



CANADIAN GLOBAL AFFAIRS INSTITUTE
INSTITUT CANADIEN DES AFFAIRES MONDIALES

CAF Reconstitution and Culture Change: Addressing the Warrior Spirit

Defence Deconstructed Podcast Transcript
March 17, 2023



Charlotte Duval-Lantoine – Ottawa Operations Manager & Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Dr. Christopher Ankersen – Associate Professor, New York University

Dr. Tammy George – Associate Professor, York University

Charlotte Duval-Lantoine (CDL): Tammy Chris, thank you so much for joining us today. As Western militaries and the Canadian Armed Forces in particular are facing recruitment and retention issues, culture change has become an important part of the discussion. A central piece of it is the concept of the warrior ethos. And Chris, I'll start with you. You've been working for many years on deconstructing that concept.

CDL: Can you get us started by explaining what the warrior ethos is and how it fits within modern conceptions of the profession of arms?

Dr. Christopher Ankersen (CA): It is not something that is well understood or well defined, and therefore trying to use it as a term means that you are essentially one of many owners – and that becomes a problem, I think, for professional militaries.

CA: Now what it's trying to connote is often bravery, determination, a certain expertise in the skill of fighting, essentially. And I think there is there's much to be said about those potential upsides. And I'm going to leave that, I think, because that is, I think, fairly well understood. However, I think if we look across time and space, at least within the Indo-European mythical and historical tradition, going back thousands of years everywhere from the Himalayas, all the way through Greece and Rome, through to Norse mythology, into Irish mythology, for example, we see a number of traits that are more worrying.

CA: Yes, warriors can be brave, they can be determined, they can be experts, but they are extremely selfish; they tend to be motivated by a need for glory or proving themselves against some internal standard of performance. They have a very troubled relationship with authority. If we think about the notion of Achilles, for example, and the relationship that that he had with Agamemnon, the relationship that, for example, Thor has with Odin, we see a very difficult time for warriors, largely because of this selfish worldview of settling into positions and hierarchies where someone else is going to tell them what to do.

CA: And usually that someone else is too old or too weak, or too bureaucratic or not themselves a warrior and therefore not worthy of the kind of respect that a warrior should deserve. And the third dimension, I think, of the warrior across all of these various traditions is they have a very paradoxical relationship with the feminine. And that, I think, is worth exploring in some detail. We'll probably do that in other the questions, but whether it's the notion that the feminine is there to be protected, for example, or that the feminine is there just rewards for service, and therefore we see things like battlefield rape or the tradition of war brides, for example. There's a real paradoxical relationship with the feminine, including when we have archetypes of female warriors and we can perhaps



tease this out a little bit later that it's not unproblematic, even when we have women in the role of warriors.

CA: And then the last aspect that we see repeatedly in the notion of the warrior is that they tend to be given to rage, violence, destruction, and indeed atrocity. And that atrocity can take the form of perfidy, that is to say, not acting honorably with other warriors. So, killing warriors in their sleep or killing disarmed warriors or indeed fits of rage and atrocity against non-combatants, civilians, etc.

CA: Now, lest that this only be seen as a mythical figure, we do see elements of this repeated in contemporary times. For example, in the Somalia report, the notion of warrior culture was correctly identified as being problematic as it was in the Brereton report, the examination of misconduct by members of the Australian Special Air Services Regiment and this notion of selfish, self-defined performance, the notion that big Army or the rest of the system is too bureaucratic, and the notion that there will be times when this violence will have a cathartic or a cleansing and bonding aspect. I think kind of encapsulates why whether we're talking about ancient or contemporary, the warrior figure, while it does bring in some positive potential positive characteristics, is too problematic to be used in professional militaries.

CDL: Thank you for that, Chris. And I would like to turn to you, Tammy, and kind of jump onto the topic of Somalia, because studying the 1990s, my real confrontation with the warrior ethos taken to either its historical roots are too extreme to me, was in Somalia, where members of the Canadian Airborne Regiment killed a Somali teenager, and it's in line with some other racial violence that took place in Belet Huen back in 1992 1993.

CDL: So, to me, the warrior ethos is really rooted in whiteness. Can you help us, especially as you completed a study of the experience of racialized service women in the military? Can you deconstruct the racial aspect of that ethos?

Dr. Tammy George (TG): So, it's a really great question and a really big question. And I will also jump off some points that Chris had mentioned in understanding this idea that a warrior and I think, you know, before I kind of begin to talk about its connection to whiteness, I think it's really important for us to think about whether it is, you know, whether it is like new documents coming out in terms of *Trusted to Serve* or this new warrior ethos and how we're kind of envisioning it. I think one of the important questions to think about is what is this term doing? What is the function? It's a really important thing to think about that when we think about the warrior, what gets conjured up for us, what is gets conjured up in our imaginations, both within the military context, but also in a civilian context.

TG: How do we imagine this idea of the warrior? And so, for me, typically in Western militaries in general, and I would say the CAF in particular, they haven't been necessarily narrated as institutions organized along racial lines. And typically what we've seen is that while there's ample research on aspects of various aspects of military life, whether it's



training, whether it's recruitment, whether certain aspects of education, very rarely have there been conversations in and around this idea of military masculinity as connected to whiteness.

TG: And so, the idea is here that we need to start to think about is kind of how do we begin to think about how race and whiteness operates in and through the concept of the warrior itself? And, you know, it's interesting that you mention the Somalia affair, because for me, one of the seminal moments punctuated moments for me to start thinking about race and military life or whiteness and military life was the Somalia affair and thinking through how is it that this event could take place?

TG: But then also thinking about alongside what were the values that were espoused in order for this event to unravel in the way that it did. And so, I think that's one particular point. I think now, looking back at the Somalia affair and the knowledge that we've come to understand in the Canadian context, I would actually argue in the North American context writ large, I think what's really become important to think about when we look back at the Somalia affair and this is something that wasn't really covered that much during that time, but the two men that were involved, what are the two men that were involved, Kyle Brown, Clayton Matchee, were actually Cree, Cree men, were indigenous.

TG: And so this is something really important that I think doesn't get factored into our understandings. And so this brings me to, you know, this idea of the research that I've done on servicemen and women and how they negotiate national belonging in the Canadian military. So this project involved me thinking about soldiers of color, thinking about what were their journeys into the military, how were their journeys within the military culture itself, and then what does that look like in theaters of war? What does that look like in deployment?

TG: And so what we start to see in this research is that service men and women of colour have a particular experience, I think, of whiteness in the Canadian military. And I want to be clear here that typically the way we talk about whiteness in the Canadian landscape, it's something that's quite fraught.

TG: Immediately you start talking about whiteness, people start assuming that you're calling them racist or that they have sort of racist views. And I think it's really important for us to think about this in terms of systems, in terms of systems. And as Frankenberg says, in terms of whiteness, you know, Frankenberg says that this is a location of structural advantage and privilege.

TG: Another point that Frankenberg makes is the idea that it's particular processes that are often unmarked and unnamed. And so, what I like to think about is what is the status quo, right, formally and informally. So, if we're fish in water, we never really interrogate the water. We just kind of swim around. We never really interrogate that. And I guess kind of bringing this idea of whiteness to the fold is beginning to interrogate the status quo because it has implications for how we think about ideas.



TG: All that see the warrior as we, you know, just discuss issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. It really does have implications for how we speak about these things. So I want us to begin to consider when we talk about this idea of the warrior or this military ethos, what are the values? What are the values that we're espousing?

TG: And I'll leave it on this final note is to really begin to think about are those values neutral? Again, I come back I come back to this idea, right? I think I come back to this idea that what is the work that these values are doing? And I think it's really important for us to begin to consider how, while there's been ample research on how masculine energies, you know, we come to understand the Canadian Armed Forces as a masculine institution. What is often missing in conversations about military masculinity is its connection to whiteness, and then how larger systems of oppression like patriarchy, white supremacy work to consolidate the CAF in very powerful ways.

CDL: So, Tammy, we'll have you continue on that. And thank you for closing your remarks on masculinity as well. So unfortunately, Vanessa Brown couldn't be with us today. So, I will turn that question to both you. And then and then Chris is the masculine mask of in any aspect of it, especially as the warrior ethos now has been influenced by pop culture and vice versa, like there was there has been a back and forth between pop culture and militaries in terms of the warrior ethos.

CDL: So can you help us fully deconstruct the masculinity aspect of this concept, not only in terms of like how this ethos is going to influence civilians, but also how it influences people within the organizations who do not necessarily embody this type of masculinity that the ethos is valuing, if I can put it this way.

TG: So, I think when we think about military masculinities, when we think about this, I think it's important for us to think about when we have an ethos that's put forward, whether formalized or formalized, what are the characteristics here, and how are they embodied?

TG: And, you know, typically when we think about, you know, the warrior fighting spirit, these kinds of things, it conjures up particular aspects around hegemonic masculinity. Right? And I want to sort of also argue that this form of masculinity, one that sort of, you know, not very emotional, you know, self before anything, you know, a country before anything else, this idea of sacrifice, you know, all of these kind of ideas, these ideals, loyalty and, you know, I think we need to sort of unpack them in terms of thinking about because it's all been a lot of work that's done and thinking about the particular values that are espoused that are very much connected to particular aspects of military masculinity, that what happens is that when it starts to consolidate itself and get constructed in even more entrenched ways, what we start to see is that then other groups have very difficult times achieving these forms of particular types of espoused masculinity. And, you know, so for example, in my research, what we've found is that often men of colour or of other ethnicities are often feminized, are often feminized, not really kind of achieving have aspects of military masculinity in terms of know their fitness.



TG: But what we start to see is that, you know, once they don't fully attain it by virtue of who they are, it becomes really problematic. And then if you have an organization that kind of espouses these ideas and puts these ideas forward, it becomes really, really complicated to actually think about aspects of inclusion, diversity, equity, because you have this standard that very few people can achieve.

TG: And so I wonder what it means to sort of broaden that, what it means to broaden that and increase those the capacity to be.

CDL: Chris?

CA: Yeah, I think as I mentioned briefly, the notion of the warrior and, and the and the feminine, for example, is extremely complicated in the sense that as, as Elshtain talks about¹, there's this notion of the beautiful soul, and this is what the warrior is about saving, protecting in many cases, protecting against racial impurity, for example, as Tammy would know.

CA: So there's on one hand, the feminine is the referent object, the thing that should be protected, and that has a large animating figure for the warrior. But at the same time, this does not prevent the warrior from seeing the feminine as the trophy, the thing to be one or the thing that they deserve for their service. So again, the notion of Briseis as a war bride in *The Iliad*, for example, that that ends up becoming the fictional point between Achilles and Agamemnon.

CA: But we can also see Queen Guinevere and others. And we see this on the contemporary battlefield as well. And I think the third dimension of this is, is negotiating exactly where women, or non-male figures fit into this. For example, the famous women warriors that we can that we have in our minds, whether it's Joan of Arc or Boudica or others, the Amazons in Greek mythology, are women who have had to either hide their feminine dimensions or certainly foreground the masculine dimensions, whatever those masculine components are.

CA: And again, they try to cleave as closely to a brave, determined and expert figure by masking their feminine aspects. What we don't see is a valorization of particular feminine characteristics in the warrior. So, if you want to be a warrior, it is a masculine figure. Whether it's done by men or by women or people who wouldn't identify as either of those two categories, they need to approximate this standard of some form of masculinity.

CA: And that's largely because the role that the notion of the warrior plays is as one of symbolic capital, right? It is a symbolic way of proving to others, also to yourself that you have not only attained some degree of knowledge and expertise, but even more importantly, that you are recognized for that this is really a badge of recognition that the label warrior conferred either by yourself or by others, is a way of recognizing that you indeed meet those particular standards and are welcome into that club.

¹ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0277539582900437>



CA: And therefore, the notion of warrior is intrinsic in any notion of inclusion and belonging into an organization. And you see, for example, elite organizations within militaries drawing this circle ever, ever smaller, right? Not everybody in this force can be a warrior. It's only us. And it's only us because we have a particular mission, because we've gone through some form of selection, because we are somehow more elite than the general run of the mill everybody else.

CA: And whether that's in a conscript army or in a professional army, there's this notion of very self-identifying and hoping that through the use of badges, through the name, the use of wearing a beard, not getting your haircut, whatever it might be, it gives you this recognition as well as this actual kind of internal peace. And I think that's where the notion of gender becomes very, very tied up with this.

CA: The performative nature of gender, the notion that this is very much about, you know, conforming to societal rules. And this in this case, these are organized national rules. And again, I would hearken to say that this is not something that any military, the Canadian Armed Forces notwithstanding, can fix on its own, because the notion of the warrior is not defined wholly within the organization.

CA: You got thousands of years of history, thousands of years of mythical aspects. You've got popular culture all pumping and helping to define what this means. And therefore, any attempt to use the term warrior is only ever going to be a partial, you know, grip on it.

CDL: Thank you for that, Chris. And, you know, to me as a person that looks at the intersection of those espoused values that you mentioned, Tammy, and like the way that the structure functions is that there is an interrogation to be done about the fact that operat— like how we value operators as opposed to other types of occupations within the military and how that can reinforce the warrior ethos in parts of the of the military, both in maybe its overall culture, but also understanding the fact that there are so many occupations in the military and so the different services have different way of approaching things.

CDL: And in how those subcultures and the way that the organization functions is, is confronting all of that. And I'll move more to the specific Canadian context because right now the military is trying to change its culture, asking actually the questions that you asked, Tammy, at the beginning. What are the values that some of the concepts are really encouraging and how does that confront the structure of the military all together?

CDL: And so right now, the military is moving away from the question of warrior to actually include now instead “the fighting spirit.” To me, because of the very neutral terms and the fact that in *Trusted to Serve*, the new CAF Ethos, that that concept is not developed in very specifically, and it seems to be gender neutral, race neutral, and neutral also of any difference aspect of identity markers of people.



CDL: Do you think that the fighting spirit is a good alternative to the warrior ethos? Is it useful? Is it something that the military needs or are we ending up with something more like a repackaging of the warrior ethos that is more palatable to other audiences? And Tammy, I'll start with you.

TG: So I've been giving this a lot of thought. You know, as somebody who's been thinking about military culture change quite intensely for a little bit now. I'm very curious around, you know, what prevents institutions from changing, what can prevent, what are the obstacles that – and I think it is different across institutions by virtue of history, by virtue of the make up the goals. And, you know, it's interesting, I've been thinking lately a lot around this notion of, you know, what are the sort of the pervasive logics within the CAF that kind of prevent it from shifting or changing some of the logics, including operational effectiveness?

TG: So do we do we consider X, Y, and Z as a form of change if it doesn't lead to operational effectiveness? Another one that's really big that I that I'm sensing is one around buy in the idea of buy-in that if we don't have buy in for change, then it's not likely that it will happen. And my question is buy-in from who?

TG: Because this also speaks to issues around power, right? So, while we largely are talking about issues around masculinity, the disavowal of the feminine, the warrior ideal, and what that conjures up both in, let's say, popular discourse and formally in institutions, I think it's also important for us to think about how all of this consolidates power and how that operates within an institution.

TG: So, to kind of go back to your question around this shift, and I notice the shift that in the *Trusted to Serve* document, the notion of warrior isn't used anymore. And I'm curious, you know, those who developed also the document, the question, what was the shift about to this idea of the fighting spirit? What was kept in mind during that time?

TG: And so ,because I think what's really interesting here is that if we're having formalized documents, if we're having these kinds of ideas, there really needs to be a real intentionality behind these terms. Right? So, we're using “warrior”. What do we mean about it? If we're using “fighting spirit”, what do we mean specifically and how does it depart from the warrior?

TG: Does it depart from the warrior, or is it just kind of changing names for optics sake? But then in reality, what's actually happening on the ground, what's actually happening in institutional space is nothing is really shift. But in fact, the warrior ideal is continually being espoused and in fact increasingly asserted, because now we can't say warrior. We're now moving to fighting spirit.

TG: And so, I think this is something really important for us to think about that when we make these shifts in language as well. Again, I go back to this question: What are these terms doing right? So even if we shift from warrior to fighting spirit, what is the nuance there? How is that communicated and how does that kind of translate across the



institution becomes really important for us to think about because otherwise we'll be changing terms every few years.

TG: And yet the very fabric of the institution doesn't shift. And this is something I want us to sort of be vigilant about, because how we do this matters. Is there an accountability? Is there an understanding of what's taking place as this language shifts? And often what we see is that even the language shifts institutionally. On the ground, it's a little bit slower to change.

TG: And, you know, people are very much invested in these ideas. People have joined militaries, military service because of these ideas. So it's really important that coming from leadership from the top, that it is very clear, you know what we mean by this terminology.

CDL: Chris, what do you think?

CA: Yeah, I think this is all exactly where the discussion needs to go. And I would say that if you're talking about culture as part of the problem/ solution, that does not mean that it's easy to figure out how you do that. How do you actually shift a culture is not the same as saying culture is where we need to be looking at. And I think that that can't be underestimated, right?

CA: Nobody was trained to be a problem in the military. Therefore, you can't train people not to be a problem. Right. There's something more than just another three-hour lecture or another beautifully constructed pamphlet. As Tammy says, it's about the intentionality and it's about the follow through with. With that being said, though, I would like to kind of pick up on a couple of things that have been mentioned here.

CA: Absolutely. This is about power in some sense. It's about the dominant figure, the hegemonic figure, and what that is. And that's intentional, right? Where do we want the ideal where everybody is aiming to be good at? Where is it going to sit? And there's a whole panoply of where that could be. But when you establish this figure, this archetype, whatever it's going to look like, that is theoretically being held out by the organization as being we want you to be like this or as close as you possibly can, and you're going to strive towards this.

CA: So, it's going to necessarily involve a shift in power unless you stick with exactly the same thing as you've got now. It's going to mean, as you mentioned, Charlotte, potentially taking the spotlight off of those who consider themselves to be operational or operators. And but if all you're going to do is then flip the spotlight onto some other aspect of the military, then all you really done is just move that power around, which is going to cause, you know, like it or not, resistance as anyone would, you know, any sociologist would tell you, wherever you have the application of power, you have resistance.



CA: So I think the intentionality has to go beyond just a simple we don't like the status quo. Let's change it. There does have to be a recognition that there's going to be a transmission and problem there somehow. And I think what's interesting when you look at when you talk to people in the Canadian Armed Forces, especially if you talk to women, for example, about the use of the term warrior, there are some who say, hang on a second.

CA: So now that we're allowed to be in the Canadian Armed Forces across all of the different classifications and occupations, now you're going to take away the term warrior. We don't get to be warriors. So this there is a feeling of loss to some. And again, I think we have to be very careful not to speak about monoliths on any dimension here.

CA: But there are some women in the Canadian Armed Forces that say "Hang on a second. All you've really done is taken away the brass ring that we've all been – that was theoretically the pinnacle of military expertise, and we're not allowed to be that." And there is a feeling of resentment that. Hang on a second, This is a bit this is a bit of a problem.

CA: But I want to go back to this notion of operational effectiveness, which I think you can't ever stray very far from, whether it's a rhetorical device for maintaining the status quo or it's a legitimate concern. So, the Canadian Armed Forces, like any military, could be tasked to do anything right. There's no nothing sacrosanct about it must do the following things.

CA: There is a process in the democratic country about how that Canadian Armed Forces, like any other institution, can be rerolled or retasked to do anything, filling sandbags, cutting down trees and/or defending Canadian territory and/or applying military force internationally. That being said, in the current makeup, most countries in the world believe that there is a need to have some kind of institution that can apply military force in the furtherance of national policy in the international realm.

CA: For Canada, that is the Canadian Armed Forces. We don't have other competing people. For example, the United States. You might say that the clandestine aspects of the CIA or others can do that. Canadian Armed Forces is what Canada has to do those roles for now. That can that can certainly change. With that being said, there is then, according to people like Huntington, two dimensions that militaries have to keep in mind.

CA: The first is there's a functional imperative. Can it do whatever it's supposed to do by mandate, by statute, by the instructions and direction given to it by the government? There's not to say there's one way of doing that, but I think there is an imperative that they have to be able to do what it says on the tin.

CA: Canadians are spending taxes on this. They want it to be able to be effective, whatever that is. And the second dimension– even Huntington brings up is there's a societal imperative. It has to fulfill those functions in a way that fits in with and is acceptable to the broader society. And that societal imperative is a moving target. It is it is going to ebb and flow and change with the fads and recognitions and overlooked and now finally, recognize aspects of social life that are going to change.



CA: And the military has to be able to perform in both of those imperatives. I think if we look at the most recent recruiting video² and some of you have probably seen it, I think it came out this week, this notion of It's For You kind of highlights one of the problems that I would like to talk about here; which is to say the Canadian Armed Forces, like any military, does not exist to or solely to provide its individual members with a sense of job satisfaction.

CA: You don't create a military and spend billions of dollars on it to say, "hey, this is a way in which you can climb Maslow's pyramid and you can get to the top and self-actualize; we created this for you as individuals to be all that you can be." We may recruit that way and we may say there's great value in you joining the Canadian Armed Forces because you can do X, Y, Z, You can actually, you know, test yourself, you can meet great friends, you can see the world.

CA: Those are all benefits from a transactional perspective of why you as an individual want to join the military. That is not why any organization is created by the state. The state did not create the military to say, "Hey, we need an organization where people can be the best version of themselves." That's not why we have the military. We have the military to do something, whether it's go and fight overseas or defend territory or fill sandbags or whatever it is.

CA: And I think in some senses, the more we allow individuals to define what it is they want to do in the Canadian Armed Forces. And again, if you look at that video that, you know, whether it's rappelling down a cliff with a bicycle on your back, I didn't see that in my 12 years in the military, but perhaps that's a while ago now or whatever else that video is purporting to represent as "this is for you."

CA: There is a big problem with making the expectation that you can have the military à la carte. You can have it the way you want it, because that's not the way that that's going to be. And that applies for the 18-year-old who's just joined. And it applies to the 57-year-old who's been in the military for 37 years.

CA: Right. There is going to have to be some form of collective purpose. And we can't allow people to define exactly what it is their military service means to the country. What it means to them is great. They can have that. That's not something that— we're not a totalitarian organization that's going to force you to understand the military in a particular way.

CA: However, there is going to have to be this notion that you don't get to define yourself as the warrior or the rescuer or the guardian or whatever those other personas may be. That's not what the institution exists for. The institution is an instrument of the state. The state will determine what it's going to do, and you, by signing up, are going to be an instrument of that instrument.

² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0kpavVasNPE>



CA: The fact that you get great satisfaction out of that is to be encouraged, to be welcomed. Let's hope that's the case. But that is not why the state created the armed forces in the first place. And I think there's a tension there. This individual versus collective identity, for example, is always going to be right. And that's the part of culture that's not going to be easy to, you know, rectify.

CA: There are there's not one culture. There are several overlapping cultures. And how you negotiate that, how you give space for that personal individual identity, which is going to be multiple, multiple to this. It's going to have psychological dimensions, it's going to have social dimensions, it's going to have familial dimensions, it's going to have other identity group dimensions that's going to be rectified in some way with a collective identity that is acceptable to the society, acceptable to its own individual members.

CA: That's not a— that's not an easy thing to do. And anybody who thinks this can be done in a calendar year or on the back of that perfect three-hour mandatory training session or that beautifully crafted manual, no matter which it is, is going to be impossible. And that leads me to my last point. When we talk about values and we talk about culture being made up of values, this is very much about what is valued by the organization.

CA: And if the values of your organization are bravery, selfless service, whatever it is, and I agree with Tammy, we need to be explicit about what those values are. How do we actually make sure that those values are seen as important and lived by valuing them? The organization, the culture is made up of what is accepted, what is promoted and what is punished.

CA: And those behaviours have to be in accordance with those values. So be explicit about the values and then be explicit about how you're actually going to accept, promote or punish people who either cleave to or don't cleave to those values. And I think that's a very much taller it's easy to say. It's very, very hard to do. And it's going to be a conversation where people feel like there is a way that they could talk about this.

CA: It can't be a silver bullet. It's going to be a long slog and a continuous effort. It's not going to be something we're going to fix this and move beyond it right. This is going to be continuous improvement. And that kind of that that is also a component of the culture. It's not about setting a new target. It's about actually working on a journey that's going to be an ongoing process.

CDL: The last question that I'm going to ask you and I'll start with you, Chris, because you talked a little bit about this. So I'm a structure person in the sense of like I like to look at how espoused values are actually transforming within the organizations and becoming what we call value in use – the values that people are actually embodying on a day to day basis and how to structure encourages those values, or actually discourages them.

CDL: And so you to have brought this to the forefront, we and we have circled around this question, but if we look at being deliberate in changing the values of the military in a ways that is in line with the direction that the military wants to go to in recruiting more



people and be a more inclusive military, what do you think are some of the structural changes that need to get done? Obviously, we talked about rewarding behavior and maybe discussing the operator supremacy in the military, you know, maybe flatten who gets to be more valued than others in the military, which might create resistance because some people have joined the military to become warriors, to become fighters.

CDL: So how do we grapple with all of that? Do you have any ideas of how can we address all of that in in concrete measures rather than just writing new doctrines, new concepts, or, as you said, Chris, do a three-hour training and check the box and say we we've told people what we want from them.

CA: Yeah. First, I would say that this is not – this is not a problem that the Canadian Armed Forces is alone in trying to solve, right. Across many militaries in the Western world, this is an issue. But across other organizations. I spent 12 years of my life in the United Nations and the amount of mandatory training that we did in order to try to solve deep structural cultural problems was– it would fill up more than not more than a week. So I think that's one aspect. So there's learnings probably the armed forces can find from other sources, right?

CA: It needs to be tailored and targeted for the Canadian Armed Forces in that particular cultural and social history that it has. But there are examples out there that they can look at and I would give as an example, I had the Special Air Service Regiment or the Australian Defense Force read and actually paid attention to the Somalia report.

CA: They perhaps could have a very similar set of circumstances that happened. And if you read the Brereton report and you read the Somalia report, it's really sad that 30 years between them, very little cultural understanding or lessons learned were actually accomplished. And I would say two things just to be brief and be very explicit about the values you want, try not to try not to use any code word, whether it's warrior or fighting spirit by itself as a thing that has meaning for everyone.

CA: You need to be extremely explicit. This this includes conversations. It's more than just a bumper sticker. You need to really get into it. So even terms and I think I think Troy very much for putting up in the chat. I can multitask only to a limited degree here, but Troy put up some great examples of what the values espoused by the Canadian Armed Forces are.

CA: But as Tammy said, what does loyalty actually mean? Means to whom? Does everybody understand it? Well, if we're just going to spout things and not actually get into the meaning of them in the potential confusion that may exist there or the alternate meanings, that's going to be a problem. So be explicit. And then I would just repeat what I said before.

CA: Whether you think it's a gentle or structural or a combination of the both, you have to not just espouse these values, but you have to live them. And therefore you need to punish people who don't conform, and you need to encourage people who are willing to



meet your your espoused values. And this is a continuous process. Now, by punish, I don't necessarily mean, you know, give no voice to or kick out, but there has to be a way in which when you see somebody who has broken all these values, who has who has not lived the life that that is wanted and that person gets promoted, you have undone years and years of effort in terms of, you know, training and conversations. So, the lived experience of people is very much more acute than what they get trained or told to do. So, if you are going to, you know, to quote the other English speaking Canadian regiment, you never pass a fault: "What you what you pass by is what you accept."

CA: And therefore, this is never going to be a journey that's finished. It's going to be a continuous issue as the culture continues to grow.

CDL: Tammy?

TG: I think it's really important for us to really reflect on what has brought us to this particular moment. Right? What are the things that have occurred that have brought us to this particular moment where now the CAF is grappling with an issue of culture change?

TG: And I think we really have to think about that because ,it's important for us to think about. Is this something that would have happened on our own, or is it that things needed to happen? Things, you know, you know, particular class action suits, you know, all issues of sexual misconduct. I mean, these are things that have brought the CAF to the forefront to be able to have these conversations.

TG: And I think it's really important for us to think about what does bring us to these conversations, like very rarely. And I mean, the CAF is not alone in this. I think, you know, Chris is right across institutional life, across society, banks are grappling with this, academia is grappling with this. So many institutions are grappling with these issues.

TG: Now, there are histories in terms of how they formed. How they'd come to this particular moment in time will be very different. But I also think there's such a terrific opportunity here if we seize it, because especially when we think about, you know, I want to go back to some of the symbolic work that Chris is talking about around the warrior.

TG: In the same way there is such symbolic work around the Canadian Armed Forces for the average Canadian, I would argue that the average Canadian doesn't know that much about their military, and that is an issue between civilian and military connection. But I think, you know, those of us who have family in the military, I mean, this is you're very steeped in all this.

TG: And unless you have that, you don't really know much. You're not really sure what's kind of being done in our name. And I think but at the same time, the mechanic in our forces becomes a massive symbol for the Canadian landscape. When we think about how



Canadian national identity is constructed, the Canadian Armed Forces as one historically of being peacekeeping, is one that comes up.

TG: And so I think if we can think about the opportunity we have here, it will have such reverberations across the Canadian landscape. And so that's one point I want to make, is to think about how we got to this particular point, because across society, institutions will have very different starting points, very different histories to have what have brought them to this particular moment.

TG: So, I think it's important to keep that in mind. The second thing I want to sort of emphasize is this idea of values. And, you know, as the *Trusted to Serve* document, does not use warrior anymore. It does espouse the following values in terms of loyalty, integrity, courage, excellence, inclusion, and accountability. And I also want to echo what Chris is saying.

TG: We need to think about what these terms are doing. Are they as neutral as we imagine them to be? So, when I think about something like loyalty, for example, when I look at my race, my research with racialized soldiers in the Canadian Armed Forces, some actually are very quite loyal to their whole their country of origin. You know, they kind of live they speak a particular language, they speak a number of languages.

TG: And they're also grateful for being in Canada as well. So how do we think about this meaning of loyalty? Is it sort of a singular meaning around just to the loyalty to the Canadian nation-state? Or is it something that is a lot more layered among individuals? And I think this is something really important for us to think about for each one of these terms. In different cultures, in different communities do these terms have different meanings?

TG: And this is something I think we need to really think about because we assume the assumption is we're all on the same page. And, and I think this is something where conversations need to take place. When I think about something like inclusion, it is such a buzzword these days. Inclusion. Every institution is talking about being more inclusive. But when I think about inclusion, I often think it's really about bringing those on the margins into the center, and that's constantly sort of the way the dynamic works.

TG: But we never interrogate the center. The center never gets interrogated. What is it that those on the margins are desiring or wanting to be included into? And it's these kinds of conversations we need to think about as opposed to say, yes, inclusion is a value, yes, I'm in without really thinking about how does it operate, how does it function, how are we imagining it in the contemporary moment?

TG: And I think that's really important for us to consider. And so, then the other part of this is that we have values, but then how are they operationalized? And Chris, I think this is something you were thinking you were talking about at the end of what you were just saying is that how does this translate? How are the operations?



TG: I don't think the values in themselves are problematic. I think how they are operationalized, how they are imagined, how they get carried out is something very different. And that is something I think we need to pay attention to. And so one of the things I'm particularly interested in is, you know, what do recruits, new recruits, you know, internalize about the expectations of military service, you know, and what an ideal military member is.

TG: How does this how do they think about this in basic training, entry level courses, military colleges, and then also posted in their first unit? You know, and I think this is something really important for us to really think about, even though we may have documents that say the following values, I think it's really important to also pay attention to what's also happening informally in spaces as well in terms of trying to understand this and then be able to bring these conversations together.

CDL: Thank you so much, Tammy and Chris.

Canadian Global Affairs Institute

The Canadian Global Affairs Institute focuses on the entire range of Canada's international relations in all its forms including (in partnership with the University of Calgary's School of Public Policy), trade investment and international capacity building. Successor to the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI, which was established in 2001), the Institute works to inform Canadians about the importance of having a respected and influential voice in those parts of the globe where Canada has significant interests due to trade and investment, origins of Canada's population, geographic security (and especially security of North America in conjunction with the United States), social development, or the peace and freedom of allied nations. The Institute aims to demonstrate to Canadians the importance of comprehensive foreign, defence and trade policies which both express our values and represent our interests.

The Institute was created to bridge the gap between what Canadians need to know about Canadian international activities and what they do know. Historically Canadians have tended to look abroad out of a search for markets because Canada depends heavily on foreign trade. In the modern post-Cold War world, however, global security and stability have become the bedrocks of global commerce and the free movement of people, goods and ideas across international boundaries. Canada has striven to open the world since the 1930s and was a driving factor behind the adoption of the main structures which underpin globalization such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and emerging free trade networks connecting dozens of international economies. The Canadian Global Affairs Institute recognizes Canada's contribution to a globalized world and aims to inform Canadians about Canada's role in that process and the connection between globalization and security.

In all its activities the Institute is a charitable, non-partisan, non-advocacy organization that provides a platform for a variety of viewpoints. It is supported financially by the contributions of individuals, foundations, and corporations. Conclusions or opinions expressed in Institute publications and programs are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of Institute staff, fellows, directors, advisors or any individuals or organizations that provide financial support to, or collaborate with, the Institute.