National Defence Défense nationale

Canadian Forces College

Collège des Forces Canadiennes

COMMUNICATION UNIFICATION: THE NEED FOR CANADIAN ARMED FORCES INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Major H.A.B. Apostoliuk

JCSP 39

Master of Defence Studies

Disclaimer

Opinions expressed remain those of the author and do not represent Department of National Defence or Canadian Forces policy. This paper may not be used without written permission.

PCEMI 39

Maîtrise en études de la défense

Avertissement

Les opinons exprimées n'engagent que leurs auteurs et ne reflètent aucunement des politiques du Ministère de la Défense nationale ou des Forces canadiennes. Ce papier ne peut être reproduit sans autorisation écrite.

Canada

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE – COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 39 – PCEMI 39
2012 – 2013

MASTER OF DEFENCE STUDIES – MAÎTRISE EN ÉTUDES DE LA DÉFENSE

COMMUNICATION UNIFICATION: THE NEED FOR CANADIAN ARMED FORCES INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

By Major H.A.B. Apostoliuk
Par le major H.A.B. Apostoliuk

Word Count: 19 592

Compte de mots : 19 592

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

In times of fiscal constraint and in the absence of a spotlight mission, the Canadian Forces public profile fades, and the military institution faces risks and benefits from such variability that deserve scrutiny. This paper explores the communications imperatives of the Canadian Forces as an institution necessarily distinct from other elements of the Canadian Government and the public, and concludes that a unified, commander-driven strategic communications approach is necessary to address unique military requirements. Specifically, the military ethos, the need for apolitical military expertise, and the requirements of effective military operations necessitate focussed command engagement. Through a review of the communications environment, the paper concludes that leaders must also delicately navigate between the differing communications needs of the Government, the Canadian people and the military institution itself to have a positive strategic effect, and assure that at all times the institution acts, and is seen to act, subordinate to the civil authority.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In times of fiscal constraint and in the absence of a spotlight mission, the Canadian Forces public profile fades. Public opinion polling recently demonstrated this trend when the number of Canadians that had "recently seen, read or heard something about the Canadian Forces" dropped from 57 per cent in 2011 to 38 per cent in 2012, related in part to the end of the combat mission in Afghanistan.[1] This variability deserves scrutiny, in light of the importance of communications to democratic government institutions.[2]

For the Canadian Forces, it is valuable to question how the institution should approach communications, and strategic communications, in a complex communications environment. Is there a need for a unique Canadian Forces voice distinct from other Government of Canada communications? Further, in what areas would such a voice be necessary to achieve the Government's objectives in the military domain, and how would leaders assure alignment of a distinctly military strategic communications approach with overall Departmental and Government communications imperatives?

Military communicators would have to consider such an approach in light of the existing communications environment. Key questions include what limitations and opportunities are presented by current and evolving communications mediums, what is

---

[1]Government of Canada Public Opinion Research Reports – National Defence – 2012, "Views of the Canadian Forces, tracking study, final report - Summary," last accessed February 12, 2013, http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsc-tpsgc/por-ef/national_defence/2012/049-11-e/index.html.

[2]D.M. White, Political Communication and Democratic Government, *Politics* 24, no. 1 (May 1989): 30. 29-41

the public and Government appetite for military discussion, what are the current policies and communications guidance, and what limitations do existing practices impose.

Given the importance of these questions, this paper will review the concepts of communications and strategic communications, and propose a Canadian Forces approach that considers the military's communications environment. Further, an analysis of the needs and expectations of the Government, the Canadian people and the military will demonstrate the imperative for the Canadian Forces to communicate strategically as a unified institution, in areas of unique interest to the military. In light of existing shortfalls, the paper will recommend areas for focused communications planning and leadership engagement.

Definitions

Some explanatory definitions facilitate common understanding of the concepts used in this paper, including the Canadian Forces institution, institutional communications, strategic communications, public affairs and information operations. The distinction between the military institution and the broader Department of National Defence is important when discussing the possible long-term needs of institutional communications. As explained by the Government, "Under the law, the Canadian Forces are an entity separate and distinct from the Department." [3] The National Defence Act

[3]National Defence and the Canadian Forces, "What is the relationship between DND and the Canadian Forces?," last updated 26 June 2012, http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/about-notresujet/index-eng.asp.

outlines the separation between these establishments, and the name "The Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces" reflects this division. Under the Minister, a civil servant Deputy Minister heads the Department, while the Chief of the Defence Staff leads the Canadian Forces. The Deputy Minister is responsible for "policy, resources, interdepartmental coordination and international defence relations."[4] The Chief of the Defence Staff is exclusively responsible to Government for the "command, control and administration of the Canadian Forces and military strategy, plans and requirements."[5]

Members of the military have a special relationship with the government forged on sworn fealty to the Crown, and with the Canadian people they serve to defend. Military leaders have a critical relationship with the men and women they command and lead in dangerous operations, which could result in their deaths. These unique relationships and responsibilities necessitate that the communications associated with the institution be examined distinctly from, but in close relationship to, the communications approach of the Department of National Defence and the Government. At the same time, this separation of entities does not negate the reality of the jointly run National Defence Headquarters, the subordination of the CF to civil authority, or the functional authority for public affairs given to the Assistant Deputy Minister Public Affairs (ADM PA) within the Department.

The Canadian Forces institution incorporates both the "organizational characteristics arising from the CF's functional role, and professional attributes reflected

---

[4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Ibid.*

in the CF's distinctive values and norms."[6] Thus, its leaders lead not only the organization, but also the profession of arms. The military doctrinal manual, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution*, provides guidance to current and future institutional leaders on "how best to direct, enable and motivate others while steering the Canadian Forces in the successful achievement of its very wide range of tasks and maintaining its professional ethos and relevance."[7] Canadian military leadership doctrine defines institutional leaders not by position, but by the impact that select officers and senior non-commissioned officers can have on the institution. Those most obvious examples include the Chief of the Defence Staff, senior officers and non-commissioned members in the services: the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army, the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Canadian Special Forces Command, and the leadership teams in the Canadian Joint Operations Command and Military Personnel Command. For the purposes of this paper and in line with doctrine, institutional leaders are those who "have significant influence on the CF as an institution and on its members, the development of CF policy, the integration of DND/CF policy, and the representation of the CF within the domestic and international security environments."[8] Institutional communications, then, in the context of this paper focusses on defining what enduring approach may be necessary to enable their critical leadership. As these activities do not take place in isolation, this paper links institutional communications with other essential activities in

---

[6]Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000 AP-004 2005, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations* (Ottawa: DND Canada, 2005), 1.

[7]Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-006, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution* (Ottawa: DND Canada, 2007), i.

[8]*Ibid*., vii.

the information and cognitive domain, including public affairs, strategic communications, and information operations.

Public affairs is broadly defined in Canada's Defence Administrative Orders and Directives as encompassing "activities related to informing internal and external audiences. This function includes research and analysis, communications advice and planning, and the delivery of information programs."[9] Public Affairs is the responsibility of the chain of command, involves more than news media engagement, and is perhaps the most obvious, but not the sole element of strategic communications. Certainly, not all aspects of public affairs are necessarily strategic, such as the routine response to media queries, or the inviting of local media to a unit training exercise. However, such activities can have a collective strategic effect, if leaders harness their potential for the good of the institution. If not guided by an understanding of the institution's higher objectives, such routine activities could also have the potential to damage the Canadian Forces.

Canadian Forces doctrine does not yet formally incorporate the strategic communication terminology added to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) policy documents in 2011. NATO defines strategic communications as "the coordinated and appropriate use of NATO communications activities and capabilities . . . in support of Alliance policies, operations and activities, and in order to advance NATO's aims."[10] For NATO, it includes Public Diplomacy, Public Affairs, Military Public Affairs, Information Operations and Psychological Operations, and most of those activities are within the

---

[9]National Defence and the Canadian Forces, "DAOD 2008-0, Public Affairs Policy," last modified 18 December 2008, http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/dao-doa/2000/2008-0-eng.asp.

[10]North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "NATO Military Public Affairs Policy - MC 0457," last modified February 2, 2011, http://www.nato.int/ims/docu/mc0457-2_en.pdf, 10.

military domain. However, strategic communication must be more than a list of functions with a communications nexus if there is to be a strategic effect, which is the intent of the concept.[11] Indeed, there are many routine military communications activities that while necessary, are not and should not be viewed through the lens of strategic communication.

With war defined as "an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will"[12] by the Prussian military strategist Carl von Clausewitz, and accepting his view that war is "not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument," it is clear that the use of military force is a political act.[13] Communications associated with the use, or potential use of that force may also be strategic and political, with implications reaching beyond the military domain. That understood, there is little consistency in how strategic communications is defined outside of military circles within the wider government framework.[14] The United States Department of Defense, though, has broadened their definition of strategic communications to encompass all aspects of a state's power, as follows:

> Focused US Government efforts to understand and engage key audiences to create, strengthen, or preserve conditions favourable for the advancement of US Government interests, policies, and objectives through the use of coordination programs, plans, themes, messages and products synchronized with the actions of all instruments of national power.[15]

Importantly, strategic communications is not only about words and images, but also about actions, and military actions must match political statements to be credible and have the

---

[11]Dennis Murphy, "The Trouble with Strategic Communication(s)," *IO Sphere* (Winter 2008): 24.

[12]Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. by Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 75.

[13]*Ibid*., 87.

[14]Paul Cornish, Julian Lindley-French, and Claire Yorke, *Strategic Communications and National Strategy*, (London: Chatham House, 2011), 3-6.

[15]Department of Defense, DoD Dictionary of Military Terms, "Strategic Communication," last modified 15 November, 2012, http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod_dictionary/.

intended effect.[16] Strategic communications has domestic, international, and internal-to-government dimensions, and thus its coordination should not be the sole purview of a military force. Further, in order to achieve mission success on today's complex battlefields in the instantaneous and borderless information environment, military forces require the enabling power of nationally-guided strategic communications. Within the Canadian Government, strategic communications is a function assigned to the Privy Council Office, as it has the coordinating power to facilitate such a comprehensive approach and unity. However, successful strategic communications may depend on a pervasive, adaptable, responsive mindset that is "not best achieved through a fixed, separate central structure."[17] This suggests that although strategic communications should be guided and shaped at the strategic level, not all communications need to be, and perhaps should not be, actively controlled in order to achieve the desired strategic effect.

Political pre-eminence notwithstanding, there are elements of Canadian Forces institutional communications that warrant the label "strategic", tied to the overall concept of military strategy. A national or "grand strategy" includes the war and peacetime long-term interests of a nation as defined by the British historian Paul Kennedy, and includes both military and non-military instruments of power.[18] Within such an overall strategy, Canadian Forces Doctrine defines the military strategic level as where "military strategic goals consistent with the desired national policy end state . . . are determined" and where "military strategies are formulated, resources allocated, and political constraints

---

[16]Dennis Murphy, "The Trouble with Strategic Communication(s)," *IO Sphere* (Winter 2008): 24.
[17]Cornish, *Strategic Communications . . .*, ix.
[18]Paul Kennedy, "Grand Strategies in War and Peace: Towards a Broader Definition," in *Grand Strategies in War and Peace*, ed. Paul Kennedy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 5.

established."[19] Thus, while military strategic communication must be conducted in support of a national strategy or direction, the function can be delineated from the political according to the military's unique role with respect to the use of force. Considering the potentially strategic impact of military force employment, military leaders should therefore address the military's strategic communications needs alongside other aspects of military strategy. However, as will be explored in Chapter Four, there is currently no formal expression of the strategic communications imperatives of the military profession of arms in Canada. At the operational level, however, communications needs are now well defined in the context of military operations, following the first introduction of joint military doctrine in western militaries in 1998.[20]

At the operational level and on military operations, information operations can and should contribute to the military and political strategic communications effort.[21] Defined as a coordination function, Information operations is intended to affect the "will, understanding and capability" of the adversary or other identified groups.[22] This function requires the harmonization of effects within both the physical and psychological domains, and the networking of inputs from experts in operational security, electronic attack and computer networks, psychological operations, civil-military cooperation, and public

---

[19]Department of National Defence, B-GJ-005-000/FP-001, *Canadian Military Doctrine* (Ottawa: DND Canada, 2011), 2-11.

[20]North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "Strategic and Organisational Implications for Euro-Atlantic Security of Information Operations," last accessed 27 March 2013, http://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/99-01/rathmell.pdf, 9.

[21]North Atlantic Treaty Organization, AJP-3.10, *Allied Joint Doctrine for Information Operations* (Brussels: NATO, 2009), 1-1.

[22]*Ibid*., 1-3.

affairs.[23] For the sake of institutional credibility, information operations require the distinct separation of psychological operations from public affairs activities, while still integrating and synchronizing these efforts.[24] Although a key enabler on the battlefield, military information coordination efforts are insufficient by themselves to influence all relevant stakeholders to find an acceptable road towards conflict termination. Like strategic communications, information operations are not a list of activities to accomplish or a discrete line of operations. Rather, successful information operations enable a military commander to look at his mission through the lens of the effects of information on the operation, and to maximize the benefits and minimize the risks of that information on that mission.[25]

Accepting that a strategically-driven approach is necessary for a commander and his forces to operate effectively in the information environment, communications efforts also require a sound understanding of the outcome that the military force desires from the exchange, those intended to receive and possibly act on the information, and the barriers to achieving the desired results. Communications theory can aid in framing this complex problem.

---

[23]Neil Chuka, "A Comparison of the Information Operations Doctrine of Canada, The United States, the United Kingdom, and NATO," *Canadian Army Journal* 12, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 93.

[24]Small Wars Journal, "Public Affairs and Information Operations," last accessed 27 March 2013, http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/public-affairs-and-information-operations.

[25]Eric V. Larson, *et al.*, *Understanding Commanders' Information Needs for Influence Operations* (Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 2009), 18.

Communications Theory

In the communications environment in which the Government, and the Canadian Forces in its support, wishes to have a strategic effect, it is valuable to review traditional communications theory and consider updated approaches that may now be more applicable. Common communications approaches make use of the work of C. Shannon, and W. Weaver and D. Berlow that compare human communications to a telephone system.[26] In this concept, the originator of information or idea transmits a message through a transmitter to a receiver, overcoming interference in the communications channel to reach the intended destination.[27] The noise in the system is attributed to the quality of the channel or medium selected, while distortion of the information may be attributed to how skillfully the idea is encoded into a message by the receiver or decoded through cultural and personal lenses by the receiver. [28] Key to this "message influence model" is the message, which is intended to influence the receiver "to understand the information in the same way as the source, if not persuade him or her to change attitudes or act in a particular way."[29] To overcome the barriers to communication, the message originators "speak louder" to overcome the noise, frequently repeat the same message,

---

[26]Steven R Corman, Angela Trethewey and Bud Goodall, "A 21st Century Model for Communication in the Global War of Ideas: From Simplistic Influence to Pragmatic Complexity," Consortium for Strategic Communication: Arizona State University, last updated 3 April 2007, http://csc.asu.edu/wp-content/uploads/pdf/114.pdf.

[27]*Ibid*.

[28]*Ibid*.

[29]*Ibid*.

and try to better formulate the message so that it translates effectively.[30] Strategic-level communicators use this model, exemplified by the 9/11 Commission recommendation that "the U.S. Government must define what its message is, what it stands for" and it "must do more to communicate its message."[31] The Canadian Government's communications policy expresses a similar approach with the direction that "all institutions must . . . collaborate with other institutions of the Government of Canada in communication activities that promote common or government-wide messages and themes."[32]

The desirability of clear, consistent information emanating from a government is understood. However, with increased intercultural dialogue in a world shrunk by transportation and communication technology, communications are now considerably more multifaceted than the dated telephone analogy suggests. Concerns are emerging that in this complex environment, the use of the message-driven model is having serious unintended negative consequences.[33] Bombardment of an audience with a set message through multiple mediums, even if adjusted for cultural context, does not have the desired effect if the originator sends the wrong message. Through repetition, the message is amplified, causing increasingly negative reactions from the audience in response. To counter this effect, researchers at The Arizona State University Center for Strategic Communication advocate the concept of "pragmatic complexity" in which people's

---

[30]*Ibid*., 4-5.

[31]National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, *The 9/11 Commission Report*, 376-377, last accessed 31 January 2012, http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf.

[32]Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, "Communications Policy of the Government of Canada," last modified 21 December, 2012. http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=12316&section=text.

[33]Arizona State University, "A 21st Century Model for Communication . . .," 8.

interpretation of a larger vision is central, rather than a set message.[34] This idea takes advantage of other concepts expressed by David Berlo, including that meanings change over time, form from experience rather than dictionary definition, and that "meanings are in people, not words."[35] The "pragmatic complexity" model is also influenced by the German sociologist Niklas Luhmann's complex systems approach: members of an audience, rather than passively receiving information, interpret multiple senders' words and actions and ascribe certain motivations and intentions to those words and actions.[36] In practice, this model requires acknowledgement that one cannot control the message or the effect of the message, that variations on a theme are more helpful than set messages, and that audience response must be monitored so that unhelpful approaches can be immediately abandoned.[37] The communications approach recommended in the *Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan* commonly known as the Manley Report is more akin to this nuanced model, as it advised, "The Government must engage Canadians in a continuous, frank and constructive dialogue about conditions in Afghanistan and the extent to which Canadian objectives are being achieved."[38]

The "pragmatic complexity" model reflects acceptance of the uncertainty and chaos that is common in any military theatre of operations. Military doctrine has sought

---

[34]*Ibid*., 9.

[35]D.K. Berlo, *The Process of Communication: An Introduction to Theory and Practice* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), 184.

[36]Universidade de São Paulo, Pandaemonium Germanicum, Kathrin Maurer, "Communication and Language in Niklas Luhmann's Systems-Theory," last updated 16 March 2010, http://www.fflch.usp.br/dlm/alemao/pandaemoniumgermanicum/site/images/pdf/ed_2010.2/01_Maurer_-_Luhmann.pdf., 5.

[37]Arizona State University, "A 21st Century Model for Communication . . ., 12-13.

[38]Department of Foreign Affairs, *Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan*, last accessed 31 January 2012, http://www.afghanistan.gc.ca/canada-afghanistan/assets/pdfs/Afghan_Report_web_e.pdf., 36

not to tame that chaos, but to empower commanders to deal with and take advantage of it through clear expression of intent, and with great reliance on trust, training, and accountability. The doctrine specifically states,

> To be effective, command should normally be decentralized to the greatest degree practicable in order to cope with the uncertainty, the disorder, the complexity, and the confusion that are usually present at the tactical level. Commanders must always make their intentions clear to subordinate commanders who, in turn, must make decisions on their own initiative based upon their understanding of the senior commander's intentions.[39]

The Government entrusts the military with the use of lethal force, within set boundaries clearly defined in policy. Commanders then give orders consistent with that policy, and empower their subordinate commanders to act.[40] Similarly, there are policies that bind communications activities regarding that use of force, in consideration of the power inherent in the communication itself. Thus, it should be intuitive for military leaders to move beyond message-driven communications to accept the complexity of communications, and adapting their words, images and actions to an ever-changing, people-driven environment.

Communications are usually described as being directed or targeted at an "audience," and the word and its synonyms suggest receivers passively receiving information.[41] Communications have a purpose though, and military leaders wish to elicit a response whether they are communicating to motivate internal members of the forces, to generate support and understanding from Canadians among which and for whom they

---

[39]Department of National Defence, B-GJ-005-000/FP-001, *Canadian Military Doctrine* (Ottawa: DND Canada, 2011), 5-1.

[40]*Ibid*., 4-2 – 4-3.

[41]BusinessDictionary.Com, "Target Audience," last accessed 27 March 2013, http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/target-audience.html.

serve, or with parliamentarians and others who shape defence policy.[42] Thus, this paper does not speak of audiences to target, but of stakeholders to engage, a concept more reflective of the two-way communication sought by military leaders, and the reality of the modern, technologically integrated, socially networked and multicultural world. While Canadian Forces leaders adhere to the coordination requirements of the Government's communication policy, leaders should consider going beyond a message-centric approach when opportunity allows. Leaders can choose to employ a more dynamic and interactive concept based on an exchange of ideas and dialogue to enable effective institutional communications, and enable their subordinates to do the same.

Approach

In order to determine the need for a strategic-level Canadian Forces institutional communications approach, or what form one should take, this paper explores the military's imperatives for communicating in the current complex environment. Chapter Two considers the uniqueness of the military institution and related communications needs of the Government, Canadians, and the Canadian Forces. Chapter Three explores the communications environment in which the military operates, shaped by the mediums for public dialogue, government policy, and extant public perceptions about the military. The fourth and final chapter, in consideration of existing communications approaches,

---

[42]Department of National Defence, B-GJ-005-361/FP-000, *Joint Public Affairs* (Ottawa: DND Canada, 2007), 1-3.

demonstrates the need for a strategically driven, institutionally focussed, unified and enduring communications approach, to assure the ability of the military to successfully accomplish the Government's priorities and preserve the Canadian Forces profession of arms.

CHAPTER TWO:

IMPERATIVES FOR INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Introduction

The military's role in Canada, as defined by the Government is to defend Canada and North America and contribute to international peace and security.[43] Douglas Bland of Queen's University states that "the defence of Canada is the responsibility of all Canadians, they will determine through their votes how Canada will be defended, how many dollars will be spent on defence, and what risks will be taken and what vulnerabilities will be accepted."[44] Given the critical role of the military, with interests shared among the Government, Canadians, and the military itself, an important question to address is how should the Canadian Forces appreciate what dialogue is necessary among these stakeholders to enable that essential defence of Canada? Specifically, what subjects should leaders address for the military institution to be effective, and what areas should they avoid?

It is first necessary to establish that the military has a mandate to communicate publicly. The Government's communications policy specifies that its institutions must be "visible, accessible and accountable to the public they serve."[45] Further, public

---

[43]Department of National Defence, Canada First Defence Strategy, "Roles of the Canadian Forces," last modified 13 January 2012, http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/pri/first-premier/defstra/role-eng.asp.

[44]Douglas Bland, "Parliament's Duty to Defend Canada," *Canadian Military Journal* 1, no. 4 (Winter 2000-2001): 35.

[45]Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, "Communications Policy of the Government of Canada," last modified 21 December, 2012. http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=12316&section=text.

information is "necessary for Canadians – individually or through representative groups or Members of Parliament – to participate actively and meaningfully in the democratic process."[46] As a government institution, the Canadian Forces is therefore required to demonstrate its accountability, and to be accessible to both Canadians and parliamentarians to facilitate democracy.

In determining where strategic military communications might be helpful, it is useful to identify some areas for which such an approach would be neither necessary, nor beneficial. There is little value in communications direction that would duplicate guidance already provided by the Government as the chain of command can simply relay the information, if within their area of responsibility to do so. Subjects common with other government departments, such as budgetary policy, contracting, established whole-of-government priorities, or management practices do not require distinct military direction or discussion in order for the Department and the Canadian Forces to meet the Government's priorities in these areas. Leaders could also guard against approaches that would compromise trust in the institution and hence its effectiveness, such as critique of existing government policy, priorities or procurement decisions, or that would otherwise go against policy.

Given a mandate to communicate, and eliminating areas of likely duplication, it is important to delve further into how the Canadian Forces is unique as an institution, and how that uniqueness might require distinct strategic communications. In particular, the military can be differentiated from other institutions in terms of its culture, its mandate,

---

[46] *Ibid.*

and the nature of its action, in fact, its nature as a profession.[47] While the Canadian Forces may differ from other institutions in other ways, such as in terms of its size or its budget relative to other institutions, these differences are relative, rather than unique, and are the result of policy decisions rather than precursors to them. This chapter will therefore first explore the institutional uniqueness of the military profession in Canada, through its culture and the culture gap between it and its civilian public, and the role of the military ethos, the "characteristic spirit of a culture, era, or community,"[48] in the credibility and accountability of the institution.

The second section will consider the unique role of the Canadian Forces as the state's "most powerful instrument of violence,"[49] and along with that role, its ability and responsibility to provide and to communicate military expertise towards the development of policy necessary to employ that lethal force. With Government policy in place to guide military action, the remaining institutional element of uniqueness lies in its actions. The core of unique action is in military operations, and thus the final section will explore what communications activities may be necessary to enable effective military operations.

The civil-military gap and the Canadian military ethos

Military forces are culturally distinct from the civilian publics they serve to protect to various degrees, and Samuel Huntingdon, Morris Janowitz, Peter Feaver and

---

[47]Samuel P. Huntingdon, *The Soldier and the State* (New York: Vintage Books, 1957), 8.

[48]"Ethos," *Pocket Oxford English Dictionary*, Ninth Edition, ed. Catherine Soanes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 305.

[49]Huntingdon, *The Soldier and the State . . .*, 82.

others have explored this "civil-military gap" from different perspectives in detail.[50] Although the members of a military may be drawn from, and hence be very similar to their society as a whole, the fighting force is necessarily a subset of the larger group, which is then trained and resourced to carry out their violent function. The separation has relevance, if the divide "in values or attitudes . . . is so wide that it threatens the effectiveness of the armed forces and civil military cooperation."[51] Military leadership, the government, and the people all have different stakes in the extent of this space, and interaction and communication serves a key role in the development, reduction, or maintenance of an appropriate civil-military gap.[52] Canadian Forces leaders have a powerful tool to affect this gap and maintain institutional credibility, through the communication of the Canadian military ethos.

The military's ethos, enshrined in the publication *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada* published in 2009, "identifies and explains military values and defines the subordination of the armed forces to civilian control and the rule of law."[53] The ethos is intended to "establish the trust that must exist between the Canadian Forces and Canadian society" and "create and shape the desired military culture" among other requirements.[54] In addition to the military necessity for fighting spirit, discipline, teamwork, physical fitness and the acceptance of unlimited liability, the ethos demands

---

[50]Peter D. Feaver, Richard H. Kohn, and Lindsay P. Cohn, "The Gap Between Military and Civilian in the United States in Perspective," in S*oldiers and Civilians: The Civil-military Gap and American National Security* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), 2.

[51]*Ibid*., 1.

[52]Stephen Biddle and Stephen Long, "Democracy and Military Effectiveness: A Deeper Look," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48, no.4 (August 2004): 532.

[53]Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-001, *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada* (Ottawa: DND Canada, 2009), 21.

[54]*Ibid*., 26.

its members adhere to Canadian values reflected in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, and to "perform their tasks with humanity."[55] Finally, the ethos requires full observance of the military values of duty, loyalty, integrity and courage that must be "in harmony and never in conflict with Canadian values."[56] The volume's publication demonstrates an effort to minimize a value gap between the military and the Canadian people. The ethos holds the profession to a very high standard that to some degree also distinguishes the uniformed warrior from ordinary Canadians rather than demanding sameness.

The impetus behind this expression of the ethos is the aftermath of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry of the 1990s that looked into the deaths of Somali citizens at the hands of Canadian Forces personnel. The Commission exposed leader tolerance of indiscipline and racism in junior personnel, and a lack of honesty and integrity among senior leaders.[57] General Hillier expressed the resultant military-civilian divide in this way: "we had lost contact with Canadians, and if we were going to survive, the Canadian Forces had to win back their respect . . . . Average Canadians and our country's leaders had to have complete confidence in their military and its leaders."[58] Although unnecessary violence, intolerance, and lack of integrity are evident in any wider population, such weaknesses were not to be tolerated in the armed forces entrusted with

---

[55]*Ibid*., 27-31.
[56]*Ibid*., 32-33.
[57]Department of National Defence, The Somalia Commission of Inquiry, "Report of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry, Executive Summary," last accessed 18 February 2013, http://www.dnd.ca/somalia/somaliae.htm.
[58]Rick Hillier, *A Soldier First: Bullets, Bureaucrats, and the Politics of War* (Toronto: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009), 126.

valuable human and materiel resources, and the weapons of war. The Government replaced the Chief of the Defence Staff four times from 1993 through 1997, suggesting a lack of confidence and trust in military leadership.[59] Further, John Ward of the Canadian Press described the change in public support for the military in the 1990s, from Canadian soldiers being "held in the highest esteem" to being "lower than dirt."[60] Clearly, the military ethos, or a lack thereof was of great importance to the military, to the Government, and to the Canadian people.

Communicating a changed or renewed ethos, internally within the forces and externally with the public, is not achievable through one order or publication. In fact, the formal wording of the 2004 military ethos in *Duty with Honour* came after the institution had made substantial changes, and after those in uniform and the Canadian people had a new perception of the revived institution.[61] Visible military effectiveness in support of civil authority, evidence of accountability, and palpable integrity likely served a role. In the late 1990s and ever since, Canadians have seen the men and women in uniform professionally and calmly helping them at times of greatest needs in natural disasters such as floods, forest fires and ice storms. These tangible, visible efforts rehabilitated the military's image after Somalia, according to Martin Shadwick of York University.[62] The Ice Storm in January 1998 in which about 15,800 personnel deployed to Ontario, Quebec

---

[59]Wikipedia, "Chief of the Defence Staff (Canada)," last modified 15 March 2013, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chief_of_the_Defence_Staff_(Canada).

[60]Hillier, *A Soldier First . . .*, 127.

[61]Claude Beauregard, "The Army and Public Affairs from 1990 to 1998," *Canadian Army Journal* 2, no. 1 (Winter 1999).

[62]David Pugliese, "Canadian Forces can't specify criteria or provide guidance for providing emergency help," *Ottawa Citizen*, 11 January 2013.

and New Brunswick, and in particular the new, open public affairs approach that allowed their efforts and attitude to be freely communicated with the public throughout the mission was assessed as a "key element of mission success."[63] In contrast with ugly images of a tortured Somali teenager, Canadians had fresh images and memories of fellow Canadians in whom they had pride. Canadians saw the military ethos in action.

Next, those who fail to meet the demands of the military ethos are held publicly accountable through the courts martial process. The military justice system was and is necessarily separate from the civil system as upheld by the Supreme Court in the R. v. Généreux case in 1992, and in Right Honourable Antonio Lamer's review on the Military Justice System in 2003.[64] As reflected in the work *Military Justice in Action: Annotated National Defence Legislation*, there are those who argue for the "reducing, if not eliminating, the several important derogations between Canadian criminal law and the existing system of military justice."[65] The fact that those in uniform are subject to different laws than other Canadians indicates that the current military justice system adds to a civil military gap. If so, the separate justice system concurrently reduces another gap between the public's expectations of those in uniform and their actions, by maintaining the essential discipline that the military justice system upholds. In the words of Justice Lamer, "These soldiers who risk their lives for our country deserve a military justice system that protects their rights in accordance with our Charter, while maintaining the

---

[63]Department of National Defence, Army Lessons Learned Centre, "Operation Recuperation – Lesson Learned Staff Action Directive, 15 March 1999," A-20-27.

[64]Michael Gibson, "Canada's Military Justice System," *Canadian Military Journal* 12, no. 2 (Spring 2012): 61-62.

[65]Richard Pound, "Preface," in *Military Justice in Action: Annotated National Defence Legislation* by Gilles Letourneau and Michel Drapeau, (Toronto: Carswell, 2011), vi.

necessary discipline for achieving successful missions."[66] Further, the public can see the process of justice unfold as courts martial are open to the public, and occasional media coverage of higher profile cases puts the high standards of conduct expected of military members on display.[67] To sustain public trust in the military force, not only must its members be accountable, but also its senior leaders must represent the highest embodiment of the military ethos.

CF leaders' adherence to the military ethos, and hence their trust covenant with Canadians, is best communicated through public demonstration of integrity. Integrity is easily recognizable in its absence, as when the Somalia Commission alleged that senior leaders were complicit in withholding information from the Commission, altering official records, and attempting to cover up the Somali deaths.[68] A solution, then, is for leaders to simply to be forthright with bad or uncomplimentary news. From the perspective of one senior leader of the time, Lieutenant-General (Retired) Jack Vance, "…one of the most troubling features of the Somalia experience was the failure of leaders to admit, openly and frankly, that problems had developed and things had gone wrong."[69] The public removal of senior military leaders such as Brigadier-General Daniel Menard from his position of authority in 2010 when there were allegations of inappropriate fraternization

---

[66]Department of National Defence, Canadian Forces Grievance Board, "The First Independent Review by the Right Honourable Antonio Lamer P.C., C.C., C.D. of the provisions and operation of Bill C-25, An Act to amend the National Defence Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, as required under section 96 of Statutes of Canada 1998, c.35," last accessed 18 February 2012, http://www.cfgb-cgfc.gc.ca/documents/LamerReport_e.pdf.

[67]Department of National Defence, Chief Military Judge, "Court Martial Procedure Guide," last modified 14 December 2012, http://www.jmc-cmj.forces.gc.ca/en/procedure-guide.page.

[68]The Somalia Commission of Inquiry, "Report . . ., Volume 4, The Failures of Senior Leaders," http://www.dnd.ca/somalia/vol4/v4c26e.htm.

[69]Jack Vance, Lieutenant-General, "The Profession of Arms: A Commander's Perspective on Military Ethos" (speech, Canadian Forces College, Toronto, Canada, August 21 2000).

demonstrates a low tolerance for leaders that appear not to adhere to the ethos.[70] The continued public release of the findings of Canadian Forces National Investigation Service investigations continues to maintain an impression of transparency. For example, with a 2013 finding that charges were not warranted regarding an off-colour video played at an internal social function, the military still took the opportunity to publicly reinforce the requirement for its members to uphold a higher standard of "military ethos that is respectful of all cultures, religions, and ethnicities, and the values we all share as Canadians."[71] By making this statement, the institution reinforced both the internal ethos, and the public's perception of that ethos, and its compatibility with Canadian values.

Despite the value of openness and truthfulness, senior leader comments that are perceived as contradicting government policy are problematic, and opposition parties and the media make immediate note of apparent discrepancies. For example, General Hillier was called upon in October 2007 to clarify comments regarding the length of time required to train Afghan National Security Forces, when his assessment appeared to be in contradiction to the Speech From the Throne.[72] In his response, the General stressed his subordination to civil authority, stating "The speech from the throne was crystal clear about government intentions and we wait to get direction from the government of Canada . . . . What I talked about in the long-term was merely the continuation of a professional

---

[70]Brendan Kennedy, Susan Pigg and Mitch Potter, "Grounding a rising military star," *The Toronto Star*, 31 May 2010.

[71]Department of National Defence, Royal Canadian Air Force, "Statement from Lieutenant-General Yvan Blondin, Commander, Royal Canadian Air Force," last updated 7 February 2013, http://www.rcaf-arc.forces.gc.ca/v2/nr-sp/index-eng.asp?id=13583.

[72]Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, CBC News Canada, "Hillier denies contradicting PM over Afghan mission length," last updated 26 October 2007, http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2007/10/26/afghanistan-hillier.html.

military force."[73] Media again looked for contradictions between General Lawson and the Government in 2013 when comparing the words of the newly appointed as Chief of the Defence staff and Prime Minister Harper regarding planned cuts to the defence budget and the amount of "fat" available for cutting. The Chief of Defence Staff again reinforced the primacy of parliament in his comments about his role, when he stated that, "my primary duties . . . to the Prime Minister and for the Minister and for all Canadians is to make sure that whatever . . . budget line we're given, we maintain the greatest number of capabilities and capacities to provide options for the government."[74] Thus, while being as open as possible to maintain the trust of the Canadian people, the Canadian Forces must also retain the trust of the civil authority to whom subordination is required.

Rarely, open contradiction is required. Chiefs of Defence and other senior leaders routinely appear before House of Commons committees, and naturally, witnesses are required to answer all questions put to them by a committee and to speak the truth, or else face the potential of being held in contempt of parliament or being charged with perjury.[75] While giving factual answers to factual questions, military officers appear before committees on behalf of the Minister, and "do not defend policy or engage in debate as to policy alternatives . . . answers should be limited to explanations."[76] The

---

[73]CBC News Canada, "Hillier denies contradicting PM . . .."

[74]Tom Lawson, General (news conference, Government of Canada, Canadian War Museum, Ottawa, Ontario, 29 October 2012).

[75]Parliament of Canada, House of Commons, "Guide for Witnesses appearing before committees of the House of Commons," last accessed 18 February 2013, http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/House/WitnessesGuides/PDF/WitnessGuide-e.pdf, 9.

[76]Parliament of Canada, Senate, "Wounded - APPENDIX IX Truth to Power - Regulations governing the Department of National Defence appearances before Parliamentary Committees," last accessed 27 March 2013, http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/381/defe/rep/repintsep05part2-e.htm.

onus on Canadian Forces leadership to be honest while avoiding critique of government policy is enshrined in the military ethos both in terms of integrity and subordination to civil authority. Thus, the testimony of General Ray Henault and Vice-Admiral Madison to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on Tuesday, February 26, 2002 disputing facts known to the serving Minister of National Defence regarding the employment of Special Forces personnel in Afghanistan was absolutely necessary.[77] Although Douglas Bland perceived the honesty displayed in 2002 as a message to politicians that they "could no longer expect senior officers to cover politicians' failures or indiscretions,"[78] it is more to the point that politicians should not only expect such integrity from senior military leaders; they should demand it. In order to have an effective military force, the Government is at least as interested as the military in having credible senior officers, who are both trustworthy, and trusted by the Canadian public.

The challenge for military leaders is that while being honest, they must also be, and appear to be, both apolitical and subordinate to civil authority. The armed forces faced a challenge at the end of the Second World War, when the then Minister of National Defence, Brooke Claxton, was "all for silent soldiers and sailors too" when popular wartime senior commanders publicly critiqued government policy.[79] Complete silence is not helpful for the Canadian Forces today, as the military must not only be professionally effective on the battlefield, it must also be perceived as effective, and

---

[77]House of Commons, Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, *Committee Evidence*, Tuesday, February 26, 2002.

[78]Douglas Bland, "Hillier and the new generation of Generals: The CDS, the policy and the troops," *Policy Options* (March 2008): 58.

[79]*Ibid*., 54.

maintain "legitimacy in the eyes of Canadians and the international community."[80] Such legitimacy, both with serving members and with the broader Canadian public, requires senior military leaders to communicate as openly as possible. To avoid being silenced, or to avoid deterioration in the critical relationship between senior military officers, senior civil servants and the Government, these leaders navigate between the needs of its key stakeholders. Perceived contradictions are inevitable. Leaders can mitigate this, however, through preparation before speaking with media, through periodic public reinforcement of their subordination to the Government, and further, by putting comments in context as demonstrated by successive Chiefs of Defence.

In summary, an appropriate civil-military gap is maintained by the existence and communication of an appropriate military ethos that enshrines the values of Canadians. Canadians must see the ethos in action through the positive, apolitical behaviour of the majority of forces members, matched with appropriate punishment for those who do not meet its demands. To be seen, the Canadian Forces must be accessible to the Canadian people, and must be in constant communication about both positive and negative issues. While the public is inclined to trust leaders who are seen to "speak truth to power" as argued by Desmond Morton,[81] the honesty of senior leaders in the public domain may be contentious and lead to lack of trust between those leaders and the civil authority. Demonstration of military subordination to civil control reduces tension between the

---

[80]Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-004, *Leadership. . .*, 18-19.

[81]Desmond Morton (speech, "No Crisis, No Business: An Ally's Dilemma in a Busy World," Queen's University Canadian Studies Symposium, Kingston, Ontario, March 27, 2004).

authority of the Government and the power of the military. The primary mechanism for that civil control of the Canadian Forces, is through the expression of Defence Policy.

Defence Policy Development

As described in the manual *The Public Management of Defence in Canada*, the intent of defence policy "is to define defence objectives, identify resource requirements commensurate with these goals, the rules governing the use of force, and the process by which the civil authority will oversee the armed forces."[82] According to Peter Feaver, the critical issue in civil-military relations, is "how to reconcile a military strong enough to do anything the civilians ask them to with a military subordinate enough to do only what civilians authorize them to do."[83] In developed democracies such as that which exists in Canada, there is little fear of a military coup. There is an element of risk, however, in how much power the military has over the amount of resources it receives, particularly as defence expenditures constitute a significant amount of the national budget.[84] While the military is concerned with ensuring it has the capability to defend the nation against threats, the nation's civil government decides what degree of risk to accept, and what resources it can afford to spend on that defence without impoverishing the nation.[85] Thus, the public debate over the appropriate role of senior military leaders in the formation of

---

[82]Douglas Bland, "The Public Administration of Defence Policy," in *The Public Management of Defence*, 9-18, ed. Craig Stone (Toronto: Breakout Educational Network, 2009), 10.

[83]Peter D. Feaver, "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntingdon, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces and Society* 23, no. 2 (Winter 1996): 149.

[84]Bland, "The Public Administration of Defence Policy . . .," 49.

[85]Feaver, "The Civil-Military Problematique . . .," 152.

defence policy is actually an embodiment of concern about civil control over the military. Such disquiet was evident when General Hillier was leading the transformation of the armed forces and related to that, his engagement in the formation of the Defence Policy Statement in 2005.[86] Some expressed concern that "he intruded into a realm best reserved for politicians and civilian officials,"[87] while those close to the Prime Minister at the time revealed that "[General Hillier] articulated things we all felt needed to be done. We didn't have any civilian control anxiety."[88]

There is debate in Canada over who is responsible for that policy development. Douglas Bland argues that military officers and the elected representatives share this responsibility, and he advocates for senior military leaders to build "strong apolitical links" to politicians so that they are more informed and capable of seeking "all-party consensus on national defence policy."[89] This approach is somewhat similar to the "Concordance Theory" advocated by Rebecca Schiff, who proposes that a more appropriate military-civil relationship is maintained if there is "cooperation and involvement among the military, political institutions, and society at large."[90]

Philippe Lagassé of the University of Ottawa presents a different view: that responsibility, and specifically accountability, for defence policy lies solely with the elected Government, and that the role of Parliament is not to shape the policy but to

---

[86]Janice Stein and Eugene Lang, *The Unexpected War* (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2007),155-158.

[87]Philippe Lagassé, "Accountability for National Defence: Ministerial Responsibility, Military Command and Parliamentary Oversight," *Institute for Research on Public Policy Study* no. 4 (March 2010): 4.

[88]Stein, *The Unexpected War*, 158.

[89]Bland, "Parliament's Duty to Defend Canada . . .," 41.

[90]Rebecca Schiff, *The Military and Domestic Politics: A concordance theory of military-civil relations* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 43.

question it vigorously with the benefit of defence expertise within their own political parties.[91] He confines the role of the Chief of the Defence Staff to privately providing "the defence minister, cabinet, and the prime minister with professional military advice," and to internally challenge the Government's policy if the military considers their policy or defence policy advice "unwise or dangerous."[92] A difficulty with this approach, is that the defence expertise, to be helpful to a political party, would likely include retired military personnel. The prime minister in recent years has spoken about an intent to "seek broad consensus" on the employment of military forces, as seen with the limited deployment of Canadian Forces personnel to aid French forces in Mali in 2013,[93] and in the more robust deployment over Libya in 2011.[94] Although the Government provided time for some public discussion and parliamentary debate, the ultimate decision to deploy military force has remained with the Government. Further, military leaders have not commented on potential operations in these brief periods of public debate on an imminent mission.

Clearly, defence policy, like other government policies, are shaped by many forces. Glen Milne compares the policy environment as a "chaotic marketplace" that can include inputs from "public opinion research, personal relationships, partisan politics, power-brokering and party loyalty," as well as formal consultative processes, informal

---

[91]Philippe Lagassé, "Accountability for National Defence: Ministerial Responsibility, Military Command and Parliamentary Oversight," *Institute for Research on Public Policy Study* no. 4 (March 2010): 14-20.

[92]*Ibid*., 43.

[93]Mark Kennedy, "Stephen Harper seeks consensus on increased role in Mali," *Post Media News*, 23 January 2013.

[94]CTV News, "Canada approves extension of NATO's Libya Mission, last updated 1 June 2011, http://www.ctvnews.ca/canada-approves-extension-of-nato-s-libya-mission-1.651594.

networks, the media, business associations, academia, institutes, advocates and lobbyists.[95] By virtue of their presence in Ottawa as part of formal processes, and formal and informal relationships based on other duties, senior military leaders cannot help but be engaged in the policy development process beyond the provision of in-cabinet military advice. Further, it would be illogical to exclude current military expertise from policy development discussions, in particular in the policy areas of military resource requirements and the rules regarding the use of force.

According to Douglas Bland, the Canadian public at large also has a role in shaping policy when he states that "Civil control of the military in Canada and abroad should come from attentive citizens acting through an informed, concerned, and vigilant parliament."[96] Political parties and the Government gather input to policy development through pervasive public polling.[97] While the military, and indeed the Government desires broad public support for the military for professional and operational reasons, defence policy development through public opinion polling may not meet prudent military requirements. As described by Robert Weissberg of the University of Illinois, "Public opinion polling measures the wishes and preferences of respondents, neither of which reflect the costs or risks associated with a policy."[98] First, specific policy decisions may be best informed through the presentation of facts and enumerating risks that

---

[95]Greg Milne, *Making Policy: A guide to the Federal Government's Policy Process* (Ottawa: Greg Milne, 2006), 1-2.

[96]Bland, "Parliament's Duty to Defend Canada . . .," 42.

[97]Parliament of Canada, "Public Opinion Polling in Canada," last accessed 27 March 2013, http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp371-e.htm#OPINION POLLS AND POLICY-MAKING(txt).

[98]Robert Weissberg, "Why Policymakers Should Ignore Public Opinion Polls," *Policy Analysis* No. 402 (Champaign: CATO Institute, May 29, 2001), 1.

necessitate detailed and lengthy discussions, which clearly would not be feasible with each Canadian polled. Further, the emotive, "of the moment nature" of some polls, combined with the lack of knowledge in the general public about defence issues, could mean that tough decisions on the use of military force would not be made. Canadian citizens could be reluctant to put members of their armed forces in harm's way even if the deployment could best serve the longer-term interests and strategic objectives of the nation. That said, as the United States Secretary State John Kerry said, "In today's global world there is no longer anything foreign about foreign policy," and foreign policy decisions "matter more than ever before to our everyday lives."[99] Similarly, Canadian citizens, if noting an impact on their personal lives from decisions about defence policy on dispersed family, personal security, or financial matters may tune in to ongoing policy discussion and make their voices heard. Further, regardless of the mechanism of broad public input into the policy process, Canadian Forces leaders recognize that "civilians have the right to be wrong — that civilian preferences should trump military preferences even if they are wrong on the policy."[100] Direct citizen engagement in the policy development process is therefore welcome, but should be enhanced by the role of parliamentarians and other Canadians with more consistent engagement in military matters and access to detailed information.

---

[99]British Broadcasting Corporation, News: US and Canada, "John Kerry: 'There is nothing foreign about foreign policy'," last updated 20 February 2013, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-21524075.

[100]Peter Feaver, "The Right to Be Right: Civil-Military Relations and the Iraq Surge Decision," *International Security* 35, no. 4 (Spring 2011): 117.

Canadian Forces leadership has written into doctrine the view that "the senior leadership of the profession of arms, led by the CDS, engages in a continuous dialogue with civilian officials and civil authorities to help shape Canada's security policy" with stress on the fact that the civil authority will ultimately set the objectives and assign resources.[101] This guidance follows research into the Canadian civil-military gap conducted by the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute between 2001 and 2003, based on earlier work sponsored by the Triangle Institute for Strategic Studies in the United States.[102] The Institute found that senior military officers did not understand the ultimately political process of defence policy development. As a result, the study concluded that senior leaders did not have "the ability to anticipate and/or adapt to upcoming changes" to defence policy and recognize that "the people have the right to choose the kind of military they want to have."[103]

Military leaders are responsible to assure that national security policy and the use of military force have the benefit of military advice. The Chief of the Defence Staff specifically has the duty to advise the Minister, and at times Cabinet and the Prime Minister directly on "current and future military requirements, force capabilities, and possible courses of action and the consequences of undertaking (or failing to undertake) various military activities."[104] Other institutional leaders in the Commands and in the

---

[101]Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-001, *Duty with Honour . . .*, 43.

[102]Alan Okros, Sarah Hill and Franklin Pinch, "Between 9/11 and Kandahar: Attitudes of Canadian Forces Officers in Transition," *The Claxton Papers no. 8* (Kingston: Defence Management Studies, 2008),: 2.

[103]Okros *et al*., "Between 9/11 and Kandahar . . .," 50-51.

[104]Department of National Defence, Chief of the Defence Staff, "Responsibilities," last modified 28 January 2013, http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/ocds-bcemd/cds-cemd/index-eng.asp.

Services contribute to this advice, and it is the role of the Chief of the Defence Staff to rationalize their input and put forth a coherent, cohesive vision to the Government as that senior military advisor.[105] The very creation of the position of Chief of the Defence Staff within the framework of Canadian Armed Forces Unification in the 1960s, came from the identified need to deal with the "duplications and redundancies" of three services, and to deal with the "conflicting interests generated by service rivalries."[106] With the role of the Chief of the Defence Staff well entrenched,[107] service interest reconciliation takes place as a matter of course and is as applicable to public communications regarding military expertise, as it applies to internal-to-government policy discussions.

Noting the competing academic views regarding the best way for Parliament and Canadians more generally to shape policy development, Canadian Forces leaders contribute to a broad intellectual discussion of military issues, while concurrently reinforcing the fact of civil control and respect for the political decision making processes. There is good reason why military advice to Cabinet is confidential. As described by the Department of Justice,

> Cabinet is the political forum in which Ministers meet to establish a consensus on the government's general directions and on broad governmental policies that each Minister must individually and publicly defend. Cabinet confidences are therefore, in the broadest sense, the political secrets of Ministers individually and collectively, the disclosure of which would make it very difficult for the government to speak in unison before Parliament and the public.[108]

---

[105]*Ibid*.

[106]Lagassé, "Accountability for National Defence . . .," 31.

[107]Daniel Gosselin, "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old – Part One," *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 13.

[108]Department of Justice, "Strengthening the Access to Information Act," last modified 3 August 2012, http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/dept-min/pub/atia-lai/p4.html.

If the Government is actively considering policy on a given issue, for example, a possible military deployment, military leadership must be publicly silent, in subordination to the political process and civil control.

The time for military leadership to have an influence on policy development outside of formal submissions to Government, is through routine unclassified education and dialogue about military operations, military capabilities, military threats, and current challenges separate from specific policy files. As expressed by former Chief of the Defence Staff General (Retired) Maurice Baril,

> Parliamentary democracy, however, can only function properly if the debate, discussion and choices made are based on accurate and timely information. That is why openness, transparency, public discussion and seminars . . . are so important.[109]

However, military leaders should not publicly champion a specific policy approach, noting Samuel Huntingdon's delineation that "civilian political leaders . . . make the basic decisions on foreign and defence policy."[110] In the same vein, though, the "professional competence" of the military should be respected, in permitting military leaders to inform potential stakeholders in some depth about military matters to help them shape policy recommendations.[111] Such apolitical discussions would be most effective in communicating complex military considerations in context, which demand dialogue and exchange rather than reiterations of extant government policy. If these discussions are

---

[109]Maurice Baril (speech, "The Role of the Chief of the Defence Staff in Relations with Parliament," Conference of Defence Associations Annual Seminar, Ottawa, Ontario, January 27, 2000).

[110]Samuel Huntingdon, "Reforming Civil-Military Releations," in *Civil-Military Relations and Democracy*, ed. Larry Diamond and Marc Plattner, (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 4-11.

[111]*Ibid*.

framed by formal communications direction from the Chief of the Defence Staff, coherency can be achieved across the Services and the Commands in the same way that coherency is achieved throughout the Canadian Forces on other matters.

As previously discussed, parliamentarians outside of Cabinet have a role in selecting or opposing the Government's defence policy, and they should have the benefit of direct interaction with senior military leaders to inform their views. Although some understanding can take place through parliamentary committee hearings as described by Hugh Segal when he was President of the Institute for Research on Public Policy, these venues are not ideal forums for debate, and can be confrontational and highly politicized.[112] There is value, though, in longer-term apolitical engagement to educate those politicians with an interest in defence issues, with the awareness and support of the Minister of National Defence. Interaction should include the continuation of parliamentarian familiarization visits to Canadian Forces bases, and could include open invitations to National Defence Headquarters as encouraged by Douglas Bland.[113] Further, one-on-one discussions with senior military leaders to respond to significant ministerial queries, supplementing any information provided in formal written responses, would enable deeper understanding of the issue at hand. While direct interaction is of key value, military expertise can reach parliamentarians through others who have a key role in shaping their policy views, including academic groups and think tanks.[114]

---

[112]Hugh Segal, "Where have all the ideas gone: Democracy in the 21st Century," *Canadian Parliamentary Review* 28, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 2-3.

[113]Bland, "Parliament's Duty to Defend Canada," 39.

[114]Donald Abelson, *Do Think Tanks Matter? : Assessing the Impact of Public Policy Institutes*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009), 74-77.

Military leadership participation in academic discussion through the penning of academic articles or participation in academic conferences helps to deal with Samuel Huntingdon's concern with "the difficulty of establishing defence policy when [governments are] dependent on the advice of experts who may be in a conflict of interest position when they offer such advice."[115] Academic rigour can provide a challenge function through the inclusion of opposing views, and the dilution of emotional responses.[116] Military input into broader academic and think-tank discussions can bring balance, context, and essential facts to the large policy table, mitigating the risk of the military being accused of acting in its own, rather than in the national, interest.[117] Further, military minds themselves become enriched by such exchanges, bringing new context, considerations and opportunities into the Canadian Forces as expressed by the Commander of the Royal Canadian Navy in his 2012-2016 communications strategy.[118] In a rapidly changing world with dramatic advances in technology, altered social dynamics, and emerging threats, the military has much to gain by accessing a wider wealth of knowledge and research. That said, Douglas Bland argues that academic reports, and other external expressions or criticism of defence policy are only paid attention to if accompanied by external and sustained media attention regarding the

---

[115]Ross Graham, Civil Control of the Canadian Forces: National Direction and National Command," in *Canadian Military Journal* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 27.

[116]Nicholas Finney and Paul Walkner, "Skill development and critical thinking in higher education," *Teaching in Higher Education* 4, no. 4 (October 1999): 531.

[117]Gerard Theriault, "Democratic Civil-Military Relations: A Canadian View," in *The Military in Modern Democratic Society* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, November 1996), 10.

[118]Department of National Defence, *The RCN's Communications Strategy 2012 – 2016: A Conversation with Canadians*, (Ottawa, Royal Canadian Navy, 2012), i.

report, or if the drafter of the report has sufficient public profile or internal prestige.[119] However, engagement between military experts and academics during which facts are communicated and ideas shared, is likely to generate increased shared "common sense" and result in potential buy-in into finalized reports, in particular if the report's acceptance would result in any organizational change.[120]

In summary, military leaders have a responsibility to assure the availability of effective military expertise, and through engagement with politicians, academics and think tanks, can ensure that key element of military professionalism is available to shape policy. Such discussion can indeed respect Cabinet confidentiality and respect government processes, if timed appropriately and if provided transparently. Civil supremacy is paramount, and such dialogue would require support from the Minister. The broad Canadian public is less likely to be engaged in these discussions, given that such dialogue, in order to be effective, is lengthy and most effectively conducted in person. The next section further explores the communications engagement required for the successful conduct in military operations, in which the general public serves a greater role.

---

[119]Douglas Bland, "Let Sleeping Dogs Lie: The Influence of External Studies and Reports on National Defence Policy 2000 to 2006," in *The Claxton Papers*, no. 15 (Kingston: School of Policy Studies, 2011), 105.

[120]Michael Y. Moon. "Making Sense of Common Sense for Change Management Buy-in," *Management Decision* 47, no. 3: 529.

Military Operations

The relevance of the Canadian Forces resides in its ability to conduct effective operations on behalf of the Government, and to adapt to "evolving threats and changing conditions."[121] The government is responsible for empowering that force to accomplish that which it requires in the present and into the future, and assigning tasks that are feasible given the resources it has provided.[122] Further, external perception of military credibility and effectiveness can be as powerful as concrete physical power utilized by a force, as was demonstrated during the Cold War in particular.[123] In the interests of military effectiveness on operations, institutional leadership therefore has a responsibility to encourage communications that add to, rather than detract from its capability to provide the Government with the credible force it requires.

The possibility of a "commitment-capability" gap for the Canadian Forces was exposed in the 2008 Manley Report that examined Canada's participation in the United Nations-mandated, NATO-led International Security Assistance in Afghanistan (ISAF). The report found that "the most damaging and obvious deficiency in the ISAF mission in Afghanistan is the insufficiency of military forces" and further demanded the immediate provision of medium-lift helicopters and unmanned aerial vehicles if the mission was to

---

[121]Department of National Defence. Canada First Defence Strategy, "Rebuilding the Canadian Forces," last modified 13 January 2012, http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/pri/first-premier/defstra/rebuild-rebatir-eng.asp.

[122]Philippe Lagassé Paul Robinson, "Reviving Realism in the Canadian Defence Debate," *Martello Paper Series* (Kingston: Queen's University, 2008), 112.

[123]James Blackwell, "Deterrence at the Operational Level of War," *Strategic Studies Quarterly* (Summer 2011): 30.

continue.[124] This very public report gave impetus to the government to conduct a sole-source purchase of six Chinook helicopters from the United States military for immediate use in Afghanistan. The Canadian Forces had been requesting this renewed medium-lift capability since at least 2005, but it took the non-partisan report to spark immediate action.[125] The government then used this report to keep its combat troops in Afghanistan, and to pressure NATO into committing more troops to Kandahar province.[126] It is clear, then, that military advice on its own with respect to what resources it requires, may be insufficient to result in a significant change in resources required for successful operations, even with the Government conceptually in support of the initiative.

Operational empowerment can come directly from the Canadian people. If Canadians living close to military establishments note that training creates substantial noise or inconveniences local traffic from time to time, they can either accept the inconvenience as a necessary adjunct to military training, or demand that military training be stopped or moved elsewhere. There is therefore a cost associated with public support, or lack thereof.[127] It is incumbent upon military leaders therefore to ensure that the communities around military establishments are well informed of military training and missions, and provided as much access to see the training as is practicable to solidify that understanding. While the responsibility to engender this support is that of local

---

[124]Department of Foreign Affairs, *Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan*, 36, last accessed 31 January 2012, http://www.afghanistan.gc.ca/canada-afghanistan/assets/pdfs/Afghan_Report_web_e.pdf , 35.

[125]Ed Storey, "CH-147D Chinook Nose Art in Afghanistan," *Canadian Military History* 20, no. 1 (Winter 2011): 75. pp.74-80.

[126]Clive Addy, "The Manley Report: Its Impact on Canada and NATO," *Frontline Defence* no. 2 (March 2008).

[127]Amanda Boccuti, Lauren Faul, and Lauren Gray, "Establishing Creative Strategies for Effective Engagement Between Military Installations & Communities," *Engaging Cities,* 21 May 2012.

commanders, institutional leaders have the power to establish the priority of such engagement.

Further, when a community is aware of a demanding military mission, and recognizes that there are military spouses and children in their midst dealing with related stresses of extended absence and fears, that community can band together in support.[128] The "Wear Red on Fridays" initiative, spurred on in Canada by two military spouses, is one example of the extension of community moral support to the military family.[129] Numerous other avenues of support are listed by the Canadian Forces Personnel Family Support Services, which rather than being a morale-generating effort sparked by the military, were developed in response to private individuals and corporations seeking to directly support the needs of the military families.[130] Although these initiatives have "grass roots" beginnings, institutional leaders have aided in their development through the power of their personal presence at community activities through three successive chiefs of defence.[131]

The connection must be evident, though, between the morale of military members and their families, and operational effectiveness. Sun Tzu drew the link in *The Art of War* that "an army may be robbed of its spirit and its commander deprived of his courage" and

---

[128]The Vanier Institute of the Family, Military Families in Canada Initiative, "Military Families in Canada," last accessed 4 April 2013, http://www.vanierinstitute.ca/military-families-in-canada-initiative.

[129]Leslie Dunnett, "Red Friday Rally to Celebrate Five Years of Supporting Our Troops," *Canadian Military Family Magazine* (April 2011), last accessed 4 March 2012, http://www.ubiquitousmagazine.ca/en/red-friday-rally-celebrate-five-years-supporting-our-troops.

[130]Canadian Forces Personnel Family Support Services, "Support our Troops," last accessed 4 March 2013, https://www.cfpsa.com/en/SupportOurTroops/Pages/default.aspx.

[131]Canadian Military Family Magazine, "Forces and Families Campaign launched," last accessed 4 April 2013, http://www.ubiquitousmagazine.ca/en/forces-and-families-campaign-launched.

it is then that the force should be attacked.[132] Modern military sociologists have explored this subject, and Madel Segel characterized the issue as a struggle for the military institution to "develop mechanisms for motivating individual participation and commitment" in the face of family demands or competing "greediness" for their time, energy, and emotions.[133] The link with operational effectiveness was made more explicitly by Vice-Admiral Gary Garnett, when, as Vice Chief of the Defence Staff, he wrote, "Our people and their families are . . . our most important asset . . . . we must create an environment that attracts and retains highly skilled and motivated people."[134] Finally, Canadian Forces leadership doctrine defines "member well-being and commitment" as an essential enabler of mission success, as it has practical implications in task performance and long-term attrition, and a moral dimension in that military leaders are obliged to "reciprocate" the personal costs of military service.[135] With the operational necessity clear, the Canadian public can be an important enabler of military morale, regardless of the degree to which they support any individual military mission.

The degree of commitment of the nation to a given mission is in itself an important aspect of the information environment. The perception of Canada's ambivalence towards the mission in Afghanistan was reflected in an al-Qaeda warning in 2006, when media reported, "the text of the threat suggests that al-Qaeda is aware of

---

[132]Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, ed. and trans. Samuel B. Griffith (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 108.

[133]Mady Wechsler Segal, "The Military and the Family," *Armed Forces and Society* 13, no. 1 (1986): 9-38.

[134]Gary Garnett, "The Flag Officer as a Resource Manager," in *Generalship and the Art of the Admiral: Perspectives on Canadian Senior Military Leadership*, edited by Bernd Horn and Stephen J. Harris (St. Catharines: Vanwell Publishing Limited, 2001), 473.

[135]Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000 AP-004 2005, *Leadership . . .*, 20.

divisions within Canada over the mission, pointing to public opinion polls and opposition within Parliament."[136] Despite the positive intent of open, democratic political debate in Canada, there was a strategic effect in how that dialogue was interpreted in another culture, and with military and information operations implications. Two years later, the Manley Report stressed the need for the Government to better explain the Afghanistan mission to Canadians.

Noting the sensitivities discussed earlier around the shaping of military policy, it is interesting to note the assessment by Senator Joseph Day that "it is unfair to have the CDS be the spokesman . . . . He sees the gap in information and fills it, where I consider that Ministers and the [Prime Minister] should be the ones providing the information directly to Canadians. The CDS then gets criticized for doing what is needed."[137] In the face of an on-going combat operation, the Chief of the Defence Staff has the operational requirement to facilitate both public support for the men and women in harm's way, and public understanding of the military mission itself. Although public support for the mission may or may not follow, the most senior military expert in the country clearly has both the ability and the imperative to communicate the facts. Although the Government may have the requirement to garner support for its political decision, military leaders should not be curtailed from acting to build up "member well-being and commitment" through public engagement.

---

[136]S. Bell, "Al-Qaeda warns Canada," *National Post*, 28 October 2006.

[137]Clive Addy, "The Manley Report: Its Impact on Canada and NATO," *Frontline Defence* no. 2 (March 2008).

Another area of the impact of the information environment on military operations is in the area of deterrence. In the words of Sun Tzu, "To subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill."[138] Therefore, the regular, planned, and communicated demonstration of military capability, be it through fighter operations engaged in the active defence of North American airspace, or media access to pre-deployment joint training exercises, can be a force in and of itself.[139] Although communications of these activities should be nested within the Government priorities of the day, there is a distinct military operational requirement to ensure this important part of an effective information operations campaign is not neglected. The effect of communications regarding these activities is in fact amplified if tied to strategic efforts by the Government using other aspects of state power; for example, if they are timed with diplomatic overtures with possible adversaries or potential allies.[140] To be effective, words must be matched with the capability to act, and the military force provides the Government with the ultimate proof of its resolve.

Clearly, there is overlap within the communications domain, where words and actions of the Canadian Government, community citizens, and military members at home and on deployment have an effect, and at times a strategic effect, on other groups. In this complex environment, Canadian Forces institutional leaders have the responsibility to find the nexus of these effects on the military institution, so that they can predict or shape communications activities to enable the desired strategic effect, and avoid those that are

---

[138]Sun Tzu, *The Art of War . . .*, 77.

[139]Blane R. Clark, "Information Operations as a Deterrent to Armed Conflict," *Military Review* (May-June 2010): 97.

[140]*Ibid*., 104.

detrimental. In summary, effective military operations require enabling efforts within the information domain, which may include external substantiation of military resource requirements, and certainly requires broad moral support from the nation to the fighting force. With respect to specific military operations, such missions are more likely to achieve the strategic objectives of the nation if the political strategic level is leading related communications that then guide and shape military information operations efforts. Further, with appropriate strategic coordination and consistency, words can and should be matched with actions to serve as a deterrent to potential adversaries, and encourage and demonstrate resolve to allies. Military operations do not take place in isolation, and to be successful, require strategically enabled communications that take place among the people, by military forces, and by political leaders.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that there are three major imperatives for the Canadian Forces to communicate as a distinct institution. It is first of all essential that the Canadian public trust in the men and women who wield lethal power on their behalf, and that trust can only be assured and sustained through their awareness of how the Forces is acting in their name. The military ethos encapsulates the expectations of the Canadian people and the military for how the force lives and breathes, and it is through the failure to uphold this ethos in the 1990s that demonstrates so clearly that open, honest communications are essential. For the ethos to be understood, accepted, and to develop in tune with the Canadian people, the men and women in uniform should be in touch with and reflect the

fellow Canadians they serve to defend. The military's need to maximize transparency and trust, however, needs to be balanced with Government prerogative to control the release of information when it deems necessary.

The second imperative for a distinct communications approach lies in the expression of military expertise in the development of defence policy. While assuring subordination to Government control, and respect for Cabinet confidentiality, the best approach for the defence of Canada is to assure that military context is widely available to all parties, through sanctioned engagement, interaction and dialogue with key potential or actual stakeholders. Through this process of dialogue, gaps between public expectations and military understanding of the role of the military force in Canada can be reduced, or at least explained in context by an informed Government.

The third imperative for military communications lies in the necessity for effective military operations themselves. The military force must be empowered with appropriate equipment and resources, that can be enabled through informed policy development. Those fighting will be stronger and more effective with vocal moral support from the people of Canada, known both to those serving and to their families. Whether or not the people agree with the operation, military leadership can aid the Government by explaining what is happening on an operation with what effect, even if not responsible for explaining why the operation is taking place with military resources in the first place. Further, coherent, planned communications about military capabilities, meshed with Government efforts in other ways, can serve to deter potential adversaries. When political leaders clearly communicate and champion their nations' will, backed up by credibly communicated military capability, the power of that nation to achieve its

objectives is that much greater. Subsequent military operations are more likely to succeed, in such a strategically-driven communications environment. In all, the Canadian Forces must shape communications regarding the force from a strategic perspective, considering the needs and expectations of the Canadian Government, its people, and the military force itself in order to assure the military is able to deliver on its commitment to defend the nation. With the communications imperatives established, the next chapter will explore the environment in which that communications might take place, to further the development of a unique, strategic military communications approach.

CHAPTER THREE:

THE INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATIONS ENVIRONMENT

Introduction

Given the interconnectedness afforded by the internet and global communications networks, the communications environment in which the military operates is broad. Canadian Forces leaders consider this environment, whether they are communicating within their own institution, with Government, with the Canadian people, or with foreign potential stakeholders or adversaries. This chapter gives some shape to this world of words, images and ideas, to indicate where leaders could focus their communications efforts to meet the institution's communications imperatives. The first section describes the mediums available for communication, categorized as electronic media, conventional news media, and direct in-person dialogue. The next section examines the policy environment, and limitations imposed on communications by both Government and the Canadian Forces. The final section focusses on the people with whom institutional leaders need to communicate. The chapter will demonstrate that military leaders should focus their efforts strategically on those stakeholders who can have an effect on the military institution and its policy and operating environment, while maintaining institutional credibility in the process.

Mediums for Dialogue

Multitudes of deliberate and unintended communications avenues affect the Canadian Forces. Global information sharing takes place in real time where communications infrastructure is in place and accessible to both senders and receivers of information. For those connected electronically, the quantity of information available is unlimited, often unfiltered, and at times unverified.[141] Canadian media expert Marshall McLuhan wrote, "Electric technology is reshaping and restructuring patterns of social interdependence . . . . It is forcing us to reconsider and re-evaluate practically every thought, every action, and every institution."[142] For the Canadian Forces, this environment means that any action is potentially transmittable, and any image or word shareable to friend or foe, regardless of intentions.[143] Military leadership must consider the full spectrum of mediums for engagement, including mainstream and emergent e-media, traditional mass media, and direct communication, each with their own benefits and risks. These mediums do not operate in isolation, and information flow is not controllable. As David Taras of Mount Royal University stated, "The stark reality today is that every medium is merging with every other medium, every medium is becoming every other medium, and all media are merging on the Internet."[144]

---

[141]Tom Alderman, "The Internet is Absolute Democracy," *Huffington Post*, 23 April 2009.

[142]Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, *The Medium is The Massage: An Inventory of Effects* (Corte Madera: Ginko Press, 1967), 8.

[143]Thomas D. Mayfield III, "A Commander's Strategy for Social Media," *Joint Force Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (2011): 79.

[144]David Taras, "Introduction," in *How Canadians Communicate IV: Media and Politics*, ed. David Taras and Christopher Waddell, 1-25 (Edmonton: AU Press, 2012), 1.

Electronic Media

Web-based communications continue to evolve, and represent a significant medium for public dialogue, information exchange, and social activism. Personal and professional blogs, video-sharing sites including YouTube, character-limited feeds such as Twitter, and social networking sites such as Facebook and LinkedIn are pervasive and growing in influence in marketing and political realms.[145] At the same time, participants in social media can be both consumers and producers of news that can reach worldwide networks in seconds. The pervasiveness of electronic forms of information does not mean that the public is educated about foreign or national military affairs. To the contrary, the targeting of electronic media to an individual's interests means that people are not necessarily broadening their horizons. For example, the Reuters newswire service reported that in 2012, "sports and pop culture dominated the tally of tweets,"[146] and Twitter statistics indicate that United States President Obama was the sole non-entertainer in the top 20 "most followed" on Twitter accounts.[147] It is not surprising then, that Emory University professor Mark Bauerlein interprets current trends in *The Dumbest Generation*, saying, "instead of opening . . . minds to the stores of civilization and science and politics, technology has contracted their horizon to themselves, to the social scene

---

[145]Brian Solis and Deirdre K. Breakenridge, *Putting the Public back into Public Relations: How Social Media is Reinventing the Aging Business of PR* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press, 2009), xvii.

[146]The Financial Post, "Twitter's top tweets of 2012," last accessed 22 January 2012, http://business.financialpost.com/2012/12/11/twitters-top-tweets-of-2012/.

[147]Twitter, "Twitter Counter," last accessed 22 January 2012, http://twittercounter.com/pages/100.

around them."[148] Social media statistics also demonstrate the preponderance of personalities as the focus of dialogue, rather than institutions. The immediacy and theoretical raw honesty of social media commentary also present risks, as has been seen by the various foibles of actors, professional athletes, and politicians in poorly executed Tweets.[149] Noting the importance of a military commander's credibility to both operational and institutional effectiveness, senior officers and other members with public profile are vulnerable from errors made in haste, or from external, intentional attack via social media.

With e-mediums filled with vast quantities of entertainment and social content, it is logically difficult for un-provocative news, and certainly non-controversial military news, to reach audiences not already interested in the theme. That said, stories with mass appeal spread in seconds, and can result in not only increased discussion on the topic, but also physical action. Motivation, coordination and social mobilization for the protest actions of the 2011 Occupy Movement in North America and for elements of the 2011 Arab Spring, have taken place largely in the social media domain.[150] Of particular interest to the Canadian Forces, global actors including criminal and terrorist groups have

---

[148]Mark Bauerlein, *The Dumbest Generation: How the Digital Age Stupifies Young Americans and Jeopardizes our Future* (New York: Penguin Group, 2009), 10.

[149]Business 2 Community, "Scandals made Possible by Twitter," last accessed 22 January 2012, http://www.business2community.com/twitter/scandals-made-possible-by-twitter-0230738.

[150]Julia Skinner, "Social Media and Revolution: The Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement as seen through three Information Studies Paradigms," in *Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems* 11 (169), last accessed 28 January 2012, http://sprouts.aisnet.org/11-169, 2.

instantaneous and largely unfettered means of communicating worldwide to spread their ideology, training, and calls to action.[151]

As with other Canadians, military members are active in social media. Recognizing this, military commanders increasingly use social media to augment internal communications activities, albeit with specific approvals and registrations as demonstrated by the Canadian Army's Canadian Army Social Media Registry.[152] While member sites and posts present potential public image or operational security risks, they also represent the military in daily Canadian dialogue, and can be a multiplier of official communications activities. Well-informed members, educated about operational security and privacy considerations, have the potential to demonstrate important elements of the Canadian Forces profession of arms including professionalism, responsibility and discipline inherent in its ethos.[153] Canadian Forces operational directives reflect this reality, in stating that "Everyone within the Department of National Defence/Canadian Forces who uses social media (whether personally or officially) becomes a strategic asset to the organization and should be trained and enabled to use social media . . . ."[154] Social media allows for direct dialogue with the Canadian public, without the exchange filtering through journalists, experts, academics, or politicians. For those wary of the security risk that social media presents to the military by its immediacy, uncontrollability, and

---

[151]Paul Cornish *et al*., *On Cyber Warfare* (London: Chatham House, 2010), 8.

[152]Department of National Defence, Canadian Army, "Canadian Army Social Media Registry," last modified 27 February 2013, http://www.army.forces.gc.ca/land-terre/sm-ms/registry-repertoire-eng.asp.

[153]Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-001, *Duty with Honour . . .*, 14-34.

[154]Department of National Defence. CEFCOM Directives for International Operations - CDIO 13000 Series – Section Eight – Policy on Social Media (Ottawa: CEFCOM, 2012), 13.8-3.

consequent risk to operational security,[155] the curtailing of Canadian Forces member access to social media would be akin to refusing phone calls home or conversations over the fence with neighbours. Further, the social divide between the military and the public as expressed in Chapter Two would be all the greater if members were largely excluded from main communications market. The social media realm allows for a borderless exchange, given that communications is not limited to the geographic distribution of Canadian Forces personnel. Further, the full scope of the force, including the Navy, Army and Air Force services have the potential to be represented even in the urban centres where they are not physically present. However, the communications opportunity presented by social media is tempered with the concern that its use is leading to "social fragmentation," that promulgates "narrowly-focussed or special-interest content, or . . . create[s] spaces for narrow interest groups apart from larger society."[156] If so, the utility of social media for the military may be more to enable internal communications, rather than to directly enhance external communications.

Electronic mediums are powerful forums, which can add as much noise as utility to conventional communications activities.[157] Regardless, the Canadian Forces must be present in this modern conversation and leaders can empower individual members to personally represent the institution, even if that presence is diluted by the volume of voices in these spaces. A distributed approach to communications on social media has the

---

[155]Mike Sachoff, "Canadian Soldiers Told to Use Caution on Facebook," *WebProNews*, 26 February 2008, http://www.webpronews.com/canadian-soldiers-told-to-use-caution-on-facebook-2008-02.

[156]Leah Lievrouw, "New Media and the 'pluralization of life-worlds': A Role for Media in Social Differentiation," *New Media and Society* 3, no. 1: 22.

[157]Adam Barrell, "Twitter Best Practices: Making Sense of the Noise," *socialmediatoday*, 25 March 2013, http://socialmediatoday.com/adam-barrell/1322176/twitter-best-practices-filter-out-noise.

potential to reap the flexibility of "pragmatic complexity" discussed in Chapter One, where exchanges are not message driven, but people driven. For official comment, though, there is an important connection between e-mediums and conventional mass media, whose relevance is remaining despite the surge of self-reporting.

Conventional Mass Media

A second aspect of the environment important to the development of a strategic military institutional communications approach is the continued presence of conventional mass news media. Journalists and media agencies have been credited with the ability to "enhance and protect democracy in democratic states," and thus are seen to hold a government and other public figures to account on behalf of the public.[158] In that vein, military leaders can also find themselves and their institution under media scrutiny. In the words of Jane's Defence reporter Sharon Hobson, their role is to link "information from the government and the military together with eye-witness accounts, research, interviews . . . and critical analysis . . . so that the public is given the information it needs to understand what the military forces are doing."[159] With the emergence of social media, it is important to be aware of changes taking place within the media industry, and any resultant impacts on the military-media relationship. Due to the convergence of mediums on the internet and the competitive challenges faced by print and broadcast medium,

---

[158]Jabbar al-Obaidi, "Communication and the Culture of Democracy: Global Media and Promotion of Democracy in the Middle East," *International Journal of Instructional Media* 30, no. 1 (2003): 102.

[159]Sharon Hobson, "The Information Gap: Why the Canadian Public Doesn't Know More About its Military," *Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute Research Papers* 2007, 5.

conventional news carriers have focused content, and the generation of content, to meet web and social media demands. Pew Research reports that for 2012, "a continued erosion of news reporting resources converged with growing opportunities for those in politics, government agencies, companies and others to take their messages directly to the public."[160] Concurrently, the quality, depth and accuracy of conventional media coverage is increasingly under time and financial pressure as agencies adjust to meet the demands of instant communications. Benjamin Radford in *Media Mythmakers* comments, "How a particular story is reported, and how the facts are filtered by the journalist, can greatly influence the audience. Time and space constraints strip away valuable information needed to really understand a news event."[161] Further, with increased financial pressures on conventional media and related staff reductions, those with depth of knowledge about the military or other specialized areas gleaned from years of interaction and coverage will not necessarily be available to cover these stories.[162]

Despite limitations, the indirect flow, and possible screening of information from its primary source through news media, adds a degree of credibility to the consumer of information. Canadian trust in conventional media is strong, as indicated by the Canadian Media Research Consortium which reported in 2012 that "about 90 per cent of wired Canadians consider the information they get from newspapers, television, radio and online news sites to be reliable" compared with 26 to 40 per cent for information of social

---

[160]The Pew Centre, The Pew's Centre's Project for Excellent in Journalism, "The State of the News Media 2013," last accessed 3 April 2013, http://stateofthemedia.org/2013/overview-5/.

[161]Benjamin Radford, *Media Mythmakers* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2003), 67.

[162]The Pew Centre, The Pew's Centre's Project for Excellent in Journalism, "The State of the News Media 2013," last accessed 3 April 2013, http://stateofthemedia.org/2013/overview-5/.

media.[163] Further, trust in information direct from government is at 42 per cent. Therefore, the Government benefits in the military having a voice somewhat distinct from other elements of government, to take advantage of Canadian Forces credibility with the public that will be discussed later in this Chapter, coupled with the credibility of conventional news media. Despite the opportunity to communicate directly with Canadians, conventional media remains a highly relevant avenue for informing, if not engaging the public.

The context and detail surrounding military operations is complex, and therefore it is in the Canadian Force's interest that those who report on its operations are educated, informed, and credible. Therefore, military institutional leaders have a continued need to develop and maintain relationships with members of the media, as they represent an important avenue through which to inform Canadians.[164] Despite the continuing value of conventional news media, though, a recent focus group conducted as part of the Government's public opinion research found that Canadians prefer that at least for video imagery "stories must be told by the Canadian Forces not by a news network on their behalf" and they would prefer that videos be of "a personal nature . . . that document 'a day in the life' of a soldier, or provide a soldier's point of view."[165] This desire for an unfiltered, personal connection with the Canadian Forces members infers trust in

---

[163]The Globe and Mail, "Online Canadians trust information from media more than other sources: report," last updated 24 August 2012, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/technology/tech-news/online-canadians-trust-information-from-media-more-than-other-sources-report/article579546/.

[164]Department of National Defence, Defence Administrative Orders and Directives, "DAOD 2008-2, Media Relations and Public Announcements," last modified 18 December 2008, http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/dao-doa/2000/2008-2-eng.asp.

[165]Government of Canada Public Opinion Research Reports – National Defence – 2012, "Views of the Canadian Forces, tracking study, final report - Summary," last accessed February 12, 2013, http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsc-tpsgc/por-ef/national_defence/2012/049-11-e/index.html.

Canadian Forces members that can be capitalized on, particularly with respect to direct, in-person communications.

In-person Communication

For military leaders, accountability to Government, to the Canadian people, and to the men and women in uniform is of great importance. That accountability is embedded in leadership and command doctrine, and further demonstrated in the development of the Officer Professional Development 2020 programme. With essential input from senior leaders, the Officer Corps vision reads, "Leading by example, fully accountable, they [officers] are dedicated to their subordinates and inspire loyalty and mutual trust."[166] Institutional leadership doctrine goes on to state that, "The emotion demonstrated by a senior leader, particularly the delivery of the vision with fire and passion that can be seen in his or her eyes and actions, is key. Inherently this means face-to-face communications."[167] Therefore, any Canadian Forces institutional communications approach must address the need to maximize the opportunity to meet with people in person.

Face-face-communication is the richest communication medium, where richness is determined in terms of "a medium's capacity for immediate feedback, the number of

---

[166]Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-006, *Leadership. . .*, 88.
[167]*Ibid*.

cues and channels utilized, personalization, and language variety."[168] Richard Daft and Robert Lengel who introduced the theory of media richness further explain, "communications transactions that can overcome different frames of reference or clarify ambiguous issues in a timely manner are considered rich."[169] This implies that there is no increased value in a face-to-face exchange over another medium in a particular circumstance, if, due to culture impediments or individual characteristics, that exchange will not result in an increase in understanding. Taking into account the nuances of "pragmatic complexity" model shared in Chapter One, there *can* be value in face-to-face interaction based not on increased understanding, but in the very fact that the exchange is taking place at all. Social media strategist Anthony Juliano said succinctly, "In an era where digital communication is becoming more and more prevalent, face-to-face communication is more important than ever before . . . It comes down to one word: accountability."[170]

Effective senior leaders spend considerable time meeting with Canadian Forces members of all ranks, hearing directly the challenges their subordinates face, witnessing operations, responding to concerns, and inspiring those who listen.[171] Senior leaders also meet with military families when their loved ones are deploying or returning from

---

[168]Richard Daft and Robert Lengel,"Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design," *Management Science* 31, No. 5(May 1986): 560.

[169]*Ibid*.

[170]Anthony Juliano, "After Sandy Hook: Why face-to-face communications still matter," *Content: Making Sense of our Changing Communications Environment* (blog), December 20, 2012, http://anthonyjuliano.wordpress.com/2012/12/20/after-sandy-hook-why-face-to-face-communication-still-matters/.

[171]Ivey Business School, Ian O. Ihnatowycz, Institute for Leadership, "Lessons of a Leader," last updated 7 March 2011, http://www.ivey.uwo.ca/research/leadership/news-and-events/news/speakers/rick-hillier.htm.

military operations, and mourn with family members in the event of a death, alongside the Minister of National Defence.[172] Military leaders, and in particular the Chief of the Defence Staff, are accountable to the Government for decisions they take and the military advice they provide. An important part of this accountability is demonstrated in person, when senior military leaders participate in routine interdepartmental meetings, and appear before parliamentary committees including the Senate Standing Committee on National Security and Defence, and House of Commons Standing Committee on National Defence, as a review of committee witness lists will attest.[173] General (Retired) Maurice Baril argued in a speech that these are critically important venues, and represent "one of the most effective ways for [the Chief of the Defence Staff] to discuss . . . issues with Parliament and ensure that they have the best possible information about the Canadian Forces."[174] However, these appearances are not conducive to considered discussion, developing consensus or refining policy approaches as discussed in Chapter Two. Therefore, there is value in senior leaders seeking interaction with these key government and elected stakeholders outside of venues dictated by parliamentary procedure or adversarial traditions.

In response to requests from civic organizations, corporate clubs, and academic groups, senior military leaders also speak to a wide variety of Canadians directly about

---

[172]Afghanistan Repatriation Memorial, "Another Tearful Ceremony at CFB Trenton," last accessed 9 April 2013, http://www.afghanistanmemorial.ca/another-tearful-ceremony-at-cfb-trenton.

[173]Parliament of Canada, Senate Committees, "Standing Committee on National Security and Defence," last accessed 4 April 2013, http://www.parl.gc.ca/SenCommitteeBusiness/CommitteeHome.aspx?parl=39&ses=1&Language=E&comm_id=76.

[174]Maurice Baril (speech, "The Role of the Chief of the Defence Staff in Relations with Parliament," Conference of Defence Associations Annual Seminar, Ottawa, Ontario, January 27, 2000).

operations and capabilities. These events can be relatively intimate, or open to the media such as with appearances at the Annual Conference of Defence Associations.[175] These events provide opportunities for leaders to provide facts in context about military operations and issues, unfiltered by politically-driven debate or otherwise affected by the time and depth limitations of news media reporting. However, comments made in these venues can be re-interpreted by politicians or the media and broadcasted to a larger audience, with accompanying risks as was seen with retired General Hillier's comments about "the decade of darkness" made at such an event in 2007.[176]

A different form of public appearance became popular during Canadian Forces participation in combat operations in Afghanistan, when the Chief of the Defence Staff was invited to attend major sports games alongside many other members as part of military appreciation events.[177] The shared emotion on these occasions, during which individual members of the forces are often held up as "national treasures" appears to resonate with those in attendance in a personal way that no news release or speech could ever replicate.[178]

Institutional leaders have multiple opportunities and mediums to choose from when engaging with military personnel and their families, with Canadians, with those internal to government, and with other key groups and individuals. Whether engagement

---

[175]Conference of Defence Associations Institute, "Ottawa Conference on Defence and Security," last accessed 4 April 2013, http://www.cdainstitute.ca/en/ottawa-conference.

[176]Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, CBC News, "Liberal MP slams Hillier as Conservative 'prop'," last updated 17 February 2007, http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2007/02/16/coderre-hillier.html.

[177]National Hockey League, Ottawa Senators, Features, "Heartfelt salute to troops on Canadian Forces Night: Senators show appreciation to 3,300 Canadian Forces personnel and families, last updated 5 November 2011, http://senators.nhl.com/club/news.htm?id=599071.

[178]Sarah Gilmour, "CDS honours CF heroes," *The Maple Leaf*, 25 April, 2007.

takes place on-line, with members of the media or directly in person, information conveyed in one domain can readily be transmitted from one group to others. However, those gaining their news about military operations through broadcast or social media are not apt to be well informed. The media richness of direct contact, or information presented through the eyes of an individual's experiences, are more likely to resonate with the wider public. For in-depth understanding, dialogue should take place in person. While all these medium present great opportunities to communicate, policies put boundaries on information and vision sharing, particularly in the public domain.

Communications Policy

Canadian Forces senior leaders follow the communications policies and practices established by the Government, but also shape the internal communications policies in consideration of government-wide requirements. The policy environment with its constraints and restraints is a critical factor in the development of any communications approach. The Treasury Board Secretariat is responsible for the development and promulgation of the *Communications Policy of the Government of Canada*.[179] Key principles of the policy include the provision of "timely, accurate, clear, objective and complete information about its policies, programs, services and initiatives" to the public, and ensuring that Government institutions are "visible, accessible and accountable." The

[179]Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, "Communications Policy of the Government of Canada," last modified 21 December, 2012, http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=12316&section=text.

principle of openness, which specifies that all are encouraged to "communicate openly with the public" about that which "they are familiar with and for which they have responsibility" is balanced with the requirement for institutions to "work collaboratively to achieve coherent and effective communications."[180] In principle, collaboration and coherency should not preclude openness, but coordination takes time and can give the perception of lack of openness. Assuring coherency can also mean a reduction in volume of content released. That said, significant coordination of communications activities inside and outside of government is one way for government to mitigate the dilution or contradiction of sanctioned information in the modern competitive, politicized information marketplace.[181]

The emphasis on coordination and coherency of information released to the public, primarily lead by the Privy Council Office, reflects the centralization of power within the Government. Glen Milne, author of *A Guide to The Federal Government's Policy Process*, states that "the wide range of powers built into the position of the Prime Minister are a unique feature . . . woven through every aspect of the Federal government."[182] On behalf of the Prime Minister and within the Privy Council Office, the Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet (Communications and Consultation) provides

---

[180]Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, "Communications Policy . . .."

[181]Brooke Jeffrey, "The Harper Minority and the Majority Myth: Implementing the Conservative Agenda," Canadian Political Science Association 2011 Annual Conference, Waterloo, Ontario, May 18, 2011, 19.

[182]Glen Milne, Making Policy: A Guide to the Federal Government's Policy Process (Ottawa: Glen Milne, 2011), 8.

communications advice to Cabinet and coordinates government-wide communications.[183] Departmental communications are primarily Minister-led in accordance with policy that designates the Minister as the principle spokesperson, and thus communications have a clear political focus with priority on the Government's agenda of the day. Falling under the authority of the Minister of National Defence, the Chief of the Defence Staff is subject to government communications policy, as are all members of the Canadian Forces.

The Canadian Force's own expression of communications policy appears in the *Defence Administrative Orders and Directives 2008* on Public Affairs.[184] Further communications principles appear in the *Canadian Forces Doctrine* and *Joint Public Affairs Doctrine* publications that guide military action on operations, which are consistent with those of Canada's key allies and with NATO. Key to the Canadian Forces approach, is the belief that "public support and confidence follow from the ability of the CF and DND to both deliver and inform." The policy "actively encourages openness and transparency," timeliness, and unlike the centralist approach of overall Government policy "delegates authority and empowers CF members and DND employees to speak more openly to Canadians." The origins of this transparent approach lies in the crisis of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry of 1996, that accused senior officers of "evasion and

---

[183]Privy Council Office, "The Role and Structure of the Privy Council Office 2011," last modified 12 March 2012, http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=role/role2013-eng.htm#a6.2.

[184]Department of National Defence, Defence Administrative Orders and Directives, "DAOD 2008-0, Public Affairs Policy," last modified 18 December 2008, http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/dao-doa/2000/2008-0-eng.asp.

deception."[185] One of the final recommendations of the report was to "ensure that public affairs policy and practices reflect the principles of openness, responsiveness, transparency and accountability."[186] In response, the Department of National Defence put the revised public affairs orders into force in 1998. The Services and the Commands also have the ability to provide further directions regarding communications.

The Canadian Forces manages the risk of more than 60,000 voices representing the military, and therefore the Government, in part by meeting the training requirement for all spokespersons to receive media training as expressed in the Government policy.[187] All military members receive some media training throughout their careers, including at basic training, at subsequent leadership courses, prior to deployments, and in advance of planned public comments. This approach permits Canadian Forces members to respond to impromptu questions from members of the public or the media without reference to higher authority, and for leadership to speak about their military operations and training activities.[188] Military members are not, however, permitted to offer opinion on government policy, or make planned public announcements without specific approvals, in particular when the issues are of a "national scope or nature."[189] Whether or not given issues are of "national scope" varies, and within its functional authority responsibilities, Assistant Deputy Minister of Public Affairs within the Department of National Defence,

---

[185]Department of National Defence, "Report of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry, Executive Summary," last accessed 31 January 2012, http://www.dnd.ca/somalia/vol0/v0s1e.htm.

[186]Department of National Defence, "Report of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry, Chapter 39 – Openness and Disclosure," last accessed 31 January 2012, http://www.dnd.ca/somalia/vol0/v0s39e.htm.

[187]Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, "Communications Policy . . .."

[188]Department of National Defence, Defence Administrative Orders and Directives, "DAOD 2008-2, Media Relations and Public Announcements," last modified 18 December 2008, http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/dao-doa/2000/2008-2-eng.asp.

[189]*Ibid*.

or the Privy Council Office determines this designation; thus, consultation in the making of announcements is essential to ensure compliance with the policy.[190] Further, the defence role of the military adds operational security and privacy considerations.

The military administrative orders on public affairs, not formally updated since 2000, do not specifically address newer electronic or social media as does the wider Government policy. However, the principles expressed in the orders regarding the requirement for members to speak "within their personal areas of experience or expertise" and to comply with Treasury Board Policy, provide initial guidance in these areas.[191] Canadian Forces General Orders (CANFORGENS) and other direction from the chain of command fill policy gaps, such as how to assure operational security when social media is accessible during military deployments.[192] Similar direction exists with respect to embedding media on operations.[193]

Despite subtle differences in approach, existing military direction adheres to the requirements of the Government policy. Institutional leaders are also responsible for the development of Canadian Forces policy, and to ensure adherence. Commanders can delegate or retain approval authorities expressed within the policy, as they believe necessary to assure appropriate coordination or risk mitigation. Essentially, the guiding communications principle for institutional leaders is to ensure that the military remains as

---

[190]*Ibid*.

[191]Department of National Defence, Defence Administrative Orders and Directives, "DAOD 2008-2, Media Relations and Public Announcements," last modified 18 December 2008, http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/dao-doa/2000/2008-2-eng.asp.

[192]Department of National Defence. CEFCOM Directives for International Operations - CDIO 13000 Series – Section Eight – Policy on Social Media (Ottawa: CEFCOM, 2012), 13.8-3.

[193]Department of National Defence. CEFCOM Directives for International Operations - CDIO 13000 Series – Section Five – The CF Media Embedding Program (Ottawa: CEFCOM, 2012), 13.5.

open as possible with the public, given necessary limitations imposed by operational security considerations and political restraints. At all times, the Canadian Forces are subject to civil authority, which in Canada's democracy, represents all Canadians.

The People

Canadian Forces institutional leaders by necessity communicate with many groups of people, including those in uniform, those in government, the broader Canadian public, and others. The precursor to effective engagement is "knowing your audience" as advised by most communications advice, because it enables the speaker to "appeal" to the groups, shapes what information is included, how it is arranged, what supporting details are necessary, and the tone of the discussion.[194] Any institutional communications approach is best developed in consideration of, and in the future refined by, an understanding of the views or changing views of the people with whom the institution wishes to communicate.[195] Surveys and polls provide a scientific approach to grasp the complexities of public opinion. It is important to note as Walter Hickey wrote in the on-line publication *Business Insider* that "polls are conducted by statisticians with the intention of being interpreted by people with some background in statistics."[196] Daniel Goodman in the same publication goes on to explain why polls are often misread due to

---

[194]University of Maryland University College, "Writing for your Audience," last accessed 18 February 2012, http://www.umuc.edu/writingcenter/writingresources/writing_for_audiences.cfm.

[195]James E. Grunig, *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management* (Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1992), 125-126.

[196]Business Insider, "Everything You Need To Know To Really Understand A Poll," last updated September 25, 2012, http://www.businessinsider.com/how-to-read-a-poll-2012-9.

the media or the public disregarding the effects of margins of error, statistical bias, and sampling methods.[197] In context, and when monitored over time, polling data provides valuable insight into the communications environment.

The Government conducts annual polling to "to better understand Canadian society and to identify citizen needs and expectations."[198] The Department of National Defence participates in this wider public opinion research process, to glean information that may inform decision-making and communications activities. According to polling data released in April 2012, 90 per cent of Canadians have positive or very positive views of the Canadian Forces, 90 per cent believe that the military is essential or very essential, and 82 per cent consider the military as a source of pride or great pride.[199] As the majority of information regarding the military still continues to reach Canadians through television news reports, and based on the nature of news media, that information is apt to lack depth.[200] Therefore, the overwhelmingly positive support does not come with great awareness or understanding of the roles of the force. The Canadian population appears evenly split over whether the military should be engaged in combat or peacekeeping operations, if the military is properly funded or equipped, or whether the Canadian Forces is doing a good job "looking after returning soldiers."[201] Overall, the views of Canadians

---

[197]*Ibid*.

[198]Public Works and Government Services Canada, Public Opinion Research, "Frequently Asked Questions," last modified January 18, 2012, http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/rop-por/faq-eng.html#a2.

[199]Government of Canada Public Opinion Research Reports – National Defence – 2012, "Views of the Canadian Forces, tracking study, final report - Summary," last accessed 12 February 2013 , http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsc-tpsgc/por-ef/national_defence/2012/049-11-e/index.html.

[200]*Ibid*.

[201]Government of Canada Public Opinion Research Reports – National Defence – 2012, "Views of the Canadian Forces, tracking study, final report - Summary," last accessed 12 February 2013 , http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsc-tpsgc/por-ef/national_defence/2012/049-11-e/index.html.

have remained relatively constant over time. These results indicate that at least in the short term, the decrease of media coverage since the end of combat operations has not resulted in a decrease of public support for the military institution. Leaders can take note of future changes in opinion as collective memory of Canada's combat role in Afghanistan weakens.

In addition to polling, the public demonstrations in support of men and women in uniform such as the grass-roots emergence of the "Highway of Heroes" honouring fallen soldiers, and the plethora of business, sports and community-based groups under the "Support our Troops" banner also represents an important part of the communications environment.[202] These public displays of affection, and their continuance even while combat operations are not underway such as the creation of a Highway of Heroes in Manitoba,[203] are an important barometer of public engagement and support, if not of understanding. As discussed in Chapter Two, these activities can positively affect operational effectiveness, and are thus of great morale and practical value.

Within the Canadian population, federally elected parliamentarians have a specific need to understand the Canadian Forces and its activities, as they should "set the goals for national defence and then supervise the defence policy process," and they may debate or vote on the employment of military force or sit on related parliamentary

---

[202]Canadian Air Force Heritage, For Valour: Canadian Airmen and the Victoria Cross, "Tribute Video: 50 Bridges," last accessed 4 April 2013, http://www.forvalour.manlab.com/english/index.html.

[203]Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, CBC News, "Manitoba gets its own Highway of Heroes," last updated 7 June 2012, http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/story/2012/06/07/mb-highway-heroes-transcanada.html.

committees.[204] Therefore, senior Canadian Forces leaders, expert in their field, have a responsibility to contribute to their knowledge and understanding, with the concurrence of the Minister of National Defence. Personal experience can aid a politician in their understanding of the uniqueness of military requirements, and as tabulated by the Parliament of Canada, almost 18 per cent of all members of parliament since Confederation have served with Canadian or other nations' military forces.[205] The majority of their service was during the First and Second World Wars, and in Korea. A comparison of this roll of veterans with current serving Members of Parliament indicates that at the close of 2012, 13 sitting members had served in the forces, equating to 4 per cent of the 308-member House. The more than 30 Parliamentarians with Canadian Forces establishments in their ridings also have the opportunity to become more educated about the military. However, Douglas Bland, after conducting a survey of politicians views and understanding of defence issues, argues that "political leaders will not normally involve themselves in debates about "effective" national defence."[206] He goes on to state that "Emergencies and international crises may prompt some political debate, but usually they will be addressed in isolation and once resolved, they will disappear from the table."[207] Politicians are also usually cognizant of, though not necessarily subject to the priorities of

---

[204]Bland, "Parliament, Defence Policy and the Canadian Forces . . .," 16.

[205]Parliament of Canada, "Military Service in the House of Commons," last accessed February 12, 2013, http://www.parl.gc.ca/parlinfo/Lists/MilitaryService.aspx?Menu=HOC-Bio&Section=03d93c58-f843-49b3-9653-84275c23f3fb.

[206]Bland, "Parliament, Defence Policy and the Canadian Forces," 14.

[207]*Ibid*., 15.

the constituents they represent, [208] and as polling has routinely found that "Canadians usually assign defence a lower priority than . . . health care, education and the economy," political action and dialogue on defence issues may wax and wane with priorities of the day.[209] Thus, it is incumbent upon military leaders to recognize when, how, and with which politicians defence issues can be of tangible interest, and to provide factual information that will aid them to make political policy decisions in times of urgent need.

As Canadian Forces members deploy on operations throughout the world and alongside allies from many different nations, predominant world views of Canada and Canadians are relevant to its operations. The Ipsos polling company in 2010, in researching opinions from almost 20,000 people from 24 countries, captured such an international perspective. Of relevance to Canadian Forces leadership, 55 per cent of respondents agreed that Canada has an influence in world affairs, and 67 per cent indicated that Canada was a "leader in working for peace and human rights around the world."[210] While 60 per cent believed that "Canada pretty much just does what the U.S. does when it comes to foreign affairs," 82 per cent believed that Canadians are different from Americans.[211] This differentiation is important for institutional leaders, who work very closely with the United States in combined planning and training activities, in the defence of North America, and in coalition and alliance operations. The Global Attitudes

---

[208]World Bank Institute, Professional Development Programs for Parliamentarians and Parliamentary Staff, "The Role of MPs and Parliamentary Staff," last accessed 4 April 2013, http://www.parliamentarystrengthening.org/commonwealthmodule/pdf/Commonwealth%20Unit%208.pdf.

[209]Ross Graham, "Civil Control of the Canadian Forces . . .," 25.

[210]Historica Dominion Institute, "New Survey Measures What the World Thinks of Canada and Canadians," last accessed February 12, 2013, https://www.historica-dominion.ca/node/999.

[211]Historica Dominion Institute, "New Survey Measures What the World Thinks of Canada and Canadians," last accessed February 12, 2013, https://www.historica-dominion.ca/node/999.

Project by the Pew Research Centre provides clear data on nation-by-nation opinion over the past ten years, covering such topics as opinions on United States–led anti-terrorism operations as well as views about the United States more generally.[212] The countries polled do not usually include those failing or failed states where Canada is most likely to deploy its military forces and where literacy and awareness of world affairs could be limited. However, relevant polling may exist if United Nations or NATO forces have been in location for some time, such as in Afghanistan where Canada has been committed to operations for more than 10 years."[213] With a diverse range of public opinion data available, leaders can consider the wider information environment that may have an impact on the success, or perceived success, of an operation when providing military advice to government or when planning specific operations. As discussed in Chapter One, Canadian Forces actions alone will not likely be sufficient on their own to affect these opinions, and a politically-led communications strategy should determine where external perceptions need to be addressed, with what elements of state power.

In summary, Canadian Forces leaders have access to considerable information, often in the form of polls and surveys, regarding the prevailing views of a wide range of potential stakeholders in Canada, as well as in and outside conflict areas. Awareness of baseline attitudes help shape communications activities, and may also shape which potential stakeholders merit further or deeper engagement. Members of Parliament are

---

[212]Pew Research Centre, "Global Attitudes Project," last accessed February 12, 2013, http://www.pewglobal.org/database/?indicator=8&survey=14&response=Oppose&mode=chart.

[213]The Asia Foundation, "Afghanistan in 2010: A Survey of the Afghan People," last accessed February 12, 2013, http://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/Afghanistanin2010survey.pdf.

more likely to be interested than the general public in defence issues, although that interest may be transient. The lack of general public preoccupation with military issues does not mean that the public should be ignored as a priority for institutional communications activities; rather, leaders should be aware what type of dialogue is welcome or feasible with a given group, and tailor their information and form of engagement accordingly. For strategic effect, broad policies can ensure that Canadians have enough access to military members to have confidence in them and to emotionally support the men and women in uniform. Key stakeholders however, with the potential to have strategic influence on the institution, require focussed leadership attention.

Conclusion

When directing communications activities or when engaging with stakeholders, Canadian Forces institutional leaders require detailed knowledge about the groups or individuals to ensure communications are effective as possible. The myriad of options and content available means that there is often little interest and little news space for non-controversial military news. Leaders can therefore focus communications efforts and make use of the overlap between the news media, social media networks, and the internet more generally. News media have not become less relevant, even though their reporting may progressively have less depth.

Individual forces members can be empowered through policy to professionally represent the institution and powerfully communicate with fellow Canadians on an individual basis. The overlap of communications mediums, and the reality of uncontrollable communications does mean a degree of risk to senior leaders, in terms of

operational security, and with respect to their relationship with the Government. Policies and related orders must respect Government communications requirements. Further, military communications approaches must take into account the potential positive and negative strategic effects of information, and find the means to ensure coherency without constraining dialogue. The risk of limiting the opportunity for Canadian Forces members to communicate directly with other Canadians is social irrelevance. The benefits of such engagement are a reinforced military ethos and operational effectiveness.

Ultimately, direct, personal, face-to-face communications still represent the most powerful means for dialogue on military issues, particularly with respect to military expertise in the development of defence policy. With limited time, institutional leaders can focus their efforts to inspire, to inform, or to discuss the facts and demands of military operations. With this review of the military communications environment complete, the next chapter explores the imperative for Canadian Forces leaders to communicate in these environs.

CHAPTER FOUR:

A STRATEGIC INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATIONS APPROACH

Introduction

Leaders of the distinct military institution must assure the effectiveness of its operations, appropriate military input into Government policy decisions, and the preservation of the military ethos. As the preceding chapters have argued, these efforts require deliberate communications activities, which take into account the different and at times conflicting needs of the military, the Government, and the Canadian people. The preceding chapters demonstrate the imperative that communications be strategically driven and meshed with official government positions, while still being distinct from political and departmental dialogue. This final chapter incorporates the evidence presented thus far, to recommend the development of an enduring strategic institutional communications approach that goes beyond the communications strategies currently promulgated. The communications approach must fill a current gap in senior military leadership direction, and be distinguishable from departmental, civil service and politically-focussed guidance. Essentially, it must achieve the military's communications needs regarding the military ethos, the availability of military expertise, and ultimately enable successful military operations.

For each of these topics, institutional leaders need to ensure that related communications neither compete with nor contradict the communications efforts of the Government, and in fact should align with and reinforce political strategic objectives. Still, these topics are distinct from other Government efforts, and must be addressed in

order for the military institution to be effective. With respect to the institution's ethos and identity as a profession of arms, the Canadian Forces are a unique institution that needs to be understood by the public as being reflective of its own values. With respect to military advice, institutional leaders must be able to contribute to policy development and communicate unclassified military fact and context to any stakeholder, while remaining demonstrably apolitical. Regarding operations, and again without compromising security, communications must both aid in achieving the military and political objectives of the mission, while contributing to Canadian understanding of the actions of its men and women in uniform.

The Need

Respecting government priorities, the institutional communications approach must enable the Canadian Forces to fulfil its mission. Any approach should uphold the military ethos, aid in informed policy decision-making based on sound military expertise, and add to the effectiveness of military operations. These are not short-term goals determined by any one mandate or mission, but endure through successive military and political leaders. Thus, the military communications approach should be agreeable to a broad range of parliamentarians, to defence civilian partners, and to Canadians in general. Further, the pervasive needs of the military to inform, educate and build relationships take place over time and over the course of military member's careers.

From a pan Canadian Forces perspective, there is currently no overarching communications strategy in place. What does exist, is a Department-focussed

communications strategy, as well as separate Royal Canadian Navy, Canadian Army, and Royal Canadian Air Force strategies and plans that vary considerably in format, scope, depth and intent. Appropriate references to Government priorities are made in each of the documents, but each element has come to subtly different conclusions regarding strictly military communications priorities. An examination of these existing documents demonstrate the need for a unified, command-led, strategically-driven Canadian Forces institutional communications approach that addresses the unique needs of the military profession of arms.

The Assistant Deputy Minister of Public Affairs within the Department of National Defence annually promulgates a Department of National Defence / Canadian Forces communications strategy, as required by the Government's communications policy. Well-meshed with current Government priorities, the strategy focuses on communications processes and controls, and the role of public affairs staff to enable that process in support of their respective Commander or manager. The document sets broad department-wide communications themes that match the Government's and the Department's priorities, and are accompanied by "desired strategic effects."[214] For 2011-2013, the themes are as "Excellence in Operations, Excellence in Defence Management, Care of Our Own, and Working to Support Whole-of-Government Priorities."[215] The details of each theme are closely tied to immediate, predominantly government-wide programs of the moment. The document alludes to further guidance and messages to

---

[214]Assistant Deputy Minister Public Affairs, "DND/CF Communications Strategy 2011-2013," 9.
[215]*Ibid*.

follow on specific communications activities, broadly identifies target audiences, and calls for the content of the strategy to be "operationalized" across the other elements of the Department and the Canadian Forces.[216] The prescribed strategic-level themes cover the broad range of Departmental and Canadian Forces key activities, and provide clear initial guidance for annual communications efforts. The document is traditional in its approach to target audiences, messages, and focusses more on one-way communication that is "coordinated, aligned, integrated and sustained."[217] Such an approach, by itself, does not meet the Canadian Forces institutional communications needs in the current complex environment.

Although a valuable and keystone document on which to base Canadian Forces communications on specific themes, the strategy does not by itself provide the Command-driven vision and empowerment that is integral to military operations and to the military ethos. With its focus on control, the strategy does not take advantage of the collective power of strategically informed Canadian Forces communicators distributed throughout the country, the complexity and immediacy of communications, and the personal relationship that the military has, and needs, with the Canadian people. While accepting central control of current political issues, successful Canadian Forces institutional communications need to be pervasive, personal, and based on dialogue in order to have a sustainable strategic effect. While focussed on the military institution,

---

[216]*Ibid*., 16.
[217]*Ibid*.

such an approach must still be consistent with and complementary to the Department's communication strategy.

Canadian Forces leadership ensures strategic coherence with the use of military force through the communication of a Commander's intent. In matters directly concerning the military function and its ethos, the same approach can and should be used with respect to military institutional strategic communications. A degree of communications coherence is achieved currently, through existing command and control mechanisms. The Chief of the Defence Staff broadly communicates his agenda during the annual seminar of all General and Flag Officers, through periodic distribution of overarching Chief of the Defence Staff Guidance, and through the Armed Forces Council."[218] General Lawson, the current Chief of the Defence Staff has made his current priorities public in the February 2013 speech to the Conference of Defence Associations conference. In that speech, he outlined his priorities: leading the Profession of Arms, delivering excellence in operations, caring for personnel and their families, and preparing the forces for the future.[219]

While the Chief of the Defence Staff's priorities are consistent with the overall Defence priorities, they are explicitly focussed on the military and on the profession of arms. There are similarities with the Department's communications themes, in particular regarding "excellence in operations," and "care of our own," listed earlier. However, departmental and politically-driven priorities understandably do not put an emphasis on

---

[218]Department of National Defence, Office of the Chief of the Defence Staff, "Armed Forces Council," last modified 25 January 2013, http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/ocds-bcemd/afc-cfa/index-eng.asp.

[219]Tom Lawson. General (speech, Conference of Defence Associations, Ottawa, Canada, February 22, 2013).

leading the profession of arms, a Chief of the Defence Staff priority, that is so integral to effective military command and the safeguarding of the military ethos. Leading the profession of arms falls within the purview of the Chief of the Defence Staff with his associated expertise and experience, and are not in the civilian realm according to the separation of responsibilities as expressed in Chapter One. Therefore, the strategic communications needs associated with these priorities, will not in their totality be addressed by a Departmental approach. Further, the area of "preparing the forces for the future" speaks to the delicate balance of policy development and the provision of military expertise. In a time of near instant communications, there may be little time between the Government making a policy decision, and the order to the military to plan and execute a related operation. However, the Government and the Canadian public expect senior military leadership to be ready for such circumstances, in line with the mandate to defend Canada. Therefore, the Canadian Forces needs an aligned, but distinct strategic communications approach to enable the Chief of the Defence Staff's priorities. Further, while the Chief of the Defence Staff's clearly stated priorities set the scene for strategically driven action, the institution's communications approach to enable these priorities should be formalized to enable the military to achieve them.

The need for this overarching institutional document is further evident in a comparison of the strategic-level communications strategies of the Royal Canadian Navy, Canadian Army, and the Royal Canadian Air Force. The Royal Canadian Navy's Communications Strategy 2012-2016 subtitled "A Conversation with Canadians" is a compelling document, that uses the themes of purpose, platforms, people and pride in order to maintain the trust of Canadians and protect the credibility of the Royal Canadian

Navy.[220] The Canadian Army's strategy, "The Army: Advancing with Purpose," is a high-level document that includes the communications priority to "Connect with Canadians" among its three other goals of delivering combat-effective land forces, sustaining the army, and shaping Army culture.[221] The Air Force Strategic Communications Plan 2010-2012, "Engaging Canadians: An Air Force that is relevant to Canadians," is highly detailed, and focusses on supporting and reflecting the modernization of the Air Force, conveying the Air Force story more compellingly, and enabling successful engagement with Canadians.[222]

Although there are broad and important similarities regarding the value of a personal face to military communications and the demonstration of the military ethos, each strategy reviews the Canadian public environment through the lens of its own service, and focuses on the need to be present and better inform Canadians about their particular element. The lack of presence in major urban centres is one example of this concern. As demonstrated earlier in this paper, despite a decade of combat operations, Canadians do not have more understanding or knowledge about the Canadian Forces, and no agreement on the appropriate roles for the force. Although awareness and support for the Canadian Forces is needed across the country, general public knowledge of the individual elements of the force cannot be expected, is possibly unaffordable, and is most likely unnecessary for institutional credibility. What can be addressed, is the need for the

---

[220]The Royal Canadian Navy's Communications Strategy 2012-2016: A Conversation with Canadians (Department of National Defence: Royal Canadian Navy).

[221]The Army: Advancing with Purpose (Department of National Defence: Canadian Army).

[222]The Air Force Strategic Communications Plan 2012 – Engaging Canadians: An Air Force that is relevant to Canadians (Department of National Defence, Royal Canadian Air Force).

Canadian Forces to have appropriate relationships with key or potential stakeholders in all major centres, and to focus education and understanding where it will best serve the whole military institution. The solution to Canadian awareness and stakeholder relations is not in competing speaker's bureaus, duelling video productions or imagery team capabilities, but in presenting a joint presence to Canadians. Each potential stakeholder has only so much mental space to put towards understanding the military, and that attention should not be diluted by inadvertently parochial service concerns.

A strategic-level approach can bring the communications capabilities and expertise of each element to bear, just as the forces does on joint operations. This is not to say that element-specific communications are not necessary; to the contrary, due to their respective locations across the country, their unique capabilities and skills, and different training and operating requirements, element-driven communications are essential. Further, some members of the public may be passionate about a life at sea, dream of flying, or seek the challenge of combat operations, and the elements should speak to these interests. From a strategic institutional perspective, however, one of the reasons behind the unification of the Canadian Forces in the 1960s and the creation of the position of the Chief of the Defence Staff, was the desire to "redirect the loyalties of the officers away from their traditional service to the . . . unified force."[223] The general Canadian public does not need to differentiate between the arms of the Force, and we should not ask them to. It is time to bring unification into the realm of communications and address the

---

[223]Daniel Gosselin, "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old – Part Two," *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 3 (2009): 12.

institutional shortfalls without duplicating the work of the Assistant Deputy Minister Public Affairs. Indeed, the effort does not require significant resources, other than those required to draft such a strategic-level command-led, institutionally focused communications approach. Such a unified approach, logically developed within the Strategic Joint Staff that support the Chief of the Defence Staff, can enable the effects of joint deterrence, joint credibility, and joint admiration for the men and women in uniform.

What isn't needed

Noting the necessity of compliance with political direction and the coordinating role of the Department's Assistant Deputy Minister (Public Affairs), there is no need for the strategic Canadian Forces institutional communications approach to deal with current issues for which directive guidance from the Government is expected. For such issues, Canadian Forces – specific direction would have little to add, other than to assure that any messages are fittingly "operationalized" to the level of military member expected to relay the content, so that the information is delivered with appropriate apolitical credibility.

Although commanders and public affairs officers need to develop or maintain strong professional relationships with select media, attempts to garner national news coverage when there is no national 'news' should not be used as a measure of success for the institution. Public polling has thus far indicated that despite a significant reduction in national media coverage, public support in the men and women in uniform remains

strong. That said, national news coverage that champions the efforts of individual Canadian Forces members who epitomize the military ethos may help balance criticism regarding procurement processes, budget expenditures, or other issues of the moment. Media monitoring provides an indication of current media and political trends and concerns, but represents only one lens through which the Canadian Forces is viewed.

Finally, noting recurrent fiscal constraints that impact the military operations and training and related communications activities that expose these activities to the Canadian public, the approach should not advocate a reduction in communications efforts. For reasons of the military-civil relationship, morale and military effectiveness, such efforts must be sustained. The lessons of the 1990s and Somalia should not be forgotten, and the Canadian Forces must maintain its presence and connection with Canadians. Further, whether a combat mission is ongoing or in the recent past, the men and women who sacrifice themselves and the peace of mind of their families to serve Canada need and deserve the morale-building "support our troops" endeavours that became ubiquitous during the Afghanistan mission.

Key Elements

Noting the three institutional communications imperatives suggested by this paper; military ethos, military expertise, and military effectiveness, each area requires slightly different approaches to ensure strategic effectiveness. The focus of an enduring approach must be on the development and upholding of the military ethos, because it is the ethos that defines the institution. Defined and shaped by institutional leaders, the

military ethos lives in all Canadian Forces members, and thus must be communicated by the entire force. The ethos is not a talking point or a message, but an embodiment of actions matching words in the institution's leaders and in all personnel. As expressed by the Canadian Forces Recruiting Group in 2006,

> Our soldiers, sailors and airmen and airwomen already have what it takes to represent the CF: they wear the uniform with pride, they have achieved tremendous personal growth through the training they receive, and through employment in operations they have made a lasting and positive difference in the world. All we need them to do is to talk about their experience with their fellow Canadians.[224]

Thus institutional leaders can enable both the communication of the ethos itself and its refinement by empowering all Canadian Forces members to actively represent the institution. Current Canadian Forces policies permit all members to speak externally regarding their areas of expertise and responsibility. A strategically driven approach cannot only permit, but also actively encourage engagement, so that the majority in uniform see themselves as having a responsibility to promote understanding of the profession of arms. This dialogue works both ways, shaping those who communicate with the public, as well as those with whom they speak. This dynamic can aid in minimizing the civil-military gap, keeping members in touch with the Canadian people, and understanding and delivering on their expectations. It is worth noting that the Government's communication policy requires that communications "safeguard Canadians' trust and confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the Public Service of

---

[224]Department of National Defence, Canadian Army, "Op CONNECTION: Reaching out and touching Canadians," last updated 9 March 2006, http://www.army.forces.gc.ca/land-terre/news-nouvelles/story-reportage-eng.asp?id=941.

Canada."[225] It is certainly no less important that the public has trust and confidence in the military institution, and in the men and women that risk their lives and wield lethal force on their behalf.

This paper has also addressed the need for the Canadian Forces to ensure that stakeholders in and outside government have access to military fact, context and expertise, appropriately restrained by operational security and policy advice given to Cabinet. A Canadian Forces strategic approach can provide senior military leaders with the boundaries of such engagement, to focus efforts, and to avoid competition between the elements. Also, noting the close relationship between military context and policy development, this engagement should be approved by the Minister of National Defence, and focus on other parliamentarians, academics, think tanks, and other similar stakeholders.

A robust military ethos, combined with a defence policy informed by clear military facts set the stage for effective operations, the *raison d'être* of the Canadian Forces. A strategic military-focussed communications strategy can further add to this effectiveness, by addressing the need for the information requirements of individual operations or campaigns to be meshed with and enhanced by political-level strategic communications. The newly formed Canadian Joint Operations Command has begun the process of formulating overarching themes for the major missions, and communicating

---

[225]Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, "Communications Policy of the Government of Canada," last modified 21 December, 2012. http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=12316&section=text.

them broadly to interested stakeholders to increase informed dialogue.[226] For these missions to succeed in meeting the political aims of the country alongside other aspects of the nation's power, the information aspects of the mission should be addressed at the political strategic level. Senior institutional leaders can speak about military missions, explaining what the force is doing and with what effect. Such communications can be matched by political dialogue, which can deter potential adversaries, retain the commitment of allies, explain the rationale behind the nation's use of military power to Canadians, and boost the morale of those putting their lives in harm's way for the nation. Senior military leaders can recommend, alongside advice regarding the use of kinetic military force, the strategic communications activities that will reinforce the effort.

In summary, the Canadian Forces strategic communications approach should be unified, personal, apolitical, and open. It should address the critical institutional needs of the military, including upholding the military ethos, aiding in the development of defence policy through the availability of military expertise, and add to the effectiveness of military operations. Such efforts must be complementary to the Department-wide communications strategy, and unify but not eliminate communications efforts of the services and the Commands. Though strategically driven, the approach empowers all members of the force to contribute to the relationship with the Canadian people and the Government, rather than restricting and controlling that dialogue.

---

[226]Communications guidance in the form of "CJOC Public Affairs Current Themes and Talking Points" are promulgated monthly by the Canadian Joint Operations Command.

Conclusion

This paper advocates the introduction of a Canadian Forces focussed communications approach that addresses the strategic needs of the institution both as an operating entity and as a profession of arms. This review demonstrates that current policies and strategies do not address the critical communications needs of the Canadian Forces, specifically with respect to the military ethos, and the availability of military expertise to all those considering defence policy. Further, more needs to be done to ensure that communications regarding general military effectiveness and specific operations are enabling both military and political success. The military's strategic communications approach must be respectful of Government policies and requirements, while charting a slightly different course to achieve the same objective: an effective military force.

The power of Canadian trust and respect for Canadian Forces members, through the profession's adherence to and communication of the military ethos, cannot be underestimated. The weaknesses exposed by the Somalia Inquiry processes took years to overcome, and bear lessons that should not be forgotten. The Canadian Forces has regained its place of respect with the Canadian people in large part because it became accessible to the people. Without continued access and contact with the men and women in uniform, the Canadian people will be vulnerable to the often shallow reporting from the news media, which by its nature focusses on the negative and controversial. A unified, Canadian Forces-led communications approach can assure that a significant amount of unfiltered dialogue continues to take place to assure a connection with

Canadians, despite any budgetary, operational, or political restraints. Face-to-face dialogue, as well as the power of social media can be employed for forces members at all levels to maintain continuous exposure to Canadian Forces members and their ethos, noting that the objective is broad support and not detailed comprehension of military issues. Such personal engagement will be most effective if those members clearly understand their Commander's intent as well as their obligations with respect to operational security and privacy, and if those engaging are armed with their military ethos. Existing communications policies support such an approach, but the result needs to be assured through strategic military direction, and unified across the Canadian Forces, eliminating branding competition between the services.

Regarding the development of defence policy, the military must assure that it acts and is seen to act subordinate to civil authority. The trust that Canadians have with respect to their military is in part assured by the belief that those with considerable lethal power are always acting in support of the Government's objectives, and not for its own ends. At the same time, senior military leaders are responsible for providing military advice to the Government and for helping to shape the defence policies that guide its actions. Therefore, this paper has demonstrated that military expertise should be available to those with a definable interest in developing or contributing to defence policy in an apolitical fashion, and in particular in academic venues and in informing parliamentarians. Due to the complexities of information being shared, face-to-face communications have been demonstrated as the most effective means of achieving greater understanding of military issues. In this process, military leaders and experts can be as much shaped by the exchange as those with whom they engage. Such an approach

requires the support of the Minister of National Defence, and related discussions should be open as possible to assure that the military is not perceived as acting in its own rather than in the nation's interest.

Finally, as the *raison-d'être* of the Canadian Forces is to deliver military force at the time and place of the Government's choosing, a strategic approach focussed on military mission requirements, as opposed to departmental processes, budgetary considerations or transient issues, is more likely to enable mission success. Close connections between the Forces members and the public, as well as with community leaders can ensure that morale-raising initiatives that "Support our Troops" continue. With respect to the use of military force, the "mission command" approach that the Canadian Forces doctrinally prefers can also enable strategic communications. The complexities of the interconnected and diverse communications environment can be accepted rather than controlled. Whether or not political intent, political will or public political engagement regarding a particular military mission or region is forthcoming, military leaders can recommend strategic communications approaches alongside other elements of military advice. Those institutional leaders then have an essential role to ensure that the military force's communications also strive to achieve the desired national end state.

Regardless of whether or not the military is in the conventional public spotlight from a major mission, and irrespective of the relative size of its budget, the Canadian Forces as an operational entity and as a profession of arms must be present in the hearts and minds of Canadians. The Canadian people, academic and defence experts, community leaders and elected officials at all levels can have as much impact on the

effectiveness of the military force as the force itself, but such synergy is possible only if there is dialogue among these peoples. It is the responsibility of Canadian Forces institutional leaders to assure that this connection between the Force and other Canadians is maintained. In order to assure the necessary pervasive, strategic, unified and enduring effect, the communications imperatives of the institutional should be codified through the drafting, approval and maintenance of a Canadian Forces strategic communications approach that addresses its unique requirements. Communications thus will take its place alongside the other essential elements of institutional leadership and serve its part in ensuring that the Canadian Forces continues to deliver on its commitment to defend Canada.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Authors

Abelson, Donald. *Do Think Tanks Matter? : Assessing the Impact of Public Policy Institutes*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009.

Al-Obaidi, Jabbar. "Communication and the Culture of Democracy: Global Media and Promotion of Democracy in the Middle East." *International Journal of Instructional Media* 30, no. 1 (2003): 97-110.

Alderman, Tom. "The Internet is Absolute Democracy," *Huffington Post,* 23 April 2009.

Baril. Maurice. Speech. "The Role of the Chief of the Defence Staff in Relations with Parliament." Conference of Defence Associations Annual Seminar, Ottawa, Ontario, January 27, 2000.

Bauerlein, Mark. *The Dumbest Generation: How the Digital Age Stupifies Young Americans and Jeopardizes our Future*. New York: Penguin Group, 2009.

Berthiaume, Lee. "Move to charge for military disaster help concerns provinces, municipalities." *Postmedia*, February 9, 2013.

Berlo, D.K. *The Process of Commuication: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Biddle, Stephen and Stephen Long. "Democracy and Military Effectiveness: A Deeper Look." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48, no.4 (August 2004): 525-546.

Blackwell, James. "Deterrence at the Operational Level of War," *Strategic Studies Quarterly* (Summer 2011): 30-51.

Bland, Douglas. "Hillier and the new generation of Generals: The CDS, the policy and the troops." *Policy Options* (March 2008): 54-58.

Bland, Douglas. "Let Sleeping Dogs Lie: The Influence of External Studies and Reports on National Defence Policy 2000 to 2006." In *The Claxton Papers*, no. 15. Kingston: School of Policy Studies, 2011. *Check format for series*

Bland, Douglas. "Parliament, Defence Policy and the Canadian Forces." In *The Claxton Papers*, no. 1. Kingston: School of Policy Studies, 1999. *Check format for series*

Bland, Douglas. "Parliament's Duty to Defend Canada." *Canadian Military Journal* 1, no. 4 (Winter 2000-2001): 35-43.

Bland, Douglas "The Public Administration of Defence Policy," in *The Public Management of Defence*, 9-18, ed. Craig Stone. Toronto: Breakout Educational Network, 2009.

Boccuti, Amanda, Lauren Faul, and Lauren Gray. "Establishing Creative Strategies for Effective Engagement Between Military Installations & Communities." *Engaging Cities*, 21 May 2012.

Campion-Smith, Bruce. "G20 Summit: Why face time still matters." *The Toronto Star*, 11 June 2010.

Clark, Caroline. "Wide Angles and Narrow Views: the Iraq conflict in embed and other war zone reports." In *Evaluation and Stance in War News*, edited by Louann Haarman and Linda Lombardo, 97-115. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009.

Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Corman, Steven R., Angela Trethewey and Bud Goodall. "A 21st Century Model for Communication in the Global War of Ideas: From Simplistic Influence to Pragmatic Complexity." Consortium for Strategic Communication: Arizona State University. Last updated 3 April 2007. http://csc.asu.edu/wp-content/uploads/pdf/114.pdf.

Cornish, Paul. Julian Lindley-French and Claire Yorke. *Strategic Communications and National Strategy.* London: Chatham House, 2011.

Cornish, Paul, David Livingstone, Dave Clemente, and Claire Yorke. *On Cyber Warfare.* London: Chatham House, 2010.

Daft, Richard and Robert Lengel. "Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness, and Structural Design." Management Science 31, No. 5 (May 1986): 554-574.

Evans, C. *Assessing the Well-Being of the Canadian Forces*, (Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 2004), 7.

Feaver, Peter. "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control." *Armed Forces and Society* 23, no. 2 (Winter 1996): 149-178.

Feaver, Peter. "The Right to Be Right: Civil-Military Relations and the Iraq Surge Decision," *International Security* 35, no. 4 (Spring 2011): 87-125.

Finney, Nicholas and Paul Walkner. "Skill Development and Critical Thinking in Higher Education." *Teaching in Higher Education* 4, no. 4 (October 1999): 531-548.

Garnett, Gary. "The Flag Officer as a Resource Manager." In *Generalship and the Art of the Admiral: Perspectives on Canadian Senior Military Leadership*. Edited by Bernd Horn and Stephen J. Harris. St. Catharines: Vanwell Publishing Limited, 2001.

Gibson, Michael. "Canada's Military Justice System." *Canadian Military Journal* 12, no. 2 (Spring 2012): 61-64.

Gilmour, Sarah. "CDS honours CF heroes." *The Maple Leaf*, 25 April, 2007.

Gosselin, Daniel. "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old – Part One." *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 6-15.

Gosselin, Daniel. "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old – Part Two." *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 3 (2009): 6-16.

Graham, Ross. Civil Control of the Canadian Forces: National Direction and National Command." *Canadian Military Journal* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 23-29.

Hillier, Rick. *A Soldier First: Bullets, Bureaucrats, and the Politics of War*. Toronto: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009.

Hillier, Rick. "Families First." *The Maple Leaf* 10, no. 12 (2 May 2007): 2.

Huntingdon, Samuel. "Reforming Civil-Military Releations." In *Civil-Military Relations and Democracy*, edited by Larry Diamond and Marc Plattner, 4-11. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Huntingdon, Samuel. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. New York: Vintage Books, 1957.

Jeffrey, Brooke."The Harper Minority and the Majority Myth: Implementing the Conservative Agenda." Canadian Political Science Association 2011 Annual Conference, Waterloo, Ontario, May 18, 2011.

Juliano, Anthony, "After Sandy Hook: Why face-to-face communications still matter." *Content: Making Sense of our Changing Communications Environment* (blog), December 20, 2012. http://anthonyjuliano.wordpress.com/2012/12/20/after-sandy-hook-why-face-to-face-communication-still-matters/.

Kennedy, Brendan, Susan Pigg, and Mitch Potter. "Grounding a rising military star." *The Toronto Star*, 31 May 2010.

Kennedy, Mark. "Stephen Harper seeks consensus on increased role in Mali." *Post Media News*, 23 January 2013.

Kennedy, Paul. "Grand Strategies in War and Peace: Towards a Broader Definition," in *Grand Strategies in War and Peace*, ed. Paul Kennedy. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Lagassé, Philippe. "Accountability for National Defence: Ministerial Responsibility, Military Command and Parliamentary Oversight." *Institute for Research on Public Policy Study* no. 4 (March 2010): 1-60.

Lagassé, Philippe and Paul Robinson. "Reviving Realism in the Canadian Defence Debate." *Martello Paper Series*. Kingston: Queen's University, 2008.

Larson, Eric V., Richard E. Darilek, Dalia Dassa Kaye, Forrest E. Morgan, Brian Nichiporuk, Diana Dunham-Scott, Cathryn Quantic Thurston, and Kristin J. Leuschner. *Understanding Commanders' Information Needs for Influence Operations*. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 2009.

Lawson, General Tom. Speech, Government of Canada, Ottawa, Canada, October 29, 2012.

Lawson, General Tom. Speech, Conference of Defence Associations, Ottawa, Canada, February 22, 2013.

Lievrouw, Leah. "New Media and the 'pluralization of life-worlds': A Role for Media in Social Differentiation," *New Media and Society* 3, no. 1: 6-28.

Maurer, Kathrin. "Communication and Language in Niklas Luhmann's Systems-Theory. Universidade de São Paulo: Pandaemonium Germanicum. Last updated 16 March 2010. http://www.fflch.usp.br/dlm/alemao/pandaemoniumgermanicum/site/images/pdf/ed_2010.2/01_Maurer_-_Luhmann.pdf.

Mayfield III, Thomas D. "A Commander's Strategy for Social Media." *Joint Force Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (2011): 79-128.

McLuhan, Marshall and Quentin Fiore. *The Medium is The Massage: An Inventory of Effects*. Corte Madera: Ginko Press, 1996.

Milne, Greg. *Making Policy: A guide to the Federal Government's Policy Process.* Ottawa: Greg Milne, 2006.

Morton, Desmond. Speech, "No Crisis, No Business: An Ally's Dilemma in a Busy World," Queen's University Canadian Studies Symposium, Kingston, Ontario, March 27, 2004.

Moon, Michael Y. "Making Sense of Common Sense for Change Management Buy-in." *Management Decision* 47, no. 3: 518-532.

Neil Chuka. "A Comparison of the Information Operations Doctrine of Canada, The United States, the United Kingdom, and NATO." *Canadian Army Journal* 12, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 91-99.

Norton, Michael. *The Worldwide Fundraiser's Handbook: A Resource Mobilisation Guide for NGOs and Community Organisations*. London: Directory of Social Change, 2009.

Okros, Alan, Sarah Hill and Franklin Pinch. "Between 9/11 and Kandahar: Attitudes of Canadian Forces Officers in Transition." *The Claxton Papers* no. 8. Kingston: Defence Management Studies, 2008.

Pugliese, David. "Canadian Forces can't specify criteria or provide guidance for providing emergency help." *Ottawa Citizen*, 11 January 2013.

Radford, Benjamin. *Media Mythmakers*. New York: Prometheus Books, 2003.

Sachoff, Mike. "Canadian Soldiers Told to Use Caution on Facebook." *WebProNews*, 26 February 2008. http://www.webpronews.com/canadian-soldiers-told-to-use-caution-on-facebook-2008-02.

Schiff, Rebecca. *The Military and Domestic Politics: A concordance theory of military-civil relations*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Segal, Hugh. "Where have all the ideas gone: Democracy in the 21st Century." *Canadian Parliamentary Review* 28, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 2-3.

Skinner, Julia. "Social Media and Revolution: The Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement as seen through three Information Studies Paradigms." In *Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems* 11 (169). Last accessed 28 January 2012. http://sprouts.aisnet.org/11-169.

Solis, Brian and Deirdre K. Breakenridge. *Putting the Public back into Public Relations: How Social Media is Reinventing the Aging Business of PR.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press, 2009.

Stein, Janice and Eugene Lang. *The Unexpected War* (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2007).

Storey, Ed. "CH-147D Chinook Nose Art in Afghanistan." *Canadian Military History* 20, no. 1 (Winter 2011): 74-80.

Taras, David. “Introduction.” In *How Canadians Communicate IV: Media and Politics*, edited by David Taras and Christopher Waddell, 1-25. Edmonton: AU Press, 2012.

Theriault, Gerard. “Democratic Civil-Military Relations: A Canadian View.” In *The Military in Modern Democratic Society*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, November 1996.

Tzu, Sun. The Art of War. Edited and translated by Samuel B. Griffith. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Vance, Jack. "The Profession of Arms: A Commander's Perspective on Military Ethos." Speech, Canadian Forces College, Toronto, Canada, August 21, 2000.

White, D.M. “Political Communication and Democratic Government.” *Politics* 24, no. 1 (May 1989): 29-41.

Winseck, Dwayne. “Lost in Cyberspace.” In *Mediascapes: New Patterns in Canadian Communication*, edited by Paul Attallah and Leslie Regan Shade, 325-342. Scarborough: Nelson, 2002.

Organizations

Afghanistan Repatriation Memorial. “Another Tearful Ceremony at CFB Trenton.” Last accessed 9 April 2013. http://www.afghanistanmemorial.ca/another-tearful-ceremony-at-cfb-trenton.

British Broadcasting Corporation. News: US and Canada. “John Kerry: 'There is nothing foreign about foreign policy'.” Last updated 20 February 2013. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-21524075.

Business 2 Community. “Scandals made Possible by Twitter.” Last accessed 22 January 2012. http://www.business2community.com/twitter/scandals-made-possible-by-twitter-0230738.

Business Insider. “Everything You Need To Know To Really Understand A Poll.” Last updated September 25, 2012. http://www.businessinsider.com/how-to-read-a-poll-2012-9.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. CBC News Canada. “Hillier denies contradicting PM over Afghan mission length.” Last updated 26 October 2007. http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2007/10/26/afghanistan-hillier.html.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. CBC News In Depth. “Poll: What Afghans think.” Last updated October 2007.

http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/afghanistan/afghan-survey2007.html#overall.

Conference of Defence Associations Institute. "Ottawa Conference on Defence and Security." Last accessed 4 April 2013. http://www.cdainstitute.ca/en/ottawa-conference.

CTV News, "Canada approves extension of NATO's Libya Mission, last updated 1 June 2011, http://www.ctvnews.ca/canada-approves-extension-of-nato-s-libya-mission-1.651594.

Historica Dominion Institute. "New Survey Measures What the World Thinks of Canada and Canadians." Last accessed February 12 2012. https://www.historica-dominion.ca/node/999.

National Hockey League. Ottawa Senators. Features. "Heartfelt salute to troops on Canadian Forces Night: Senators show appreciation to 3,300 Canadian Forces personnel and families. Last updated 5 November 2011. http://senators.nhl.com/club/news.htm?id=599071.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "NATO Military Public Affairs Policy - MC 0457." Last modified 2 February 2011. http://www.nato.int/ims/docu/mc0457-2_en.pdf.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. AJP-3.10. *Allied Joint Doctrine for Information Operations*. Brussels: NATO, 2009.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "Strategic and Organisational Implications for Euro-Atlantic Security of Information Operations." Last accessed 27 March 2013, http://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/99-01/rathmell.pdf.

Pew Research Centre. "Global Attitudes Project." Last accessed February 12, 2013. http://www.pewglobal.org/database/?indicator=8&survey=14&response=Oppose&mode=chart.

Small Wars Journal. "Public Affairs and Information Operations." Last accessed 27 March 2013. http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/public-affairs-and-information-operations.

The Asia Foundation. "Afghanistan in 2010: A Survey of the Afghan People." Last accessed February 12, 2013. http://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/Afghanistanin2010survey.pdf.

The Globe and Mail, "Online Canadians trust information from media more than other sources: report," last updated 24 August 2012, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/technology/tech-news/online-canadians-trust-information-from-media-more-than-other-sources-report/article579546/.

The Vanier Institute of the Family. Military Families in Canada Initiative. "Military Families in Canada." Last accessed 4 April 2013. http://www.vanierinstitute.ca/military-families-in-canada-initiative.

University of Maryland University College. "Writing for your Audience." Last accessed 18 February 2012. http://www.umuc.edu/writingcenter/writingresources/writing_for_audiences.cfm.

Western University. Ivey Business School. Ian O. Ihnatowycz, Institute for Leadership. "Lessons of a Leader," last updated 7 March 2011. http://www.ivey.uwo.ca/research/leadership/news-and-events/news/speakers/rick-hillier.htm.

Countries

Canada. Department of National Defence, A-PA-005-000/AP-001, *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada.* (Ottawa: DND Canada, 2009.

Canada. Department of National Defence. A-PA-005-000 AP-004 2005, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations*. Ottawa: DND Canada, 2005.

Canada. Department of Foreign Affairs. "Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan." Last accessed 31 January 2012. http://www.afghanistan.gc.ca/canada-afghanistan/assets/pdfs/Afghan_Report_web_e.pdf.

Canada. Department of Justice. National Defence and the Canadian Forces, "What is the relationship between DND and the Canadian Forces?" Last updated 26 June 2012. http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/about-notresujet/index-eng.asp.

Canada. Department of National Defence. ADM (Fin CS). Queen's Regulations & Orders. "Volume I - Chapter 19 - Conduct And Discipline 19.44 – Political Activities and Candidature for Office." Last modified 22 December 2011. http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/qro-orf/vol-01/chapter-chapitre-019-eng.asp#cha-019-44.

Canada. Department of National Defence. B-GJ-005-000/FP-001, Canadian Forces Joint Publication: Canadian Military Doctrine. Ottawa: DND Canada, 2011.

Canada. Department of National Defence. B-GJ-005-361/FP-000, *Joint Public Affairs*. Ottawa: DND Canada, 2007.

Canada. Department of National Defence. A-PA-005-000/AP-001, *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada*. Ottawa: DND Canada, 2009.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Canada First Defence Strategy. "Roles of the Canadian Forces." Last modified 13 January 2012. http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/pri/first-premier/defstra/role-eng.asp.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Canadian Forces Grievance Board. "The First Independent Review by the Right Honourable Antonio Lamer P.C., C.C., C.D. of the provisions and operation of Bill C-25, An Act to amend the National Defence Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, as required under section 96 of Statutes of Canada 1998, c.35." Last accessed 18 February 2012. http://www.cfgb-cgfc.gc.ca/documents/LamerReport_e.pdf.

Canada. Department of National Defence. *CEFCOM Directives for International Operations - CDIO 13000 Series*. Ottawa: CEFCOM, April 13, 2012.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Canadian Army. "Canadian Army Social Media Registry." Last modified 27 February 2013. http://www.army.forces.gc.ca/land-terre/sm-ms/registry-repertoire-eng.asp.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Canadian Army. "Op CONNECTION: Reaching out and touching Canadians." Last updated 9 March 2006. http://www.army.forces.gc.ca/land-terre/news-nouvelles/story-reportage-eng.asp?id=941.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Chief Military Judge. "Court Martial Procedure Guide." Last modified 14 December 2012. http://www.jmc-cmj.forces.gc.ca/en/procedure-guide.page.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Chief of the Defence Staff. "Responsibilities." Last modified 28 January 2013. http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/ocds-bcemd/cds-cemd/index-eng.asp.

Canada. Department of National Defence. "DAOD 2008, Public Affairs." Last modified 18 December 2008. http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/dao-doa/2000/2008-0-eng.asp.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Army Lessons Learned Centre. "Operation Recuperation – Lesson Learned Staff Action Directive, 15 March 1999."

Canada. Department of National Defence. "Report of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry, Chapter 39 – Openness and Disclosure." Last accessed 31 January 2012. http://www.dnd.ca/somalia/vol0/v0s39e.htm.

Canada. Department of National Defence. *The RCN's Communications Strategy 2012 – 2016: A Conversation with Canadians*. Ottawa, Royal Canadian Navy, 2012.

Canada. Department of National Defence. *The Air Force Strategic Communications Plan 2010 – 2012 Engaging Canadians: An Air Force that is relevant to Canadians*. Ottawa, Chief of the Air Staff, 2010.

Canada. Department of National Defence. *The Army: Advancing with Purpose*. Ottawa, Canadian Army, 2012.

Canada. Department of National Defence. The Somalia Commission of Inquiry. "Report of the Somalia Commission of Inquiry, Executive Summary." Last accessed 18 February 2013. http://www.dnd.ca/somalia/somaliae.htm.

Canada. House of Commons. Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. *Committee Evidence*, Tuesday, February 26, 2002.

Canada. Parliament of Canada. House of Commons. "Guide for Witnesses appearing before committees of the House of Commons." Last accessed 18 February 2013. http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/House/WitnessesGuides/PDF/WitnessGuide-e.pdf.

Canada. Parliament of Canada."Military Service in the House of Commons." Last updated December 8, 2010. http://www.parl.gc.ca/parlinfo/Lists/MilitaryService.aspx?Menu=HOC-Bio&Section=03d93c58-f843-49b3-9653-84275c23f3fb.

Canada. Parliament of Canada. "Public Opinion Polling in Canada," last accessed 27 March 2013. http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/researchpublications/bp371-e.htm#OPINION POLLS AND POLICY-MAKING(txt).

Canada. Parliament of Canada. Senate. "Wounded - APPENDIX IX Truth to Power - Regulations governing the Department of National Defence appearances before Parliamentary Committees." Last accessed 27 March 2013. http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/381/defe/rep/repintsep05part2-e.htm.

Canada. Parliament of Canada. Senate Committees. "Standing Committee on National Security and Defence." Last accessed 4 April 2013. http://www.parl.gc.ca/SenCommitteeBusiness/CommitteeHome.aspx?parl=39&ses=1&Language=E&comm_id=76.

Canada. Privy Council Office. "The Role and Structure of the Privy Council Office 2011." Last modified 12 March 2012. http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=role/role2013-eng.htm#a6.2.

Canada. Public Works and Government Services Canada. "Views of the Canadian Forces, tracking study, final report – Summary." Last accessed February 12, 2013.

http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsc-tpsgc/por-ef/national_defence/2012/049-11-e/index.html.

Canada. Public Works and Government Services Canada. Public Opinion Research, "Frequently Asked Questions." Last modified January 18, 2012. http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/rop-por/faq-eng.html#a2.

Canada. Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat. "Communications Policy of the Government of Canada." Last modified 21 December, 2012. http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=12316&section=text.

United States. Department of Defense. DoD Dictionary of Military Terms. "Strategic Communication." Last modified 15 November, 2012. http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod_dictionary/.