CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
CSC 28 / CCEM 28

EXERCISE/EXERCICE NEW HORIZONS

CANADIAN MILITARY AND SOCIAL VALUES: THE REASONS FOR DIFFERENCE

By /par Maj R.N. Francisco

CANADIAN MILITARY AND SOCIAL VALUES: THE REASONS FOR DIFFERENCE

"Even the CF itself recognises that the armed forces are a separate group within a democratic society"[1]

Since the end of the Cold War in 1989, there has been a renaissance in thought on the relationship between society and the military. The Canadian introspective experience has generally mirrored that of other Western democracies. During this period, though, there have been events peculiar to Canada alone that have defined its discussion on this relationship. These events for the military include the Somalia incident in 1992 and subsequent inquiry ending in 1997, the withdrawal of 4 Canadian Mechanised Brigade Group from Germany in 1993, and the public episodes of post-traumatic stress disorder for some of the senior military leadership throughout the decade. Socially, Canada has been grappling with the concept of national unity during the same period. All of these events have resulted in the Canadian military-society relationship developing in a unique manner. This relationship is defined by the broader perception that the military is a separate part of Canadian society, a perception considered correct by both military and social analysts. The manifestation of this separateness is evident in the differing sets of values held by Canadian society and the Canadian Forces (CF). During this period of introspection the Minister of National Defence (MND) reported to federal parliament on the leadership of the CF[2]. This report reviewed, amongst other topics, CF military values and how they should mirror Canadian social values.

---

[1] Department of National Defence, *Ethos and Values in the Canadian Forces (1997)* http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/Ethos/ETHMAR19.htm, 23 January 2002, p1

In the broadest, sense the values of any society and its military may not always be reflective of each other. These values will be different for a variety of reasons; some may be based in the society itself or, conversely, in its military. The values of Canadian society and the CF are different because Canadian society is segmented[3] and the military perceives itself as separate from society. The cause for this separateness, and hence differing values, is rooted in issues such as the nature of values themselves being intrinsic to a specific social group and the historical relevance of the relationship between the military and society. Additional causes of this feeling of separateness are the unity of Canadian values themselves, the perceived and stated purpose of the CF, and demographic factors in both the CF and Canada.

Other items pertinent to this discussion but not included in this paper are issues involving federalism; Quebec separatism; indigenous groups (both First Nation people and Aboriginals); the impact of international humanitarian law and the United Nations; the effect of religion as a specific demographic issue and other specific demographic determinants. All of these causes are intertwined with the continuing search for Canadian unity. It is intended to examine only the key issues pertaining to why CF values differ from those of Canadian society as a whole. These issues are the intrinsic nature of values, the interaction of society and military, Canadian unity, the perceived separateness of the CF and Canadian demographics. This paper focuses upon these causes to demonstrate why the values of the Canadian Forces will not always reflect Canadian values.

---

[2] Department of National Defence, *Report to the Prime Minister on the Leadership and Management of the Canadian Forces (tabled 25 March 1997)*, http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/PM/mnd.60.html, 7 March 2002, p1
[3] J.B. Sykes, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (7ed)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982, p952

"The values Canadians expect their soldiers to demonstrate in their actions and conduct abroad as makers and keepers of peace may be gleaned from the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. These values include fairness, decency, respect for human rights, compassion, and a strong sense of justice"[4]

Canadian society has always had an expectation that the CF will be an extension of itself. Philosophically, most Canadians would hope that the CF is another method of expressing the values of Canadian society. The conduct, behaviour, intent and purpose of the Canadian military are all developed from these values. There is, however, no obvious set of Canadian societal values for this reflection to be effective. The *Spicer Commission Report 1991* in its study of Canadian unity coincidentally produced a generally acceptable set of Canadian values. These were later reflected in former Prime Minister Joe Clark's *Shared Values: The Canadian Identity*. It is in comparison to these Canadian values that CF military values are assessed as different. A theme amongst the literature on this topic is that CF values are a significant but separate part of Canadian social values. Further to the notion that the values of the CF have developed separately from those of Canadian society is the consideration that these values, and cultures, may no longer be acceptable to Canadian society[5].

The notion that any military is separate to its society is a modern perception that has evolved through centuries of conflict when societies were seemingly continually at war. This separateness notion is considered common to most militaries and the CF is no different in the

[4] Justice G. Letourneau (Chairman), *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair (Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia) (Volume Five)*, Ottawa, Canadian Government Printing, 1997, p1448

[5] Department of National Defence, *Ethos and Values in the Canadian Forces (1997)* http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/Ethos/ETHMAR19.htm, 23 January 2002, p2

respect in that feels it has *"a consequent separateness from society"*[6]. Military and social history both record that societies mobilised armies for military action only when there was time of war. The link between the society and its military was immutable as once the time for war had ceased the demobilisation of the army occurred, repatriating these soldiers back to their civilian lives and societies. The modern position is that professional standing armies, such as the CF, are held to public scrutiny to ensure that their values are reflective of the society from which it is drawn from. It is this position that suggests that there must be causes for the publicly stated values of both Canadian society and the CF to be different; otherwise, they would be more closely aligned.

Social values are held as important to a specific society because they are *"those moral beliefs to which people appealed for the ultimate rationales of action"*[7]. This importance must include sub-sets of that society as each of these segments builds towards a hierarchical whole. Values are therefore the moral reflection of a group of people that can then become the social and cultural determinants for those people. Values are also a reflection of social perspectives. Perspectives are subject to all the social and cultural filters that have evolved in the history of that group of people. It is recognised that people develop values as part of a cultural process and that they are intangible concepts, merely ideas, rather than fixed economic considerations[8]. These values then form a part of our society, both domestically and nationally.

The broadest extrapolation of society is generally restricted by national boundaries. It does correlate, however, that within those national boundaries that there is only one national society.

---

[6] Justice G. Letourneau (Chairman), *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair (Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia) (Volume One)*, Ottawa, Canadian Government Printing, 1997, p77

[7] J.L. Spates, "The Sociology of Values" in *Annual Review of Sociology*, Volume 9, 1983, p28

Given that any national society is broadly made up of a variety of social groups, customs and organisations it is logical that there must be some considered difference in culture and practices amongst those domestic societies that exist within it. A national society is distinct in the global community from other national societies and it may also be very distinct from the domestic societies that form its foundation. The influence each of these domestic societies has upon the national culture and values will be determined by the perspective of the national population, as a whole, towards that domestic society. This is critical to understanding why the CF, a military society, has a different set of values to those of the national society of which it is a sub-set. It is also important to the understanding of the relationship between Canadian society and the CF.

The manner in which society and military interact is dependent upon what level of militarism the society has experienced. It is considered by many military leaders throughout history that the lesser the involvement of the state's civilian leadership in military affairs, particularly in the conduct of war, the greater the potential for success[9]. There is a suggestion in this reflection that there should be some level of military dominance, or militarism, over the civilian society. It is implicit in militarism though that the influence of military values over their civilian counterparts is undue or unwarranted. There is no suggestion, however, that the military can exist outside of its society. In a democracy, such as Canada, it is essential that the CF *"...adhere to common social values..."*[10] thus in the modern Canadian context the link between society and military is described. The stronger the link between a military and a society the stronger the correlation there is likely to be between the values held by each.

---

[8] J.L. Spates, "The Sociology of Values" in *Annual Review of Sociology*, Volume 9, 1983, p29
[9] B. MacIntyre, "Politicians and generals are always at daggers drawn" in *The Times (UK)*, 30 October 2001
[10] Department of National Defence, *Report to the Prime Minister on the Leadership and Management of the Canadian Forces (tabled 25 March 1997)*, http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/PM/mnd.60.html, 7 March 2002, p2

It is recognised that a separate military society has continued to flourish in civil society if only for operational expediencies[11]. These expediencies have allowed military societies to develop idiosyncrasies, characteristics, traits and other cultural identities common, but not exclusive, to the military. Importantly, they have included rules of engagement that permit killing and destroying in order to protect society. Additionally, the expediencies include the surrendering of certain liberties, submission to another set of laws, the concept of ultimate sacrifice, as well as some traditional values of loyalty, duty, and honour. In many modern societies though, the presence of the military is indistinguishable from the civilian element of government and the Canadian Department of National Defence (DND) reflects this philosophy. This structure suggests a closer link between the two sets of values than is currently perceived in the Canadian experience. This is acknowledgement of a gap created by the perception that Canadians are not militaristic people despite having been involved in conflicts in many theatres, on many continents, against a variety of foes in order to establish and preserve the Canadian way of life that are, in essence, its values. It is clearly noted by the DND, however, that the CF is one of the few institutions that is *"truly reflective of our (Canadian) society"*[12].

The relationship between a society and its military can be easily determined if the military is intrinsically linked to the society through ethnic, cultural, national or political association. It is in this context that military values are considered in reference to those of society. The suggestion that *"...the military plays a special role in the nation as the repository of the nation's*

[11] Second Lieutenant J.F. Giles, "Moral Component: Threats to the British Army Ethos" in *The British Army Review*, Number 128, p50

[12] Department of National Defence, *Report to the Prime Minister on the Leadership and Management of the Canadian Forces (tabled 25 March 1997)*, http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/PM/mnd.60.html, 7 March 2002, p2

values"[13] is met with hesitancy in Canada. This hesitancy is based on the perception that the values of society and the military are different and that the military has cultivated and communicated a special status for military personnel in society[14]. This concept of special status within a society is a reflection of the link between the military and the society, particularly the role of the military in that society. This link, in Canada, is not perceived to be as strong or continuous as in other countries such as the United States of America (USA).

The US experience is demonstrated through the stated requirement of the military to protect and preserve the stated rights and freedoms in the US Constitution[15]. The construct of this constitution and the history of the USA as a nation whilst similar to Canada in some ways is also very different in others. The significant role of the US Army and Navy in the development of social institutions is well documented and many of the values of the early US military forces were embedded in aspects of the US Constitution. The comparison with Canada is not to suggest that the US experience is better or worse. The example serves to act as a contrast of how the differing social and military histories of two neighbouring countries have produced very contrasting modern military-society relationships. The values of each of these two countries reflect the social and military perspectives of each country's people.

"Canada is a country that believes in freedom, dignity and respect, equality and fair treatment, and an opportunity to participate."[16]

---

[13] General Sir John Hackett, *The Profession of Arms*, London: Times Publishing Company Ltd., 1962, p58
[14] Major J. Tasseron, "Military Manning and the Revolution in Social Affairs" in *Canadian Military Journal*, Volume 2, No.3, Autumn 2001, p60
[15] M.M. Wakin, *Military and Societal Values: The Relevance of Knowing and Doing*, http://www.usafa.af.mil/jscope/JSCOPE95/Wakin95.html, p2
[16] J. Clark, *Shared Values: The Canadian Identity*, Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1991, p1

This quote from *Shared Values: The Canadian Identity* in 1991 is the most recent statement of Canadian values. There is no suggestion that Canadian society has either accepted or rejected these values or whether the intention was for that to occur. Quite simply, given the difficulty in defining values in the purest philosophical sense, it is understandable that Canadian values are not well defined. There is no single document, amongst the federal policies and Acts of Parliament, which openly and succinctly defines Canadian values. These documents include the Constitution and Charter, citizenship requirements, as well as immigration, foreign, and defence policies. The *Spicer Commission Report 1991*, which preceded the *Shared Values* document, provided a longer and slightly broader list of Canadian societal values.

The Spicer Commission in releasing its report in 1991 was defining the issue of Canadian unity and realised that this required a focus upon the importance of shared values in nation building[17]. The single most influential public comment that the Commission received was that the core values of Canadians were outdated and that a new set of values was required for the future. The previously perceived values of peace, order and good government were considered no longer appropriate[18] and a list of seven contemporary values was published[19]. These new social values are:

a. equality and fairness in a democratic society,

b. consultation and dialogue,

c. accommodation and tolerance,

[17] R. Cashmin and R. Normand, *Spicer Commission: 1991 Citizen's Forum on Canadian Unity*, June 1991, http://uni.ca/spicer.html, 23 February 2002, p2
[18] R. Cashmin and R. Normand, *Spicer Commission: 1991 Citizen's Forum on Canadian Unity*, June 1991, http://uni.ca/spicer.html, 23 February 2002, p2
[19] R. Cashmin and R. Normand, *Spicer Commission: 1991 Citizen's Forum on Canadian Unity*, June 1991, http://uni.ca/spicer.html, 23 February 2002, pp3-7

d. diversity,

e. compassion and generosity,

f. attachment to Canada's natural beauty, and

g. commitment to freedom, peace and non-violent change

The *Canadian Constitution of 1867 (as amended)* is the practical application of the founding Canadian values. Subsequent amendments to the Constitution are reflections of changes in Canadian values. The 1867 Constitution itself does not state the values of Canada, as it is meant to be a representative expression of those values. Canadian values are embodied in the words that guide how Canada will be structured and governed. The 1982 amendment incorporating the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*[20] indirectly expresses Canadian values. These values are captured in the fundamental rights and freedoms, which are clearly described for all Canadian citizens but not necessarily for Canadian society specifically. The core values of Canadian society are therefore embedded into the Constitution, incorporating the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, without there being a need for a prescribed listing as does the *Spicer Commission R1(t499 Tm(Rights and F21 Tw2.00031 Tre71.99985 295.019928 Tm(20)TjETEMC P 8MCID 7 B

Canadian citizens is the *Citizenship Act (1974-6)*[22] itself. Section 24 of the *Citizenship Act* requires a potential Canadian citizen, therefore an immigrant and not an ordinary Canadian, to take an oath or affirmation of citizenship. This oath/affirmation requires the successful Canadian citizen to *"fulfil my duties as a Canadian citizen"*[23], duties which are not listed nor described. There is no relationship between these undescribed duties and Canadian values provided by other government departments. This is a reflection of the earlier discussion regarding the disengaged link between citizenship, the Constitution, and the Charter.

There is no direct correlation between aspiring to Canadian citizenship and aspiring to any set of Canadian values by either immigrants or by ordinary Canadians. The stated sets of values by Joe Clark and the Spicer Commission appear to be relevant to ordinary Canadians only. Canadian values, though, are not published as an authoritative societal regime for all Canadian citizens to live by. Following the *Spicer Commission Report (1991)*, it was conversely noted that the more homogeneous the values of any particular group are, the more that there would be an emphasis on with the differences[24]. Essentially, Canada is loosely bound by a set of generally harmonised values that are not designed to constrain the development of Canadian society within any one particular perspective. In concert with this idea of values as a loosely binding concept there does not appear to one body acknowledged as the 'guardian' of Canadian values nor one organization as the embodiment of the same. This is in contrast to CF values, which are considered critical to

---

[21] Citizenship and Immigration Canada, *Citizenship*,http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/newcomer/fact_093.html, p1
[22] Department of Justice Canada, *Citizenship Act (Chapter C-29)* http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-29/29146.html, p21
[23] Department of Justice Canada, *Citizenship Act (Chapter C-29)* http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-29/29146.html, p22
[24] W. Norman, "Shared values do not a country make" in *National Post (CA)*, 24 June 2000

the effectiveness of the CF, are perceived as being embodied in every member of the CF, and epitomised by the actions of every Canadian service person.

Aside from the Constitution and the Citizenship Act, only the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and DND proclaim Canadian values. DFAIT notes Canadian values in *Canada and the World (1995)* as being the *"respect for democracy, the rule of law, human rights, and the environment"*[25] but this is noted as a part of foreign policy and it is not correlated to the Constitution or the Charter. These values are different from those proclaimed by the DND. The DND document *Strategy 2020*[26] identified the Canadian values to be defended as *"democracy and the rule of law; individual rights and freedoms as articulated in the Charter; peace, order and good government as defined in the Constitution; suitable economic well-being"*. Clearly there are significant discrepancies between the publicly perceived social values, as identified by the Spicer Commission and former Prime Minister Joe Clark, and those proclaimed by any of three federal government departments. It is not surprising then that the CF has values that are different again. This highlights the significance of why the CF has a separate set of values. The discord of implied and unspecified values, as perpetuated by a variety of federal government departments, has, in contrast to the openly proclaimed and practised values of the CF, allowed the CF to develop its own values in isolation. These values, though, reflect the required operational effectiveness of the CF for it to fulfil its role as given to it by Canadian society.

[25] Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, *Foreign Policy* http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreignp/menu-e.asp

[26] *Shaping the Future of Canadian Defence, A Strategy for 2020*, Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 1999, p2

Amidst this discussion is the notion that values worth having are values worth defending. In the absolute sense the defender of social values is construed as being the military. The promoter of Canadian values is considered to be another group altogether, whilst the task of the preservation of these values may belong to another again; but the defence of Canadian values is publicly perceived as the role of the CF. The critical link is whether that in defending the values of Canadian society the CF needs to hold the same values.

The link is expressed in the national policy objectives across various departments using the military as a political instrument. These objectives are sometimes achieved, as an expression of national will, with military power based upon a set of national values as stated in foreign policy. It is considered inherent that the defence policy must reflect, to some degree, the values of that nation, as the nation's people will expect the military to defend those values. Essentially, it is conforming to the concept that "…*in a democracy, those in power must justify their use of coercion as being necessary to maintain such values as freedom, equality, justice, and the rule of law…*"[27] which is the premise of the Canadian Constitution and equates to the Canadian social values prevalent during the Cold War period. The validity of this proposition is the degree to which the CF reflects Canadian societal values in the performance of its role.

The role of the CF is to protect and defend the security of Canada[28]. Additionally the CF could be expected to defend the social institutions that represent Canadians, such as federal parliament in the physical and broader sense and social values in the philosophical sense. The physical aspects of Canada are easily identifiable but the values to be defended are not. It is perceived

[27] S. Brooks, *Canadian Democracy: An Introduction*, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2000, p6
[28] Department of National Defence, *Ethos and Values in the Canadian Forces (1997)*

that in the defence of Canada that national security can be construed as the preservation of a way of life acceptable to Canadian people and compatible with the needs and legitimate aspirations of others. In essence, the defence of Canada is the defence of Canadian values.

The *Defence White Paper 1994* is a reflection of the link between military and social values. This document clearly states that *"a nation not worth defending is a nation not worth preserving"*[29] - a specific reference to the purpose of the Canadian Forces. The *Defence White Paper* forms a part of the national security debate that focuses upon three specific freedoms. These freedoms loosely fit the generic themes typically associated with Canadian values. The freedom from military attack or coercion, freedom from internal subversion, and freedom from the erosion of the political, economic, and social values that are essential to quality of life in Canada are the publicly stated objectives of defence policy. They also form the foundation from which military values are developed, as they are the purpose, in this instance, for the existence of the CF. The *Strategy 2020* document[30] identifies the Canadian values to be defended but does not attempt to align them with those in the *Defence White Paper* nor those in any other public document. Even though it is a strategic document is does not attempt to correlate the relationship between the military and society of the future thus ensuring that the values of each can remain different and the CF separate to society.

Neither stated sets of values by the DND match those expressed in *Canada and the World (1995)*, the keystone document of DFAIT activities. The result is that members of DFAIT desire

---

http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/Ethos/ETHMAR19.htm, 23 January 2002, p1

[29] Department of National Defence, *1994 White Paper on Defence*, http://www.dnd.ca/admpol/pol_docs/94wp/highlights.html, p1

[30] *Shaping the Future of Canadian Defence, A Strategy for 2020*, Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 1999, p2

to project a set of Canadian values and the members of DND desire to defend another; hence the difficulty, as a nation, in determining a position on the dilemma of *"It is harder for us than for just about any other nation, though, to be both a warrior and a peacemaker."*[31]. This problem has arisen again in the approaches to the current war against terrorism where the CF, universally recognised as peacekeepers, are now heavily involved in fighting alongside the US-led coalition forces. The problem now arising is whether these two roles are compatible with Canadian values. The difficulty that is developing is in determining whether either set of values, as stated, is reflective of either Canadian society or its military or neither. It can be deduced that if values in Canada have developed and diverged to the point where neither the social nor military values are reflective of society, there must be significant reasons for this to have occurred. It is suggested that these reasons are rooted in the inherent segmentation of Canadian society, the separateness of its military and the impact of Canadian demography.

Well before the current war against terrorism the CF had clearly stated its values. These values were last published in the *Statement of Defence Ethics* in 2001. This statement incorporated three principles and six obligations as recognition of a commitment by the DND, of which the CF are part, to its special responsibility for the defence of Canada[32]. These values are *"integrity, loyalty, courage, honesty, fairness, responsibility"* with the three principle values of *"respect the dignity of all persons, serve Canada before self, and obey and support lawful authority"*[33]. In addition to these publicly stated values the *Ethos of the Canadian Forces* describes the Canadian Forces as sharing the same values as all Canadians, these being stated as *"fairness, integrity, and*

[31] R. Gwynn, "We're losing our image as impartial third party" in *The Toronto Star (CA)*, 20 January 2002
[32] Department of National Defence, *DAOD 7023-1, Statement of Defence Ethics* http://www.dnd.ca/admfincs/subjects/daod/7023/form/a_e.asp, 7 November 2001, p1
[33] Department of National Defence, *DAOD 7023-1, Statement of Defence Ethics*

respect for the rule of law"[34]. These values do not match the social values as stated by DFAIT and DND. Further, the officers' commissioning scroll refers to *"an adherence to an ethos based in core values of loyalty, courage, and integrity"*[35] which is considered applicable to all CF officers. The MND's report to parliament in 1997 clearly stated another set of values inclusive of *"love of country, courage, loyalty, duty, honour, submission to discipline, unlimited liability of service, and self sacrifice"* all of which were described as *"traditional and timeless military values"*[36]. Clearly there is some confusion as to what are CF values, a position similar to the debate Canadian social values.

Following on from the internal disparities within DND there has been significant concern in the wider public about what values the CF holds. The concern amongst sections of Canadian society is about the CF being labelled as warriors. In the wider use of the word, a warrior is considered to be faithful to a cause – a level of commitment above that of society. The perception, though, is that the warrior is committed to a cause other than the defence of social values. This commitment was recently recognised by the *Somalia Inquiry Report (1997)* where it was noted that the distinguishing features of military life was leading to sense of separateness by the military, even a feeling of superiority over its society[37]. The distinguishing clause of *"unlimited liability"*[38] has been universally recognised by military historians and commanders for many

---

http://www.dnd.ca/admfincs/subjects/daod/7023/form/a_e.asp, 7 November 2001, p1

[34] *The Ethos of the Canadian Forces Statement*

[35] Justice G. Letourneau (Chairman), *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair (Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia) (Volume Two)*, Ottawa, Canadian Government Printing, 1997, p365

[36] Department of National Defence, *DAOD 7023-1, Statement of Defence Ethics* http://www.dnd.ca/admfincs/subjects/daod/7023/form/a_e.asp, 7 November 2001, p2

[37] Justice G. Letourneau (Chairman), *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair (Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia) (Volume One)*, Ottawa, Canadian Government Printing, 1997, p78

[38] General Sir John Hackett, *The Profession of Arms*, London: Times Publishing Company Ltd., 1962. p63

years. This term has oft been remarked as the ultimate sacrifice and there has been considerable honour given to dying for your country. The idea of dying to defend a commitment to a cause above or before social values is one of the problems associated with military values being different.

In this essay it is acknowledged that the warrior concept has grown from the position in history where *"…(the warrior) served primarily himself and his caste, and he defended society's values largely because they were his values to begin with…"*[39] to the point that there is a strong relationship between the society and the development of policies for social welfare and defence. The notion of the warrior, as discussed previously, is considered not applicable in the modern social context. The profession of arms, the modern development of the warrior caste, holds the values of *"duty, courage, discipline, dedication, teamwork, and honour"*[40] as important. It is suggested, though, that these values and those of the CF are not exclusive to the military and that most, if not all, easily transcend into social norms. The difficulty is in determining whether society needs those values to function effectively in the manner in which the profession of arms does. This difficulty is influenced by the demographic construct of both the CF and Canadian society. As part of this construct it is readily recognised that the majority of the CF is focused upon ensuring that their institution is reflective of Canadian values the demographically based notion of *"the social reality of contemporary Canada"*[41].

---

[39] Captain T. St Denis, "The Dangerous Appeal of the Warrior" in *Canadian Military Journal*, Volume 2, No2, Summer 2001, p31

[40] Department of National Defence, *Ethos and Values in the Canadian Forces (1997)* http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/Ethos/ETHMAR19.htm, 23 January 2002, pp4-5

[41] Department of National Defence, *Report to the Prime Minister on the Leadership and Management of the Canadian Forces (tabled 25 March 1997)*, http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/PM/mnd.60.html, 7 March 2002, p2

Given that the modern military, for example Canada, recruits from all demographic groups, it is common for the society to expect the military to be its demographic reflection. Demography can be the basis of structure within the military and society; hence, the possibility that either group could be divided along demographic segments is very real. Such segments are bound by religion, citizenship, language, ethnicity, aboriginality, and gender. This demographic segmentation of society, according to CF recruiting policy, should be reflected in the CF, as it is an extremely important variable for CF recruiting[42]. These demographic differentiations are already reflected in the Canadian Army where regimental divisions are aligned with geographic and linguistic segments[43]. The sub-unit groupings within the now disbanded Canadian Airborne Regiment were based upon similar divisions despite it drawing from across the whole Canadian Army. This is recognition of the diversity of Canadian demography but also an example of the segmentation that has occurred. This type of segmentation is what can lead to different social groups developing differing values.

The Canadian public considers its society to be a cultural mosaic. This stems from the considerable amount of landed immigrants who have become Canadian citizens. The history of Canadian demography, in broad terms, has been the migratory influences of the original French and British settlers of the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries. The recent phase of immigrants of the last century added to an extensive mosaic that now formally recognises and includes the native Indian people in the southern areas and the aboriginal people of the Arctic regions. This is recognised in the acknowledgement that *"diversity has been a fundamental characteristic of*

[42] P.S. Li, "Race and Ethnicity" in P.S. Li (ed), *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990, p8

Canada since its beginnings"[44]. It is near impossible to singularly and clearly state who or what a 'Canadian' is, beyond their state of citizenship. The concept of the hyphenated Canadian, i.e. French-Canadian, has become an almost universal method of describing a Canadian, which is a reflection of the significance and diversity of minority groups in Canadian society.

In all societies, not just Canadian, these minority groups can have a proportional or disproportional influence upon the values of society and the military. Militancy amongst Canadian ethnic minorities is more likely to have an impact when derived from an indigenous standpoint. The impact of immigration on Canada, as a whole, has resulted in a *"cultural, ethnic, and linguistic makeup found nowhere else on earth"*[45] and this has also impacted the CF. This level of immigration has been unprecedented in Canadian history and has presented an unheralded challenge of *"integrating ethnic and visible minorities into Canadian society"*[46] and then into Canadian institutions such as the CF. One set of Canadian values is important to the integration of migrants into Canadian society. The segmentation of Canadian society has not allowed proper integration of existing minority groups. For future immigration, this perceived failure would make further integration increasingly difficult. The implication for the CF of failed migrant integration is that it will most likely lead to a failure to recruit from migrant groups. The consequences of failing to recruit from migrant groups by the CF will result in a narrower social strata base in the military; such circumstances can then encourage CF values to

---

[43] Justice G. Letourneau (Chairman), *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair (Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia) (Volume One)*, Ottawa, Canadian Government Printing, 1997, p79

[44] Canadian Heritage Multiculturalism, *Canadian Diversity: Respecting our Differences* http://www.pch.gc.ca/multi/respect_e.shtml, p1

[45] Canadian Heritage Multiculturalism, *Canadian Diversity: Respecting our Differences* http://www.pch.gc.ca/multi/respect_e.shtml, p1

[46] Canadian Heritage Multiculturalism, *12th Annual Report on the Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1999-2000*, http://www.pch.gc.ca/multi/reports/ann99-2000/contents_e.shtml, p4

develop in increasing isolation. Therefore, it is suggested that the stronger the integration of minority groups, both existing and migrant, into Canadian society should lead to greater homogeny with the CF. This should enable CF values to be more reflective of Canadian values through greater CF participatory rates by visible minorities and, hence, greater homogeny between the two demographic groups.

Canadian society can therefore be seen as demographically segmented. Inherent in this is that Canadian values are not homogeneous because of this segmentation. Given the interaction of the CF in a modern Canadian society it is then not surprising that the two sets of values are different. Since the end of the Cold War these societies, or a society with many sub-societies, have developed in very different ways. Canadian society has become a broader multicultural society whilst the CF has continued to develop with a focus on operational effectiveness. In order to achieve this effectiveness the CF has become a tightly controlled organisation with a highly homogenous population group and a strong sense of purpose. This has resulted in a clear set of stated values. The notion that the CF, like other military organisations, is separate to the rest of society has led to the development of these values separately to those of Canadian society. These military values are perceived as current, relevant, timeless and contributing to operational effectiveness.

Canadian society, however, as a loose mosaic with a contrasting demographic homogeny, has no authoritative expression of social values. The divergence between these values and those of the CF is an unconscious recognition that *"divergence from wider social values rests on ... sober*

judgement of what is required for a militarily effective organisation"[47]. The divergence within Canadian society, at the expense of national unity, has created demographic segmentations thus allowing diverging values to develop. This is often noted in the issues surrounding federalism, separatism, aboriginality, First Nations, religion and other demographic and political factors. The diverging CF values would appear to be an indicator of the broader lack of unity in social values. Given that demographics are the key influence on values as determinants of social unity, it is expected that they will also directly influence all social values. Canada's demography is becoming increasingly diverse in terms of the number and size of social segments as well as the apparent failure to fully integrate these segments into society. The impact on Canadian society is unheralded; hence, the debate on values has become increasingly complex. The increased diversity and decreased integration has widened the gap between social and military values within Canada. This gap is what can be described as the lack of reflection between these two key sets of values with the solution appearing to be a review of both.

Amidst this seemingly confusing mass of differing social and military values, it is clear that there has been significant debate over the last decade on such values. In order for the CF to be effective, it has developed values that will support its operational function, values that are perceived as timeless, traditional, and common to most militaries. Canadian society, on the other hand, has struggled with the debate on national unity inclusive of referendums, failed accords, open confrontation, and continued failure with constitutional matters as demonstrated in the 'opting out' by Quebec on the 1982 Constitution, and the failure of Accords at Charlottetown and Lake Meech. It remains then, in this post Cold War era, that the values of the CF will not

[47] C. Dandeker, "New times for the military: some sociological remarks on the changing role and structure of the armed forces in advanced societies" in *The British Journal of Sociology*, Volume 45, Issue 4, December 1994, p652

always reflect those of Canadian society. In the current context, the reason for the difference is that Canadian society is segmented and the CF is perceived as separate to society with developing demographic influences widening this feeling of separateness.

Bibliography

Books

M. Adams, *Sex in the Snow: Canadian Social Values at the End of the Millennium*, Toronto: Penguin Books, 1998

S. Brooks, *Canadian Democracy: An Introduction*, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2000

J. Clark, *Shared Values: The Canadian Identity*, Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1991

G. Daniker, *The Guardian Soldier: On the Nature and Use of Future Armed Forces*, New York: United Nations, 1995

J. Curtis and L. Tepperman, *Understanding Canadian Society*, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd, 1988

General Sir John Hackett, *The Profession of Arms*, London: Times Publishing Company Ltd., 1962

P.S. Li (ed), *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990

W. Maley (ed), *Shelters From The Storm: Developments in International Humanitarian Law*, Canberra: Australian Defence Studies Centre, 1995

J.B. Sykes, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (7ed)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982

S. Taylor and B. Nolan, *Tarnished Brass: Crime and Corruption in the Canadian Military*, Toronto: Lester Publishing, 1996

A. Vagts, *A History of Militarism*, Greenwich: Meridian Books, 1959

Articles

D.L. Bland, "A Unified Theory of Civil-Military Relations" in *Armed Forces and Society*, Volume 26, No1, Fall 1999, pp7-26

C. Dandeker, "New times for the military: some sociological remarks on the changing role and structure of the armed forces in advanced societies" in *The British Journal of Sociology*, Volume 45, Issue 4, December 1994

H. Fallding, “A Proposal for the Empirical Study of Values” in *American Sociological Review*, Volume 30, Issue 2, April 1965, pp223-233

C.P. Gibson and D.M. Snider, “Civil-Military Relations and the Potential to Influence: A Look at the National Security Decision-Making Process” in *Armed Forces and Society*, Volume 25, No2, Winter 1999, pp193-218

Second Lieutenant J.F. Giles, “Moral Component: Threats to the British Army Ethos” in *The British Army Review*, Number 128, pp50-52

General Sir John Hackett, “The Military in the Service of the State” in M.M. Wakin, *War, Morality, and the Military Profession (2ed)*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1979

A. Koch, “The Status of Values and Democratic Political Theory” in *Ethics*, Volume 68, Issue 3, April 1958, pp166-185

DR P. Martin and DR M. Fortmann, “Support for International Involvement in Canadian Public Opinion After the Cold War” in *Canadian Military Journal*, Volume 2, No.3, Autumn 2001, pp43-52

J.L. Spates, “The Sociology of Values” in *Annual Review of Sociology*, Volume 9, 1983, pp27-49

Captain T. St Denis, “The Dangerous Appeal of the Warrior” in *Canadian Military Journal*, Volume 2, No2, Summer 2001, pp31-37

Major J. Tasseron, “Military Manning and the Revolution in Social Affairs” in *Canadian Military Journal*, Volume 2, No.3, Autumn 2001

H.W. Wright, “Objective Values” in *International Journal of Ethics*, Volume 42, Issue 3, April 1932, pp255-272

Reports

DR A.D. English, *Understanding Military Culture: A Canadian Perspective*, Toronto: DCIEM, 2001

Justice G. Letourneau (Chairman), *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair (Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia) (Volume One)*, Ottawa, Canadian Government Printing, 1997

Justice G. Letourneau (Chairman), *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair (Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia) (Volume Two)*, Ottawa, Canadian Government Printing, 1997

Justice G. Letourneau (Chairman), *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair (Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia) (Volume Five)*, Ottawa, Canadian Government Printing, 1997

Shaping the Future of Canadian Defence, A Strategy for 2020, Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 1999

Newspaper Articles

R. Gwynn, "We're losing our image as impartial third party" in *The Toronto Star (CA)*, 20 January 2002

B. MacIntyre, "Politicians and generals are always at daggers drawn" in *The Times (UK)*, 30 October 2001

W. Norman, "Shared values do not a country make" in *National Post (CA)*, 24 June 2000

Attributed Internet Articles

R. Cashin and R. Normand, *Spicer Commission: 1991 Citizen's Forum on Canadian Unity*, June 1991, http://www.uni.ca/spicer.html, 23 February 2002

Prime Minister P.E. Trudeau, *Notes for a National Broadcast Friday 16 October 1970* http://www.nelson.com/nelson/school/discovery/cantext/speech2/1970trwm.htm, 4 December 2001

M.M. Wakin, *Military and Societal Values: The Relevance of Knowing and Doing*, http://www.usafa.af.mil/jscope/JSCOPE95/Wakin95.html, 14 September 2001

Organisational Internet Articles

Canadian Heritage Multiculturalism, *12th Annual Report on the Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1999-2000* http://www.pch.gc.ca/multi/reports/ann99-2000/contents_e.shtml, 21 November 2001

Canadian Heritage Multiculturalism, *Canadian Diversity: Respecting our Differences* http://www.pch.gc.ca/multi/respect_e.shtml, 21 November 2001

The Canadian Philosophical Association, *Philosophy in Canada: Questions and Answers* http://www.acpcpa.ca/publications/various/philocae.htm, 22 November 2001

Citizenship and Immigration Canada, *Citizenship: Fact Sheet*
http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/newcomer/fact_093.html, 21 November 2001

Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, *Foreign Policy*
http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreignp/menu-e.asp, 19 November 2001

Department of Justice Canada, *Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982*
http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/const/c1867_e.html, 21 November 2001

Department of Justice Canada, *Citizenship Act (Chapter C-29)*
http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-29/29146.html, 21 November 2001

Department of Justice Canada, *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*
http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/charter/index.html, 7 November 2001

Department of Justice, *National Defence Act (Chapter N-5)*
http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/N-5/72888.html, 7 November 2001

Department of National Defence, *1994 White Paper on Defence*
http://www.dnd.ca/admpol/pol_docs/94wp/highlights.html, 7 November 2001

Department of National Defence, *Ethos and Values in the Canadian Forces (1997)*
http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/Ethos/ETHMAR19.htm, 23 January 2002

Department of National Defence, *DAOD 7023-1, Statement of Defence Ethics – 26 June 2001*
http://www.dnd.ca/admfincs/subjects/daod/7023/form/a_e.asp, 7 November 2001

Department of National Defence, *Report to the Prime Minister on the Leadership and Management of the Canadian Forces (tabled 25 March 1997)*,
http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/PM/mnd.60.html, 7 March 2002

Miscellaneous

The Canadian Forces Officer's Commissioning Scroll
(Copy viewed was as issued to Robert Henry Smallwood on 8 September 1982)

The Ethos of the Canadian Forces Statement (circa 2001)

1945 Charter of the United Nations, San Francisco, 26 June 1945

1949 Geneva Convention (IV) Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, Geneva, 12 August 1949

1977 Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts, (Protocol I) Geneva, 8 June 1977