

Canadian
Forces
College

Collège
des
Forces
Canadiennes



ATTRIBUTES OF THE MODERN CANADIAN OFFICER: DEVELOPMENTS SINCE UNIFICATION

Maj S.D. Lloyd

JCSP 43

Exercise Solo Flight

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.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2017.

PCEMI 43

Exercice Solo Flight

Avertissement

Les opinions 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.

© Sa Majesté la Reine du Chef du Canada, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2017.

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE – COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 43 – PCEMI 43
2016 – 2017

EXERCISE *SOLO FLIGHT* – EXERCICE *SOLO FLIGHT*

**ATTRIBUTES OF THE MODERN CANADIAN OFFICER:
DEVELOPMENTS SINCE UNIFICATION**

Maj S.D. Lloyd

“This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions, which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied, except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.”

Word Count: 4910

“La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.”

Compte de mots: 4910

INTRODUCTION

The Canadian military fought effectively in both the First and Second World Wars. Towards the end of the First World War, the Canadian Corps became informally known as the ‘shock troops’ of the British Forces.¹ While numerous reasons account for the success of the Canadian Corps in the First World War, how officers were chosen for service and raised in rank within the Canadian military was important. Raising an army from minuscule levels meant that there were very few officers that had sufficient seniority. The British Army, on the other hand, was not at all a meritocracy; they based the promotion of officers strictly on an “entrenched military class.”² Without this systemic road block, the Canadian Corps over 4 years of training and war developed itself into a professional fighting force with a trained and effective officer corps. Once again, during the Second World War, Canada would raise an army and its officer corps to professional levels.³ But the end of the Second World War presented new problems to a military that understood only one way of warfare. The advent of nuclear weapons and the means to deliver those weapons internationally meant the ‘total war’ that was fought in Europe and the Pacific could not be fought again without the escalation to the use of nuclear weapons. Some questioned the role for a standing military in the nuclear age.⁴ However, limited wars and insurgencies quickly justified the requirement for a standing military. It became clear that these standing militaries needed an officer corps that was

¹ Pierre Burton, *Marching as To War: Canada's Turbulent Years 1899-1953*, (Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 2001), 208.

² Erin Weir, "Using the Legacy of World War I to Evaluate Canadian Military Leadership in World War II" *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* [Online], Volume 7 Number 1 (14 October 2009):5

³ J. L. Granatstein, *Canada's Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 311.

⁴ Andrew B Godefroy, *In Peace Prepared: Innovation and Adaptation in Canada's Cold War Army*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014), 60.

flexible enough to participate in operations ranging from forming a conventional force in a nuclear war, presenting a strong deterrent force, limited wars such as Korea, to stabilization forces, and peacekeeping missions.

Developing the framework for an officer corps within a military is a challenge. This is especially true when this effort is attempted while the organization is conducting operations internationally, and when the government had only recently re-defined the military's role.⁵ The military needed to adapt to the requirements for National Defence, laid out by Minister of National Defence Brooke Claxton in the 1947 White Paper.⁶ Developing and enhancing an effective officer corps for the Canadian Military was only one of the major challenges facing the leadership, but it would be a critical step. Reorganization, financial constraints, and international and domestic crises made it difficult to define what aspects were critical to officer corps development. During the post-World War Two period, what aspects of officership did the Canadian Forces attempt to develop or impose?

Over several decades, finding the solution was neither smooth, linear, nor incremental, with many missteps along the way. Despite the disjointed, delayed, and reactionary methods the Canadian Forces (CF) have used over the past 50 years, the CF incrementally defined the attributes required for officers in the modern military. Today, the military has a better understanding of the elements needed for the future of Canadian Forces' officers, enabling them to lead operations in the increasingly complex combined and interagency battlespace.

⁵ Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence: Volume 1- Defence Policy*, (Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University, 1997), 20.

⁶ *Ibid.*

Post-Second World War the Canadian military consisted of separate services until unification. Unification was an organizational change that had mixed results but had some unintended consequences. Several reports through the 1970 and 1990's discussed aspects of officership and the professional development of officers. The challenges of the institutional crises and the implications of large sustained operations and challenges in creating a consistent development model all had significant effects on the understanding of the modern requirements for Canadian officers.

UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF UNIFICATION

In the 1960s, the Canadian government decided to integrate the Canadian military and unify it under one structure. As the three services had conflicting concepts of priorities and how to implement them, the Canadian military was spending substantial amounts of money on personnel in three separate services and very little on much-needed equipment.⁷ Most agreed that an organizational change was needed since the military could not keep up the personnel expense while bringing in new equipment.⁸ The organizational change offered by Liberal Minister of National Defence Paul Hellyer, in the 1964 White Paper, outlined the objective of unifying the forces under a centralized chain of command and the increased emphasis on research and development.⁹ Savings from personnel, Hellyer proposed, would be directed towards operations and new equipment so that the Canadian military could remain operationally relevant. While the White Paper never directly dealt with the development of leadership, it did comment on

⁷ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 353.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Hon. Paul Hellyer, and Hon Lucien Cardin, *White Paper on Defence*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, March 1964)

the increased opportunities for officers and members of the unified organization.¹⁰ Structurally forcing separate elements to train and work together was meant to increase the knowledge and experience of CF officers.¹¹ Significant improvements in the organization and combined training of officers resulted. However, despite the good organizational development, Hellyer's implementation of unification damaged the officer corps through unintended consequences.¹² These problems helped to define elements needed for officers in a modern force. Specifically, unification adversely affected the morale of members of the Canadian Forces. Loss of identity to a fighting force is very significant. Any successful military force requires a degree of fighting spirit, sometimes referred to as *esprit de corps*. This fighting spirit is largely supported by a strong sense of identity, in both themselves and their unit. Identity is closely linked to customs and traditions and it cannot be altered by enforced legislation alone.

Identity

Unification potentially damaged traditional identities and, as a result, the morale and fighting spirit of the Canadian Forces. Hellyer's plan entailed loss of distinctive uniforms, a common rank structure and neutralization of many customs and histories that supported the single services.¹³ This loss of identity had negative impacts on the performance of officers, soldiers, sailors and airmen, and airwomen. The hard-won identities of the Second World War and Korea were lost, and the *esprit de corps* that goes

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² These concepts have been expanded upon in the Master's Thesis by Scott Lloyd, "The Effects of Unification on Joint Warfare in Canada." (American Military University, 2016)

¹³ Geoffrey Shaw, "The Canadian Armed Forces and Unification." *Defense Analysis* 17, no. 2 (2001): 160.

with them were devastated. Canadian historian, Jack Granatstein, states that Hellyer went “that one step too far” in trying to force a single identity on the Canadian military.¹⁴

It is the morale, or esprit de corps, supported by a strong identity that allows the military to push through adversity. It is also those aspects that allow a force to remain cohesive in confusing situations. When unification saw the loss of distinctive uniforms, badges, and rank structure it forced military personnel to question who they were, struggling to identify with those warriors who came before. Of the unintended consequences of unification, the loss of identity and esprit de corps caused the most immediate problems. Even though the members in the Canadian Forces recognized the importance of what Hellyer called “buttons and bows,” it would take the government another decade to acknowledge the problems with the loss of identity, morale and esprit de corps.¹⁵

The government recognized the value of identity, that was lost, in the 1980 *Review of Unification*, recommending a return to distinctive uniforms to the CF.¹⁶ The return to distinctive uniforms took only a couple of years. However, other customs took longer; the former services in the 2000s received some service rank distinctions and the reinstatement of the historic names of the Canadian Army, the Royal Canadian Navy, and Royal Canadian Air Force. The return of the items of identity and the historic names acknowledged identity as a significant factor in the development and maintenance of Canada’s military force and a key element of officer development. No less important than identity was the unintended negative consequence of careerism and regimentalism. These

¹⁴ Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 82-83.

¹⁵ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 355.

¹⁶ Canada. *Task Force on Review of Unification of the Canadian Forces. Final Report 15 March 1980*, (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 1980), 78.

two problems would become significant challenges to officers making decisions that are in the best interest of the nation.

Regimentalism and Careerism

There have always existed those in the military who use the service for their own personal career success or with misplaced loyalties within the organization. These people can be present some of the greatest challenges to ethical conduct within a military force. These obstructions can manifest themselves in those who place their emphasis on personal careers over the organization, referred to as careerism. The CDS believed careerism was important enough to define it in his instructions to future Commanding Officers: “the self-serving advancement of one’s own career at the expense of the service and/or subordinates.”¹⁷ The second manifestation is that of regimentalism, when the loyalties of the officers are first and for most directed towards their regiment, and not the CF.

These two problems did not present themselves for the first time during unification, however, unification clearly aggravated both. Unification alienated many officers causing many to leave the military. Other officers Hellyer would fire directly. The power vacuum created developed some unsavory traits. While loyal advice to government had been a long-standing element in the ‘British style’ relationship between government and the military, this relationship was adversely affected by Hellyer who removed those who provided any advice that did not agree with his view. One of the

¹⁷Canada. Department of National Defence. *Chief of Defence Staff Guidance to Commanding Officers*, 2000. As cited by: Darwin Gould, in “A Solution to Careerism in the Canadian Forces.” *Exercise New Horizons*. Canadian Forces College, (2001), 5.

more public firings was that of the Commander of Maritime Command, Rear Admiral Landymore. Landymore spoke up numerous times to the minister privately about his concerns about unification. Unfortunately, Hellyer viewed anything but one hundred percent support as an obstacle and Landymore was subsequently fired.¹⁸ The weak support Hellyer believed he was getting from his CDS also meant that he would have to find an officer who could make unification happen. Lieutenant-General Jean Victor Allard, an intelligent and accomplished soldier, agreed to be Hellyer's unification champion as CDS.¹⁹ However, Allard took the position and the task with the understanding that he would have the opportunity to implement policies that would see the representation of Francophones in the military increase.²⁰ In Allard's case, it was less about advancing his personal interests or career and more about advancing his own personal agenda. Unification "encouraged a self-centered careerism nurtured by a subjective performance evaluation system."²¹

Regimentalism became a problem when the centralized personal management systems came into place and the informal methods of advancing the careers of regimental 'selected officers'.²² Dr. John English studied the ramifications of the loss of army structures, and determined that some of the army regiments who survived unification filled a loyalty void and the Generals that came from these regiments began to act like "petty Mafioso... cutting deals to ensure the advancement of favoured sons to selected

¹⁸ Michael J. Whitby, Richard Howard Gimblett, Peter T. Haydon. *The Admirals: Canada's Senior Naval Leadership in The Twentieth Century*, (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2008), 581

¹⁹ Peter Kasurak, *A National Force: The Evolution of Canada's Army, 1950-2000*, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2013), 106.

²⁰ Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 76-77.

²¹ English, *Lament for an Army*, 55.

²² Peter Kasurak, "Concepts of Professionalism in The Canadian Army, 1946—2000: Regimentalism, Reaction, And Reform," *Armed Forces & Society* 37. (2011): 100

positions whether they were qualified or not.”²³ Additionally, regimentalism adversely affected the meritocracy, contributing directly to the leadership issues which surfaced during the Somalia affair.²⁴ The Somalia Inquiry identified that careerism and regimentalism led directly to leadership and disciplinary problems.²⁵ Identification of careerism and regimentalism issues within in the Canadian Forces suggested the requirement for a cultural change that impresses the military ethos and strong ethical decision making. Not only was ethical decision making a problem, but often personal or regimental loyalty placed a person in a leadership role who was not suited or experienced enough for the position.²⁶ The misplaced loyalty affected the heart of an effective merit-based system. The Canadian Forces required an identified program for decision making and ethics that would combat the tendency of some officers to look after their own interests or push for under qualified ‘regimentally selected’ officers to be placed in position ahead of better officers. From the aspect of developing the ethical decision making within the officer corps, Dr. Richard Gabriel emphasized that “ethical courage must be rewarded in career terms as a well as ethical terms.”²⁷ In response to these lessons on ethical decision making the Department of National Defence launched the Defence Ethics Program in 1997.²⁸

²³ *Ibid*, 55.

²⁴ Canada. *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia -Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair*, (Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997), 23.

²⁵ *Ibid*.

²⁶ Kasurak, *A National Force*, 235.

²⁷ Richard A. Gabriel, *The Warrior’s War: A Treatise on Military Ethics* (Kingston, Ontario: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2007), 116.

²⁸ Canada. Department of National Defence, “Defence Ethics Program.” *Department of National Defence*. <http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about/ethics-faq.page> Accessed: 25 April 2017.

The Canadian Forces would learn a great deal from the consequences of unification, but it would take some time for organizational changes to be implemented and multiple attempts to rectify the problems. Developing and maintaining an identity that was forged in battle is an important element in the creation of a fighting spirit required of all military leaders. An identity cannot arbitrarily be changed. With the proliferation of careerism and regimentalism following the Unification, the Canadian Forces developed solutions to have a basis for ethical decision making and reinforced personnel policies that would reduce the effects of the regimental ‘mafia’. Developing ethics, reinforcing merit-based succession for officers, and maintaining the sense of identity were all important aspects of the developing officers, but more was needed. In the 1950s and 1960s officers lacked education commensurate with civilian counterparts.

EDUCATING CANADA’S OFFICERS

Establishing a basic level of education for Canadian officers would be a well debated issue in the latter part of the twentieth century. Some would argue that the officers needed only a professionally based education, whereas others would argue that a civilian academic education would be best to prepare officers to work across the military – civilian divide. As historian Peter Kasurak describes, there were “modernists” who sought to develop an officer corps that integrated into civil society and opposing the modernists were the “traditionalists” who advocated for officers being trained primarily in the military arts of tactics, leadership and “regimentalism.”²⁹ Eventually, a blended approach to educating officers ensured that officers possessed an academic education as

²⁹ Peter Kasurak, “Concepts of Professionalism in The Canadian Army, 1946—2000: Regimentalism, Reaction, And Reform.” *Armed Forces & Society* 37. (2011): 97.

well as a professional one. The evolution to a degreed officer corps was not quick or simple.

As part of his reinvigoration of Officer training, Minister of National Defence Brooke Claxton reopened the Royal Military Colleges making it a tri-service organization in 1947 and opened a National Defence College in 1949.³⁰ Claxton believed that officer development was “one of the most important matters to be dealt with.”³¹ Canadian Officers were respected for their abilities in the field, as demonstrated by their performance in Korea, and their North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) commitments in Europe.³² Despite their success in these theaters and on international missions, their academic background was significantly lacking, with only a little over 30 percent of officers holding a university degree.³³ The university degree enabled officers to deal better with the challenges of NATO doctrine of “Flexible Response.”³⁴ The ability of the officers to think critically became a standard element in those arguing for a degreed officer corps. The counter argument was that many officers without degrees had successfully led the military through the Second World War and Korea. This was undeniably true, but the world was changing; officers were now coming from a civilian society where education was more valued. The range of activities that an officer could be called upon to lead their soldiers through was expanding. The concept of a degreed officer corps became a profound debate with significant weight being given to

³⁰ Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 71.

³¹ Bernd Horn, and Bill Bentley, *Forced to Change: Crisis and Reform in the Canadian Armed Forces*, (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2015), 12.

³² Horn and Bentley, *Forced to Change*, 13.

³³ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 342.

³⁴ Horn and Bentley, *Forced to Change*, 13.

developments within allied nations.³⁵ With successive leaders advocating for officers to have degrees, the concept was entrenched with the Canadian military. Following unification, General Allard established the degree as a basis for officer education, asking Major General Roger Rowley to lead a review of the Officers professional development.³⁶

Rowley's Officer Development Board

Major General Rowley was directed to determine the best methods and organizations for the service colleges and officer professional development institutions.³⁷ The primary direction from Allard was political in nature, to develop an economical organization for officer professional development with the clear undertones of reduction. The secondary requirement for Officer Development Board (ODB) was more focused on a needs analysis for the future of officer training, from Officer Cadet to General.³⁸ Rowley had been given a very challenging mandate, but he approached this task with enthusiasm and creative thinking. Consequently, his conclusions and recommendations were very credible. He also defined some elements that his staff said should be a component of any officer's professional development program:

- The soldierly virtues (classic qualities including loyalty, honour, and courage; in short, a professional ethos);
- Command ability (the ability to command groups of subordinates commensurate with rank);
- Branch and specialty skill (infantry, aerospace engineer, logistician, etc.);

³⁵ Randall Wakelam, "Officer Professional Education in the Canadian Forces and the Rowley Report, 1969." *Historical Studies in Education*, (Kingston, On: Queen's University, 2004). Accessed: 14 April 2017. http://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/edu_hse-rhe/article/view/334/393

³⁶ Horn and Bentley, *Forced to Change*, 32.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid*, 15.

- List competence (the ability to employ large forces for sea, land, air, or support operations; at this level officers would not be expected to be expert in other than their own 'list');
- Military expertise (knowledge of the capabilities of armed forces, both domestic and foreign, and an ability to provide strategic level military advice to government);
- Intellectual capability (native intelligence for use in grasping concepts, reasoning logically, and solving problems);
- executive ability (capacity to deal with problems and decisions that "defy solution"); and
- Military-executive ability (the context in which the officer will apply his executive ability and military expertise and give his advice to government).³⁹

Rowley recommended a mixture of professional and academic training for all officers through a "military university."⁴⁰ The Canadian Defence Education Center (CDEC) would replace all the existing service colleges and staff colleges.⁴¹ The system designed by the ODB was extensive and considered amongst numerous options.⁴² However, this option, which would have undoubtedly improved the officer development system, came with a resource bill. As well, the removal of the Military Colleges around the country and a central organization established in Rockcliffe, near Ottawa was politically unpalatable. Even though, General Rowley and his ODB may have been given a difficult task they presented a very good centralization option for the professional development of officers in the Canadian Forces. The CDEC would never come to into effect. A lesser organization was formed, the Canadian Defence Education Establishments (CDEE), but it would not be the organization envisioned in the report. Almost 30 years later, in 2003 the need for centralized control would be realized in the

³⁹ Wakelam, "Officer Professional Education in the Canadian Forces and the Rowley Report, 1969."

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Horn and Bentley, *Forced to Change*, 13.

⁴² Wakelam, "Officer Professional Education in the Canadian Forces and the Rowley Report, 1969."

creation of the Canadian Defence Academy (CDA).⁴³ While CDA was not the physically centralized institution envisioned in the report, it was vested with the mandate to maintain the standards of professional military development and education within the Canadian Forces.

The Rowley report highlighted the need for a centralized organization to tackle the professional development and education in the Canadian Forces. It also presented a significant outline of the principles that the military professional development must follow. Allard agreed with Rowley's proposal but decided it was too much change for the system to endure. The changes would have to wait until the creation of the CDA. Two decades later some of the problems that Rowley had forecasted or identified came to the surface and as a result of new inquiries into the officer development in the system. The lessons of the Rowley Report came to fruition only after the institution realized the benefits of the ethical warrior when it became necessary and when it was obvious.

Recognizing a Deficiency

The Rowley Report was largely ignored through the 1970s and 1980s, but in the early 1990s, cracks in the officer development were noticed by senior officers in the Canadian Forces. The Royal Military Colleges developed problems. Those in command questioned if the institutions were delivering a product that the Canadian Forces actually wanted and needed. In 1993, a Ministerial Commission led by Mr. Pierre Martin presented its findings and 32 recommendations to the Minister of National Defence.⁴⁴ As well, the CDS, General John de Chastelain created the Officer Development Review

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Dennis C. Tabernor, "The Aftermath of The Somalia Affair." Research Essay, (Canadian Forces College, 1999), 10.

Board (ODRB) and appointed retired Lieutenant-General Robert Morton to lead it.⁴⁵ The ODRB was given a mandate very similar to Major General Rowley's mission decades earlier.⁴⁶ Both reports defined significant problems in the education and professional development system. The Morton Report presented virtually the same type recommendations that the Rowley report had delivered. The Somalia Inquiry and release of several videos of the Canadian Airborne Regiment created negative public opinion of the military which resulted in the government's desire to seek definite reforms.

SOMALIA AND REFORM

The Canadian Armed Forces had recognized its deficiencies in officer development, but there was internal resistance to change. The public outcry over the handling of the Somalia affair, the Bakovici hospital incident in the Former Yugoslavia, and books published revealing the extravagance and expenses of senior officers forced the government to act. Implementing the recommendations of the Rowley, Morton, and Martin reports would be incentivised by the public Somalia Inquiry.⁴⁷ Unsatisfied with internal military investigations, the government ordered a commission into the Somalia affair, led by Judge Gillies Letourneau.⁴⁸ The inquiry lasted two years and exposed the nerves of the organization. The Somalia Inquiry Report presented many

⁴⁵ Horn and Bentley, *Forced to Change*, 39.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ The Bakovici Hospital affair was an incident that came to light early in 1997 which highlight the unprofessional conduct of the of Canadian Soldiers from Royal 22e Régiment including with nurses and interpreters, alcohol consumption and sex; assaulting patience and black market activities. Cited from "Archived - Board Of Inquiry Into Command, Control And Leadership Of CANBAT 2" at <http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=board-of-inquiry-into-command-control-and-leadership-of-canbat-2/hnlhlx39> Accessed: 15 April 2017.; and

Kasurak, *A National Force*, 269.

⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 268.

recommendations on leadership and selection of leaders.⁴⁹ It reinforced the core qualities and attributes required of an officer and recommended that they are used in the selection, training, development, and promotion of officers.⁵⁰ Further, it recommended the enhancement of training at RMC into ethics and core officer qualities, and suggested that the CDS prepare guidance for racism and extremist conduct in the CF.⁵¹ The Somalia Inquiry was a traumatic event for the Canadian Forces, but the essence of the problems had been mentioned in the previous reports. The difference being that the Somalia Inquiry was public and called upon the most senior officers in the military to account for their actions.

The problems that had been indicated for over 25 years had finally been brought to the public attention. The Canadian Forces as an institution had lost credibility and the government was taking advantage of the low popularity of the military to reduce the defence budget. Military bases and two of the military colleges were closed, while the CF budget was depleted by at least 25 percent.⁵² Above all the specific recommendations, the problems of the 1990s taught the military that its officer corps must have the confidence and respect of the public for them to function properly. No longer could the commissioned officer stand apart from society. They must become a reflection of society. Somalia did provide the true catalyst for the Minister of National Defence Doug Young to act and present his plan for reforming of the Canadian Armed Forces.

⁴⁹ Canada. *Dishonoured Legacy*, 57-61.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Haycock, 7.

The Young Report

In 1997, Minister of National Defence Doug Young came to the position with a plan and methodology for reform of the Canadian Forces. The new minister provided a strategic solution to these institutional problems. As Colonel Bernd Horn and Dr. Bill Bentley describe in *Forced to Change, the Report to the Prime Minister on Leadership and Management in the Canadian Forces* “became the main engine for DND/CF project of reform.”⁵³ Supporting the Minister with advice were the noted Canadian military historians and academics: Desmond Morton, Jack Granatstien, David Bercuson and Albert Legault, their advice varied from undoing the failures of unification to remedying problems with civil-military relations.⁵⁴ Young’s team concentrated on developing a leadership model and how to implement it. Included in the sixty-five recommendations was having a degreed officer corps, curriculum changes at the Land Force Command and Staff College, the Canadian Forces College and the Royal Military College, a review of the Officer Professional Development Program, implementation of a course to prepare officers for General or Flag appointments, as well as overall strengthening of the Royal Military College and officer education as a whole.⁵⁵ Additional to officer education and leadership, the report offered recommendations that would remove the ambiguity of the command relationship within the National Defence Headquarters, increase accountability for use of resources.⁵⁶ Since the reorganizations following Unification, the responsibilities between the Deputy Minister and the Chief of Defence Staff became

⁵³ Horn and Bentley, *Forced to Change*, 52.

⁵⁴ Kasurak, *A National Force*, 273.

⁵⁵ Horn and Bentley, *Forced to Change*, 55-57.

⁵⁶ Horn and Bentley, *Forced to Change*, 57-58.

blurred.⁵⁷ In some cases, both the Deputy Minister and the Chief of Defence Staff shared responsibility for decisions.⁵⁸ This resulted in confused lines of accountability. The sixty-five recommendations in the report pushed the Canadian Forces forward but it would not be under the guidance of Doug Young.

Unfortunately for Young, electoral loss in the 1997 election meant that the new Minister, Art Eggleton would follow through with the implementation of the recommendations and changes. Eggleton, a former Toronto mayor, was distrustful of the senior leadership of the Canadian Forces and decided to impose an oversight committee to monitor the success of the reforms. The Minister's Monitoring Committee (MMC) ran from 1999 until 2003 and consisted of many of the academics who assisted Minister Young in the preparation of the report. There seemed to be a genuine effort within the Canadian Forces to develop and reinforce a military ethos that reflected the Canadian public's view of the Canadian Forces. The MMC was satisfied that the CF was working effectively to achieving these results.⁵⁹ The Young Report and the follow up with the Eggleton's MMC made those inside and outside of the military believe that they were on the road to institutional change. The challenge to the Canadian Forces was that while improvements were being made in ethics and officer professional development, the process of fixing the problems that had been identified in the 1970s and 1980s were now only being dealt with. A further challenge to the Canadian Forces at the end of the MMC was commencement of operations in Afghanistan.

⁵⁷ Douglas Young, *Report to the Prime Minister on the Leadership and Management of the Canadian Forces*. (Canada. Department of National Defence, 1997), 29.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 30.

⁵⁹ Tabbernor, "The Aftermath of The Somalia Affair," 25.

AFGHANISTAN AND BEYOND

During the heart of the reforms in the 2000s, the western world was dramatically altered by the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11th 2001. These attacks set in motion operations that would eventually see Canada committed for almost 10 years in a counter-insurgency in Afghanistan. Much like Canada entered the Second World War and Korea, in Afghanistan the military would relearn the battlefield. Afghanistan was a test of many of our lessons learned. Those officers participating in the first few years of the deployment would not have had the benefit of the Young Reforms being truly embraced by the institution, but by the end of the decade-long mission in Afghanistan, many of the changes had taken root. The popularity of the Canadian Forces had turned around and citizens were actively supporting their soldiers. It appeared that the Canadian public, for the most part, understood the risks the soldiers were taking. Military members were honored with celebrations around the country. Canadians even honored the fallen soldiers on the piece of the Ontario highway 401, dubbed the 'Highway of Heroes'. As much as Somalia had taught the military the problems when soldiers set themselves apart from society, Afghanistan appeared as an opportunity to bridge that gap. Afghanistan also demonstrated that leaders and officers could meet the challenges of the modern battlefield. The officers, for the most part, made the right decisions and placed their priority on achieving the mission within the law and conditions they were given. The mission in Afghanistan also suggested that the military adopted and embraced the post-1997 changes.

Following the Young reforms, the military learned that the most challenging aspect to developing officers in a proper fashion was changing established patterns.

Officers are the leaders of the institution and occasionally the organization's values become desynchronized with what is required of them from the Canadian government and public. As with the Young reforms, this required a cultural shift. A policy change alone could not change traits and customs if they run counter to the ethos of the organization. When the military had decided to make a change in the late 1990s, it was expected that there would be some apparent immediate changes by the early 2000s. The ethical aspect that would truly make the officer professional development system work, needed some time to be absorbed into the system. This change was an alteration of the institution's organizational culture. Dr. Terry Terriff, in his examination of organizational change within the United States Marine Corps, explains "that long-standing organizational trait that is not compatible with an organizational innovation are very likely to resume."⁶⁰ The cultural change that was made more difficult because of the officers themselves. For 30 years, the negative aspects of careerism, and opportunism increased in the CF. Initially, those who were motivated by self-interest rose quickly within the military and influenced bringing along those who they also possessed those qualities; 'like promotes like.' It would be inaccurate and very unfair to label Canadian leaders during in the post-unification military as careerists, opportunists, devoid of a properly formed military ethos. However, the imperative of fighting in a high-intensity operation provided many opportunities for character flaws that lay dormant or unseen in a peace time military to come to the surface. And like a truly professional organization, it began to police themselves. Despite the development of a military ethos, training in ethical conduct, and a solid officer professional development program, the Canadian Forces could not stop the

⁶⁰ Terry Terriff, "Warriors and Innovators: Military Change and Organizational Culture in The US Marine Corps," *Defence Studies* 6(2), (2006.): 219.

illegal killing of a wounded Taliban fighter by Captain Robert Semrau. This should seem like an indication that the new system of reforms was failing. However, a closer examination reveals that it was members of the Canadian Forces that reported the incident and testified at trial. There appeared no attempt to conceal the incident, it was properly investigated within the military and there were significant charges laid.⁶¹ More striking was that media covering the subsequent trial began to justify Semrau's actions under an "a warrior's code" which allow a warrior to put another one "out of their misery" if the injuries are extreme.⁶² Which as Queen's University professor Allan English explains, this code is nowhere to be found in the doctrine of Canadian Forces ethics and in fact, it directly violates the "humane treatment of all prisoners of war."⁶³ The Canadian Forces understood the challenges they faced. Simply saying a policy was now in effect did not mean that the organization would embrace it. One of the clearest roles for officers was to conduct that organizational change when it was required. Officers would need to understand organizational culture, and where it is routed for them to fulfill their duties.

CONCLUSION.

Understanding what attributes are needed for Canadian Forces officers allows the system to continue to ensure that they are prepared for future challenges. Since the mid-1960s, there have been many developments and events that modified the militaries understanding of what an officer requires. Often in this period, the best learning comes

⁶¹ Richard J. Brennan, and Bruce Campion-Smith, "Capt. Robert Semrau found not guilty of murder.", *The Star*, July 19, 2010

⁶² Allan English, "Robert Semrau," *The Globe and Mail* (1936-Current), Oct 12, 2010.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

from hardship. The unintended consequences of unification taught the CF the value of identity and ethical decision-making and the importance of merit and ability in selecting leadership. In the reports following unification, the CF took on a model of what officers professional development should look like. Officers must have the ability to think critically and analysis situations beyond their experience. This critical thinking should be built on a foundation of professional and academic education; strong ethical and purpose basis; military training and experience across a wide variety of positions. As well, a centralized institution with significant authority should govern all the professional development and education of officers. The establishment of the Defence Ethics Program, and the various complimentary ethics programs, the Canadian Defence Academy, and the numerous other developments recommended by Minister Young would take time to implement and have aided in furthering our understand of what attributes and institutions are required for developing officers. And from all of these organizational changes, it is easy to identify that an officer in the Canadian Armed Forces must be able to recognize institutional problems, and lead organizational change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Former Wainwright base commander guilty of sexual assault.” The Canadian Press, Apr 10, 2014. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/former-wainwright-base-commander-guilty-of-sexual-assault-1.2605967>
- Bland, Douglas. *Canada's National Defence: Volume 1- Defence Policy*. Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University, 1997.
- Brennan, Richard J. and Bruce Campion-Smith. “Capt. Robert Semrau found not guilty of murder. *The Star*. July 19, 2010. https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2010/07/19/capt_robert_semrau_found_not_guilty_of_murder.html
- Burton, Pierre. *Marching as To War: Canada's Turbulent Years 1899-1953*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 2001.
- Canada. Department of National Defence. *Chief of Defence Staff Guidance to Commanding Officers*, 2000.
- Canada. Department of National Defence. “Defence Ethics Program.” *Department of National Defence*. <http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about/ethics-faq.page> Accessed: 25 April 2017.
- Canada. *Task Force on Review of Unification of the Canadian Forces. Final Report 15 March 1980*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1980.
- Canada. *Report of the Ministerial Committee on the Canadian Military Colleges*. Ottawa: Department of National Defence. 1993.
- Canada. *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia -Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair*. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997.
- CTV News.ca Staff. “MacKay: Renaming military corrects 'historical mistake'.” *CTV News*. 16 Aug 2011. Accessed: 27 Apr 2017. <http://www.ctvnews.ca/mackay-renaming-military-corrects-historical-mistake-1.684081>
- Deschamps, Marie. *External Review into Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment in the Canadian Armed Forces*. Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 2015
- Chiarelli, Peter W. “Goldwater-Nichols Act: Beyond Goldwater-Nichols.” *Joint Force Quarterly*. no 2 (Autumn 1993): 71-81
- English, Allan. “Corruption in The Canadian Military? Destroying Trust in The Chain of Command. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 23 (1), (2017): 32-46.

- English, Allan. "ROBERT SEMRAU." *The Globe and Mail (1936-Current)*, Oct 12, 2010. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1444942210?accountid=9867>
- English, John A., and Canadian Institute of International Affairs. *Lament for an army: The Decline of Canadian Professionalism*. Concord, Ontario: Irwin, 1998.
- French, David. *Military identities: The Regimental System, The British Army, And the British People, c.1870-2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Gabriel, Richard A. *The Warrior's War: A Treatise on Military Ethics*. Kingston, Ontario: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2007.
- Granatstein, J. L. *Canada's Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Granatstein, J. L. "The Revolt of the Admirals." *Canada's History*, Oct 2010.
- Granatstein, J. L. *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* Toronto: Harper Flamingo Canada, 2004.
- Gray, Colin S., and Byers, Roddick Beaumont. *Canadian Military Professionalism: The Search for Identity*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1973.
- Godefroy, Andrew B. *In Peace Prepared: Innovation and Adaptation in Canada's Cold War Army*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014.
- Gould, Darwin. "A Solution to Careerism in the Canadian Forces." *Exercise New Horizons*. Canadian Forces College, 2001.
- Haycock, Ronald G. "The Labours of Athena and the Muses: Historical and Contemporary Aspects of Canadian Military Education." *Canadian Military Journal* 2, no. 2 (2001): 5-22.
- Hellyer, Hon. Paul and Hon Lucien Cardin. *White Paper on Defence*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, March 1964.
- Hellyer, Paul. *Damn the Torpedoes: My Fight to Unify Canada's Armed Forces*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990.
- Horn, Bernd, and Bill Bentley. *Forced to Change: Crisis and Reform in the Canadian Armed Forces*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2015.
- Johnson, David E. "Preparing Potential Senior Army Leaders for the Future: An Assessment of Leader Development Efforts in the Post-Cold War Era." Rand Corporation. Prepared for the United States Army. Santa Monica, CA. 2002.

- Kasurak, Peter. *A National Force: The Evolution of Canada's Army, 1950-2000*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2013.
- Kasurak, Peter. "Concepts of Professionalism in The Canadian Army, 1946—2000: Regimentalism, Reaction, And Reform." *Armed Forces & Society* 37. (2011): 95-118.
- Lloyd, Scott. "The Effects of Unification on Joint Warfare in Canada." Master's Thesis, American Military University, 2016.
- March, H.J. "Command Challenges in the Twenty-First Century." Harris, Stephen John, Bernd Horn, H. P. Klepak, Bill McAndrew, J. L. Granatstein, Ross Pigeau, Carol McCann, et al. *Generalship and the Art of the Admiral: Perspectives on Canadian Senior Military Leadership*. St. Catharines, ON: Vanwell Pub, 2001.
- Mercier, Noemi, and Alec Castonguay. "Our Military's Disgrace." *Maclean's* vol. 127. Rogers Publishing Ltd, 2014.
- Shaw, Geoffrey D.T. "The Canadian Armed Forces and Unification." *Defense Analysis* 17, no. 2 (2001): 159-174.
- Stone, Craig, and Daniel Gosselin. "From Minister Hellyer to General Hillier: Understanding the Fundamental Differences Between the Unification of the Canadian Forces and Its Present Transformation." *Canadian Military Journal*. Winter 2005-2006 (2006): 5-16.
- Tabbemor, Dennis C. "The Aftermath of The Somalia Affair." Research Essay, Canadian Forces College, 1999.
- Terriff, Terry. "Warriors and Innovators: Military Change and Organizational Culture in The US Marine Corps." *Defense Studies* 6(2), (2006.): 215-47.
- Wakelam, Randall. "Officer Professional Education in the Canadian Forces and the Rowley Report, 1969." *Historical Studies in Education*. Kingston, On Queen's University (2004). Accessed: 14 April 2017.
http://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/edu_hse-rhe/article/view/334/393
- Weir, Erin M. K. "Using the Legacy of World War I to Evaluate Canadian Military Leadership in World War II" *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, Volume 7 Number 1 (14 October 2009)
- Whitby, Michael J., Richard Howard Gimblett, Peter T. Haydon. *The Admirals: Canada's Senior Naval Leadership in The Twentieth Century*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2008.

Young, The Honourable M. Douglas, P.C., M.P. *Report to the Prime Minister on the Leadership and Management of the Canadian Forces*. Canada. Department of National Defence, 1997.