

Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

Abstract

Since the mid 1960's, successive generational values among Canadian youth have become increasingly divergent from national core values and from those espoused by the Canadian Forces (CF). This paper contends that the divergence of values will present a serious obstacle to successful junior officer leadership development over the next ten years. Challenges along these lines already exist and they will continue to intensify as the CF regenerates itself. Examination of the values of two generational cohorts – Generation X (GenXers) and Generation Y (Millennials) suggests that there are potentially significant conflicts between the CF Ethos and generational expectations. To address this shortcoming, the CF needs to inculcate, in its future leaders, a moral ethos consistent with military service before empowering these individuals with leadership authority. Professional development programs for junior officers must take this background of dissimilar values into account and make concerted efforts to relate appropriate leadership styles that will offer a greater chance of success. Failure to adequately respond to this emerging threat to core leadership principles will result in decreased operational capability and will ultimately undermine the legitimacy of the CF as a professional body.

SETTING THE STAGE FOR SUCCESS:
DEVELOPING JUNIOR OFFICERS OF CHARACTER

As each generation has come to maturity in modern society, many individuals have often wondered how their predecessors managed to survive under such suffocating social circumstances. Youth have often felt misunderstood and even sometimes mistrusted by those who established and controlled the mechanisms to viewed as successful. Most honestly believe that their generation held the prescription for national ills and that given the opportunity and the audience, they might prevail. Economic conditions, security concerns and social structure all play a role in moderating the degree of change, however most experts agree that change is constant but unpredictable¹. A more fundamentally unanswerable question is however, whether we are on a linear path in changing generational values, or a circuitous one. A circular path suggests that, after some element of time, we will return, to some degree, to values previously held. A linear path implies that we will continue to chart new territory with each successive generation. Route notwithstanding, what does this mean for institutions whose core values provide meaning for their very existence, and such, adopt change in very limited doses? How can our national institutions maintain their relevancy and their responsibilities when their survival is predicated on regeneration through youth?

This paper contends that the divergence of values held by the Canadian Forces (CF) and Canadian youth will present a serious obstacle to successful junior officer leadership development over the next ten years. Challenges along these lines already

¹ Richard P. Appelbaum, *Theories of Social Change*, (Chicago: Markham Publishing, 1970), 25.

exist and they will continue to intensify as the CF regenerates itself. The CF needs to inculcate, in its future leaders, a moral ethos consistent with military service before empowering these individuals with leadership authority. Professional development programs for junior officers must take this background of dissimilar values into account and make concerted efforts to relate appropriate leadership styles that will offer a greater chance of success. Failure to adequately respond to this emerging threat to core leadership principles will result in decreased operational capability and will ultimately undermine the legitimacy of the CF as a professional body.

To demonstrate the nature and degree of the problem, core values expressed within the CF Ethos will be compared against those attributed to two youth cohorts – Generation X and Generation Y. This comparison will be placed a context by reviewing generational value changes since the end of the Second World War to give a better sense of the evolution of generational values over time. This analysis will consider the likely nature and scope of operational loss the CF might face as a consequence of diverging values. Leadership style will be the focal point of this assessment. Finally, recommendations on how to mitigate the problem and provide a lasting solution will be offered. The contribution of this paper is to assess the probable effect of inter-generational value changes for junior officer development in the CF, and to offer practical strategies for remediation.

VALUES, MORALS AND ETHICS

“What is wrong is wrong, even if everyone is doing it. Right is right, even if no one else is doing it.” -- William Penn ²

In 2003 the CF published a keystone manual on the profession of arms in Canada entitled *Duty with Honour*. For the first time, this document articulated in writing the essence of what it meant to be a member of the CF, the responsibilities associated with service, a clearly defined military ethos and what it meant to have honour as a warrior.

Across the history of modern civilization, peoples have gathered together in groups based on common beliefs, desires and expectations. Social structures formed within these populations gave rise to nations states providing a place of refuge for people with common expectations, traditions and values. Values represent our most fundamental beliefs. They are the principles we use to define that which is right, good and just.³

conditions by representing the ought and should of life. When one acts in ways that are consistent with broad moral values we characterize that as acting ethically. One can have professional ethics but very seldom do we refer to professional morals. Finally, character is demonstrated through actions taken that reflect values, ethics and morals in which one believes. Character brings congruence between professed beliefs and actual behaviour by putting ethical principles into action. The quality of character is sometimes referred to as moral courage because it demonstrates who you are, even when no one is looking.⁴

Men and women of such character have always been present in the CF. Some members possessed the seeds of character upon enrolment and developed greater depth through experience and heightened awareness of their responsibilities. Others came to the Forces with well-developed character and became role models for others to emulate. Finally, some arrived lacking a clear ethical compass, perhaps seeking out the CF to develop character. It is primarily for those individuals that the CF has articulated its Ethos.

CANADIAN FORCES VALUES

“The profession of arms in Canada is composed of military members dedicated to the defence of Canada and its interests, as directed by the Government of Canada. The profession of arms is distinguished by the concept of service before self, the lawful, ordered application of military force, and the acceptance of unlimited liability. Its members possess a systematic and specialized body of military knowledge acquired through education, training and experience, and they apply this expertise competently and objectively in accomplishment of their missions. Members of the Canadian profession of arms share a set of core values and beliefs found in the

⁴ Changing Minds, “Morals, Values and Ethics,” http://changingminds.org/explanations/values/values_morals_ethics.htm; Internet; accessed 20 March 2005.

military ethos that guides them in the performance of their duty and allows a special relationship of trust to be maintained with Canadian society.”⁵

All professional institutions within Canada are bound together by specific values and beliefs that support their respective organizational foundation, and the martial profession is no different. The military ethos referred to in *Duty with Honour* comprises the values, beliefs and expectations that reflect core Canadian values, the imperatives of military professionalism and the requirements of operations. This ethos acts as the center of gravity for the military profession and establishes an ethical framework for the professional conduct of military organizations.⁶ The profession of arms is unique in that it serves only the nation, it is subordinate to civil authority and its members are subject to unlimited liability.⁷ Chapter 2 of *Duty with Honour* identifies the three fundamental components that make up our military ethos: beliefs and expectations about military service, Canadian values, and Canadian military values.

The central beliefs and expectations about military service are further defined as the acceptance of unlimited liability, possession of a fighting spirit, self-discipline and teamwork⁸. These qualities underline the unique nature of the profession of arms and suggest that the demands, both individually and collectively, will be high. Canadian values have always played a major role in determining how Canadian military

⁵ Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-002 *Summary of Duty with Honour* (Kingston: DND Canada, 2003), 9.

⁶ Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-001 *Duty with Honour* (Kingston: DND Canada, 2003), 25.

⁷ General Sir John Hackett describes this commitment, as “The essential basis of military life is the ordered application of force under an unlimited liability. It is the unlimited liability which sets the man who embraces this life somewhat apart. He will be always a citizen. So long as he serves he will never be a civilian.” General Sir John Hackett, *The Profession of Arms* (London; Times Publishing, 1963), 126.

⁸ *Duty with Honour...*, 26.

professionals executed their responsibilities. Although they seem obvious, the rule of law and peace order and good government are values reflected in our national legislation. These overarching ideals have had a direct impact on DND's statement of ethics, which espouses the following imperatives: to respect the dignity of all peoples; to serve Canada before self; and, to obey and support lawful authority. Canadian military values have their roots in our national values, tempered with the unique aspects of a profession that includes warfighting. These values are Duty, Loyalty, Integrity and Courage.⁹

Duty entails service to Canada and compliance with the law above all else. It is the overarching value that motivates all members to strive for the highest standards of performance. It provides us with the purpose and direction for all of the demanding tasks we face in our careers. The principle of the primacy of the mission and of service before self, are both embodied in duty.¹⁰

Loyalty is closely related to duty and entails personal allegiance to Canada, faithfulness to comrades and commitment to the rule of law. It is based upon mutual and reciprocal trust, regardless of rank. It implies responsibilities to both superiors and to subordinates, ensuring trust and confidence are shared in both directions. Loyalty is nurtured and developed in training and called upon in times of crisis to sustain us.¹¹

Integrity exemplifies the ultimate standard in ethical and moral conduct. It implies a principled approach to obligations while being responsible and accountable for ones actions. Embodied in this attribute are honesty, truthfulness, avoidance of deception and

⁹ Ibid., 30-31.

¹⁰ Ibid., 30.

¹¹ Ibid., 31.

adherence to high ethical standards. Integrity requires actions to be consistent with professional codes of conduct and institutional values. Its manifestation is especially important in commanders because of the impact their personal example has on subordinates.¹²

Courage is moral strength displayed in a will to do what is right in spite of adverse consequences or the conduct of others. It has a distinctly personal quality that allows a person to disregard the cost of action in terms of physical risk or popularity. Courage entails mental discipline, willpower and the resolve not to quit.¹³

These are the crucial values that create the atmosphere under which leadership ability is inculcated and developed. The fundamental awareness that we are surrounded and supported by like-minded servicemen and women makes the aggregate force greater than the sum of its parts. At the institutional level, shared values are a force multiplier.

National Values

As a national institution, the CF must reflect the core values of the population it represents or it risks losing legitimacy in the eyes of the public. Our National Security Policy, *Securing an Open Society*, identifies Canadian core values as respect for democratic institutions, peace order and good government, and respect for others.¹⁴ Canadian representatives to international organizations around the world convey the

¹² Ibid., 31.

¹³ Ibid., 31.

¹⁴ Privy Council Office, *Securing an Open Society: Canada's National Security Policy* (Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 2004), 1.

common message that these are the foundational values of what it means to be Canadian. Although not espoused by every individual citizen, they broadly reflect the basic understanding of the vast majority of Canadians. These are the bedrock values upon which individuals are then able to express their personal values without fear of persecution or exclusion. Each successive generation has been protected by the atmosphere created by societal acceptance of these core values through public institutions including Parliament, courts, and tribunals. More often than not it is the youth generational cohort that expresses itself (or is labeled as such) as breaking with tradition through a newly discovered need for freedom and quite often they are considered to speak with one voice. However, as a number of social scientists will illustrate, defining the values held by Canadian youth is anything but simple.¹⁵ To fully assess the range of youth values within the national population, we must first examine those expressed through generational differences in social values.

Although age profiles vary in different populations based on a range of demographic effects, the population of Canada can be broken down into four distinct generations: matures, baby boomers, Generation X and Generation Y.¹⁶ While demographics directly influences the size of populations and the pools from which employees are drawn, they also have a direct impact on beliefs, attitudes and values. While these generational beliefs are not totally uniform, researchers have found shared set of socio-cultural assumptions – values, attitudes, aspirations, expectations and

¹⁵ Douglas Coupland, *Generation X: Tales for an Accelerated Culture* (New York: St Martin, 1991), 20-30.

¹⁶ As broadly supported by social scientists, the mature generation in North America is composed of those born between 1909 and 1945. Baby boomers were born between 1946 and 1964. Generation X was born between 1965 and 1980, and Generation Y after that date.

motivations – within each of the four generations.¹⁷ The mature generation believes in performing one's duty and being rewarded for hard work. They have been referred to as "The Greatest Generation"¹⁸ as they survived the trials of the Second World War and returned to North America to generate unparalleled economic prosperity for themselves and their families. Teamwork, conformity and the assurance that they are right reflect their basic generational attitudes. Conformity is desirable for this group because they achieved so much through collective effort. They believe in power, authority and institutions and share a common law-and-order ethic. As employees, they are committed not just to the values of government, but also to the institutions – like the CF. Change is not considered to be a positive value.¹⁹

Boomers on the other hand know what they like and what they want and while they share matures' fundamental values, they do not need to be told what to do. They are self-motivated and see control and professional empowerment as key issues.²⁰ They are driven to accomplish things, to be successful in life and believe that everyone can share in the wealth. Although they have lived their lives morally, they have not wholly embraced their parents' morals.²¹ Freedom to express themselves is seen as more

¹⁷ Eleanor Glor, *The Effect of Generational Cohort on Public Sector Ethics*, A paper prepared for the Ethics in the New Millennium – Bridging the Gap Between Private and Public Sectors conference of the International Institute for Public Ethics (IIPE), Ottawa, Canada, September 24-28, 2000, 3.

¹⁸ Tom Brokaw, *The Greatest Generation* (New York, Random House, 1998), 1.

¹⁹ Eleanor Glor, *The Effect of Generational Cohort on Public Service Ethics...*, 5.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 6.

²¹ J. Walker Smith and Ann Clurman, *Rocking the Ages: The Yankelovich Report on Generational Marketing* (New York, Harper Business, 1997) http://www.bizsum.com/articles/art_rocking-the-ages.asp; Internet; accessed 21 March 2005.

important than the need to conform to social expectations.²² Their follow-on cohort continued to develop attitudes in this direction, generally characterized as individualism.

Generation X (Gen X) is a term used to broadly describe the post baby-boom generation. They are most often characterized by a hedonistic lifestyle, the right to a good life in this life (rather than the next one), and the personal entitlement to happiness. This is yet a further shift towards individualism from the previous generation. Although these trends have slowed somewhat in Generation Y, the value of self-interest before group interest prevails.

In his book *Sex in the Snow* Michael Adams, an accomplished Canadian researcher, identifies the evolving nature of social tribalism in Canada. He suggests that we are evolving away from a culture which values peace, order and good government characterized by deference to authority, and gravitating towards independence and non-conformity.²³ These values have been most prevalent in generations since the baby boomers. Based on research conducted in 1997, Adams felt that Gen X was the most complex of those he studied and by far the least understood. This youth cohort 15-29 (in 1997) makes up 30 percent of the adult population within Canada and is formed into five distinct social tribes:

The “Aimless Dependents” (25 percent) have financial independence, stability and security as their fundamental motivators. They are the most nihilistic

²² J. Walker Smith and Ann Clurman, *Rocking the Ages...*; Internet.

²³ Douglas Adams, *Sex in the Snow: Canadian Social Values at the End of the Millennium*, (Toronto: Penguin Books, 1998), 17.

of their generation, shunning organized religion, humanistic ideals and equality of sexes. They are accepting of and prone to violence.²⁴

The “Thrill-Seeking Materialists” (25 percent) have traditional communities, social status and experience seeking as their fundamental motivators. Key values are a desire for money and material possessions and a desire for respect, recognition and admiration. They express a strong identification with Canada and place importance on traditional symbols – the flag, national anthem, Queen and military. They believe quite strongly in Darwinist “every man for himself” approaches when dealing with societal issues.²⁵

The “New Aquarians” (13 percent) have experience-seeking and new communities as fundamental motivators. Key values are egalitarianism, ecologism and hedonism. They demand total control over their lives and believe this is a universal “right”. They believe that the individual should decide personal values and morals rather than society or historical tradition.²⁶

The “Autonomous post-materialists” (20 percent) have personal autonomy and self-fulfillment as their fundamental motivators. Key values are freedom and respect for human rights. They reject deference to authority, paternalism, family values, institutional authority and the notion that there is a “proper way to conduct oneself”. They exhibit rebellious social behaviour.²⁷

²⁴ Ibid., 105.

²⁵ Ibid., 109.

²⁶ Ibid., 113.

²⁷ Ibid., 117.

The “Social Hedonists” (15 percent) have experience seeking and new communities as their fundamental motivators. Key values are aesthetics, hedonism, sexual permissiveness and immediate gratification. They have a limited attention span and are easily bored. They value life, family and friends and have confidence in traditional institutions to take care of them.²⁸

In Feb 2002 Adams was invited to participate in a leadership seminar about Canadian Army Leadership in the 21st Century. The conclusions he offered were quite striking. Extrapolating from current trends, Adams predicted that Generation X military recruits would likely demonstrate the following values and attitudes:

Strong On	Weak On
Equal Relationship with Youth	Everyday Ethics
Acceptance of/Attraction to Violence	Spiritual Quest
Penchant for Risk Taking	Meaning of Life
Adaptive Navigation/Enthusiasm for Technology	Ecological Consumption
Importance of National Superiority	Introspection and Empathy
Civil Disobedience	Effort for Health
Sexual Permissiveness	Attraction to the Simple Pleasures of Life
Attraction for Crowds	Religiosity
Pursuit of Happiness to the Detriment of Duty	Primacy of Family/Awareness of Mortality

Table 1²⁹

The implications of this table for the profession of arms are dramatic. Taken within the context that these are only general predictors of behaviour, there are indications of a

²⁸ Ibid., 120.

²⁹ Roberta Abbott and Col Capstick, *Canadian Army Leadership in the 21st Century*, Report of the Army Future Seminar-Leadership, 6-7 Feb 2002, Theme 3, Canadian Values and Military Ethos by Douglas Adams, (Kingston: LFDTS, 2002), 24.

significant divergence in the core values held by the CF and those purported to be held by 22-36 year olds within our country (our current Junior Officers and Officer Candidates). If one had to identify the essential military value at the core of our profession, it would likely be duty. Represented within the principle of service before self, sacrifice, or commitment, it is diametrically at odds with those who would pursue happiness to the detriment of duty. Loyalty entails personal allegiance to the country, commitment to the rule of law and faithfulness to comrades. Civil disobedience and an attraction for crowds do not appear to lend themselves to supporting military values in this vein. Finally, a commitment to moral principles and subsequent ethical behaviour is central to our legitimacy as a profession. Those with a weak ethical foundation will compromise the very core of our institution by dilution of the standard or by individual failure.

Adams summed up his conclusion with the following “I believe that by the year 2020, the institutions the boomers fought to reform will have much less significance for Generations X, Y and Z.... institutions like universities, the professions and yes, even the nation state-will all be much less relevant.”³⁰ He is not alone in his assessment that youth values are polarizing. In 1995 social analyst Loek Halman also examined the moral decline in North America and suggested “values are no longer dominated and prescribed by tradition and traditional, particularly religious institutions, but are increasingly rooted in personal choices and considerations.”³¹

³⁰ Ibid., 29.

³¹ Loek Halman, “Is there a moral decline? A cross national inquiry in a contemporary society” *International Social Science Journal* 145, (September 1995): 42.

Other social scientists suggest that there has been a significant shift in the moral values of our youth as a result of media influence, where anti-society figures are portrayed as heroes. They further imply that the dissolution of the family and the reduction in the role of stabilizing institutions like the church has resulted in youth who are at a lower stage of moral development and are more prone to unethical behaviour.³²

Balancing off a relatively bleak picture are those who suggest that it is not the values of the youth cohort that is out of place it is the sensitivity of the measuring device. Strauss and Howe suggest that Gen Xers lack of commitment to society is not a reflection of apathy but rather an unwillingness based on being let down before.³³ Unlike the boomers, Gen Xers have been significantly affected by economic recession and the failure of leadership figures to meet their expectations. Their notion of “making a difference” is manifested at a much more localized level through close friends or small groups and not political power or status based groups.³⁴ Others suggest that there are ways to accommodate the generational value gap through focusing on the needs of both employer and employee and not on values differences. Their comfort with an accelerated pace of change can be an asset because they work smarter, not harder. Their primary commitment to themselves and immediate group may ultimately be leveraged into institutional support on a less macro scale.³⁵

³² Dave Grossman, *On Killing* (Toronto: Little Brown & Company, 1996), 122.

³³ Neil Howe and William Strauss, *13th Gen: Abort, Retry, Ignore, Fail?* (Toronto: Random House, 1993), 35.

³⁴ Graeme Codrington, “Generation X: Who, What, Why and Where to? Defining Characteristics of Generation X” available from <http://www.youth.co.za/genxthesis/ch3html>; Internet; accessed 11 March 2005.

³⁵ Eleanor Glor, *The Effect of Generational Cohort on Public Service Ethics...*, 8.

As a cohort, the GenXers have demonstrated a significant departure from even the liberal attitudes and values expressed by their predecessors, the boomers. They have carried the themes of anti-establishment and anti-authority to new levels while defining self-expression and self-fulfillment as their accompanying end state. Many of the values held by this generation are at odds with those inherent in military service and are more extreme than preceding generations. Before assessing the generational impact on the CF, an assessment of the most recent youth cohort – Generation Y will be examined.

GENERATION Y – THE MILLENNIALS AND THE FUTURE

Following close on the heels of the GenXers are the offspring of the early boomers who are identified as a group by the terms Generation Y, the Millennials or Generation Next. This youth cohort is generally identified as having been born between 1980 and 2000 with an influence on the workforce that began in the late 1990s. As the children of boomers they have enjoyed being nurtured in a resource rich environment and like their parents, they represent a significant spike in the demographic norm. As a group there is limited research based information as their impact on the market place and the business community has only begun to be felt. There are however, many social scientists offering theories on how this cohort will influence society. In 2005 Millennials will begin to enter the workforce in significant numbers and their attitudes, outlook and values will have ever-significant impact over the next 15 years.

So what has formed their system of beliefs and how will this affect the CF? In many respects they have been exposed to the influence that GenXers have had on

society thought the marketplace and this has shaped their views. Although they are somewhat more risk averse as a group, they share a similar skepticism for authority and a common familiarity with technology. The relative abilities they have mastered as adolescents promote self-confidence and they do not stand in awe of older generations. They do not view age, rank or seniority as a measurement of accomplishment or expertise but regard demonstrated ability as the clearest sign of able leadership.³⁶ They view their skills or abilities as their most marketable asset and are not oriented toward any single career path. Indeed, they foresee changing employment many times based on jobs that bring them the most satisfaction. They do not necessarily fear failure at work, lack of promotion or even unemployment, as these are all short-term issues, which they feel are manageable. As such, traditional techniques to motivate and inspire may be ineffective, presenting difficulties for organizations unable to adapt.³⁷ Loyalty is highly valued and generally reserved only for those very close to them; friends and family. They have seen their parents affected by the results of corporate downsizing, re-engineering and layoffs and are somewhat jaded by the notion of corporate loyalty. They are time-oriented, “been there done that, what’s next” stimulus-seekers with a relatively short-term focus.³⁸ They are high-speed decision makers and believe that the patient are “glanced over, passed

³⁶ Mary Merrill, “Merrill Associates – Five Generational Differences Shaping Leadership”; available from www.merrillassociates.net/topic/2004/08/01/five-generational.html; Internet; accessed 19 March 2005.

³⁷ Dr. Linda Duxbury, as quoted by Anne Marie Owens in *Workplace Cockiness the way of the future*, available from www.canada.com/nationalpost/news/story.html; Internet; accessed 15 March 2005.

³⁸ Major J Tasseron, “Military Manning and the Revolution in Social Affairs,” *Canadian Military Journal*, (Autumn 2001): 57.

over and run over”.³⁹ Outside of work, balance is a fundamental value for millennials. As children of workaholic baby boomers, they view time, commitments and career advancement more proportionally than did their parents. Quality of life is central to their outlook.

Their pursuit of happiness through personal interests at the expense of advancement is a common thread that connects them to GenXers. It has been suggested that they are more internally self-aware and less future focused. They differ from their previous generation in that they are less hostile and less nihilistic than GenXers. Although they have a “show me what you can do for me”⁴⁰ attitude based on their perceived superior abilities, they are less cynical of institutions and have a healthier outlook toward the place of work in life.

Taken as a group their outlook on life appears to be somewhat less polarized than the GenXers leading some to conclude that society may have turned a corner and that youth values have begun to moderate. The impact on the CF however, is likely to be no less significant than that experienced by the arrival of the GenXers. The Millennials lack of deference toward authority in the context of the hierarchical military structure could present potential problems. In the CF, authority is tied to rank and rank is tied to a structure based on the collective experience of our institution. Our personnel management is founded on linkages between rank and ability. Challenging stereotypes of this magnitude may provide vigor and renewal of archaic administrative policies however challenging authority on operations can have drastic and adverse consequences. The

³⁹ Ibid., 2.

⁴⁰ Dr. Linda Duxbury as quoted by Anne Marie Owens in *Workplace...*, Internet.

apparent lack of interest in committing to an organization for anything other than the short term may have implications for the CF. Our developmental programs are geared for cumulative long term learning and will suffer from any mid-term exodus. As an institution, the CF values loyalty very highly and as individuals within it, we gather great strength through interpersonal loyalty and trust. How will the high-speed, short-term, low-risk outlook of the Millennials meet with the more career oriented, slow changing traditional focus of the CF as an institution? Finally, moral courage involves risk taking and acceptance of failure without quitting. The notion that life is a game that can be “re-booted” to start fresh does not support the underlying values of the CF ethos.

As a group, the Millennials appear to offer greater promise to the CF as an institution than do GenXers although there are still significant differences in expectations and outlook. What is most promising however, is the adaptability and self-confidence resident in this generation. If the CF can accommodate their zest for a high-speed life within the boundaries of military service, the combined effect could be remarkable.

DEDUCTIONS FROM ANALYSIS

Based on this assessment for both GenXers and Millennials, it is apparent that there is a divergence in values with those espoused by the CF and that this trend is likely to be maintained for at least the next ten years. The implication of this is that future leadership candidates from these cohorts may have different values than those espoused by the CF. Notwithstanding the fact that as generations mature, their values, to a greater

degree, migrate to reflect national core values⁴¹, the CF will continue to recruit leadership candidates amongst the youth of the nation. Therefore it is quite possible for the CF to reflect national core values and still be challenged by each new generational cohort. The manifestation of the challenge will be reflected in the values inherent in each aspirant. These potentially differing values will play a role in individual judgment, which could impair what the CF would identify as appropriate decision-making ability. Without some form of leadership litmus test, this may ultimately place greater responsibility on superiors within the chain of command by carefully allocating the extent of authority that can be delegated.

The ethics of leadership rests upon three pillars: (1) the moral character of the leader; (2) the ethical values in the leader's vision which are accepted by his followers; and, (3) the morality of the action pursued.⁴² When leaders are more morally mature, those they lead display higher moral reasoning. The inverse is also true.⁴³ Although there are many styles of leadership that relate to the legitimacy of authority, two basic approaches are most relevant to the CF as a military institution; transformational and transactional leadership. These distinct but interrelated ideal types of leadership style are employed daily across the CF, unwittingly or otherwise.

Transformational leadership contains four components: charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized

⁴¹ Graeme Coddington, *Generation X ...*, Internet.

⁴² Bernard M Bass and Paul Steidelmeier, "Ethics, Character and Authentic Transformational Leadership" <http://cls.binghampton.edu/BassSteid.html>; Internet; accessed 23 Nov 2004.

⁴³ Mark Green, Lamar Odom, Frank Bearden and Jim Bazar, "Transactional Leadership and Ethical Behaviour: Mutually Exclusive? The Ethics of Transactional Leadership" *Parallax: The Journal of Ethics and Globalization* <http://www.parallaxonline.org/eodom.html>; Internet; accessed 22 April 2005.

consideration.⁴⁴ Transformational leaders set the example to be emulated by their followers. This style is often associated with a more mature form of leadership and is manifest when junior officers are encouraged to “lead from the front”, “set a good example” or “inspire your soldiers”. Transactional leadership involves contingent reinforcement where followers are motivated by the leader’s praise and reward, or corrected by negative feedback, threats or disciplinary action.⁴⁵ The leaders react to whether the subordinates have carried out the tasks as a “transaction”. This is best exemplified in Senior Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) relationships with soldiers. When tasks are assigned, the contingent reinforcement is either praise if well done or further tasks if poorly done. Both leadership styles have equal merit depending on the maturity of the leader-follower relationship and the nature of the task. Both have strong philosophical rationales and ethical components. In general, highly skilled leaders use a combination of both leadership styles depending on their particular circumstances. However, what are the limitations of these leadership styles when the moral foundation of the leader differs from that of the institution?

In their examination of transformational leadership in 1998, Bass and Steidlmeier argue that when leaders are not effectively grounded with moral principles they become *pseudotransformational* leaders.⁴⁶ This is manifested in actions that are manipulative or done under false pretense, giving the appearance of confidence and support where none truly exists. These mis-leaders posture and knowingly focus their

⁴⁴ Peter G. Northouse, *Leadership Theory and Practice* (London: Sage Publications Inc, 2001), 137.

⁴⁵ B. M. Bass, *Transformational Leadership: Industry, Military and Educational Impact* (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998), 6, 33.

⁴⁶ Bernard M Bass and Paul Steidlmeier, “Ethics,... Internet..

followers on fantasy instead of attainable vision. They engage in sham and pretense because they are ultimately more interested in themselves than their subordinates.⁴⁷

The potential impact of this type of leadership on the CF is substantial. Without an adequately developed moral foundation providing an ethical compass, leaders may be predisposed to employing a *pseudotransformational* leadership style. Subordinates are thereby more likely to be lead into unprincipled or possibly unethical situations which could have a direct impact on the operational effectiveness of our forces. We rely on the independent judgment of junior officers both in training and on operations. The dynamic nature of modern deployed operations is such that our forces face situations that often call for independent and instantaneous decision-making. The CF risks very public and possibly catastrophic failure of its mission and the potential erosion of our international status through the unprincipled actions of an unprepared leader. Isolated examples of this have been seen among a number of senior officers from older generational cohorts over the past 20 years. Although there are no restrictions on unethical leaders by generation, the data suggests that the divergence in youth values could bring an increased likelihood of this being a concern in junior leaders of the future.

Critics would argue that the military has always faced a challenging process of indoctrinating leadership candidates and that the inculcation of future generations does not present anything new. Canadian society has seen a number of significant social upheavals/changes in the past 50 years. The CF has managed to survive these changes without any realized threat from massive institution-wide failures in leadership. To some degree it is true that the CF has a socializing effect simply based on

⁴⁷ Ibid.

its size and institutional presence. However, it is the degree to which the values of Canadian youth are polarizing in comparison to those held by the CF that is most relevant. The boomers held a greater degree of respect for institutions and authority than have successive generations and the rate of divergence between these cohorts has become much more pronounced. Social changes that took place in the 1970s were based on reforming traditional institutions, not abandoning them. As Adams puts it “Generally, those over fifty want to restore our institutions, the boomers want to reform them, and Generation X pretty much wants to write them off as irrelevant.”⁴⁸ There are also other, less tangible effects, which have reduced the institutional impact on newly arrived junior leaders. The military community as a whole is less influential on the individual today than it was in the 1970’s and 80’s. Unit life is not as character forming as it once was, messes are no longer the center of our social activities and military sports leagues are no longer preeminent. Many more military members choose to live outside the Base proper and only enter the military environment during working hours. While offering greater individual freedom, all of these factors have reduced the ability of the CF to informally mould and develop values consistent with military service in our junior leaders.

Finally, others have suggested that the type of candidate who approaches the recruiting center is fundamentally different than the average Canadian youth. By merit of the fact that he/she has considered the military as an employer candidates have inadvertently indicated that their values bear similarities to those of the CF. On the surface, there is some data to support this notion. A draft report to Chief of Land Staff (CLS) called *Canada’s Soldiers: Military Ethos and Canadian Values in the 21st Century*

⁴⁸ Douglas Adams, *Sex in the Snow...*, 31.

Army suggested that those youth who expressed an interest in the CF were attracted to the discipline and the risk. However, they demonstrated a tendency to lack life goals and felt alienated by society. They were not so much interested in service as being someone and belonging to something. Also, reflecting generational values identified earlier, “they tend to pursue happiness before duty, give personal life priority over work, and in ethical dilemmas tend to favour personal interests, none of which are typical attributes of serving members.”⁴⁹ These factors collectively demonstrate that reliance on applicants to self-select based on congruence between their values and those of the CF probably represents wishful thinking. There is no panacea for this issue, at least not based on the inherent values of those aspirants who come to the CF as volunteers. Reinforcement of common ground between youth expectations and CF requirements in our recruiting programs may be the catalyst required to attract high caliber leadership candidates which the CF can then adapt to its needs.

The CF, like many national institutions, adapts slowly to social pressure and often resists outside influence when it comes to change. Social engineering policies characteristic of federal governments in the 1970s left a residual mistrust of social reorientation, progressive or otherwise. It could also be argued that the CF never did recognize the arrival of the “GenXers values” and as a result we have initiated piecemeal policies in an attempt to re-engineer our belated understanding of the impact. Sensitivity, harassment and anti-racism training may all be part of a systematic catch up training for a formative period that was completely overlooked during early officer development

⁴⁹ Colonel M. Capstick, Lieutenant-Colonel K. Farley, Lieutenant-Colonel (Retd) W. Wild, Lieutenant-Commander M.A. Parkes, “Canada’s Soldiers: Military Ethos and Canadian Values in the 21st Century Army (DRAFT), Report to the Commander Land Forces Command November 2004”, 11.

periods. Given the rate of divergence of generational values and lacking any other mitigating efforts, it is entirely possible that sometime in the future the CF may institute CF Ethos training alongside the other these other programs as it struggles for balance.

Overall, there are a number of indicators that reflect a significant divergence in basic values orientation between the CF and Gen X and to a lesser degree between the CF and Millennials. Without intervention, these difference could manifest themselves in unacceptable leadership practices on a broader scale than previously experienced. Acknowledging that CF values are presently aligned with Canadian national values, and must remain so to maintain legitimacy, the CF will continue to be challenged by generational value differences as they recruit junior leaders in each successive youth cohort. The divergence of youth values from core CF values are apparent, significant and cannot be dismissed as routine generational change experienced in the past. However, there are a number of reasonable avenues of advance.

THE WAY AHEAD

“A man can be selfish, cowardly, disloyal, false, fleeting, perjured and morally corrupt in a wide variety of other ways and still be outstandingly good in pursuits in which other imperatives bear than those of a fighting man. He can be a superb creative artist, for example, or a scientist in the very top flight, and still be a very bad man. What the bad man cannot be is a good sailor, soldier or airman. Military institutions thus form the repository of moral resource that should always be a source of strength within the state.”⁵⁰

⁵⁰ General Sir John W. Hackett, *The Military in the Service of the State, War, Morality and the Military Profession* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), 119.

If General Hackett's quote is true and our professional of arms is a moral repository for the state, how can we best prepare our junior leaders for success? If successful CF leaders have at their core, an ethical foundation similar to that expressed in the CF Ethos, then how do we align the developmental programs to produce junior officers of character?

Currently, the CF Officer Professional Development (OPD) System establishes the framework for the planning and conduct of all professional development of officers. The Canadian Forces Leadership Institute (CFLI) is the organization primarily responsible for overseeing and enforcing the OPD System. The OPD System is broken down into four basic Developmental Periods (DP) of which two are most relevant to this paper. DP 1 covers the period from enrolment through to the rank of Second Lieutenant (2 Lt) with focus placed on leadership, language skills and occupational training⁵¹. DP 2 covers the period from 2Lt to Captain⁵² and focuses on occupational, experiential and environmental training.⁵³ DP 1 includes most of the common requirements of the Officer General Specification (OGS) and is delivered through the Basic Officer Training Course (BOTC) at Canadian Forces Leadership and Recruit School (CFLRS) St-Jean and at Royal Military College of Canada (RMC) Kingston. Language training is conducted at a number of CF institutions. CFLRS St-Jean has as its mission to:

“educate, instruct and train today's recruits and officer candidates by providing initial indoctrination to the rudiments of military knowledge

⁵¹ DP 1 covers training from enrolment until Trained Effective Strength (TES) 2Lts.

⁵² DP 2 covers professional development training for 2Lts (TES), Lieutenants and Captains.

⁵³ Department of National Defence, A-PD-007-000/JS-H01 *The Officer Professional Development Handbook* (Ottawa: DND Canada, 1997), 12.

and leadership together with the fundamental ethics and values that characterize the profession of arms. ... The training emphasizes physical and mental robustness, basic military skills, fundamentals of leadership and ethical values.”⁵⁴

A detailed review of the training program however, reveals that of the 14 weeks of instruction there is one 40-minute period⁵⁵ set aside for ethics and values of the profession of arms.⁵⁶ On the surface, this would not appear to be sufficient ethical indoctrination for leadership candidates coming from the two most recent generational cohorts. Further, for some leadership aspirants, this is the only formal training they will receive on the military ethos in DP 1 or DP 2. Candidates attending RMC receive, over their four-year undergraduate degree, more comprehensive instruction through mandated courses in leadership.⁵⁷ This is reinforced with exposure to NCOs during summer Military Occupation Specialty (MOS) training which provides a forum for instant feedback on theory. However, the inclusion of this instruction at RMC is based on an academic standard through a curriculum established by the college as a university. It falls beyond the mandate achievable in DP1 because it is not universal for all officers entering the CF. As such there exists a significant imbalance in the level of Ethos awareness resident in our junior leaders.

⁵⁴ Department of National Defence, “Canadian Forces Recruit and Leadership and Recruit School,” http://www.recruiting.forces.gc.ca/engraph/btraining/cflrs_e.aspx; Internet; accessed 18 April 2005.

⁵⁵ Department of National Defence, Canadian Forces Leadership and Recruit School Master Lesson Plan, available from <http://elrfc.saint-jean.mil.ca/fichiers/index.cfm>; Defence Wide Area Network; accessed 27 April 2005.

⁵⁶ In comparison there are forty three (43) forty-minute periods assigned to drill.

⁵⁷ Author is a graduate of RMC and has returned several times as a moderator for ethics symposiums.

Although our current Officer Professional Development (OPD) System recognizes the issue, it does not identify how ethics instruction is to be achieved and by whom. The OPD System identifies seven core themes within a professional body of knowledge: leadership, communications, ethics, ethos, history, management and technology. Each of these categories can be found in training plans from BOTC to DP 3. However, it states, “ The teaching of ethics, for example, cannot easily be quantified and does not reside within any specific institution.”⁵⁸ This statement embodies the essence of the problem - when everyone is responsible for it, no one is responsible. At the departmental level, the Defence Ethics Program (DEP) basic implementation plan directs that training be conducted within existing course structures – recruit, RMC, CFC etc. In 177 pages, it provides great detail on program description, standards, guidelines, quality control and methodology, however it does not address training required upon entry to the CF.⁵⁹ A great deal is left to the interpretation of the organization conducting the training, which can ultimately lose some of the decisiveness articulated in the DEP. Recognizing the existing values gap between where GenXers and Millennials are now and what they need to be aware of as junior officers, a much more comprehensive program is required.

The solution lies in developing a comprehensive program to inculcate newly minted junior officers to the CF ethos during DP 1. This would see Officer Cadets (OCdts) and 2Lts exposed to a decisive, intellectually demanding, emotional experience that would be the defining moment for them as junior officers. The core of the experience

⁵⁸ Department of National Defence, A-PD-007-000/AG-H01 *The Officer Professional Development System Document* (Winnipeg: DND Canada, 1997), 9.

⁵⁹ Department of National Defence, *Defence Ethics Program Handbook* (Ottawa: CRS, DND Canada, 2000), 21.

would be centred on group interaction with veterans of past conflicts coupled with serving CF senior commanders to reflect on their understanding of ethics and leadership. This interaction would span several days and allow the junior officers to be challenged in their established patterns of ethical understanding while absorbing a tangible and living history lesson. The ultimate aim would be to relate the CF Ethos and the responsibilities inherent in the profession of arms to leadership candidates from people who have unquestioned credibility. This would provide a fundamental awareness hereto fore not yet achieved during a most formative time in leadership development. Although representative of yet another drain on scarce training resources and time, this training would ultimately influence junior officer ethical development throughout their career and provide the foundation for greater intellectual development in DP 2 and DP 3. With a common point of departure for ethical and value awareness, much greater efficiencies can be achieved in subsequent training through the chain of command.

A great deal of inculcating and mentoring takes place in our line units across the CF every day. On ships and in squadrons, battalions and regiments there are informal but highly effective environments for junior officers to learn their professional responsibilities within the CF. However, many junior officers never experience unit life due to competing manning priorities, while others arrive well after other ethical impressions have been formed. Ethical professional development in units should be considered as enhanced exposure on top of a core experience much earlier on in the developmental period. This would provide a much simpler method of managing supervisor expectations and deliver a common product CF wide via the DEP handbook.

The notion that this type of training is required is neither unique, nor revolutionary. It has been proposed many times over many years by a number of professional development reviews. Five separate reports from the Rowley Report in 1969 to the RMC Board of Governors Study in 1997 made similar recommendations regarding the junior officer development. As summarized in the Officer Professional Development (OPD) Project 2020, it stated that there was “ a requirement for training, education and socialisation, which would provide a thorough inculcation into the concepts of leadership, military ethos, accountability, ethics, Canadian history, Canadian military history ... as they affect the operational ... environment.”⁶⁰ However, lack of consensus among the Environments, inadequate funding and a lack of will ultimately thwarted any momentum built. This reluctance needs to be overcome with bold and decisive leadership at the highest levels to avoid narrow-mindedness from defeating what could potentially deliver the next generation of outstanding leaders. OPD Project 2020, which began in 2000, is the latest attempt to refine how professional development should be approached. It potentially represents a very real solution to a decades old issue. The project needs to examine work already completed by social scientists within DND (ADM HR Mil)⁶¹ and address the generational value gap between the CF and its recruit base. Failure to act may manifest itself in anything from junior leader alienation to failure on operations. The CF has the tools required to take decisive action and avoid future crises in leadership

⁶⁰ Department of National Defence, *Officer Professional Development 2020 Project (OPD 2020 Project) Project Charter, Project 00000190 Ver 1.2*, Jan 2000, 4.

⁶¹ There are a number of Directorate of Strategic Human Resource Coordination (DSHRC) research notes produced by ADM (HR Mil) that are applicable.

however, action needs to be taken immediately if we are to be able to maximize the beneficial qualities resident within the next generation of CF leaders.

CONCLUSION

“Character is not reflected by what we say or even what we intend, it is reflected by what we do.”⁶²

Because of the way the CF regenerates its workforce, it will forever be impacted by the values of each successive youth cohort/generation. A progressive increase in the gap between CF values and successive generational values has occurred from the Baby Boomers to Generation X to Generation Y although it is impossible to predict if this trend will continue. This divergence in values will have a direct impact on the leadership abilities of future junior officers. There are many challenges that junior leaders will face in the course of their development however, an incompatibility with the values expressed in the CF ethos cannot be one of them. As a profession of arms, the CF has a responsibility to provide its junior leaders with all the tools possible to be successful. Arguably, in no other arm of government or corporate structure does the burden of clear and concise expectation find itself manifested in such absolute terms as there is no other institution with the uniqueness of mandate as found in the CF. Poor judgment within members of the profession of arms can cost lives, not just resources. Universal understanding and acceptance of the military ethos will provide a force multiplier to operations across the spectrum of conflict. Similarly, the degradation or removal of this pillar can have dire consequences. In his book “On Paradise Drive” David Brooks writes

⁶² Brainy Quote, “Anonymous”
<http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/169609.html>; Internet; accessed 20 March 2005.

“ Our [learning institutions] see passing along knowledge, not building character, as their fundamental task.”⁶³ In many ways, CF learning institutions have fallen into this trap.

The solution is to ensure that we are developing junior officer of character. They must not only be inculcated into the ethos of military values, it must be done very early on in their career. They need to be exposed to credible, passionate, and experienced members of our profession to relate the essence of how the CF ethos is reflected in every day values. With such inculcation, they will be armed with the strength of character needed to be successful as a leader in the CF.

⁶³ David Brooks, *On Paradise Drive* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 2004), 128.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Roberta and Col Capstick. Canadian Army Leadership in the 21st Century, Report of the Army Future Seminar-Leadership, 6-7 Feb 2002, Theme 3, Canadian Values and Military Ethos by Douglas Adams. Kingston: LFDTS, 2002.
- Adams, Douglas. *Sex in the Snow: Canadian Social Values at the End of the Millennium*. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1998.
- Appelbaum, Richard P. *Theories of Social Change*. Chicago: Markham Publishing, 1970.
- Bardaracco, Joseph L. Jr and Richard R. Ellsworth. *Leadership and the Quest for Integrity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1989.
- Bass, B. M. *Transformational Leadership: Industry, Military and Educational Impact*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998.
- Bass, Bernard M and Paul Steidelmeier. "Ethics, Character and Authentic Transformational Leadership." <http://cls.binghampton.edu/BassSteid.html>; Internet; accessed 23 Nov 2004.
- Beauchamp, Major Denis. *Basics of Canadian Defence Ethics*. Defence Ethics Program. Ottawa: DND Canada, n.d. .
- Brainy Quote, "Anonymous"
<http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/169609.html>; Internet; accessed 20 March 2005.
- Brainy Quote. "William Penn Quotes."
<http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/w/williampen169609.html>; Internet; accessed 20 March 2005.
- Brokaw, Tom. *The Greatest Generation*. New York, Random House, 1998.
- Brooks, David. *On Paradise Drive*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 2004.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-001 *Duty with Honour*. Kingston: DND Canada, 2003.
- Canada. Department of National Defence. A-PA-005-000/AP-002 *Summary of Duty with Honour*. Kingston: DND Canada, 2003.
- Canada. Department of National Defence. A-PD-007-000/AG-H01 *The Officer Professional Development System Document*. Winnipeg: DND Canada, 1997.

- Canada. Department of National Defence. A-PD-007-000/JS-H01 *The Officer Professional Development Handbook*. Ottawa: DND Canada, 1997.
- Canada. Department of National Defence. "Canadian Forces Recruit and Leadership and Recruit School." http://www.recruiting.forces.gc.ca/engraph/btraining/cflrs_e.aspx; Internet; accessed 18 April 2005.
- Canada. Department of National Defence. "Canadian Forces Leadership and Recruit School Master Lesson Plan." <http://elrfc.saint-jean.mil.ca/fichiers/index.cfm>; Defence Wide Area Network; accessed 27 April 2005.
- Canada. Department of National Defence. *Defence Ethics Program Handbook*. Ottawa: DND Canada, 2000.
- Canada. Department of National Defence. *Officer Professional Development 2020 Project (OPD 2020 Project) Project Charter, Project 00000190 Ver 1.2*. Ottawa: DND Canada, 2000.
- Changing Minds. "Morals, Values and Ethics." http://changingminds.org/explanations/values/values_morals_ethics.htm; Internet; accessed 20 March 2005.
- Coupland, Douglas. *Generation X: Tales for an Accelerated Culture*. New York: St Martin, 1991.
- Codrington, Graeme. "Generation X: Who, What, Why and Where to? Defining Characteristics of Generation X." available from <http://www.youth.co.za/genxthesis/ch3html>; Internet; accessed 11 March 2005.
- Duxbury, Dr Linda. As quoted by Anne Marie Owens in *Workplace Cockiness the way of the future*, available from www.canada.com/nationalpost/news/story.html; Internet; accessed 15 March 2005.
- Hackett, General Sir John. *The Profession of Arms*. London: Times Publishing, 1963.
- Hackett, General Sir John. *The Military in the Service of the State, War, Morality and the Military Profession*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1986.
- Halman, Loek. "Is there a moral decline? A cross national inquiry in a contemporary society." *International Social Science Journal* 145, (September 1995): 419-422.
- Glor, Eleanor. *The Effect of Generational Cohort on Public Sector Ethics*. A paper prepared for the Ethics in the New Millennium – Bridging the Gap Between Private and Public Sectors conference of the International Institute for Public Ethics (IIPE), Ottawa, Canada, September 24-28, 2000.

Green, Mark, Lamar Odom, Frank Bearden and Jim Bazar, "Transactional Leadership and Ethical Behaviour: Mutually Exclusive? The Ethics of Transactional Leadership." *Parallax: The Journal of Ethics and Globalization*, (n.d.). Journal on-line; available from <http://www.parallaxonline.org/eodom.html>; Internet; accessed 22 April 2005.

Grossman, Dave. *On Killing*. Toronto: Little Brown & Company, 1996.

Howe, Neil and William Strauss. *13th Gen: Abort, Retry, Ignore, Fail?* Toronto: Random House, 1993.

Merrill, Mary "Merrill Associates – Five Generational Differences Shaping Leadership." ; available from www.merrillassociates.net/topic/2004/08/01/five-generational.html; Internet; accessed 19 March 2005.

Navran, Frank. "Ethics Resource Centre News and Views." available from http://www.ethics.org/ask_e4.html; Internet; accessed 20 March 2005.

Northouse, Peter G. *Leadership Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications Inc, 2001.

Privy Council Office. *Securing an Open Society: Canada's National Security Policy*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 2004.

. Ne York, HarppterBuslinsse, 197.m