

An Open Letter to Ottawa on National Defense

Dear political leaders and all with such aspirations,

In January of this year, Prime Minister Mark Carney spoke of the end of the era of the rules-based international order which emerged following WWII in his speech at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. He stressed the need to reevaluate Canada's position in the changing world and our relationship with great world powers, most notably the United States. Upon his return to Canada, the Prime Minister delivered another speech in which he denounced the rise of nationalism and asserted Canada's devotion to multicultural pluralism.

That same month saw calls for the Kingdom of Denmark to cede Greenland to the United States from President Donald Trump, who has repeatedly expressed a desire to absorb Canada into the Union as well. Amid such posturing from the United States, it was reported in the media that the Canadian Armed Forces had modeled a hypothetical American invasion of Canada. The model postulated that Canada would be overcome by American forces militarily within less than a week. It was reported that military leaders anticipated Canada engaging in unconventional warfare in such a situation, modeled on tactics used by Islamist guerrilla fighters in Afghanistan during the 1979-1989 Soviet-Afghan War and the 2001-2021 War in Afghanistan.

While this scenario may be highly unlikely to play out in the immediate future, the fact that the Canadian military saw fit to run such a simulation highlights Canada's inability to continue to rely on the United States for defense and a need to reevaluate our security policy. In doing so, we must consider what disposition among the Canadian public would best lend itself to Canada's security needs. One does not need to be an authority on military matters to see a major omission in the envisioned guerrilla warfare tactics suggested by Canadian military leaders in their theoretical model of a US invasion. This oversight is indicative of a broader problem with our approach to national defense.

The Afghans who fought against first the Soviet then later American-led invasions of the country were deeply religious Islamic fundamentalists. Even if one does not subscribe to the same worldview, it is undeniable that their decades-long struggle against foes with far superior military means at their disposal would not have been possible without an unwavering sense of conviction. A galvanizing force capable of motivating one to take such drastic actions is notably absent in Canadian society.

There is a significant contradiction between the message Prime Minister Carney expressed in Davos and the one he espoused upon his return to Canada. His first speech warned of the end of the rules-based international order and the need for new foreign policy. However, his follow-up speech expressed a continued devotion to the social policies of that era which, as he stated, is now at an end. Much like how the past few years have exposed the faults in the international order of recent decades, the values Canada embraced during this era have likewise shown their failings domestically.

The definition of nation is a body of people united by common descent, history, culture, and language, inhabiting a particular area or territory. Thus, the creed of multiculturalism is by definition anti-national. In 2015, former prime minister Justin Trudeau declared Canada a post-national country with no core

identity. This conception of Canada was not in place at the founding of our country but adopted in the era of the rules-based international order. Just as that order can no longer be relied on, this understanding of Canada as a post-national country is no longer sufficient in our changing world, particularly in regard to national security.

The root-word of “diversity” is “divide”. Canada’s social policies of the past few decades have resulted in a deeply divided country which fewer and fewer people feel at home in. Canadian politics are now rife with foreign interference on behalf of the national interests of foreign countries. Ethnic-based blocs now exert substantial undue influence on the political process in Canada. Interethnic conflicts from around the world have been carried over into Canada by those arriving from the countries where such conflicts originate. The denunciation of Canadian history through the lens of the values of the present era has killed Canadians’ sense of national pride by fostering a culture of debilitating and perpetual guilt.

This has resulted in a widespread sense of disaffection and demoralization among the Canadian public, in particular among the young. A survey conducted by the Angus Reid Institute in 2024 found that only 34% of Canadians felt “very proud” to be Canadian, down from 78% in 1985. The same survey found that only 49% of Canadians felt a deep emotional attachment to Canada, down from 65% in 1991. Those in younger age brackets were less likely to say that they felt an attachment to Canada, with only 39% of males and 26% of females ages 18-34 saying they felt so.

It was also found in this research that new arrivals in Canada and younger Canadians had a more transactional attachment to Canada. Their attachment to the country was contingent on Canada providing them a high standard of living rather than rooted in a sense of belonging. The 2025 World Happiness Report conducted by Gallup found a sharp decline in life satisfaction among young adults in Canada, suggesting that Canada is not fulfilling the transactional requirements their sense of attachment to the country is predicated on.

Polls conducted by Ipsos in 2024 and 2025 found that 78% of younger adults in Canada felt that the country was “broken” and that 43% of young Canadians said they would vote in favour of Canada becoming part of the United States if given a financial incentive to do so. Canada now also has rising separatist movements in both Quebec and Alberta, signaling further dissatisfaction with the direction of the country. A poll conducted by Gallup in 2024 found that only 34% of Canadians said they would be willing to fight for Canada in a time of war. This number is likely lower among those of fighting age as data suggests national pride and emotional attachment to Canada is stronger among older demographics.

Herein lies the error in the proposed use of unconventional warfare tactics by military leaders in the hypothetical event of a US invasion of Canada. The will to engage in a drawn-out guerrilla-style armed struggle against a militarily superior foe simply doesn’t exist among the Canadian populous. The likelihood that such a hypothetical event would occur may be exceedingly low. However, it should be cause for concern that in a time of increased geopolitical instability, Canada would be unable to motivate the population to commit to national defense if such a necessity were to arise.

This issue is a result of the anti-national nature of the creed of multicultural pluralism which Canada has upheld for the past several decades. This has eroded a sense of national consciousness and rootedness,

the very disposition which would serve as the impetus for national defense among the public in a time of crisis. Just as how Canada can no longer rely on the old order of international governance and a new foreign policy is needed to meet our security needs, likewise a change in domestic policy is also necessary.

The shield on the Canadian coat of arms, which was once also present on our national flag, features the emblems of lands from which Canada's European settlers originated: England, Scotland, Ireland, and France. These ties of language, culture, and most vitally of all, ancestry served as the basis of Canadian nationhood for the first century after the formation of the Dominion and further back in history beyond 1867. It was this conception of nation which rallied Canadians to put their lives on the line in defense of our country in eras gone by.

This was in the minds of the sons of the United Empire Loyalists when they took up arms to defend British North America against the numerically superior forces of the American Republic in 1812. This was in the minds of the Canadians who went over the top on the battlefields of the Somme, Vimy Ridge, and Passchendaele during the First World War. This was in the minds of the Canadians who sailed off to Hong Kong, Dieppe, and Juno Beach during the Second World War. It is only through the re-establishment of this conception of nation which we can expect the same unwavering devotion to the defense of our country in the increasingly uncertain world of the present day.

Canada needs wholesale immigration reform. Not only must the large-scale flow of migration to Canada cease, but the trend of the demographic transformation of our country must be reversed through a policy of remigration. One cannot be expected to identify with nor have a sense of duty toward a country which feels increasingly alien to them. In order to inspire one to sacrifice in defense of their country, one must see themselves reflected in the populous whom they are defending and be assured that this will continue to be the case into the future.

Our culture of national guilt must be replaced by one of national pride. No more apologies. One will not be motivated to defend a country which they have been made to feel ashamed of. No longer should our national heroes and great historic achievements be derided. Rather, they should serve as a source of inspiration for a renaissance in national consciousness. Practices such as DEI must be terminated. A culture which honours the status of victimhood above all else will not encourage one to aspire towards heroism. It is the veneration of excellence which instils courage and determination.

The British philosopher GK Chesterton said that the true soldier fights, not because he hates what is in front of him, but because he loves what is behind him. Canada is ill-prepared for the oncoming time of geopolitical strife and instability because we gravely lack that galvanizing force which would rally the public to the defense of our country in a time of need. As Canada's foreign policy shifts to accommodate new global realities, a reform in our social policy from post-national to national is also in order. The restoration of a sense of nationhood, rooted in ancestral kinship, is what will inspire Canadians to take up the task of meeting the uncertainty we now face as a country. With that conviction, should the day come when we need it, we will have a formidable fighting force at our disposal.

Sincerely,

A concerned citizen