&K Scots) on Red Beach, with nine tanks in support of the first wave and Les Fusiliers Mont Royal acting as a rearguard upon the withdrawal. The map at Fig. 1 shows the insertion plan.

The execution of the operation met with obstacles before the first group landed on the beach: 3 CDO encountered a small German naval convoy en route to their objective, and the resultant interplay of gunfire on the water served to eliminate any element of surprise they may have had. Only seven out of 35 landing craft made it to Yellow Beach, and the lateness of their arrival saw the commandos in full view of the defenders, coming under effective fire immediately. After a five hour battle, the coastal gun battery which 3 CDO strove to destroy was only partially neutralized and the remaining men of the group finally surrendered. This is in stark contrast to the 4 CDO group, who achieved the only total success of the raid, landing at Orange Beach I and II on time and destroying the Verengeville battery which consisted of six, 5.9-inch guns.

The remaining two flank objectives, with the RRC under Lieutenant-Colonel D.E. Catto, and the South Saskatchewan Regiment under Lieutenant-Colonel C.C.I. Merritt, did not enjoy the success that 4 CDO had. The RRC objective at Blue beach was of great tactical importance, as the East headland enjoyed a commanding view of the beachfront with guns in enfilade. Even if the element of surprise was riding fully with the attackers, “It would have been difficult to discover anywhere on the coast of Europe a less favourable area for an assault landing.” With three platoons of the Black Watch attached, the RRC made their assault landing late, and arrived in full view of alert German defenders. The resulting toll on the RRC group saw only two officers and 65 men return to England. The South Saskatchewan fared better on Green Beach than did their counterparts at Puys; despite navigation errors which landed them west of the estuary at Pourville, the Saskatche-
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The frontal assault at White Beach and Red Beach met with dismal failure; the RHLI, under Lieutenant-Colonel R.R. Labatt, landed without their tank support from the Calgary Highlanders, and D Company was decimated almost immediately. Three landing craft of the Calgary Highlanders landed late and well west of their intended objective and by the time they arrived to support the RHLI, the initiative and the impetus for battle had already been lost, with the assaulting infantry suffering from massive casualties and a crippling morale-effect. The E&K Scots, under Lieutenant-Colonel F.K. Jasperson, had an easy landing at Red Beach, but soon suffered heavily from the effects of withering enfilade fire from the headland features. They were unable to breach the seawall and by 0545 hrs, one-third of the battalion had already been lost.

Of the 4,000 Canadians who made the landing, close to 3,367 were killed, wounded or captured, 106 Allied aircraft had been lost, and the navy lost one destroyer, five tank landing craft, and 28 other craft. In the words of one German gun commander, "We felt very sorry for the enemy because he had no chance. He was as a mouse going into a trap."11

The factors leading up to the failed raid on Dieppe can be seen in 1941, when the Canadian Prime Minister, Mackenzie-King, was under considerable military and political pressure to insist that Canadian troops be put into action; defence officials were growing restless as Canadian soldiers languished in England and politicians needed something to show for the new revitalized recruiting campaign that had been enacted back in Canada. Adding to this was pressure from the United States (US) in the spring of 1942 due to a deadlock between the US and Great Britain over Operation Sledgehammer, a US-proposed cross-channel invasion for 1943, and pressure from the Russians, who were embattled on the eastern front against Hitler’s forces and wanted the Western Allies to open a second front; all of these pressures placed an impetus on the Dieppe proposal, and it is easily seen how this pressure contributed to the desire for a Dieppe raid to be launched. In addition to the pressure from the various governments on a decisive Allied action, Canadian commanders were struggling with both the Canadian government and British military authorities for more autonomy and unity of Canadian forces in England; General Andrew McNaughton and Lieutenant-General Harry Crerar, two of the most senior Canadian commanders on the ground, pushed for Canadian autonomy, both from government decision-making processes and from British Home Forces authority. Ottawa finally granted McNaughton the freedom to commit his forces to large-scale raids, the British Army conceded that Canadian commanders should have full authority over raids involving Canadian troops, and greater mounting authority was granted to Mountbatten. The strategic aim of the Canadian government in having their troops be earmarked for an eventual push through North-west Europe was being met with the operational aim of McNaughton to gain battle-experience for his troops, together with the growing political pressure to see Canadians cease their idleness and commit to action; to this purpose, the 2nd Canadian Infantry Division (2 CID) under Major-General “Ham” Roberts was committed to the raid. All of these factors contributed to the desire and impetus for a headline-grabbing frontal-assault, with the desire to make a public impact seemingly outweighing the importance of sound tactics.

With pressure mounting from all sides, military planners began to create an outline for a dramatic raid on Dieppe in the spring of 1942; Operation Rutter was the original codename and was to be a frontal attack launched on 05 July 1942, 30 minutes after flank attacks had landed at the east and west headlands around Dieppe. Airborne forces were to be used in conjunction with the flank attacks and a heavy air bombardment was to be the precursor to the raid. The decision to launch a frontal attack was made by Bernard Montgomery, then a Lieutenant-General under the commander of Home Forces, Sir Bernard Paget; emphasis was placed on the idea that the key to success was the deployment of Canadian tanks, the element of surprise and an accurate and heavy fighter-bomber attack prior to the landings; almost immediately, Bomber Command refused to commit heavy bombers to a daylight raid and the fear of the bombers being too inaccurate in the dark negated any argument for their use in a pre-dawn action. With the vital bomber support out of the equation, planners turned to the Navy for support, with the mindset being that fire support from naval guns was vital, now that there would be no heavy air support. The British Admiralty was skeptical of the value of naval gunfire and could not be persuaded to expose a capital ship for the purposes of the raid. With no vital heavy support from either the Navy or Bomber Command, the planning for Rutter went forward until its cancellation on 07 July, due to bad weather.

Unfortunately, the impetus for a raid on Dieppe did not end there and renewed pressure from McNaughton, Crerar and Mountbatten on Home Forces Command enabled the revival of a raid on Dieppe, which became known as Operation Jubilee. Once again, there was to be no heavy air or naval gun support, and the tides scheduled for August (when Jubilee was to be launched), dictated that troops would be ashore longer than they would have been in Operation Rutter. Roberts was persuaded by McNaughton and Crerar to go along with the raid revival on the grounds that improvements would be made to the original raid plan, but this did not happen; heavy fire support was never added to the plan and the assaulting force would be forced to land 30 minutes after the flank forces due to a lack of maneuver-room at sea, thus negating the necessary element of surprise for the main assault force. Another
difficulty in the planning process was the fact that there were too many commanders and elements involved: McNaughton delegated responsibility to Crerar (commander of the Canadian Corps), who then delegated authority to Roberts, who had no combat experience commanding at a divisional level; in addition to the three Canadian commanders involved, COHQ was responsible for oversight and for fulfilling an advisory role to the Canadians, and all of the element commanders within COHQ had their own involvement as well. In total, those involved in overall planning were the three Canadian commanders, COHQ, Air Force Command, Home Forces staff, and South-East Command. This multitude of high-level commanders with headquarters separated by large distances equated to a recipe for disaster, and ended up with senior Canadian Commanders being given a “ready-made plan for the operation, to which they had no opportunity of contributing.” Before Jubilee was launched, it is apparent that military planners were aware that there would be no vital heavy support from the air or the Navy, the element of surprise would be lost for the attacking force, and environmental conditions would force troops to be on shore longer than desired. Despite all these red-flags in the planning process, commanders were desperate enough for action that the plan was pushed forward. In the words of the 4 CDO commander, Lord Lovat, “only a foolhardy commander launches a frontal attack with untried troops, unsupported, in daylight against veterans . . . dug in and prepared behind concrete . . . It was a bad plan and had no chance of success.”

So why then was this faulty plan approved? In hindsight, after the raid, Mountbatten himself admitted that he had no formal authority to proceed with the raid after the cancellation of Rutter, except on the grounds that a new request for authorization be made to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In this case it appears that silence on the part of the Joint Chiefs indicated assent, and a failure at the senior command levels to properly scrutinize and criticize the plan led to an absence of opposition from the Joint Chiefs. Any responsibility for cancelling the raid ultimately resided with the Canadians, especially Roberts, but pressure from Crerar and McNaughton on Roberts virtually negated any chance of him cancelling the operation that so many desired; it would have been unthinkable for any Canadian commander to risk the ire of his government, his officers and his men by cancelling the operation, which was perhaps a major contributor for the acquiescence of Roberts during this phase of planning. Add to this the fact that Crerar and McNaughton worked with Mountbatten to gain COHQ additional launch authority and to keep as many organizations and individuals in the dark about Jubilee, and a dubious picture emerges as to the formal process of approval that was undertaken. An agreement reached on 27 July, allowed Mountbatten to maneuver between the lines of a new procedure for mounting and launching raids, effectively executing a bureaucratic dodge without the Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee having to scrutinize the operation further. The end result of all this bureaucratic maneuvering meant that “Mountbatten revived the operation without the authorization of the British Chiefs of Staff, the result being an implementation of a plan that would either have been rejected or sent back for improvements.”

Difficulties during training for Operation Rutter brought to light many tactical issues to commanders which were ignored in favour of launching the raid; exercise Yukon I and II were the official rehearsals for Rutter and they were deemed failures by the higher echelon, especially Yukon I. It was apparent that there would be extreme difficulties in navigation and in the coordination of movement and timings of the landing craft, yet no move to increase training or call off the operation was ever made. Further compounding issues of navigation and coordination was the decision to compensate for potential operational security (OPSEC) breaches by employing dispersion; launching the various landing craft at different times from different locations in order to avoid early detection. By the time Rutter was cancelled, no further efforts were made to increase training or rehearsals. With the revival of the operation in Jubilee, fears of OPSEC breaches led COHQ to ground any further training, which proved to be a
tragic mistake, as an operation of this scope and size would have required extremely well-trained troops and extremely well-rehearsed coordination in both movement to and actions on the objective.

Aside from the lack of training, lack of coordination and lack of heavy air and naval gun support, there were tactical factors both enroute to the objective and during the landings which contributed to the ultimate failure of Operation Jubilee. A collision by 3 CDO with a German naval convoy while en-route effectively negated any chance of surprise the force may have had. This should have been foreseen in planning as enemy convoys were constantly patrolling the coasts due to Dieppe being a frequently used terminus for the Germans. Two warnings of the convoy’s likely route were sent shortly after the departure from England but it was impossible to re-route the high number of landing craft in order to avoid contact. The operation could have, and should have, been called off then, but the decision to continue ultimately fell to Roberts, who was well committed by this point. Mistiming and subsequently ignored in favour of maintaining the element of surprise, and yet mission-specific rehearsals showed that navigation and coordination would be extremely difficult and would likely negate the ability to concentrate in force, on time, on the objective. A faulty approval process allowed Mountbatten to sidestep some of the formal requirements for approval, and the raid was launched without the necessary oversight, criticism and review that should have happened. Finally, when the element of surprise was lost en-route to Dieppe, with the German naval convoy encounter, Roberts could have and should have called off the operation, but the raid went forward, despite the force having lost any small advantage they might have held with surprise. All these factors show that the raid on Dieppe was an avoidable disaster.

The brief battle at sea that occurred when 3 CDO encountered the German convoy caused the local German commander to countermand the daily stand-down order at dawn, which meant that the attacking force landed in front of an alert and well-prepared defensive position. What is important here is that all of the tactical issues on the ground should have been addressed during the planning phase and they were either not foreseen or completely ignored by planners in their zeal to get forces committed to battle.

No single factor was responsible for the failure at Dieppe; political pressure forced the Allies to act in order to show their commitment to a second front and to get inactive troops into combat. This pressure placed an impetus to raid at all costs, with senior military commanders crafting a disastrous plan that may not have been approved otherwise. The decision to launch a raid in broad daylight against well-prepared and veteran forces, without heavy bomber or naval gun support was a result of extremely poor planning and negligence on the part of senior military commanders. These red flags were identified and subsequently ignored in favour of maintaining the element of surprise, and yet mission-specific rehearsals showed that navigation and coordination would be extremely difficult.

Notes

15. Ibid: 252.
30. Ibid: 13-14
32. Ibid: 15.
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The need for capability-based planning for Canada’s future submarines

by Rob Burroughs, GSPIA

In an ideal world, this article would be unnecessary as military resources and technological platforms, including submarines, would be infinitely at our Navy’s disposal. However, the reality of Canada’s defence context is such that the Navy must make choices based on fiscal and resource restraints. Capability-based planning helps the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) as a whole develop “a rich understanding of what will need to be achieved in the future and the choices available to achieve that end” (MacDonald, 2001). In the case of submarines, the Canadian Navy (RCN) must change the rationale behind its choice to maintain that capability or risk losing it all together.

This necessity to articulate the choice to defend submarines is precipitated by three factors: the problematic history of our current submarines, the CAF’s increased adoption of capability-based planning, and the implementation of the new challenge system for defence procurement combined with the refocus of policy-based capability investment, sustainment, and divestment. This article will explore why and, briefly, how the case can be built, using capability-based planning, that all things being equal submarines are an essential capability for the CAF.

Canada’s latest class of submarines is no stranger to the delays, controversies, and criticisms of defence procurement in this country; the ones that surround both the acquisition and the operational history of the Victoria-class submarines have prompted castigators to argue that the Canadian government should discard the current fleet. Although the debate over submarines in this country has been vocally dominated by those that disapprove of our submarine force, the discussion is often narrow and limited scope.

To be clear, the purpose of this article is not to question the strategic value of submarines. The RCN has already expressed the importance they place on the platform and their desire to maintain that capability. This has been continually articulated in various statements of requirements and in institutional documents such as Leadmark or Horizon 2050. Naval theory even supports the value of submarines as a strategic asset—they are a game changer or a force multiplier. If Canadian defence policy dictated that the RCN needed to possess within its arsenal a force multiplier, then the essential capability case of submarines would build itself.

However, the strategic asset rationale, though militarily irrefutable, may not be adequate enough to justify acquisition under the new guidelines of the Defence Procurement Strategy (DPS). Paul Mitchell may not be wrong when he says that those, like me, who “rely on the ‘capability argument’ avoid the question of what, as a country, we are willing to fight for.” But defence policy is determined by the Government of Canada and this government has determined that the CAF and DND shall employ the ‘capability argument’ to “analyse, assess, and integrate future capability requirements in order to be prepared for success in the future operational environment.” (DND, 2014). As a result, the Department of National Defence (DND) Challenge Function of High Level Mandatory Requirements will force the Navy to justify their desire for all new platforms, such as the upcoming single-hull Canadian Surface Combatant promised in the Canada First Defence Strategy (CFDS), based on policy. In other words, in the case of submarines, the RCN must explain what does or can a submarine provide, based on policy requirements, that it sees nothing else (such as an unmanned submersible) performing in the future.

This could prove particularly problematic for submarines, especially on the budgetary front: current budgets and planning are struggling with the naval procurement projects already in the works. Furthermore, bringing the Victoria class online has proven costly, conforming to the media perspective that has fed public perception that submarines are expensive. The “well established narrative of waste and dysfunction”, as Mitchell describes, will make it difficult to justify spending a significant amount of money on a platform that Canadians see as a failure. This negative feeling is also prevalent in the political class, with Cabinet documents from the post-War era indicating that Canada’s possession of submarines would be “politically and morally unacceptable” (NAC, 2014)—even as the Chretien government was deliberating the purchase of the Upholders, its foreign minister suggested that submarines were “un-Canadian” (Mitchell, 2013). If submarines are to be considered a strategic asset therefore, then their role within the Navy must be justified using an adequate strategic planning process.

Capability-Based Planning

Traditional, Cold War-era scenario-point or threat-based planning tended to perpetuate the status quo by essentially putting weapon systems against specific adversaries or threats. As such, when one weapon system neared the end of its service life, it was “inevitably replaced by a newer version of the same platform” (Hartfiel, 2008), as Campbell and Bargelay
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note about the US Air Force's experience with the AWACS.

However the end of the Cold War and its existential threats signalled a shift in thinking among militaries to a new type of strategic planning: capability-based planning (CBP). CBP was developed in the late 1990s as a “response to the proliferation of security threats in the post-Cold War world” (Hartfiel, 2008:25), which were no longer as predictable (MacDonald, 2001). Therefore, militaries, particularly superpowers like the US, needed a “more flexible force development method” that could cope with a more “volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous” strategic environment.

Bland and Maloney’s definition of CBP, which is “a method of planning [which] focuses on specific and related sets of equipment, people, infrastructure, and info systems which produce defence capabilities to meet defence policy goals as defined by governments” (46-7, as found in Hartfiel, 2008:25), highlights two important components of CBP: firstly, that CBP stresses the need for and relies on clear, well-articulated policy. The role of policy, which is the purview and responsibility of the political executive to establish, in defence planning is integral to the civil-military structure in Canada. The second key observation from Bland and Maloney’s definition is the emphasis on capability development. By shifting the “central focus of attention on capabilities” rather than platforms (from Hartfiel, 2008), defence planners divorce themselves from specific platforms and instead on “the ability to achieve a desired end result” (MacDonald, 2001).

CBP was formally adopted by the CAF in 2000, but it did not take hold until 2005 with the Defence Capability Plan to complement the CFDS. Today, the CAF utilises CBP to “establish the context and choice” vis-à-vis long-term strategic investment decisions (DND, 2014). The CBP process is a three-year cycle, divided into three main phases to answer these questions:

- What do we think we will need to do?
- How well do we think we can do it now?
- What do we need to change to perform better? (DND, 2014)

A recent example of CBP in action was the Chief of Force Development’s (CFD) Missions Needs Analysis to sustain the CAF fighter capability. This MNA determined that not only was fighter capability essential to the CAF’s three roles and six missions, but that manned fighter aircraft were a crucial component to that capability. There is no reason why the same cannot be done for submarine capabilities.

The new Defence Acquisition Guide, launched in early 2014, indicates that the RCN has not yet prioritised a Victoria class successor. This leaves open the possibility that the advancements of naval technology in the next 20-30 years may render the purchase of submarines futile. In that regard, the RCN’s challenge based on the DPSS’s guidelines would be to make an argument now for a technological capacity we cannot foresee in the future. The emphasis on value for money when expending public funds means that simply identifying a platform’s sufficiency is no longer adequate in terms of defence investment and acquisition. In other words, the CAF must now be able to refute the notion that another platform can perform the same capability for cheaper.

Such a premise warrants asking whether the case can be built that having a submarine capability is essential for the CAF to help the government realise its policy expectations. To fully answer this question also includes discussions on the merits of nuclear- versus conventionally-propelled submarines, coastal littoral deployments (Halifax, Esquimalt, or Nanisivik), and the number of submarines in the fleet. However, for spacing reasons, this article will not deal with those three side discussions in depth and focus instead on evaluating whether Canadian submarines can help the government achieve its defence policy.

**Building the Case**

In theory, the answer is yes. The CAF fighter capability review was a successful example. The new procurement of heavy transport planes for the CAF as dictated under the CFDS was also conducted using CBP and had to meet the challenge function requirements. Like those two capabilities, many people have argued that submarines are important for Canada. I myself have argued that we need to be more ambitious with our submarine force. Canada is, after all, part of the modern international system that is built on the global economy, which depends on access to the maritime commons — the principle guarantors of which are navies.

Central to the RCN’s doctrine is the idea that “security in Canada ultimately begins with stability abroad.” The CFDS requires the Navy to possess capabilities to address security concerns such as, “over-fishing, organised crime, drug- and people-smuggling, and environmental degradation.” Although Canadian frigates, and other surface vessels, have and continue to perform these tasks to great success, an argument to sustain submarine capability would point to the unique contributions that the Dutch Walrus-class submarine HNLMS Zeeleeuw made in NATO’s 2012 anti-piracy mission off the coast of Somalia; or to HMCS Victoria’s successful participation in 2013’s Operation CARIBBE; or the inclusion of German submarine U33 under the tactical leadership of Standing NATO Maritime Group Two to increase “maritime situational awareness through covert intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.”

In order to maintain that stability abroad, Canada arguably needs to “continue to be a credible player on the world stage.” As I have argued in another paper, if “it is in Canada’s best strategic interest to remain a reliable partner in the defence of the continent”, then submarines could arguably be one of the key pieces of Canada’s defence infrastructure that enables that. For example, possession alone admitted and continues to admit Canada to a group of states, importantly including the United States, “participating in regulated and highly classified submarine waterspace management and intelligence-gathering schemes”. Further, once the Canadian
government signalled its intentions to re-establish a west coast submarine fleet with the Victoria class, the United States signed a Waterspace Management Agreement with Canada. On the other coast, all allied submarine transits, deployments, and activities in the Arctic and western Atlantic are registered with the Atlantic Submarine Operating Authority in Halifax.

Submarines also provide the government with a means by which it can ensure “key aspects of our equipment and doctrine are compatible” with the US. Canadian submarines used to be the primary training tool for the US Navy in anti-submarine and underwater warfare; achieving steady state with the Victoria class could make the RCN an even more attractive partner for the US considering the number of Pacific and Asian nations procuring submarines. Canada’s relationship with the US is particular important in this regard because in order to lead a “specific component of a multinational operation, such as a naval task group”, especially one that involves American naval assets, Canada’s partners might need to be reassured that Canada maintains full competencies across the entire water column. Submarines also provide the government the ability to “make a meaningful contribution across the full spectrum of international operations” because the mere presence of submarines can “alter decision-making in an entire theatre of operations” as they bring to the task group “unrivalled stealth, persistence, and lethality”.

Domestically, the RCN must also be able to “[p]rovide surveillance of the Canadian territory and […] maritime approaches”, while possessing the ability to “deter threats to our security before they reach our shores”. Perhaps the most famous example of a Canadian submarine contributing to this was during Operation AMBUSCADE, when HMCS Ojibwa successfully disrupted illegal fishing activities by American trawlers on the Canadian side of the Hague Line. In order to “help exercise Canada’s sovereignty”, Canada must be able to gain awareness of what happens within our territory, deter any potential threats, and respond to them if needed. Submarines alone can do all three solitarily: no other naval platform “has the ability to covertly track, identify, and monitor vessels in the bad weather conditions that occur frequently off [Canadian] coasts,” making submarines unparalleled in the realm of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. HMCS Ojibwa’s experience on fishery patrols and HMCS Victoria’s sejour in the Caribbean have suggested that Canadian submarines can play a varied role in the protection of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. In both of these cases, a covert surveillance capacity was crucial to the success of the mission. The single naval unit of a submarine also has both the potential and the capacity to deter a significantly more populous or overwhelming enemy—just the suggestion that an Oberon-class submarine would be deployed was enough to convince the Spanish navy to return to port; and we know that submarines, when used appropriately, can be a “most useful and deadly asset”.

One could even expand this concept and take it further, from a patrol situation to a warfare environment, and analyse the lessons from Argentina’s nightmarish experience with submarines during the Falklands War, which Paul Mitchell describes in great detail. Perhaps with knowledge of this episode in mind, the language of the CFDS suggests that Canada’s navy should be one of sea control, a role the RCN is certainly keen to play, according to institutional documents. As such, the RCN must be able to control its waters and do with them what the government chooses, which is more than simply denying a foreign entity from using the waters. This desire has implications: strictly adhering to the requirements of the CFDS, in particular the section on delivering excellence at home, the RCN must possess the capabilities that allow awareness, presence, and control of its maritime domain. If sea power therefore is a fundamental component of the defence of Canadian territory, then the case could be made that submarines, being an indispensable constituent of the sea power paradigm, are an essential capability for the Canadian Navy.

Where the submarine argument is arguably at its weakest is where applied to the government's Arctic ambitions. The CFDS places its strongest emphasis (on the sovereignty front) on the “capacity to exercise control and defence” Canada’s claims in the Arctic. In this aspect, building the case for submarines could struggle for two reasons. Firstly, the government has clearly indicated that they want the military to “play an increasingly vital role in demonstrating a visible Canadian presence” in the Arctic. Taken at a literal sense, submarines cannot accomplish this task. Granted, no unit alone can perform all the tasks required for sovereignty protection. At times one might need covert surveillance (the Australian submarines played an instrumental role in intelligence gathering on regional conflict during the 1970s and 1980s), but other times, as the government has established, one needs presence. Although the Notice of Intention to deploy a submarine off the Atlantic coast worked in Canada’s favour in 1995 to settle the Turbot Crisis, recent conflicts in the South China Sea indicate that navies also need to be able to show physical presence in order to assert sovereignty. Secondly, without air independent propulsion (AIP) technology, Canada’s conventional Victoria-class submarines are not suitable “for under-ice operations in the high Arctic” until the ocean becomes ice-free year-round. These concerns should be ideally addressed in the government’s new defence policy.

**Conclusion**

The capability provided by submarines is essential to meet the Canadian government’s defence policy expectations. It is an essential capability in the government’s defence diplomacy ‘toolbox’. This is not simply an academic exercise; because the RCN and the government by extension have not conditioned Canadians to the need for submarines. Add to this the lack of any public education effort to counter the negative media spin on the unfortunate history of the Victoria-class submarines. Frankly, it is hard to blame them: the RCN has very limited publicly available documentation of submarine
operations over the past decade. Part of that is understandably the nature of the work submarines do, but that only makes the RCN’s job harder, not impossible. This will be a mighty challenge but a necessary one if the RCN and the CAF intend on maintaining submarine capability.

Ultimately, the CAF will have to convince the Canadian public, to whom Parliament (and therefore Cabinet) is beholden. The Canadian population is not averse to spending on defence when it feels the cost is justified. The high support for the mission in Afghanistan during its peak and now for Canada’s efforts to combat the Daesh in Iraq is evidence enough. Canadians need to be shown that submarines are a necessary expenditure. Because the strategic, military argument does not appear to have made any headway in changing the public perception away from the idea that submarines are either ‘lemons’ or are “un-Canadian”, the CAF needs a different tactic. Perhaps it has already embraced CBP for submarines, behind the scenes. It is time they did so publicly.

*The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute or its members.*

### Book Review “Strategy: A History” by Sir Lawrence Freedman, PhD

*reviewed by Vincent J. Curtis*

Strategic: A History by Lawrence Freedman, Oxford University Press, is a tour de force of erudition and a powerful demonstration of his breadth of knowledge and reading.

Dr. Freedman has a terrific ability to summarize clearly and accurately the main lines of thought of other theorists. I’m glad it was recommended to me by someone whose opinion I hold in high regard. If he had not, I would likely have tossed Lawrence’s book aside after the first chapter and most certainly by the end of the first section. I would have missed much of the book.

As a history, it is lacking in the philosophy department. It is more of a survey of the uses of a word, accounted for in chronological order of occurrence. Dr. Freedman never gives a proper definition of strategy (more on that later), and most of the uses he accounts for are not strategies as a military man would conceive them. Since he does not hold to an essential meaning or definition of strategy, he frequently lapses into holding that a strategic end and the tactics to get to it are strategy. If you put an end and the tactics to gain it together into a whole, then that whole might be a strategy, but not strategy as such.

In the course of his critique of strategies found in business, and their alleged derivation from Clausewitz, Jomini, or Sun Tzu, he points out the fallaciousness of trying to correlate business practices with military strategy. I agree with that assessment. However, he didn't apply that observation to his own work! The consequence then is a very detailed philology of a term, and the term was not always used by those allegedly employing strategy. Consequently, somewhere, in the back of his mind, is a sense of what strategy is; but Freedman never really gives it. He eliminated material from consideration on the basis of this vague notion of what strategy is, and so this work must be what he thinks strategy is. But the book is supposed to be a history of a thing, not an account of what the thing is.

A strategy is a plan for the attainment of an object. Since strategy is a kind of plan, then the thing strategizing must be

---

**Notes**
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capable of conceptual thought. Moreover, since the plan is for the attainment of an object, the attainment of that object constitutes the end of the strategy. It must be a terminal end, because the attainment of it occurs at a moment in time. A strategy cannot be used to attain a normative end because a normative end is not attainable at one moment in time. A military strategy is a plan for the attainment of a military object, and is quintessentially an example of strategy as such.

Consequently, the effort to attain normative ends, such as enduring success in business, cannot have a strategy. A strategy can be used to get to a certain point of success, and from one point of success to another point of success, each point being a terminal end. But the normative end of enduring success is not attainable by a strategy.

This same analysis applies to political normative ends, the ends of the state. The end conceived of by Marx and Engels was not a terminal end, and so the so-called strategy to attain it was a strategic end combined with tactics to get there. They climbed a hill to reach the edge of the plateau at the top. But being on the plateau is a normative end. Getting to the edge was a strategic end, and revolution was the tactic to get there. The munificence of the plateau, and the matter of staying on it, Marx and Engels apparently never really contemplated—like Moses leading the Israelites to the promised land, he had no idea what to do once they got there and he died just before they got there.

Because strategy requires in the strategist the power of conceptual thought, Freedman's account of the origins of strategy is unnecessary bunkum. There was no need to impute strategic thinking to chimps. They are not capable of conceptual thought; only man is. What behaviorologists do is anthropomorphize apes by imputing strategic thinking to them to account for observed behavior. It may help man to understand apes, but it goes too far to impute to them a power they lack, the power of conceptual thought. In addition, the accounts of the strategy to defeat God's will (which also occurs in the first section) are not history because we have no evidence of it occurring as a matter of historical fact.

The book provided ample evidence that economics and sociology remain subject matters and not sciences.

All that said, I am glad to have read the entire book. It informed me on matters I had vague knowledge about, and this work concisely filled me in on the important outlines. The only section of the book directly useful to the military man is the section on military strategy.

Let me now take up the matter of Freedman offering an alleged definition of strategy, though not a proper one.

I observed that Freedman never gave a definition of what strategy was, and as a result he wandered all over the place in his history of it. On page 607 of his book, he states that he offered "the art of creating power" as his "short definition", though he never offers another.

A criticism I made of his work was that, as a history, it was weak in the philosophy department. His proffered "short definition" of strategy is another example of that weakness. The problem with that formulation is that it fails the basic test of a definition. It cannot be a definition. A statement of definition must be convertible. A statement of definition has to say the same thing when the terms are reversed in order.

But: "Strategy is the art of creating power" and "The art of creating power is strategy" do not say the same thing, and therefore cannot be a definition. Disregarding the obscurity of the phrase "creating power," the first statement has the form of a definition, but the second statement seems to be the assignment of a handy name-word to substitute for a longer formulation. The obscure expression, 'creating power' is not the essence of strategy - it is not what strategy is essentially about - but creating power may be an accidental consequence of it, sometimes. A real definition is founded upon the essence of the thing being defined, and is a phrase which contains a genus and a differentia. Freedman's formulation would hold that the genus of strategy is art and 'creating power' is its differentia, or essence.

In contrast, consider the following: "A strategy is a plan for the attainment of an object," and "A plan for the attainment of an object is a strategy." These statements are convertible, for they say the same thing forwards and backwards. The formulation passes a basic test of a definition, with 'plan' being the genus and 'for the attainment of an object' being the differentia of strategy, that which differentiates it from all other kinds of plans. In addition, 'for the attainment of an object' seems to be the essence of strategy, while the creation of power is simply too obscure to say that it is the essence of anything. The terms of a definition must be better known than the thing being defined, for the less well-known is defined in terms of things better-known. The first sentence in Freedman's book is: "Everyone needs a strategy." Substituting his proffered definition, the sentence reads: "Everyone needs an art of creating power," which makes no sense, and is certainly a more obscure sentence than the first.

Because Freedman founded his idea of what strategy was upon an obscure and accidental attribute (creating power), and that he admitted does not always adhere to it (cf pg 608), his history consists of accounts of things unrelated to each other in their essences. Freedman picks among random things and holds them before the reader as examples of strategy. Collectively, these things show no development in strategy through historical experience, as one might expect to observe historical development in a history of the fine art of painting, for example. This is why the book as a whole is so unfocussed.

I cannot take away from the erudition of Dr. Freedman, or that demonstrated in his book, but the philosophical failings result in a work that does not hold together.

The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute or its members.