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Traditionally a given society and its associated military were viewed as separate entities. In fact in a modern democracy the relationship between the military and the society it serves can be viewed in terms of the degree of difference between the societal, moral and cultural values of the populace at large and the ethos of the military. That having been said, one would also expect a degree of homogeneity between the values espoused by society and the military ethos given that the military is supposed to reflect the society it serves. The fact remains, however, that the largely liberal pluralistic values upheld by a contemporary society, such as Canada’s, are significantly different from those demanded of the military. As a result, the inevitability of cultural and social change in a modern and pluralistic society often places significant pressures on today’s militaries to adapt or alter their beliefs, values and characteristics to fit the civilian society that they serve. This divergence in values can frequently serve as a potential fault line.

Contemporary societal research, such as that conducted by Environics, suggests that Canadian societal values are evolving at a rapid pace. Catalysts include major socio-historical events such as the spread of technology, the emergence of a disease like AIDS or SARS, or the chilling aftermath of acts of terror. These factors coupled with the development and expansion of pluralism and the corresponding decline in unbending institutional regulation of people's lives has resulted in an evolution from one of high imposed stability and homogeneity across time, to one of flux and variability. In actual fact, with the accelerated pace of change in most aspects of our world today, this trend has been further magnified in current times.¹

As a result, as argued by sociologist Donna Winslow, in Canada, “compared to two generations ago, a multiplicity of views [now] exists in Canadian society.” Michael Ignatieff supports this assertion pointing out that we are “…well aware of how different we are, both as individuals and as peoples. Our differences, small as they may seem, are the basis of our

http://erg.environics.net/practice_areas/social_values/.
identity. Call it the narcissism of minor difference.”

Multi-ethnic, pluralistic, less constrained in terms of personal conduct and possessing a healthy tendency to question authority, it is not unreasonable to assert that the values of today’s generation have little in common with those of their grandparents. By way of comparison, the military, while having also evolved culturally, still bears a striking similarity in terms of the expected codes of conduct and institutional values to the military of the immediate post-World War II era. To that end, “war fighting still determines the central beliefs, values and complex symbolic formations that define [Canadian] Army culture.”

Indeed, and the military prides itself on its values, ideals and traditions. As expressed by Second World War combat veteran and professor of philosophy J. Glenn Gray, “[the professional soldier] chooses to conceive an orderly universe with stable and traditional values” in order to reduce “…all things to the matter of fact and the predictable” which ensures that the soldier will be capable of subordinating his subjective responses (i.e. fear) when he is in combat. Values therefore are central to the profession of arms and are embodied in something known as the military ethos. Values form the foundation of what is important to the profession, what is right and what is wrong. Values define the moral and the immoral as well as what is permissible and what is not impermissible.

Ethos is derived from the Greek word ‘ethikos’ meaning, ‘theory of living’ and for the military it encompasses central tenets such as duty, loyalty, integrity and courage. As articulated in Duty With Honour, “the ethos is intended to establish the trust that must exist between the Canadian Forces and Canadian society. It must guide the development of military leaders who must exemplify the military ethos in their everyday actions, creating and

---

shaping the desired military culture of the Canadian Forces. The ethos establishes the basis for personnel policy and doctrine, enables professional self-regulation within the Canadian Forces and assists in identifying and resolving ethical challenges”. The military ethos, therefore, is the foundation upon which the legitimacy, effectiveness and honour of the Canadian Forces depend and forms the cornerstone of the military profession.7

In reality, given the contemporary Canadian predilection for viewing its military as benign peacekeepers and ‘boy-scouts,’ to use the term employed by former Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, and not war fighters, it could be argued that the army’s adherence to such a militaristic “ethos [does] not resonate well in post-modern Canadian society.”8 Carol Off, host of CBC’s public affairs program Counterspin and author of The Ghosts of Medak Pocket: The Story of Canada’s Secret War, touches on this very point. According to Off, Canadians are “squeamish” about war and a military structured to conduct war. Canadians like to think of the “[Canadian Forces] as peacekeepers, not warriors.” This view exists despite the over 100,000 war dead suffered by Canada’s soldiers, sailors and airmen in the last century.

Lane Anker, a communications advisor with the Department of National Defence agrees. In his opinion, Canadians have a hard time with the notion of conflict and “in [a] contemporary society, want to see [their] forces as benign peacekeepers, distributing food and protecting the peace,” not war fighting.9 Combat, it would seem, despite being the raison d’être of a military force, is seemingly inconsistent with perceived Canadian values.10 Anker goes on to state that in truth, this distorted perception does not reflect reality. In the latter half of the 20th century “Canadian forces have been involved in numerous bloody awful wars and

---

7 Canadian Department of National Defence, Duty With Honour: The Profession of Arms In Canada (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 2003), p. 25.
10 Lane Anker, “Peacekeeping and Public Opinion.” Canadian Military Journal Vol 6 No. 2 (Summer 2005), pp. 29.
conflicts all over the world under the rubric of peacekeeping. Canadian soldiers [have taken] fire and [given] it back. They [were] often aggressive and frequently involved in combat.”

The ‘peacekeeping’ myth, however, is pervasive and has been shaped and propagated by numerous politicians, the media and even academia. John Holmes of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs wrote in 1967 that “the art and science of peacekeeping”, is of special interest to Canadians “because we have been involved in it more than almost any other country and it has in fact been incorporated into our image of our role in the world.” Walter Dorn, an Associate Professor at the Canadian Forces College and co-chair of Department of Security Studies is also a peacekeeping advocate. In Dorn’s view, “If the Canadian government wants to align itself with the Canadian public, it should be tasking the Armed Forces to do more for the United Nations. The world organization “desperately needs more Canadian soldiers in its 17 missions around the world, for instance, in Haiti, the Congo and Sierra Leone.” According to Dorn, Canada currently ranks as 33rd in the world in terms of troop contributions to UN peacekeeping operations. This, according to Dorn, is “a disgrace to our peacekeeping tradition.” Dorn’s support of the UN given the organisation’s string of well publicised military failures in the Balkans (1992-1995), Rwanda (1994) and Somalia (1992-1995) is perplexing to say the least.

Dorn’s commentary, however, highlights the divergence between the role the military envisions for itself and the role that society wishes to ascribe to the military. By extension, this also underscores the incongruity between the associated values underpinning those respective roles. On the one hand the military subscribes to discipline, duty, courage, conformity and sacrifice to the state and on the other hand society values compassion, diversity, individuality and multiculturalism. Resolving this dichotomy is critical because a

conflicting view between Canadian societal values and the military’s ethos can be particularly damaging. Indeed, if the ethos of an armed force runs counter to the general direction of social change it may well undermine widely held professional military beliefs and ultimately threaten to undercut the fighting ability of the troops.

The evolution of societal values is a direct result of political, social and cultural change and is influenced by many factors. This progression can encompass a myriad of issues. In reality, even the simple phrase ‘social or cultural change’ has nuanced meanings. Social or cultural change is influenced by traumatic events, technology, economics and politics, and includes such diverse topics as the success or failure of different political systems, globalization, democratization, development and economic growth. The phrase ‘societal and cultural change’ can encompass concepts as broad as revolution and paradigm shifts, to narrow changes such as a particular cause within a small town government. Social change can be slow, gradual, incremental, and evolutionary or it may be fast, radical, sudden and revolutionary. Social change can be wide in scope, affecting almost all people in a society or limited, affecting only a small number of people.

Social and cultural change, therefore, involves elements of political science, economics, history, anthropology, social work and many other social sciences. In terms of how social and cultural change affects the military, this could include public perceptions of the role and conduct of the military, national spending priorities and for the purposes of this paper – values or ethos. Ultimately what can emerge from this societal evolution, is an ‘us-they’ situation between the military and the public they serve where the military feels it is not supported and the public in turn cannot relate to its military.

In the last two decades of the 20th century the Canadian military, specifically the Army, has dealt with these aforementioned issues and consequently found itself at odds with the society it serves. Indeed, throughout the late 20th century military scandals, sexual and
financial, seemingly proliferated. Rape allegations within the CF were rampant in 1990, Somali’s infamous torture incident made the news in 1993, hazing rituals emerged within the Airborne in 1995 and abuse of authority and misconduct in 1996 were all captured and reported in sordid detail.\textsuperscript{15} The Canadian public was shocked. As described by Jack Granatstein, “the gung-ho, macho style [of the military]…seemed profoundly un-Canadian, and the public, Parliament and media saw this discrepancy at once.”\textsuperscript{16} Not surprisingly with views like this, public support for the military was replaced by apathy or outright contempt as Canadians questioned how their soldiers could act in such abhorrent ways.

Concurrent with this cycle of self-destruction within the military, the number and complexity of peace support operations skyrocketed with the Army deploying in significant numbers to Rwanda, Bosnia, Croatia, Kosovo, East Timor and Somalia. To a force more familiar with much smaller deployments to comparatively benign missions like Cyprus, these more numerous and hostile missions resulted in personnel burn out and increased incidents of post-traumatic stress syndrome. Commensurate with these events between 1991 and 1999 the military budget was slashed by 23% and personnel strength was reduced from 84,000 to 60,500.\textsuperscript{17} Stretched operationally, under attack by the media and with little visible support being provided by the public or government, morale within the ranks plummeted.

The nadir, however, was yet to come. As significant as equipment shortfalls, manning reductions, scandals, public apathy, and increased operational tempo and chronic under funding were, nothing had as profound an impact on the profession of arms as the murder of Shidane Arone by soldiers of the Canadian Airborne Regiment (CAR) on 16 March 1993 in Mogadishu, Somalia. When the sordid details of the affair were slowly released over

\textsuperscript{15} The Canadian Encyclopaedia Historica: Collections. MacLean’s Magazine Archive. http://www.canadianencyclopedia.ca/index.cfm?PgNm=Macleans&Params=M1
the course of a four year investigation, the public was appalled and even soldiers who barely knew the individuals involved were disgusted that their brethren could operate so far from the Army’s expected code of conduct, their ethos. To those within the military and to the average citizen it seemed, quite frankly, that the Army had lost its way. Indeed, this final atrocious act played a pivotal role in forcing the Canadian Forces in general and the Army specifically, to examine its values and even its very ethos.

It is important to note that the trials and tribulations borne by the Canadian Army in the latter stages of the 20th century were not unique. Indeed, David Bercuson details similar problems in both the British and Australian Armies. In Britain “major social changes [over the last two decades] impacted on one of the world’s oldest and tradition bound fighting forces…values, practises, rituals and beliefs [were] being undermined by television, by affluence, by new attitudes of individualism and personal liberty.”18 Australia’s Army was faced with the nation’s “growing pluralism, its feminist revolution, the greater recognition of human rights and the increased sophistication of the nation’s occupational structure…Australia [had become] a ‘rights driven society’19 and like the United States and Canada…”20

In response to these changes the CF ordered a complete review of the military ethos. This was completed in 2003 with the publication of ‘Duty With Honour,’ a document, which reaffirmed the importance of the Army ethos to the profession of arms. Integral to this reaffirmation was the emphasis placed on the relationship between the profession of arms and the society it serves. As stated in Duty With Honour, “the military ethos comprises values, beliefs and expectations that reflect core Canadian values, the imperatives of military professionalism and the requirements of operations. It acts as the centre of gravity for the

---

military profession and establishes an ethical framework for the professional conduct of military operations.”

This assertion built on the direction provided to the military with the publication of CFP 300 Canada’s Army, which stated in part that, “sustaining the military ethos…begins by recognising that moral factors are superior in war and that soldiers are the fundamental instrument in all army operations. It further requires adherence to those traditional military virtues which have been battle tested and shared by professional soldiers since the dawn of history.”

Reception of Duty With Honour within the military, however, was mixed. Some soldiers saw the ethos as inconsistent with their own individual values and ideals. The concept of placing duty before self was foreign to them. This development should not be surprising as ‘individuality’ and ‘pluralism’ are very much values cherished by the public at large. Soldiers are drawn from Canadian society and as such will tend to reflect society’s values and characteristics. To some soldiers the Army ethos was a nicely stated ideal but nobody really expected members of the profession to adhere to it. Finally, to others it was an affirmation of everything their profession should stand for.

These are divergent interpretations to say the least. If Duty With Honour was designed to be the cornerstone document that refocused the profession of arms, how could that be achieved when it appeared that soldiers didn’t accept it universally? Given that soldiers are purportedly reflective of the society they serve, what happens when those societal values make Duty With Honour inconsistent with soldier’s individual values. Is Duty With Honour incompatible with contemporary Canadian societal values? Is this why the ethos is not accepted by some of our soldiers? More succinctly, is there an inconsistency between the

individuality, freedom of expression and questioning of authority that is the norm in Canadian society with the rigours, duty before self and self-sacrifice demanded by the ethos?

The objective of this paper is to address these questions. This will be achieved by conducting an analysis of specific literature on the army ethos as presented by serving soldiers and academics with a view to determining the various ways in which the ethos is seen by soldiers and citizens alike. This analysis will also examine the apparent inconsistencies between individuality, freedom of expression and questioning of authority that are the norms in Canadian society with the rigours, duty before self and self-sacrifice to the state demanded by the ethos. This will be done by examining these four key articles with three specific sub-questions. First, how relevant is the new ethos to the soldier and the academic and what degree of importance is placed upon it? Second, what role does the ethos play as a unifying code of conduct and finally, how do our soldiers, as by-products of our society, interpret the idea of an ethos?

Once a baseline for the role of the ethos has been established, this paper will then examine the results of two cultural surveys conducted by the military after Duty With Honour was published. These two studies were commissioned in 2004 to support the Army Campaign Plan strategic objective of "Shape Army Culture." The first study, The Army Socio-cultural Survey (CROP 3SC), was undertaken by Environics Canada. This study mapped the core values of soldiers against those of Canadian society and examined the predominant values of different groups within Canada's Army. The second study, The Army Culture and Climate Survey, was undertaken by the Royal Military College of Canada. This latter study focused on dimensions of the organizational climate.23

Prior to determining whether or not Duty With Honour is consistent with Canadian societal values, it is fundamental to establish precisely what those Canadian values are. This is an essential step as these values underpin the ethos itself. Defining uniquely Canadian
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23 Canadian Department of National Defence, Canada’s Soldiers: Military Ethos and Canadian Values in the 21st Century. (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 2005, p. iii.)
values, however, is problematic due in no small part to the country’s ethnic and cultural diversity. Canada is a rights based pluralistic society. In addition, the difficulty in defining Canadian culture values is not helped by the nebulous manner in which the word ‘culture’ is defined by various cultural theorists.

Culture has been described as “the way of life for an entire society encompassing manners, dress, language, religion, rituals, norms of behaviour and systems of belief.”24 For the purposes of this paper this definition falls too narrowly along ethnic lines and is therefore unusable. Social anthropologists Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn argue that culture is “the explicit and implicit patterns of behaviours, symbols and ideas that constitute the distinctive achievements of human groups.” This interpretation, while better, is too broad and vacuous. Sir Edward Burnett Tylor provides a somewhat more useable definition when he states that culture is “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities acquired by humans as members of society.” The eminent cultural theorist Stuart Hall saw culture as “the sum total of a way of life of a people; patterns experienced by individuals as normal ways of acting, feeling and being.”25 Again, these definitions are also vague and lack specifics. Even the definition provided by the Canadian philosopher John Ralston Saul is less than useful despite addressing Canadian culture in particular. According to Ralston Saul, “Canadian culture is the vision of a northern people, who despite substantial and constant difficulties, found a way to live together while other nations tore themselves apart and imposed monolithic, centralized mythologies on themselves.”26 This may sound impressive and no doubt appeals to the Canadian self-image as a multicultural example for the world but it frankly does not provide the ‘nuts and bolts’ of what our Canadian culture represents.

Culture, therefore, as can be seen by these varied definitions, is an amorphous subject, containing a myriad of objects that can be physical, mental, metaphorical, and symbolic or any combination therein. In terms of this paper, therefore, it is the definition of social theorist Peter Walters that is perhaps the most practical and useable. This is because according to Walters, culture represents the "shared schematic experience of a society," including, but not limited to, any of the various qualifiers such as language, art, religion, but "most importantly values."27

This definition is highly useable as values are implicitly linked to a society’s culture and values are what buttress the Army’s ethos. Values are seminal to a culture as they steer or guide a society on the basis of internally chosen options. Thus, values imply the conscious prioritising of different behavioural alternatives, which are perceived to be possible for the society as a whole.28 Extending that logic to include Duty With Honour is an obvious step especially when considering that the purpose of the ethos is to capture the essence of the military’s values in order to form an expected code of conduct.

As an aside it is equally important to note that the word ‘society’ is also a nebulous descriptor and may be used to refer to a particular people, such as the Quebecois, to a sub-culture within a larger society such as the military, to a nation state, such as Italy or to a broader cultural group, such as Western Canadian society.29 This was pointed out by John Stratton and Ien Ang when they wrote“…the recognition that there is not ‘one’ culture in ‘society’ but that any society consists of a plurality of historically specific cultures structured in relations of dominance and subordination to each other…”30 That having been said, for the purposes of this paper and for simplicity, the word ‘society’ will refer to Canada writ large.

27 Mora, “Understanding Multiculturalism: Cultures and Values.”
Therefore, having established that values are seminal in terms of defining Canadian society’s culture it is now essential to understand precisely what those Canadian values are. However, as much as the broad definitions of ‘values,’ ‘culture,’ and ‘society’ have many interpretations, so too does the specific articulation of Canadian values. As noted earlier most Canadians tend to default to such self-descriptors as ‘benevolent,’ ‘multicultural,’ ‘compassionate,’ and ‘non-violent’ when they describe Canadian values. The profession of arms, however, is a national institution that exists as an extension of the Federal Government’s foreign and domestic policy. To paraphrase the highly influential military theorist Karl von Clausewitz, the military is a political tool and in effect a continuation of politics by other means. It can be argued, therefore, that the most relevant interpretation of Canadian values in this instance is that of the Canadian government and those departments intimately involved with the enactment of the government’s foreign policy. In this instance, the principle federal department that acts on behalf of the Government of Canada when it comes to the deployment and employment of Canada’s military forces abroad is the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT).

According to DFAIT, “Canadian values and their projection abroad are key to the achievement of prosperity within Canada…Canadians hold deeply that we must pursue our values internationally.”\(^31\) DFAIT then defines our Canadian values as being “…respect of the environment, human rights, participatory government, free markets and the rule of law.”\(^32\) DFAIT goes on to expand on these describing human rights as “not only a fundamental value but also a crucial element in the development of stable, democratic and prosperous societies with each other.”\(^33\) Participatory government is not sufficient if it is merely democratic it must also consist of a “civil society – one that is pluralistic and participatory” while

---


respecting the “rule of law, an independent judiciary, honest and open government [and], respect for human rights…” 34 Finally, the rule of law is to predominate over “power” as “rules based regimes of arms controls” and other such features will “reinforce the ability of our peacekeepers and the UN to do their jobs in dangerous situations.” 35 To DFAIT, these values are important as it is essential that Canada “project a clearly defined image of what it is and what it represents…only Canadian culture can express the uniqueness of our country, which is bilingual, multicultural and deeply influenced by its aboriginal roots, the North, the oceans and its own vastness.” 36 Not surprisingly, given Canada’s rights based society, these values are consistent with those articulated in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Arguably, of DFAIT’s five articulated Canadian values; respect of the environment, human rights, participatory government, free markets and the rule of law, only two could be linked directly to the military and military operations. These would be human rights or the protection thereof and the rule of law. By way of comparison, the military in Duty With Honour defines Canadian societal values as being, “the democratic ideal, the concept of peace, order and good government,” which is itself a specific clause in the British North America Act of 1867, “and the rule of law.” 37 While not a word-by-word translation of DFAIT’s interpretation, they are not inconsistent either. In terms of specific military values, however, there is a decidedly different tact as the values become less institutional and more individual. Military values, unlike those espoused for Canadian society as a whole, are identified as being “duty, loyalty, integrity and courage.” 38

37 Canadian Department of National Defence, Duty With Honour: The Profession of Arms In Canada (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 2003), p 28
38 Canadian Department of National Defence, Duty With Honour: The Profession of Arms In Canada (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 2003), p 29.
Is this where the divergence in societal and military values begins? Does this mean that the ethos is inconsistent with Canadian societal values? If the ethos does diverge and demand unrealistic standards of its soldiers, then how important is it? Arguably, it would certainly appear that there is nothing wrong with the liberal values advocated and embraced by society so are soldiers wrong to adhere to them? On the surface the answer would be ‘no’ until one reflects upon the role of the ethos in forming a code of conduct specific to the military. Indeed, this very topic – the role of the ethos within the military - has drawn a high degree of interest since the publication of Duty With Honour. The last several years have seen a number of articles submitted to various professional journals, notably the Canadian Military Journal, that debated this very topic. Of particular note is that the authors of these various articles have been both military and civilian thereby providing differing views of the role of the ethos. What remains, therefore, is to analyse those views.

This analysis is a relevant methodological approach as military literature is representative of the soldier's interpretation, while that of academics 'looking in' is more reflective of society's view of our ethos. More specifically, the military perspective is essentially a perception of the ethos as defined by the user and is, therefore, a qualitative interpretation. The soldier’s perceptions are important, as it will be these perceptions that will inform their actions. Academics, on the other hand, examine the ethos as neutral observers. Indeed, their view of the ethos contrasts with that of soldiers simply because they are not subject to the ethos. As a result, their analysis will tend to be more analytical and objective. Finally, as a result of using the soldiers’ and academics’ perspectives, what should emerge is a balanced assessment of the role and importance of the military ethos. That result can then be used as a reference point when reviewing the results of the two CROP 3SC Surveys of 2004.

Captain Neil, in his article “Ethics and the Military Corporation,” examines the role of the ethos in ensuring ethical conduct within the profession of arms. Of importance to this paper, Captain Neil describes the contrast between what are seen to be as accepted societal
norms - individuality, questioning of authority - with those of the profession of arms -
discipline, cohesion, obedience and sense of duty.

Captain Neil correctly points out that military organizations in democratic societies
are perforce required to induct citizens that have already been subjected, on average, to nearly
two decades of exposure to rapidly changing societal attitudes which in many cases reflect
values different from, and in some cases antithetical to, the core values required by military
organizations. These citizens, then moulded into soldiers, may therefore possess underlying
ethical standards which differ radically from those which must be imparted during military
socialization, risking ethical conflicts and all that these imply. According to Captain Neil,
society must therefore bear a good portion of the burden of blame for ethical failures amongst
members of the military, as each citizen will unavoidably reflect both the good and the bad
characteristics of the society which forms him or her.39

In light of this observation, Captain Neil emphasises the traditional role of the ethos
as a unifying code of conduct. This is important to note as what Captain Neil is arguing is
that a properly applied ethos, policed and enforced by the profession will serve to curb
individuality – and by extension perceived unacceptable activity – and form a cohesive team.
Captain Neil goes on to argue that with these events as a backdrop, reinvigorating the ethos is
critical in melding young recruits into a cohesive force. Captain Neil’s article does not touch
on the soldier’s perception of the ethos specifically but he does argue that society and soldiers
alike should accept the fact that the ethos demands a higher code of conduct than that
expected of the average citizen. By way of extrapolation, this suggests when a recruit joins
the military, regardless of previously held beliefs; acceptance and embracement of the ethos
should be virtually automatic.

It should also be noted enforcing an ethos is not a requirement that is unique to the
military although the standards expected may well be. Indeed, “all groups - state, corporate,

(Spring 2000), pp. 31.
cultural, scholastic, religious, military, professional, social or otherwise possess, evolve or otherwise acquire a fundamental behavioural standard, adherence to which is a *sine-quanon* of group membership. Codes of professional ethics serve three principle functions in society or indeed the military. First, they protect the members of the society against abuse by members of the profession who might choose to exploit their monopoly of expertise; second, they define the professional as a responsible and trustworthy expert in the service of his ‘client’; and third, they “delineate the moral authority for actions necessary to the professional function but generally impermissible in moral terms.” In summary it is evident that Captain Neil is advocating a traditional interpretation of the role of the ethos as a unifying code of conduct and value system; a position one would expect from a serving soldier and officer.

By way of contrast, Donna Winslow’s article “*Canadian Society and Its Army*” also contributes to the examination of the ethos, but does so with a different methodological approach. Indeed, in conducting her sociological study of the military, Dr Winslow employed a ‘three perspective model’, which examined the relationship between the Canadian Army ethos as part of a larger Canadian society. This study was pluralistic in approach as it provided an assortment of lenses for viewing this complex relationship. The three levels of analysis, Integration, Differentiation and Fragmentation, flowed from macro to micro. The macro Integrated approach provided the major themes affecting the Army that as an institution is expected to be an integral part of Canadian society. The Differentiated approach provided insight into the Army’s reaction to societal integration and its perceived ‘need to be different’ as an organisation. Finally the Fragmented approach examined post-modern Canadian society and the implications this can have for the relationship between Canadian society and its Army.41

According to Dr Winslow, since the 1980s and the introduction of the Human Rights Act there has been a move by Canadian society to generate a pan-Canadian consensus, consistency, and conformity to the principles of the Act. This would represent the Integration perspective. Her research suggests that since the introduction of Human Rights, the Army has reacted as a subculture, holding a different opinion about what was important to the military as an institution. The reasoning behind advocating a different approach for the military is that the Human Rights Act should rationalise what it asks of the Army given its unique operational imperative. This represents the Differentiation view. Concurrently Canadian society has been in a state of flux, generating multiple value systems, or a Fragmentation view, which has led to an ambiguous post-modern society whose core values do not ‘resonate’ with traditional Army values. Thus each perspective in its own way reveals one aspect of the Canadian reality. Taken collectively, the results suggest that the ethos may not be consistent with what society or even soldiers see as ‘traditional or Canadian values.’

In reality, Dr Winslow is arguing that the Army is advocating values and a code of conduct that is not in lock-step with the vast majority of what society sees as important. As a result, the army faces significant challenges in terms of recruitment, retention and connection with the public. Dr Winslow does not say the Army is wrong to adopt Duty With Honour given what is asked of the profession of arms, only that the importance, role and unifying purpose of the ethos varies significantly across the Army simply because our soldiers are by-products of a pluralistic society. Consequently, Dr Winslow contends that the Army has had to adjust to a socio-cultural context, which is less convergent with the core assumptions of traditional military culture in order to attract and retain new soldiers.

Specifically, there has been a significant shift in Canadian society away from outward directedness, tradition, communalism and morality to inward directedness, individualism and hedonism. Young Canadians are now rejecting authority and looking for more personal

autonomy, pleasure and spiritual fulfillment. In short, the deference and loyalty of Canadians can no longer be taken for granted. Instant gratification, desire for independence, and hedonism all seem to take priority.\textsuperscript{43}

This poses problems for the military as the core values of Army culture are subordination of the self to the group and the idea of sacrifice: the individual must be willing to subordinate him or herself to the common good, the team and the common task. Furthermore, there must be a willingness to sacrifice one’s life for the team in peace and war; without this, an armed force will risk defeat. What cannot be lost in this discourse is the fact that the same individual who is a private citizen one day could be a soldier the next and will undoubtedly bring many of his or her preconceived ideas about ‘citizen’ values and individuality into the military.\textsuperscript{44} In a healthy democracy, it is vital that the armed forces not remain too far apart from the society they are charged to defend. After all, it is society that funds them and bestows on them their legitimacy; and it is society from which they recruit their personnel and to which they return them to continue their working lives as civilians.\textsuperscript{45}

Winslow concludes that properly informed as to what the ethos stands for, a post-modern Canadian society might actually be more tolerant of the Army’s ‘need to be different.’ As the French military sociologist and commandant of Saint-Cyr, Bernard Boëne, pointed out, functional military values that diverge from the mainstream may no longer pose a problem to a post-modern society. In a post-modern Canada, where each and every group is left to pursue its inclinations and cultivate its lifestyle free of constraint from a cultural mainstream, the Army might just be accepted as another “tribe among tribes.” Boëne tells us that the only condition will be that “they be sparing of human life in the application of force and tolerant of diversity.” Of course, that still leaves the question as to whether anyone will

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
want to be a member of the Army tribe. Nevertheless, what is most interesting about Donna Winslow’s article is how the academic analysis confirms that while the ethos is not in line with societal values it should still be accepted as necessary given what is asked of our military. In short, Donna Winslow is arguing that *Duty With Honour* is correct.

Lieutenant-Colonel Bradley and Dr Charbonneau add to the analysis of the ethos with their article “Transformational Leadership: Something Old, Something New” where they provide an excellent examination of the transformational leadership model which itself relies on the concept of influencing subordinates through ethical and moral behaviour. Note that the article is not on leadership itself, but on how ethical behaviour, or behaviour governed by an ethos, influences leadership. As the title suggests, this is not forward thinking, rather it is an affirmation of the code of conduct embraced by the military for generations. This approach is consistent with the objective of the new ethos and as such helps develop the basis by which the ethos was developed.

According to the authors, transformational leadership has a moral quality about it because it “bonds leader and followers in a moral commitment to a cause that goes beyond their own self-interests.” In short, transformational leadership addresses a fundamental underpinning of the ethos; the concept of the collective before self. The problem with a wholesale embracement of this philosophy is that all causes that might bind leaders and followers are not necessarily moral. For example, there have been influential leaders like Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot and others who bonded with followers for a ‘higher cause’ which, in fact, was immoral and caused great pain and suffering to many. Transformational leadership is moral only to the extent that the cause is moral. In reality then, transformational leadership has the potential to be either moral or immoral.

---


Nevertheless there is a strong argument in support of a moral and ethical dimension to transformational leadership as this form of leadership does not rely on control strategies such as rewards or punishments to ensure follower compliance. This ‘carrot and stick’ approach is called transactional leadership and contrasts with transformational leaders who are noted for empowering followers. Transformational leadership, therefore, is more ethical than transactional leadership because ‘followership’ [sic] is freely given in transformational leadership and extorted in transactional leadership. Because transformational leadership is not coercive in any way, it respects the dignity of followers, avoids inflicting any pain or suffering on them, and therefore can be seen as more ethical.48 Taking that argument one step further, if the Army was to embrace the ethos fully, a transformational leadership style would be a natural extension as actions by leaders and followers alike would be based on and influenced by the Army’s expected code of conduct.

It should be noted that Dr Charbonneau was also a co-author with Colonel Capstick in writing Canada’s Soldiers: Military Ethos and Values in the 21st Century. Dr Charbonneau, therefore, is highly conversant with the nuances of the role of the ethos and its development as well as its central role in guiding the military along expected norms. His support, therefore, for a transformational leadership style and by extension an ethical basis for leadership with a foundation in the ethos itself, should not be surprising.

What the three aforementioned articles point to is that the Army possesses a unique culture, one dependent on the adoption and embracement of a rigid code of conduct that expects soldiers of all ranks to accept the premise of duty before self. Colonel Capstick’s article, “Defining the Culture: The Canadian Army in the 21st Century” builds on this assertion by explaining that military culture is an amalgam of values, customs, traditions and their philosophical underpinnings that, over time, have created a shared institutional ethos. From military culture springs a common framework for those in uniform and common

expectations regarding standards of behaviour, discipline, teamwork, loyalty, selfless duty, and the customs that support those elements. Given this background the expectation would be that soldiers would view the ethos and values of the military in a similar manner.

Historically, however, this has not been the case. Indeed, what occurred on the night of 16 March 1993, when Shidane Abukar Arone, a young Somali, was murdered while in the custody of Canadian soldiers, defied those common expectations. Colonel Capstick believes that this single “significant incident,” not to mention the subsequent four years of investigations and recriminations, turned out to have far greater impact than anyone in uniform or out could have anticipated. For most of the last decade of the 20th century, that incident defined the public debate on defence issues in Canada. It resulted in a major public inquiry, innumerable studies into every aspect of the military profession in Canada and a process of institutional reform that is shaping the Canadian Forces and will continue to do so well into the 21st century.

Much of the effort directed at institutional reform has been focused on the military justice system, “mechanisms of voice” such as the CF Ombudsman, the Military Police, education and training, and CF command and control procedures. In all, the institution has been engaged in implementing over 300 specific recommendations that resulted from an unprecedented number of studies, commissions, and reports. If “the essence of military culture is how things are done in a military organization”, there can be little doubt that this process of institutional reform will have a profound impact on Canadian military culture for a very long time.

The numerous studies and commissions also resulted in another surprising discovery for the military in that they revealed that soldiers did not share a common perspective of the code of conduct. Indeed, Colonel Capstick’s article reveals that the importance of the ethos varies markedly from soldier to soldier, unit to unit and from geographical region to geographical region. In this light Colonel Capstick’s work suggests that the Army has not achieved its aim in focusing our soldiers on a unifying code of conduct. Moreover, it also implies that the Army is not one homogenous group but a construct of different sub-groups such as Armour, Infantry and Artillery. Within these groupings is yet another sub-division into regiments or battalions. While this physical structure is common knowledge within the Army, what was not known until now was how interpretations and perceptions of given issues, such as ethos, vary within these sub-groupings.

Given the above it is apparent that a reassertion of the role of the ethos is perhaps the most important institutional reform taking place. This is because the concept of military culture encompasses the essence of military ethos and professionalism, as well as shaping the behaviours of those serving. As Colonel Capstick explains, the ethos must build upon the Canadian Forces’ values of integrity, courage, loyalty, selflessness, and self-discipline and he points to numerous other stake holders who have muddied the waters.

For example, Canada’s Army, the military’s cornerstone document for leadership, states that the Army’s expression of the Professional Military Ethos is based on the four precepts of duty, integrity, discipline, and honour. At the same time, the Minister’s Monitoring Committee’s Final Report – 1999 suggests adding “...accountability, self-examination and self-improvement, fairness and openness alongside the existing values of professionalism, loyalty, courage and service to country.” When the principles of the Defence Ethics Programme are added, it is obvious that any cogent description of the Army’s core
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military values has become muddled. Indeed, it could also be argued that much of the language used in Canada’s Army is more appropriate to earlier generations than it is to today’s recruit. Given this, Colonel Capstick contends that it is vital that the CF develop a commonly agreed list of core military values that could then be applied to each service’s unique operational requirements.54

As a result of these four articles, therefore, three lines of thought emerge. Principally, the adoption and enforcement of an ethos is fundamental to the military as it encompasses the values, traditions and morality of the profession of arms and acts in every sense of the phrase, as a code of conduct. Secondly, the values inherent with the ethos are not necessarily consistent with the values society holds as important. Indeed, the ethos demands more of our soldiers than society asks of them. This is not to say that the Army’s values of duty, loyalty, integrity and courage are wrong for the profession, just more demanding. Finally, what has also has emerged from these four articles is an indication that our soldiers may not subscribe to the ethos as it is not reflective of their own ingrained societal values.

The views, concerns and arguments expressed by Captain Neil, Dr Charbonneau, Dr Winslow and Colonel Capstick are not without merit. Indeed, subsequent to the publications of all of their articles the results of two separate surveys analysing Army culture and ethos were made public, both to the civilian populace and to the soldiers. Much of what these surveys revealed supported the arguments put forth in these four articles.

As indicated earlier, in 2004, in an effort to support the Army Campaign Plan strategic objective of "Shape Army Culture" two studies were commissioned. The Army Sociocultural Survey (CROP 3SC), was undertaken by Environics Canada and mapped the core values of soldiers against those of Canadian society. It also examined the predominant values of different groups within Canada’s Army. The first study was able to compare these results with the results from a 2003 CROP 3SC survey developed and conducted to measure

and assess Canadian societal values. The second study, *The Army Culture and Climate Survey*, was undertaken by the Royal Military College of Canada. This latter study focused on dimensions of organizational climate such as how soldiers feel about different aspects of their work and workplace.

What the two surveys revealed was a divergence between the values of the society or culture that soldiers serve and those demanded by the profession. In short, *Canada’s Soldiers: Military Ethos and Canadian Values in the 21st Century* was seen as an important first step in defining and describing the organizational military culture that exists in Canada's Army today, i.e., how we do things around here, and comparing it to the espoused ethos in *Duty With Honour* and Canada's Army, i.e., how things should be.\(^55\)

The CROP survey found that Canada’s Army possesses a very strong organizational culture. Contained within this culture are the predominant institutional Army values including the need for personal achievement, the importance of the individual, an adherence to institutional leadership, an attraction to intensity, sense of duty and accomplishment, as well as a sense of social conscience and conservatism.\(^56\)

On the other hand, soldiers' *individual* values were more closely aligned with those of Canadian society. Soldiers are similar to Canadian society in their adaptability to complexity in life, in having a penchant for risk taking, the pursuit of novelty, adaptive navigation, sexual permissiveness, introspection and empathy, need for personal autonomy, spontaneity in daily life and need for achievement through work. Soldiers also differ from Canadian society in their diminished valuation of working simply for money, by having an aversion to complexity
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in life, effort for health, rejection of order, acceptance of authority, risk aversion and a more intuitive, affective approach to life.\(^{57}\)

It would appear, therefore, that while there are differences between what the average soldiers and citizens hold as important there is also a fair degree of common ground. As noted earlier this is not surprising as soldiers are drawn from society so they will naturally emulate inherent societal values. Finally, what the CROP 3SC survey also demonstrated was that the military lifestyle tends to attract citizens that subscribe to some of the military’s central tenets. On the surface, therefore, everything seems to be in order. Soldiers seemingly reflect the society they serve and normally it is those citizens that subscribe to some if not all of the values and characteristics of the military that ultimately enlist.

However, the CROP 3SC survey was conducted in a multifaceted manner examining the Army through a number of different lenses. The survey did not view the Army as an amorphous and homogeneous gathering of people. On the contrary, the survey broke down the responses by gender, age, region and component or more succinctly, regular army versus reserve army. In doing so, some of the general fault lines within the army in terms of values and ethos were revealed.

For example, based on survey results, men in the Army demonstrated a propensity for challenge; they value culture and traditions and have a strong sense of duty. Men express some sensitivity to social and ecological issues and have a fear of random violence. Women on the other hand, have a very strong need for escape from work and family pressures and a need for goals and meaning. Looking at the returns along age lines, 17–24 year-olds expressed a strong need for challenges, novelty and intensity, as well as a propensity for sexual permissiveness and a desire to be connected. Soldiers of this age group wanted to express their creativity, valued culture and tradition and were sensitive to daily constraints

\(^{57}\) Canadian Department of National Defence, Canada’s Soldiers: Military Ethos and Canadian Values in the 21st Century. (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 2005), p. iii.
and pressure. As soldiers age, however, they seek greater autonomy, express a stronger sense of duty and ethics and become more pragmatic.58

With respect to rank, junior non-commissioned members (NCMs) expressed more critical attitudes towards their leaders, were more ethnically intolerant and were strongly attracted to risk and challenging activities. Senior NCMs had less need of challenges and novelty and were more pragmatic, valuing the need for escape.59 Junior officers demonstrated a strong attraction to intensity and were open to new experiences. Senior officers, on the other hand, were more egalitarian and pragmatic, more open to others and caring.

On a ‘regional’ level, with respect to Land Force Areas (LFAs), Land Force Western Area (LFWA) encompassing the Prairie Provinces and British Columbia was more individualistic. Secteur du Québec de la Force Terrestre (SQFT), or Quebec, was more non-traditional. Land Force Atlantic Area (LFAA), the Maritime Provinces, was more conservative, and Land Force Central Area (LFCA), or Ontario, was more conventional. With respect to Regular Force and Primary Reserve forces, Regular Force soldiers showed a stronger orientation towards ethics, were more risk averse and are less ethnically tolerant. Reserve Force soldiers were more individualistic, needed to feel connected, had a greater attraction to risk and intensity and needed meaning and accomplishment in work.60

To arrive at these broad conclusions the survey used a Socio-cultural Map to plot the individual responses. The values and attitudes of members of the Army were plotted on the four quadrant graph with their individual responses being rated on the north-south axis for conformity and individuality and along the east-west axis for outer and inward directedness.61
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In broad terms the surveys demonstrated that soldiers compare favourably to the attitudes and values of Canadian society as determined in the 2003 CROP 3SC poll taken of the Canadian public. In short, they reflect the society they serve. In the general view afforded by the two axes and four quadrants of the 3SC socio-cultural map, members of the Canadian Army were aligned with Canadian society on issues of conformity to order, authority, moral standards and respect for traditional hierarchy and individualism. That is to say, like Canadian society, soldiers are neither so excessively conservative that they categorize people by race, religion, and class, nor do they believe in a pyramidal hierarchy that is God-given. Nor are soldiers so liberal that they crave absolute autonomy to choose their own path in life and reject traditional forms of associations and identities.62

This analysis, however, provided a generalisation of the military’s views on values as a whole. While differences were identified between gender, age and region – as articulated above – the variations were more profound than that. It is important, therefore, to break down some of the responses along the sub-groupings used by the survey team to determine whether or not the values being embraced by the various sub-groupings are consistent with society in general and perhaps most importantly, in line with those of the ethos. To that end, what will be examined in greater detail are the returns for age, region and component.

As noted above, the data provided by CROP 3SC demonstrated that newer recruits tended to closely represent the society from whence they came. The longer soldiers were exposed to the institutional values of the military, the ethos, the more they subscribed to institutional values inherent within. Indeed, examining the data along age lines showed distinct differences in values reported by the different age groups who were polled. Whether these differences were due to a "mellowing" as a result of experience or are a result of
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differences in the values of society during the impressionable youth period of the personnel is unknown. 63

In the general view provided by the 3SC socio-cultural map, as aging occurs personal values move from a concern for social expectations and desire to fit in, a worldview that values tradition, discipline, authority, and success, to a self-directed, individualistic, more liberal world view that values autonomy. As aging occurs, value systems shift from emphasizing risk, adventure, belonging, conservatism, and some non-compliance and intolerance, to systems emphasizing autonomy, less risk, and non dependence on group membership and so more tolerant of diversity. That the 17–24 age group values risk and adventure is shown by above average scores on such values as risk taking, fatalism, pursuit of intensity and novelty, sexual permissiveness, and interest in the mysterious. 64

The same age group also demonstrated a need for belonging. They did not reject authority or order and placed a strong emphasis on being a member of a group, to the point that they pursued originality in order to be noticed and deported themselves in such a manner as to gain esteem and status. Even to the layman it should be apparent that this sort of individualistic behaviour is not consistent with the conformity that the military and indeed the ethos demands. This same age group is also somewhat conservative showing an inclination towards preservation of one's culture and viewing oneself as superior to foreigners as well as demonstrating intolerant behaviour, advocating civil disobedience, showing a low openness towards others and equality of the sexes, as well as non acceptance of affirmative action for women and minorities. 65 Again, these are all characteristics and values that do not mesh well with such precepts as duty, courage, integrity and sacrifice.

By way of contrast, the 45–54 age group reported much lower levels of the values described above. Adventure and risk taking were still above the level of Canadian society, but the adventure no longer involved intense emotional experiences or sexual permissiveness to the extent it had 20 years earlier. Civil disobedience in this age group was replaced by a social conscience; openness to others, equality, and affirmative action issues were consistent with mainstream Canadian society. This age group also valued autonomy, both to control their life, and, as is reported by females in the poll, to escape the stresses and responsibilities of everyday life. More than any other age group, this age group was less accepting of traditional authority, preferring greater input into decisions affecting them. Note that this does not mean that persons in this age group did not subscribe to the concept of duty before self, merely that by this juncture in their career they were normally filling positions of authority within the chain of command and as such expected a greater say in command decisions. This also does not mean that this age group is selfish. In fact, members of the 45-54 age group showed a greater sense of duty than other age groups and indeed, than Canadian society. On matters of pursuing their own happiness, placing family before work, and placing the organization ahead of self in the workplace, duty comes first in this age group.66

Also noted in the earlier summary, while different socio-cultural trends emerged for each of the four Land Force areas (LFAs), Secteur du Québec de la Force Terrestre (SQFT) emerged as the most distinct. There was a noticeable trend towards an intense emotional existence in personnel from SQFT. Risk taking, intensity and emotion, a tendency to adapt easily to uncertainty, and a need for status recognition distinguished personnel from SQFT from the other three LFAs. Personnel from SQFT were much more image-conscious than those from other LFAs. SQFT soldiers also tended to be more insular, somewhat more intolerant of immigrants and see themselves as superior to foreigners. They preferred traditional gender roles, and were even less favourable to equality of the sexes then members

of the other LFAs. Personal pleasure and happiness took a more central role in the lives of SQFT personnel than they did in the lives of personnel from other LFAs. Nevertheless, there was a need to achieve professional success through their work. To this end, personnel in SQFT desired order and clear boundaries, but preferred flexible leadership and tended not to readily defer to those in leadership positions. In summary, the views of SQFT personnel tended to have an emotional perspective rather than a solely rational one.67

On the other hand, a sense of duty and a desire to control all aspects of life are the most significant trends for personnel from Land Force Central Area (LFCA). Personnel in this LFA tend to be ethnically tolerant and accepting of sexual equality, not all that surprising considering the pluralist and ethnically diverse nature of the communities ringing Lake Ontario. Although committed to obligations and duty, personnel form LFCA believed in saving money and placing duty before personal happiness. LFCA personnel were concerned with the individual needs of youth and their own need for a balance between work and personal life. Land Force Western Area (LFWA) personnel were more individualistic than their counterparts in the other LFAs and felt somewhat alienated from Canadian society. They tended to be less ethnically tolerant than the rest of Canadian society. Although LFWA personnel are more likely than other soldiers to look upon work as a means of earning money, they are less motivated by money than are members of Canadian society. They are suspicious of big business and government, especially personal information being collected by both. Soldiers in LFWA are willing to sacrifice standards of living to pursue their goals. LFWA personnel, along with Land Force Atlantic Area (LFAA) personnel, are less concerned than the other two LFAs with challenging work, and less comfortable with complexity, and
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technology. They prefer as much autonomy as possible and the opportunity to regularly escape their everyday responsibilities.  

Like LFWA, members of LFAA tended to feel somewhat alienated from society. Also like LFWA, personnel from LFAA, more than personnel from the other two LFAs, demonstrated money concerns. They were pragmatic. Money and family, including time away from the stresses and responsibilities of everyday life, were more important to LFAA soldiers than they were to soldiers from other LFAs. Spontaneity and the pursuit of intense and emotional experiences did not hold the allure for LFAA personnel that they did for personnel from SQFT. The good of the larger society and issues such as ecology also paled in importance compared to family. This does not mean that duty was given short shrift. LFAA personnel tended not to crave the autonomy desired elsewhere. They were accepting of authority, desired strong leadership to give them direction and give them input into how to do the job. They did not, however, look to work for personal satisfaction to the same extent as members from the other three LFAs. Family is considered by LFAA personnel to be more important than it is to personnel from other LFAs. Again, while this sentiment is commendable it is hardly consistent with a profession that fully expects the individual to put the profession first ahead of individuality, much less the individual’s family.

In many respects, differences among the four LFAs reflect Canadian regional differences. For example, the SQFT propensity to sense the world from an emotional perspective is mirrored in the civilian Quebec population as determined by the administration in that province. Both samples value personal image, pleasure and happiness to a greater extent then personnel from other regions and LFAs. Both are very regional-centred and prefer traditional gender roles. SQFT personnel and Quebec civilians diverge on questions of risk, complexity, and intolerance, with the Quebec population showing more maturity in these
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areas, likely reflecting an older average age of respondents in the provincial sample vis-à-vis the SQFT sample.\textsuperscript{70} Another mitigating factor could be that persons who enrol in the military, even in SQFT, will tend to already subscribe to many of the characteristics and values contained within the military, such acceptance of the presence of risk.

Likewise, the commitment to duty, while at the same time balancing work and personal life, revealed by LFCA personnel in comparison to the other the LFAs, is similarly reflected in the Ontario civilian population compared to the rest of Canada. The ethnic tolerance shown by LFCA personnel, however, is only tolerance compared to a relatively intolerant Army. Compared to Canadian society as a whole, LFCA personnel do not show a high degree of tolerance, an attitude consistent with attitudes found in the Ontario civilian population. Attitudes of LFAA soldiers regarding work, status, distrust of strangers and business are similar to attitudes found in the region among the civilian population and differentiated the Atlantic region from the rest of Canada. Other values, such as aversion to complexity and technology, and need to escape the responsibilities of the workplace differentiated soldiers in LFAA from their civilian counterparts. These differences may result from a difference in ages of the two underlying populations, the military population being generally younger than the civilian population.\textsuperscript{71}

In spite of over-all external similarities between the Regular and Reserve Forces, some LFA differences are worth mentioning. Differences found in SQFT for the Regular Force are also found in the Reserve Force. For example, the intensity of experience and achievement, rather than money, are greater motivators of soldiers in SQFT than in the other LFAs. Social status, pride, and belonging to the community are also important, with a sense of duty as conventionally defined - service before self, nose to the grindstone, respect for authority, following orders - less important than in other LFAs. LFCA reservists tended to be

somewhat less concerned with duty and control than their Regular Force counterparts. They seemed to be more individualistic than reservists in other LFAs, felt somewhat more alienated from society, felt more strongly about national identity, and needed to routinely escape the stresses and responsibilities of everyday life. LFWA Reserve personnel tended to be at the opposite end of the continuum from SQFT Reserve personnel. Where emotion, intensity, complexity, status, and appearance were important in SQFT, risk aversion, rationality, simplicity, and maintenance of the status quo were important among LFWA reservists. LFWA Reserve personnel are even more rational and risk averse than their Regular Force counterparts and, perhaps because of this, proved to be more ethnically intolerant. No data was available for LFAA because of limited Reserve sample size.72

In summary, long serving soldiers of ten or more years experience, tended to be more conservative when compared to the Canadian population. This is not surprising as these individuals had become immersed in a quite conservative environment – the military. They were concerned with duty, loyalty, and did not rebel against structure. They held conservative views on family, money, and the sexes. This conservativeness does lead to some intolerance and a tendency to look to others for guidance rather than being guided from within. Most notably in terms of acceptance of the ethos, the soldiers willingness to embrace military values increased over time. There is a wide range of soldiers differentiated by gender, age, rank, and geographical location which also influenced how the ethos was viewed and accepted. There are also Regular and Reserve Force differences although the differences between the components is not as marked as is often assumed by those within the military.73

Quite frequently the relations between the Regular and Reserve component can be confrontational but the Army’s adoption of the ‘Task Force’ model for operations in Afghanistan, versus the old Battalion Group based on a single unit as the nucleus, will

undoubtedly reduce these tensions as reserve force participation on deployed operations has increased dramatically.

Much of the conservativeness of the Army is a result of male attitudes. Women, on the other hand, have more liberal views of equality, the sexes, and family structure. Women are also more concerned with ethical considerations. Men are more adventurous and tend to be more duty conscious. Distinct differences exist between the under 35 years of age cohort and their older counterparts—the younger age group tends more to risk and excitement, belonging and intolerance, while the older group leans toward the desire for autonomy, equality, and practicality.74

LFAs show distinctive tendencies. SQFT personnel are intense and emotional, adaptable and desiring of status while being somewhat intolerant of outsiders. LFCA personnel are tolerant and concerned with doing their duty while LFWA personnel are individualistic and feel alienated; they have life goals outside of work and prefer work to be kept uncomplicated. LFAA personnel, like LFWA personnel, feel alienated and have life goals distinct from professional goals. They are pragmatic, place great importance on family and are concerned with doing their duty. Reserve Force differences between LFAs are minimal.75

It should be clear based on the above that the Army is not one homogeneous group. On one hand, the findings of the CROP 3SC survey do give the Army leadership a high degree of confidence in the alignment of our soldiers' values beliefs and attitudes with those of Canadian society at large. On the other hand, this very fact could be seen as an area of concern. This is because this means that there is a ‘gap’ between the Army's stated ethos or espoused values and operative culture or how things are really done. In addition, as noted in

the report, managing the reality of Canadian regionalism as it impacts Army unity, a national concern, within an integrated CF must become a leadership priority.\textsuperscript{76}

As Donna Winslow wrote, “for the military, the core values of Army culture are subordination of the self to the group and the idea of sacrifice: the individual must be willing to subordinate him or herself to the common good, the team and the common task. Furthermore, there must be a willingness to sacrifice one’s life for the team in peace and war. Without this, an armed force will risk defeat”.\textsuperscript{77} Indeed, and what Dr Winslow is stating is in essence the principle of ‘mission – own troops – then self.’ This trinity remains the core element of military professionalism and is linked to the unlimited liability to sacrifice in defence of the homeland, Canadian values and national interests.\textsuperscript{78} As explained by David Bercuson, professional soldiers are “unlimited in [their] military responsibilities and, if necessary, must offer up [their lives] life in the achievement of the mission goal.”\textsuperscript{79} In a more individualistic Canadian society, however, a lower priority is given to values of the community and the subordination of the self to that of the team.\textsuperscript{80}

In essence, current Canadian social and cultural changes do not provide a supporting framework for the core values of Army culture. Indeed, today’s generation of prospective recruits have demonstrated difficulty in accepting some of the traditional demands of an Army way of life. Deference to authority figures has waned and authority has to be earned and not taken for granted in Canada. This trend poses questions for the Army with its highly-structured authority relations. Although the Canadian Army is not likely to follow the European trend of union-like associations for military personnel, it is now believed that

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{76} Canadian Department of National Defence, \textit{Canada’s Soldiers: Military Ethos and Canadian Values in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century}, (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 2005), p. 49.


\end{flushright}
service personnel ought to have the right to be able to air and represent their grievances outside the formal chain of command. For example, the oft quoted Ombudsman’s office, established in 1999 as a result of Somalia scandal, stands outside the military chain of command and frequently intercedes on behalf of individual soldiers on issues ranging from health care to pension to living conditions. While this in itself is indicative of how the army culture has evolved it also indicates a loosening chain of command in order to incorporate a more rights-based system of command and consultation more akin to non-military organizations. In effect, there are institutional changes aloof that may ultimately serve to undermine the institution itself.

This is but one area where societal evolution has influenced how the military has had to adjust how it operates. Another example is significant sections of the youth population are less physically fit than ever before. One of the effects of this is that in order to maintain standards, the costs of training are rising because of the need to bring poorer quality recruits up to the standard required. These two examples – the Ombudsman and fitness - are secondary but tangible effects of the impact societal change is having on the army. As this paper has argued, in terms of the ethos, it will also be a challenge to maintain the traditional expectation that military personnel should conform to a code of moral conduct that is more demanding than that expected in civilian life with respect to issues of honesty, integrity, sexual behaviour, drug use and conduct. Today, the Armed Forces represent barely 0.19 percent of the population, with virtually no significant flow-through. The disconnection of Canadians from their armed forces, which we have witnessed in general terms over the last 40 years, but certainly more so in the last 15-20 years, is in large measure responsible for its neglect and decline. Yet, that neglect and decline has not prevented the government from committing forces to war and to near war situations repeatedly over the last fifteen years.\footnote{Dr. Mark Milner, “Whose Army Is it Anyway?” Canadian Military Journal Vol 3, no. 2 (Summer 2002), pp. 16.}
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Institutionally, therefore, the military has struggled in the last 15-20 years. Many forces, cultural and institutional, were eroding the ethos. Consequently, the 1980s and 1990s were difficult decades to be in uniform as scandal after scandal plagued the military. This abysmal cycle was aggravated by deep cuts in defence by successive governments. With the profession under attack by the media and little visible support provided by the government, morale plummeted and many soldiers indicated their unhappiness by resigning in record numbers. The army leadership took steps to reinvigorate the Army. Part of that effort was re-establishing the importance of a unifying ethos and code of conduct through the issue of *Duty With Honour*. As this paper has described, the publication of this document has not been without controversy.

In simple terms, soldiers do not come automatically to a transcendent, or religious, sense of their occupation, any more than do professional chefs or athletes. To quote Barbara Ehrenreich, author of *Blood Rites: Origins and History of the Passions of War*, “The only values and traits universal to fighting men are courage and loyalty to one’s band or leader, and these values they share with street gangs and organized-crime syndicates.” Ms. Ehrenreich’s bizarre comparison of the profession of arms with street gangs aside, she is correct in saying that new soldiers share little in common with the exception of courage and loyalty to each other. Indeed, to expect new recruits to automatically subscribe to the exacting demands of the profession and the values inherent to its ethos upon enrolment is at best simplistic and at worst, naive.

Therefore, what the military must do is take steps to address soldiers’ expectations, thereby bolstering affective commitment, enhancing leadership and accounting for regional differences. To do this, *Duty With Honour* must be a part of all Army leadership curricula, as well as part of individual development plans for soldiers. The message quite simply must be spread. As expressed by David Bercuson, “*Duty With Honour* is a fine document. It ought to

---

be read not only by everyone who dons the uniform of the Canadian Forces, as a full-time member or as a reservist, but by every Canadian who has either a desire or an obligation to understand the awesome physical and moral burdens that every Canadian soldier takes on.83

Moreover, the military as an institution must understand that its most valuable resource, the soldiers themselves, are not blank slates blindly awaiting the infusion of the Army’s culture and values. Rather, they come to the Army imprinted with societal values and influenced by a host of cultural stimulants. Upon enrolment they do not have the same background, interests or beliefs. Nor do they come from the same region. Indeed, at best Canada's Army has four distinct subcultures related to each of the four LFAs. It is therefore important to take into account these regional differences when crafting policies and making decisions.

It is also important because *Duty With Honour* is a seminal document in the Army’s future. The fact that Canada’s soldiers from across the country, across the rank structure, male, female, Regular and Reserve possess divergent views on the role of the ethos is irrelevant in terms of what the profession of arms expects of them. It is important, however, in the sense that a methodology must be adopted to inculcate these individuals, but ultimately the ethos and its associated values must prevail. The Army must and should have a unifying code of conduct as quite simply put; the mission’s assigned to the military demand a cohesive and unified front. Canada’s soldiers, by-products of a pluralistic, self-indulgent and hedonistic society, must be made to understand that service in the military is not a job, it is a calling and it is a profession with exacting expectations and standards. This is a critical element of the Army culture, one that has transcended generations. In the final analysis, Army culture matters, the army ethos matters, it underpins all that the Army does.84
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