Canadian Forces Transformation and Canada's Way of War in the Twenty-First Century

A Monograph

by

Major Jonathan M. Cox
Canadian Army

School of Advanced Military Studies
US Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, KS

2019

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	**2. REPORT TYPE**	**3. DATES COVERED** *(From - To)*
23 05 2019	MASTER'S THESIS	JUNE 18-MAY 19

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Canadian Forces Transformations and Canada's Way of War in the Twenty-First Century

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)

Cox, Johnathan

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301

8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

Canada's unique "way of war" is a product of Canadian history, geography, and political traditions. By contributing forces to larger coalitions, Canada is able to achieve security for a lower cost by relying on others to underwrite its national security. This level of security makes it possible for the Government to look inward to higher priority domestic issues. Doing so requires less focus and funding for drastic military capability development. This fact, coupled with a reduction of forces, drives a common narrative of a declining Canadian Armed Forces. In reality, the reduction of military forces is a matter of deliberate political choice driven by current global and domestic contexts and entirely consistent with Canada's way of war. Throughout its history, the Canadian Armed Forces has consistently evolved in order to achieve assigned missions. Canadian Forces Transformation initiated in 2005 is the most recent example of this ongoing evolution, and has ensured the Canadian Armed Forces is prepared to succeed in the twenty-first century in a manner consistent with Canada's traditional way of war.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
Canadian Forces; Canadian Armed Forces; CF Transformation; Canada's way of war; Civil-military relations; operational level of war; operational art

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			**17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT**	**18. NUMBER OF PAGES**	**19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON**
a. REPORT	**b. ABSTRACT**	**c. THIS PAGE**			**19b. PHONE NUMBER** *(include area code)*
(U)	(U)	(U)	(U)	61	913 758-3300

Monograph Approval Page

Name of Candidate: Major Jonathan M. Cox

Monograph Title: Canadian Forces Transformation and Canada's Way of War in the Twenty-First Century

Approved by:

_____, Monograph Director
Matthew Muehlbauer, PhD

_____, Seminar Leader
Larry V. Geddings, Jr., COL

_____, Director, School of Advanced Military Studies
Kirk C. Dorr, COL

Accepted this 23rd day of May 2019 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Robert F. Baumann, PhD

Abstract

Canadian Forces Transformation and Canada's Way of War in the Twenty-First Century, by Major Jonathan M. Cox, Canadian Army, 63 pages.

Canada's unique "way of war" is a product of Canadian history, geography, and political traditions. By contributing forces to larger coalitions, Canada is able to achieve security for a lower cost by relying on others to underwrite its national security. This level of security makes it possible for the Government to look inward to higher priority domestic issues. Doing so requires less focus and funding for drastic military capability development. This fact, coupled with a reduction of forces, drives a common narrative of a declining Canadian Armed Forces. In reality, the reduction of military forces is a matter of deliberate political choice driven by current global and domestic contexts and entirely consistent with Canada's way of war. Throughout its history, the Canadian Armed Forces has consistently evolved in order to achieve assigned missions. Canadian Forces Transformation initiated in 2005 is the most recent example of this ongoing evolution, and has ensured the Canadian Armed Forces is prepared to succeed in the twenty-first century in a manner consistent with Canada's traditional way of war.

Contents

Acknowledgments

Thank you to all who provided their assistance and support in the completion of this monograph.

Acronyms

1 RCR BG	First Battalion The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group
2 PPCLI	Second Battalion Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry
3 PPCLI	Third Battalion Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry
CA	Canadian Army
CAF	Canadian Armed Forces
CANBAT	Canadian Battalion
CANOSCOM	Canadian Operational Support Command
CAR	Canadian Airborne Regiment
CANSOFCOM	Canadian Special Operations Forces Command
CEF	Canadian Expeditionary Force
CEFCOM	Canadian Expeditionary Force Command
CF	Canadian Forces
CJOC	Canadian Joint Operations Command
CDS	Chief of the Defence Staff
DCDS	Deputy Chief of the Defence Staff
DND	Department of National Defence
GDP	gross domestic product
GoC	Government of Canada
JTF 2	Joint Task Force Two
IFOR	Implementation Force
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
KFOR	Kosovo Force
OMLT	Observer Mentor Liaison Team
MNB	Multi-national Brigade
MND	Minister of National Defence

NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDHQ	National Defence Headquarters
NORAD	North American Aerospace Defense Command
RCAF	Royal Canadian Air Force
RCN	Royal Canadian Navy
SFOR	Stabilization Force
SJS	Strategic Joint Staff
TFK	Task Force Kandahar
TRADOC	Training and Doctrine Command
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNEF	United Nations Emergency Force
UNOSOM	United Nations Operation in Somalia
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
U.S.	United States
VCDS	Vice Chief of the Defence Staff

Chapter 1: Introduction

Geography, history, and political tradition greatly influence Canada's international role and military traditions. Being the second largest nation in the world, surrounded by three oceans, with a population of just over thirty seven million people creates a number of unique circumstances for national defence and security.[1] Experience prior to the 1931 Statute of Westminster solidified Canada's preference to rely on its geography and larger nations to underwrite national security and avoid unilateral military action.[2] As a result, Canada has had no need, nor political desire to maintain a large standing military. Without national defense at the forefront of the average Canadian's mind, defense policies have been in constant competition with other domestic issues competing for limited tax dollars derived from Canada's small population.[3]

To understand Canadian military affairs and history one must understand the close connection to government policy and competing political objectives. In Canada, much like other Western democratic nations, the development and employment of military force is a matter of political choice. Policy decisions to balance ongoing domestic and international pressures have often led to a cost effective approach to national defense and the deliberate limiting of military

[1] Canada's territorial size is 9,984,670 square kilometers. United States, Central Intelligence Agency, "The World Fact Book" under Canada, accessed November 1, 2018, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ca.html; Canada, Statistics Canada, "Canada's population estimates, second quarter 2018," last modified September 27, 2018, accessed November 1, 2018, https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/180927/dq180927j-eng.htm?HPA=1&indid=4098-1&indgeo=0.

[2] The Statute of Westminster established Canada's full legal freedom from Great Britain. Although Canada's Confederation was in 1867, it remained a British Dominion. The Canadian government managed domestic affairs while the British Parliament dictated foreign or external affairs. Thus, while a British declaration of war also encompassed Canada, the Canadian Parliament decided what level of support to provide the United Kingdom. It was not until the Statute of Westminster that Canada acquired full legal freedom as a Commonwealth nation. United Kingdom, *Statue of Westminster*, accessed September 14, 2018, http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1931/4/pdfs/ukpga_19310004_en.pdf.

[3] Despite being the second largest country by area Canada is the thirty-ninth by population in the world. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, "World Population Prospectus 2017," accessed November 1, 2018, https://population.un.org/wpp/DataQuery/. NOTE: This monograph uses the American spelling of 'defense', 'honor', and 'armor' except when used in a proper title or quotation.

capabilities. Coupled with these decisions are those by the Government of Canada (GoC) demonstrating a continued preference to contribute military forces to collective arrangements and cooperative missions to maintain international influence thereby achieving security for a lower cost. These trends are the salient features of what is understood as Canada's "way of war."[4]

During the Cold War, participation in strategic alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and other international missions increased focus on the tactical employment of forces to meet strategic and political goals. With tactical contributions meeting these goals, the maintenance of operational level capabilities became a lesser priority. To meet competing political priorities the Department of National Defence (DND) and the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) shifted focus towards creating a more streamlined and cost effective military. The search for cost savings shifted the defense mindset towards a model that preferred efficiency at the political levels rather than operational effectiveness. This approach had a secondary effect of limiting Canada's ability to support its major allies at the turn of the twenty-first century.

Canadian Forces (CF) Transformation, initiated by then Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS) General Rick Hillier in 2005, restructured the CAF into a flexible force capable of operating across the spectrum of conflict. More importantly, it reinvigorated an operationally focused culture. CF Transformation brought with it the creation of operational level commands to plan and conduct military operations and a Strategic Joint Staff (SJS) to aid in strategic command, control, and synchronization of the CAF. It thus increased operational capacity through a refined command and control structure and the ability to forecast and resource future missions. However, CF Transformation only occurred because political leaders recognized enhancing operational

[4] Bill Bentley, "Canada's Way in War," in *Institutional Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Contemporary Issues*, ed. Robert W. Walker (Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2007), 83-84.

capacities was necessary for pursuing Canada's national security goals and the Canadian way of war in the twenty-first century.

This monograph examines the impact of CF Transformation on Canada's operational level capacity. Doing so, however, requires understanding the conditions that allowed such change to take place. By changing the structure and focus of DND, CF Transformation regenerated the CAF's ability not just to function, but also to lead at the operational level. CF Transformation allowed Canada to remain a relevant and credible military force on the global stage contributing to Canada's overall global influence and security.

To examine why CF Transformation was required discussion begins with Canada's military history, pulling out key events and decisions affecting how and why Canada has employed military forces around the world. Chapter 2 briefly traces Canada's military history from the Boer War to early operations in Afghanistan. Focusing on civil-military relationships, this history demonstrates key factors that influenced Canada's traditional way of war. Chapter 3 expands upon this history to dispute common themes of military decline, reframing the narrative of the CAF in the late twentieth century as stemming from deliberate political choices to balance competing priorities. While consistent with the Canadian way of war, these decisions did create doctrinal friction in the adoption of concepts not suited to current capabilities. Using operations and initiatives in Afghanistan post-CF Transformation and beyond demonstrates how a renewed political focus paired with a more efficient command and control structure increased the capacity to meet policy and strategic goals. Understanding CF Transformation as an ongoing process, the conclusion in Chapter 4 then identifies areas for future research to ensure that Canada remains a relevant and capable military, responsive to the future needs of the GoC.

In Canada, there remains a close connection between policy and the development and employment of military force. National security is likely to remain a lesser priority for Canadians, meaning military funding will remain constrained until the rise of a truly existential threat. This is important to understanding Canada's way of war and future military employment and main

component of the nation's civil-military relationship. The connection of soldiers and their actions to citizens and their security is vitally important to the CAF. Understanding this relationship must be the cornerstone of any soldier's professional education. The goal in preparing this monograph is to further explain and discuss these issues in order to support professional development for members of the CAF responsible for the future application of Canada's military force. To understand where we are going, we must first understand where we have been and what that means.

Chapter 2: The Canadian Way of War and the CAF before Transformation

The development and employment of the Canadian military's operational concepts and capabilities has ebbed and flowed throughout history. These shifts reflect how Canada's civil-military interactions have shaped Canada's unique way of war over time. This chapter provides a brief overview of Canada's military history up to early operations in Afghanistan to reveal the connection between policy and specific military choices.

Canada's Way of War

Canada's way of war is the product of Canada's political history, international relationships, and past military experiences. As such, the use of military force to connect tactical actions to strategic goals "has a political as well as a military rationale."[5] Having a major ally in the U.S. and bounded by three large oceans, Canada possesses a level of security that allows the GoC to shift focus to issues beyond defense. The relatively small population when compared to the size of the country creates unique challenges for the government. The small tax base means Canadians pay a higher cost per capita for defense, which competes with other issues for limited tax dollars. For most Canadians national defense is a lesser priority when compared to, for example, social welfare or the environment, contributing to a political desire "to be seen to

[5] M. A. Hennessey and B.J.C. McKercher, "Introduction" in *The Operational Art: Development in the Theories of War* eds. B. J. C. McKercher and M. A. Hennessy (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers: 1996), 4.

maintain an effective military for a minimum of resources."[6] To address the gap between defense funding and national security needs, the GoC has generally offered the CAF as a force provider to support larger allies who, in turn, underwrite Canadian security.

This aspect of Canada's way of war has developed over time. Since 1899, when Prime Minister Sir Wilfred Laurier committed Canadian forces to South Africa for the Second Boer War in support of the British Empire, Canada has maintained a tradition of contributing forces to larger coalition operations abroad.[7] The provision of military forces in this manner led to what the current CDS General Jonathan Vance termed "contribution warfare."[8] Although Canada has not declared war since the end of World War II, it has provided forces to many conflicts. While continued contribution does not directly secure the country from external threats, it generates recognition of Canada as a valuable global partner. In return, Canada reaps security advantages from its membership in multiple organizations without fully investing in the military capabilities needed for unilateral operations.

Establishing a Reputation: 1812 to World War II

Although a British colonial conflict, the War of 1812 is foundational to Canada's external outlook and reliance on international relationships.[9] Based on the attempted U.S. invasions during the war, Canada remained fearful of American northward expansion, particularly with the advent of "Manifest Destiny" notions later in the century. It thus maintained close ties to the United

---

[6] Michael K. Jeffery, *Inside Canadian Forces Transformation: Institutional Leadership as a Catalyst for Change* (Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2009), 62.

[7] Bernd Horn, *Establishing a Legacy: The History of The Royal Canadian Regiment 1853-1953* (Toronto, ON: Dundurn Press, 2008), 41-42.

[8] Jonathan Vance, "Tactics Without Strategy or Why the Canadian Forces Do Not Campaign" in *The Operational Art: Canadian Perspectives, Context and Concepts* eds. Allan English, Daniel Gosselin, Howard Coombs, and Laurence M. Hickey (Kingston: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2005), 280.

[9] Canada's military history traces back to the War of 1812. Seven Canadian battle honors, "awarded to provide public recognition and to record combatant unit's active participation in battle against a formed and armed enemy," were awarded to, or based on official Regimental Lineages, perpetuated by current Canadian regiments for the War of 1812. National Defence and the Canadian Forces, "Battle Honours – War of 1812," modified July 15, 2015, accessed October 23, 2018, http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/gal/bh-hd/wg-1812/index-eng.asp.

Kingdom (UK), even after Confederation in 1867, to provide a backstop for national security and the protection of Canadian sovereignty.[10] Recognition of this dependence, and the desire to maintain good relations with the UK, was a leading factor in sending an all-volunteer infantry battalion to the Boer War in 1899 and, later, larger forces to participate in World War I.[11]

Canada, as a self-governing dominion of the British Empire during the Boer War and World War I, was automatically at war upon a British declaration. But the Canadian Parliament still managed domestic issues, particularly how to contribute to the war effort. The outbreak of war caused serious national debates in Canada about how to participate. Francophone Canadians were reluctant to support the UK, to whom they shared little connection. Anglophones, however, with a closer connection rushed to enlist. This was sufficient to support the initial fighting, however, as casualties grew the government gradually eased recruiting standards to increase the available pool of soldiers. It also passed the Military Services Act, resulting in the conscription crises of 1917. Debates over this issue divided Canadians along language lines, highlighting the close connection of domestic sentiment and military action.[12] Despite these concerns, Canada formed the Canadian Expeditionary Force (CEF) and sent a total of 430,000 men and women overseas.[13]

Early in the war, Canadian units were spread across the British Expeditionary Force. Their first opportunity to operate as a unified, independent formation came in 1917, when

---

[10] Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada: From Champlain to Kosovo*, 4th ed. (Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart Inc., 1999), 86-93.

[11] The battalion came from the Second (Special Service) Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment of Infantry, whose lineage is perpetuated by the Second Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment. Horn, *Establishing a Legacy*, 41-42; Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, 115-116.

[12] The Canadian War Museum, "Voluntary Recruitment," accessed November 9, 2018 https://www.warmuseum.ca/firstworldwar/history/life-at-home-during-the-war/recruitment-and-conscription/voluntary-recruitment/; CBClearning, "Turmoil on the Homefront: The Conscription Crisis," *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*, accessed November 9, 2018, https://www.cbc.ca/history/EPISCONTENTSE1EP12CH2PA3LE.html.

[13] Tim Cook, *At The Sharp End: Canadians Fighting the Great War 1914-1916* (Toronto, ON: Penguin Canada, 2007), 3

General Sir Arthur Currie commanded the Canadian Corps during the Battle of Vimy Ridge. Following the breakthrough at Vimy - often referred to as the "birth of the nation" - the Canadian Corps played a key role in the Hundred Days Offensive that ended the war, driving the Germans from Amiens, France to Mons, Belgium.[14]

While the war strengthened the tradition of contribution, decisions following World War I established Canada's custom of deliberately limiting military capabilities to support other political goals. Afterwards Canadians had neither the desire nor the expectation to fight such a war again. The Government reverted the military back to its pre-war structure, based on a partially trained militia for homeland defense, and reduced the Canadian Army (CA), then known as the Army Permanent Force, to an authorized strength of 10,000 (although it never achieved this number).[15]

Wartime efforts gave Canada enough political influence to secure its status as a full member in the League of Nations, fulfilling the desire to be treated as an independent state. Based on its geography and proximity to the United States, with whom relations were improving, the GoC perceived no major threat to Canada after World War I. Consequently, the desire to support collective global security was not as important as the international recognition and stature gained

[14] The victory at Vimy Ridge is widely regarded as a defining moment in Canadian military history. The Canadian Corps, comprised of four divisions, represented all regions of Canada, and became an example of what Canadian soldiers were capable of when working together. Success at Vimy earned Canadians a reputation as formidable and effective soldiers in the eyes of the Allies and the Germans. The Canadian Corps then spearheaded the final Allied advance from August 8 to November 11, 1918. During Canada's final "Hundred Days" the Canadians fought a series of battles through Ypres, Amiens, Arras, and the Somme to break through the German Hindenburg Line by the end of September 1918. Attacks continued through Cambrai, Valenciennes and Mont Houy before the Canadians reached Mons, Belgium on 11 November. Tim Cook, *Shock Troops: Canadians Fighting the Great War 1917*-1918, vol. 2 (Toronto, ON: Penguin Group, 2008), 141-144; Tim Cook, "The Battle of Vimy Ridge, 9-12 April 1917," The Canadian War Museum, accessed January 25, 2019, https://www.warmuseum.ca/the-battle-of-vimy-ridge/; Canada, Veterans Affairs Canada, "Canada's Hundred Days," last modified October 23, 2014, accessed January 25, 2019, https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/history/first-world-war/canada/Canada15.

[15] The actual names of the Canadian Army (CA), Royal Canadian Navy (RCN), and Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF) have evolved throughout Canada's military history. For the sake of clarity, this monograph uses the current titles, CA, RCN, and RCAF with historical context added where required for accuracy. George F.G. Stanley, *Canada's Soldiers 1604-1954: The Military History of an Unmilitary People* (Toronto, ON: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1954), 325-326.

through its wartime contributions.[16] Canada's newfound international status and associated security, allowed the GoC to focus inwards on issues other than security.[17] However, World War II soon challenged this perceived security.

Believing the UK's enemies would not distinguish between it and Commonwealth nations, and seeing a need to support allies to ensure national security, Canada declared War on Germany on September 10, 1939.[18] At the outset of World War II, its military had just over 10,000 personnel across all three services.[19] By war's end, it totaled over 750,000 personnel across an army corps, the Allies' fourth largest air force, and the world's third largest navy.[20] Increased numbers came with increased wartime production to support Canadian forces as well as Canada's allies. War production eventually comprised half of Canada's industry, placing it within the top four global producers and the second largest exporter of war supplies.[21]

The increased industrial capacity and size of the military made Canada an important ally in the war who assumed a number of important roles. The Royal Canadian Navy (RCN),

---

[16] Ramsay Cook "The Triumph and Trials of Materialism (1900-1945)" in *The Illustrated History of Canada,* ed. Craig Brown (Kingston, ON: McGill Queen's University Press, 2012), 442.

[17] United Kingdom, *Statue of Westminster*.

[18] C. P. Stacey, *Canada and the Age of Conflict Volume 2: 1921-1948 The Mackenzie King Era* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 237-264; Prime Minister Mackenzie King, letter to King George, accessed 14 September, 2018, http://data2.collectionscanada.gc.ca/ap/c/c140955.jpg.

[19] The Army Permanent Force totaled 4,200 personnel equipped with two light tanks and five mortars. The Royal Canadian Navy, equipped with six destroyers and four minesweepers totaled 1,990. The Royal Canadian Air Force, operating 270 aircraft sat at a strength of 4000 personnel. T. Robert Fowler, *Courage Rewarded: The Valour of Canadian Soldiers Under Fire 1900-2007* (Victoria, BC: Trafford Publishing, 2009), 141; Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, 177; National Air Force Museum of Canada, "Royal Canadian Air Force (1925-1968)" National Air Force Museum of Canada, accessed October 23, 2018, http://airforcemuseum.ca/en/the-display-gallery/royal-canadian-air-force-1924-1968.

[20] By War's end Canada managed to field another Canadian Corps, boasted the fourth largest allied air force, and the world's third largest navy. Alfred Leroy Burt, *A Short History of Canada for Americans* (Minneapolis MN: The University of Minnesota Press, 1944), 292; Hugh A. Halliday, "Canada's Air Force in War and Peace," Canadian War Museum, accessed January 20, 2018 http://www.warmuseum.ca/learn/dispatches/#tabs; Roger Sarty, "The Royal Canadian Navy and the Battle of the Atlantic, 1939-1945," Canadian War Museum, accessed January 20, 2018, http://www.warmuseum.ca/learn/dispatches/#tabs.

[21] Canada provided material support to the U.S., Great Britain, and Russia. Andre Siegfried, *Canada: An International Power*, trans. Doris Hemming (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1947), 249.

supported by the Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF), went from escorting allied shipping to commanding the Western Atlantic in 1943 effectively neutralizing the German U-Boat threat.[22] The RCAF operating in Europe went from flying the outdated twin-engine Wellington with a survivability rate of one in three crews in 1942, to flying the new Lancaster bomber with the record for best accuracy and fewest casualties in the British 6 Group by the end of 1944.[23] The CA, after losing half of its fighting force at Dieppe, evolved to adopt combined arms warfare based on infantry equipped with anti-tank weapons, supported by tanks and artillery to seize and hold terrain. The Italian Campaign put this new style of warfare to the test.[24] Hard won battles in places like Sicily, San Leonardo, and Ortona revived the reputation of Canadians as effective and formidable soldiers.[25]

The CAF, enabled by political desire and supported by the nation, solidified its international image during World War II. Afterwards, motivated by a desire to return to normalcy much like the end of World War I, Canada again reduced its military strength to below 40,000 personnel. With a recovering economy Canadians again perceived no major threat to their security, thus chose to focus on improving their lives, rather than fighting for them.

---

[22] After acquiring the B-24 Liberator long-range bomber between 1943 ad 1945, the RCAF integrated and provided effective support to the RCN in the mid-Atlantic. By war's end, Canada destroyed twenty-seven U-Boats with the majority sunk east of the 35th meridian. Nicholas Tracy, *A Two Edged-Sword: The Navy as an Instrument of Canadian Foreign Policy* (Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012), 78-79; Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, 200.

[23] Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, 206-207.

[24] Robert Engen, *Canadians Under Fire: Infantry Effectiveness in the Second World War* (Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009).

[25] Canada, Veterans Affairs Canada, "Canadians in Italy," last modified October 23, 2014, accessed January 25, 2018, https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/history/second-world-war/canada-and-the-second-world-war/canit; Michael O'Leary, The Regimental Rogue, "Battle Honours of the Canadian Army; The Royal Canadian Regiment 4th Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment," accessed January 25, 2019, http://regimentalrogue.com/battlehonours/bathnrinf/01-rcr.htm; Michael O'Leary, The Regimental Rogue, "Battle Honours of the Canadian Army: Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry," accessed January 25, 2019, http://regimentalrogue.com/battlehonours/bathnrinf/02-ppcli.htm.

Beyond establishing the enduring legacy of Canadian soldiers, sailors, and aviators in combat, Canada's military history until the end of World War II is foundational to Canada's way of war. It demonstrates the intricacies of civil-military relationships and the role of the military in achieving national security. The history highlights how the military, even when limited in capability and size, possessed the ability to grow and perform in order to meet strategic and political goals. This military tradition continued into the Cold War where the CAF, despite resource constraints and competing political priorities, continued to accomplish its missions in an evolving global security environment.

Civil-Military Relationships during the Cold War

Two major military contributions during the Cold War period demonstrate the impact of policy on the CAF's operational goals and capacity. The first was Canada's contributions to peace support operations around the world, and the second was Canada's participation in NATO in Europe to deter Soviet aggression. Throughout the Cold War the CAF was consistently equipped and employed for these missions in a manner consistent with public desire and needs, reflecting policy choices balanced against competing priorities.

With the advent of the Cold War, military reductions expected from the end of World War II were short-lived, with the GoC tripling the defense budget to 1.45 billion Canadian dollars (CAD) in 1950 and doubling the size of the Active Force to 105,000 by 1951.[26] The increase supported the commitment of a brigade to the United Nations (UN)-led efforts in the Korean War and Canada's contributions to NATO to deter growing Soviet aggression in Europe. During this period, public support for the maintenance of a large standing military began to wane while interest in the preservation of international peace and security increased. Canada's first foray into

[26] When accounting for inflation $1.45 Billion CAD in 1950 is equivalent to approximately $1.5 Trillion CAD in 2019, or $1.1 Trillion USD. Jack Granatstein, *Canada's Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 321; InflationTool.com, "Value of 1950 Canadian Dollar today," accessed January 7, 2019, https://www.inflationtool.com/canadian-dollar/1950-to-present-value?amount=145000000000.

UN missions came in 1947 when two officers went to Korea to supervise elections.[27] Participation in four more missions came between 1947 and the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) in the Suez in 1956, considered the world's first peacekeeping mission.[28]

Lester B. Pearson, then Canada's Secretary of External Affairs and later Prime Minster, played a crucial role in establishing the peacekeeping force in the Suez Crisis, winning him the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957. [29] This experience helped cement for Canadians the perception of their soldiers as peacekeepers. Canadians are proud of the fact the CAF participated in all UN missions from the Suez Crisis to 1993.[30] Most operations during this time were relatively stable and uneventful peacekeeping missions in relatively low risk environments. [31] Soldiers often

---

[27] Scott Taylor, ed., *Canada at War and Peace, II: A Millennium of Military* Heritage (Ottawa, ON: Esprit de Corps Books, 2001), 381.

[28] UNEF is considered the first peacekeeping mission because it was the first to use military personnel to supervise the withdrawal of forces and create a buffer zone to supervise impartially the ceasefire. United Nations, "Middle East — UNEF I: Background," accessed September 26, 2018, https://peacekeeping.un.org/mission/past/unef1backgr1.html.

[29] Lester B. Pearson became Prime Minister in 1963. The Nobel Prize, "Lester Bowles Pearson Facts," accessed September 20, 2018, https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/1957/pearson/facts/.

[30] Taylor, *Canada at War and Peace*, 381-389; Canada History, "Peace Keepers," accessed September 25, 2018, http://www.canadahistory.com/sections/war/Peace%20Keepers/peacekeeping.html; United Nations, "List of Peacekeeping Operations 1948-2013," accessed September 24, 2018, https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/operationslist.pdf.

[31] The terms peacekeeping and peace enforcement fall under the wider all-encompassing term peace support operations. Peace support operations make "use of diplomatic, civil and military means, normally in pursuit of United Nations (UN) Charter purposes and principles, to restore or maintain peace." "Peacekeeping is a technique to preserve the peace, however fragile, where fighting has been halted, and to assist in implementing agreements. Peace enforcement involves the application, with the authorization of the Security Council, of a range of coercive measures, including the use of military force . . . to restore international peace and security in situations where the Security Council has determined the existence of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression." Often peacekeeping missions are associated with UN missions authorized under Chapter VI of the UN Charter and the "Pacific Settlement of Disputes" while Peace enforcement are connected to Chapter VI dealing with "Action with Respect to Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression." However, these types of missions are mutually supporting and not directly tied to any Chapter of the UN Charter. The United Nations Security Council assesses and authorizes each mission on a case-by-case basis based on a number of supporting factors. Canada, Chief of the Land Staff, B-GL-300-001/FP-001 *Land Operations*, (Ottawa, ON: Department of National Defence, 2008), 3-10; United Nations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines* (New York: Department of Peacekeeping Operations, 2010), 17-20, accessed January 25, 2019, https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/peacekeeping/en/capstone_eng.pdf; Harvey J. Langholtz, ed. *Principles and Guidelines for UN Peacekeeping Operations* (Williamsburg, VA: Peace Operations Training Institute, 2010), 16, accessed January 25, 2019,

supervised buffer zones or disarmament activities at the request of all parties involved. Because of the relatively static nature of these operations, Canada did not need large fighting forces, and was able to reap international recognition for little extra cost or threat to its soldiers. Despite the pride Canadians felt for such missions, international peacekeeping was "in reality a side show."[32] Even amidst fiscal constraints and public focus elsewhere, Canada's NATO contributions trumped other mission sets.

In 1957, the Canadian economy slowed, and Canada's military commitments dropped in priority as the government attempted to control spending.[33] This fiscally constrained environment drove the search for cost-saving measures in maintaining international relationships that supported national security. The result was an inward focus designed to discover better ways to manage DND and eliminate operating inefficiencies while maximizing the return on defense investments.

The 1962 *Royal Commission on Government Organization*, often referred to as the Glassco Report, captured the inefficiencies of DND.[34] It highlighted a large administrative tail supporting three independent services and the triplication of many services and functions. Furthermore, it outlined coordination problems created by having a Chiefs of Staff Committee chaired by an officer with no command authority over the three lower ranked service chiefs, each of whom had direct access to the Minister of National Defence (MND).[35] In 1964 MND Paul

---

http://cdn.peaceopstraining.org/course_promos/principles_and_guidelines/principles_and_guidelines_english.pdf.

[32] Jeffery, *Inside Canadian Forces Transformation*, 2.

[33] Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 349.

[34] The common title "Glassco Report" refers to the name of the report's Chairman, J. Grant Glassco.

[35] In addition to the three Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman, the committee also included the Chairman of the Defence Research Board Canada. The Deputy Minister of National Defence as well as the Co-coordinator of the Joint Staff attended committee meetings although not considered members. With the establishment of the CDS, this organization evolved into the Armed Forces Council (AFC) that serves a similar function of coordinating advice and developmental efforts to meet expressed policy objectives. Canada, *The Royal Commission on Government Organization, Volume 4* (Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary: Ottawa, ON, 1962), 70; Canada, Canadian Armed Forces, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces:*

Hellyer released a defense policy *White Paper* capturing recommendations of the Glassco Report and initiated the "integration of the Armed Forces of Canada under a single Chief of the Defence Staff."[36] Receiving Royal Assent in 1968 the CF Reorganization Act, commonly referred to as CF Unification, amalgamated the RCN, RCAF, and CA into a single service — the Canadian Armed Forces. CF Unification was meant to contain inter-service rivalries while directing defense dollars through a unified organization to eliminate wasteful spending in the pursuit of national aims – particularly, the building and maintaining of a credible fighting force.[37] In addition to identifying cost savings, the 1964 *White Paper* outlined the employment of the military, particularly through NATO. Canada, as a member of NATO, could garner disproportionate security for the size of its contribution. The aim was to present Canada as a reliable partner while "ration[ing] its commitments" without overburdening the Canadian population.[38]

The 1964 defense policy set Canada's precedent of establishing an international presence to increase security without drastically increasing costs.[39] However, limited resources still forced deliberate choices by the MND and the GoC. Minister Hellyer recognized the size of any military contribution would be modest, but that Canada had "an obligation to make that contribution."[40] The need for options to "effectively contribute to collective strength" shifted policy towards

Leading the Institution (Canada: Canadian Defence Academy — Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2007), accessed January 31, 2018. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/dn-nd/D2-313-5-2007-eng.pdf, 54.

[36] Canada, Department of National Defence, *White Paper on Defence* (Ottawa, ON: Queen's Printer, 1964), 19.

[37] Canada, Department of National Defence, *White Paper on Defence* (1964), 19.

[38] Ibid., 6.

[39] Ibid., 21.

[40] Ibid., 12.

developing versatile forces capable of employment across the spectrum of conflict in a variety of collective security tasks, peace support operations, or other emergencies.[41]

CF Unification was an opportunity to cut redundant defense costs and instill more structural and procedural rigor to the Canadian defense organization. Reorganizing the separate services into a single service increased political oversight and control of military actions to ensure responsiveness to policy goals (though defense was generally not a high political priority). However, while the initiative met strategic and political needs, from an operational perspective "the results of unification were largely cosmetic."[42] Unification did not create a functional structure that "permits effective employment at the operational level."[43] The election of a new government only exacerbated this problem.

Shortly after CF Unification, newly elected Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, renowned for not having "the slightest interest in or appreciation of the Canadian Forces," froze the defense budget in 1968.[44] In the face of increasing inflation rates, this meant current defense dollars could not stretch as far and the capabilities and equipment promised in 1964 were no longer possible. Trudeau remained in office until 1984, extending the funding issues for the military.[45] From 1963

---

[41] Based on the need to maintain a presence in NATO Canada kept the Brigade Group stationed in Germany and the Air Division in France and Germany. In addition to this an additional two brigades remained in Canada for deployment in the event of any hostile actions in the Europe. The plan for the brigades in Canada was to transform them into a mobile force that would rotate through the NATO commitment and provide flexibility with a secondary task of employment on UN peacekeeping operations. An additional brigade converted into a special service force that was slightly smaller but more rapidly deployable by air to conduct a variety of military tasks on short notice. When augmented with additional tactical and strategic airlift the CAF was to become a flexible and mobile force whose employment could range from the defense of Canada to rapid support for UN Missions. Ibid., 11, 13, 21-24.

[42] J. S. Dewar, "The Impact of the Evolution of the Operational Level of War on the Structure of the Canadian Forces: A Sailor's Perspective," in *The Operational Art*, eds. English et al., 212.

[43] Ibid., 220.

[44] Jack Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* (Toronto, ON: HarperPerennialCanada, 2004), 84, 97.

[45] Progressive Conservative Joe Clark briefly interrupted Pierre Trudeau's time as Prime Minister in 1979 whose stint as Prime Minister was short lived with a no confidence vote on the first budget, followed by the re-election of Pierre Trudeau. This instance of a no confidence vote in the House of Commons, who represents the Canadian people, only reinforces the views of the Canadian people at the time, who through this action supported the policies of the Liberal government.

onward, there was an almost constant decline of the national defense budget from 3.6 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) down to 2.1 percent in 1983.[46]

Believing the commitment to NATO reduced Canadian sovereignty by overly influencing Canadian foreign and military policy, Trudeau contemplated a complete withdrawal of the CAF from Europe. Trudeau's Defence Minister, Léo Cadieux on the other hand, saw the value of Canada's NATO commitments and talked the Prime Minister into a reduction of forces instead of a complete withdrawal.[47] The decision reduced the 10,000 strong force Canada sent to Germany and Western Europe — part of the British Army of the Rhine since 1951 — to 3,000 personnel and moved it to Lahr in Southern Germany. [48] The reduction, however, enabled the GoC to equip Canadian forces in Europe with more modern equipment. The CAF purchased 128 Leopard C1 main battle tanks as well as CF-18 Hornet fighter-bombers by 1979 enabling Canada's forces to keep pace with its allies and improve NATO's overall capabilities. The contribution of combat capable forces to NATO's deterrence efforts in Europe remained an explicit priority up to 1994.

Contributions to NATO and secondary efforts in support of UN operations demonstrate how the GoC applied the Canadian way of war during the Cold War. Despite the competing priorities, the GoC maintained its commitment to collective defense and the forward defense of Canada through contributions to NATO. The collapse of the Soviet Union, though, changed the geo-political landscape again, requiring Canada to adjust how it employed the military to meet new security needs.

---

[46] The World Bank, "Military Expenditures (% of GDP)," accessed January 29, 2019, https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.GD.ZS?locations=CA.

[47] Granatstein, *Who Killed The Canadian Military*? 115-117.

[48] Canada's initial contribution consisted of an infantry brigade group, an air division made up of 300 aircraft and 40 warships, with additional reinforcements identified for use if war broke out. Dean F. Oliver, "Canada and NATO," Canadian War Museum, accessed November 1, 2018, https://www.warmuseum.ca/learn/dispatches/canada-and-nato/#tabs.

The ‘Decade of Darkness:’ 1990-2001

The end of the Cold War marked the beginning of a new world order. The conventional threat posed by the Soviets had provided focus and meaning for Canadian defense policy, producing relatively stable plans to combat the Eastern bloc through alliances and organizations such as NATO, and NORAD. With the end of the major threat, Canada now sought a “peace dividend.”[49] The GoC’s subsequent defense cuts reduced the CAF’s size, capabilities, and funding: soldiers received severance packages, vehicles such as tanks and Chinook helicopters were removed from equipment fleets, and several military installations were closed.

The 1990s commonly referred to as Canada’s “Decade of Darkness” saw a continued drop in the defense budget to a low of 1.21 percent of GDP.[50] While defense spending continued to drop, the Gulf War demonstrated the impact of previous political choices. The collapse of the Soviet Union re-ordered the global environment and Canada was forced to re-assess it priorities to ensure its continued relevance and security.

Military equipment purchased during the Cold War was aging, choices to forego investment in new capabilities now constrained Canada’s ability to employ armed force. The Gulf War demonstrated both this limited capacity and how the GoC made strategic choices to ensure Canada could contribute in a meaningful fashion and to ensure that it remained a relevant partner. Standing with its allies and the majority of the international community, Canada deployed forces to the Persian Gulf to counter Iraq’s occupation of Kuwait. In August of 1990, the RCN upgraded the defensive capabilities of three ships to guard against Iraqi threats and sent them to the Arabian

[49] A peace dividend is “a portion of funds made available for nondefense spending by a reduction in the defense budget (as after a war). Merriam-Webster, “peace dividend’ accessed January 29, 2019, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/peace%20dividend.

[50] Gloria Galloway, “Hillier decries military’s ‘decade of darkness,’” *The Globe and Mail*, last updated April 25, 2018, accessed January 25, 2019, https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/hillier-decries-militarys-decade-of-darkness/article20393158/; The World Bank, “Military Expenditures (% of GDP).”

Gulf as part of the Allied Maritime Interdiction Force.[51] Additional contributions encompassed a squadron of CF-18 fighters, in-theatre transportation and air-to-air refueling assets, and a field hospital deployed to Saudi Arabia as part of Operation Friction, all commanded by a joint force headquarters.[52] Beyond the fighter aircraft, which engaged in combat air patrols and escort duties, the Canadian operation provided integral, yet peripheral, support to the overall coalition main effort. Distinctly absent from Canada's contribution was a significant land formation capable of maneuvering alongside or as part of major allied contingents.

Modern armored or mechanized forces commensurate with the American, British, or French coalition simply were not available in 1991.[53] In particular, Canada's aging Leopard tanks were inferior to the US Abrams and British Challenger tanks.[54] Moreover, the logistics of deploying the brigade group from Canada's forces in Europe (which was the best equipped) were too great a hurdle. Even with the creation of a joint force headquarters, commanding Canadian elements from all three environments, the state of command and control structures and relationships and military equipment precluded the practice of any independent Canadian operations.

In addition to the high intensity conflict of Operation Desert Storm, Canadians now found themselves in more volatile and aggressive peace support operations under the auspices of the UN and NATO. Operations in the Former Yugoslavia as a part of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) from 1992 to 1995 provide a sample of the changing character of military

[51] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Forces, "Details/Information for the Canadian Forces (CF) Operation FRICTION," accessed October 1, 2018, http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/od-bdo/me-mo/FRICTION-eng.asp.

[52] Canada, Veterans Affairs Canada, "The Canadian Armed Forces and the Gulf War," accessed October 2, 2018, http://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/history/canadian-armed-forces/persian-gulf.

[53] Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* 5.

[54] Frank Mass, "'From Beetle to Porsche:' The Purchase of the Leopard C1 Tank for the Canadian Army," *Canadian Military Journal* 16, no. 4 (Autumn 2016): 25.

operations experienced by Canadian soldiers.[55] Poignant among the actions with UNPROFOR was the weeklong battle of the Medak Pocket in September 1993, where Canadian soldiers fought directly against Croatian forces to impose the UN mandate.

In April 1992, Canada contributed a battle group to UNPROFOR under Operation Harmony. The Canadian Battalion, nicknamed CANBAT I, began operations in the United Nations Protection Area Sector West, operating checkpoints and conducting patrols to monitor a UN imposed ceasefire in Croatia. In March 1993 a second rotation arrived based on the Second Battalion, Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry (2 PPCLI) – soon regarded in the eyes of all belligerents as "being fair, but tough."[56] The fact the CANBATs deployed with a full complement of infantry weapons and equipment undoubtedly helped form its reputation.[57]

Canada's reputation and firepower was a major factor in the UNPROFOR Commander, French General Cot, reassigning 2 PPCLI to the more volatile Sector South in September 1993. 2 PPCLI, reinforced with two French Companies was charged with implementing a cease-fire between the Croatian Army and Serb irregular forces in a disputed region South of Gospić, near the village of Medak where the exchange of small arms, mortars and artillery fire was commonplace. Upon entering the Medak Pocket on September 9, 1993 it became clear the Croatian 9th Lika Wolves Guards Brigade, complete with its own artillery and T-72 main battle tanks, were unwilling to let UN or Serb forces into the area without a fight. For the next eight

[55] United Nations, Department of Public Information, "Former Yugoslavia – UNPROFOR," last modified September 1996, accessed January 25, 2019, http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unprof_b.htm; Canada, Veterans Affairs Canada, "UN Protection Force (Yugoslavia) (UNPROFOR)," last modified May 10, 2017, accessed January 25, 2019, https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/medals-decorations/details/149.

[56] Lee Windsor, "The Medak Pocket: Professional Soldiers' Discipline and Aggressive Use of the Camera," in *Fortune Favours the Brave: Tales of Courage and Tenacity in Canadian Military History*, ed. Bernd Horn (Toronto, ON: Dundurn Press, 2009), 342.

[57] The infantry battle group companies came complete with C-6 machine guns and 84-mm Carl Gustav anti-tank weapons. The battle group's Combat Support Company rounded out the capabilities with a platoon of 81-mm mortars and a platoon of TOW (Tube-Launched, Optically-tracked, Wire-guided) anti-tank missiles mounted on armored personnel carriers. Ibid., 343.

days, the out-gunned and out-numbered 2 PPCLI continued to exchange fire with the Croatians in Canada's largest battle since Korea. [58] The Commanding Officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Jim Calvin, finally ended the battle by bringing media to a meeting with the senior Croatian liaison officer at a roadblock displaying to the world what was happening. Doing so forced Croatian capitulation and secured access to the salient on September 17.[59]

UNPROFOR provided the CAF excellent lessons on the types of equipment and capabilities needed to fulfill mission mandates in the post-Cold War era. Unfortunately, these lessons were not widely shared with the Canadian population. The first media story of Medak Pocket appeared in 1996, and it was addressed in by a House of Commons Standing Committee on Defence and Veteran's Affairs hearing in 1998.[60] But it was not until the end of 2002 when the 2 PPCLI Battle Group received a Commander-In-Chief's Unit Commendation from then Governor General Adrienne Clarkson that the event became widely known.[61] Events in the Medak Pocket had the potential to display to the Canadian public an image of its soldiers as combatants, in stark contrast to that of peacekeepers in much more mundane settings. But while Canadian soldiers increasingly found themselves harm's way, public perception of the CAF was being shaped in a different way.

---

[58] Of note, 2 PPCLI already shipped their 81-mm mortars back to Canada in anticipation of the unit rotating out of theatre severely degrading their indirect fire capabilities. The only indirect assets remaining were the 60mm hand held mortars. The standard allotment was one mortar per rifle platoon, which could be grouped at the company level. Ibid., 347.

[59] For a detailed account of the Medak Pocket, see Carol Off, *The Ghosts of Medak Pocket: The Story of Canada's Secret War* (Toronto, ON: Vintage Canada, 2005).

[60] Parliament of Canada, House of Commons Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings (Meeting No 51)," April 27, 1998, accessed January 25, 2019, http://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/36-1/NDVA/meeting-51/minutes; Windsor, "The Medak Pocket," 333.

[61] Adrienne Clarkson, "Her Excellency the Right Honourable Adrienne Clarkson Speech on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Commander-in-Chief Unit Commendation to the 2nd Battalion, Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry Battle Group," Governor General of Canada, December 1, 2002, accessed January 26, 2019 http://archive.gg.ca/media/doc.asp?lang=e&DocID=1036.

In August 1992 the GoC announced it would provide support to the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM). Then CDS, General John de Chastelain expressed a desire to provide a rapid response, while balancing commitments to the former Yugoslavia. To meet this intent the CA, then called Mobile Command, offered a battle group based on the Canadian Airborne Regiment (CAR).[62] Arriving at the end of December 1992, the CAR occupied the Belet Huen Humanitarian Relief Sector, North of Mogadishu. Belet Huen, with no functioning government or police forces, was an unstable region known for "extortion and complicated clan politics."[63] In addition to the difficulty of pacifying the lawless region, the CAR suffered from frequent attempts by Somalis to infiltrate their camp and steal anything possible.

Frustrated by ongoing theft, the CAR made attempts to catch the thieves in action. On March 4, 1993, members of the CAR's reconnaissance platoon shot two Somalis in the back, one of whom died.[64] Within two weeks, on March 16, soldiers from 2 Commando captured Somali teenager Shidane Arone in the compound adjacent to the Canadian camp. Following orders allowing prisoners to be "abused," two CAR soldiers took Arone to a nearby bunker.[65] Over the next several hours Arone was repeatedly tortured and eventually killed. Despite the loud screams, none of the officers or senior non-commissioned officers in the vicinity intervened on the teenager's behalf. A board of inquiry was soon held to examine the events leading to Arone's murder.

---

[62] The Canadian Airborne Regiment was reinforced with an armored reconnaissance squadron (equivalent to company size) from the Royal Canadian Dragoons (RCD), mortar platoon from 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment (1 RCR), and 2 Combat Engineer Regiment (2 CER). Peter Kasurak, *A National Force: The Evolution of Canada's Army, 1950-2000* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2013), 244.

[63] Ibid., 245.

[64] Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia, *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair, Executive Summary* (Ottawa, ON: Minster of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997), accessed January 26, 2019, http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/bcp-pco/CP32-66-1997-eng.pdf, ES-34.

[65] Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia, *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair,* vol. 5 (Ottawa, ON: Minster of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997), 1276.

Subsequent media coverage of the CAR displayed videos of soldiers making racist remarks and partaking in hazing rituals compounded the effects of the board of inquiry. The initial investigation and the videos raised claims of rampant racism, alcohol abuse, poor leadership and discipline, and attempted cover-ups. The resulting public outrage forced MND David Collenette to announce the disbandment of the CAR in January 1995. General de Chastelain, while not happy with the decision, acknowledged, "it [the CAR] had lost the confidence of the country."[66] While the majority of the military continued to serve honorably on international operations "for many Canadians the Somalia Affair became a symbol of their armed forces in the 1990s."[67]

While the fallout from Somalia continued the CAF maintained its international presence, particularly in the Balkans. In the latter half of the decade Canada continued to provide battle group sized formations in support of NATO's International Force (IFOR) from 1995-1996, the follow on Stabilization Force (SFOR) from 1996 to 2004 and Kosovo Force (KFOR) from 1999 to 2000. As funding remained constrained, the CAF continued its best to remain a relevant force and maintaining international presence in the new global order. That environment changed again on September 11, 2001.

The Breaking Point: Afghanistan Pre-Transformation

Canada's initial military response to 9/11 was limited. Yet, despite being stretched thin, the CAF managed to put together a force to support the United States in the War against Terror. By 2002, the CAF's contribution to Operation Enduring Freedom was a light infantry battalion based on the Third Battalion PPCLI (3 PPCLI), attached to the 187th Brigade Combat Team of the 101st Airborne Division for United States Operation Anaconda. The RCN contributed a full

[66] John de Chastelain, quoted in, "Disgraced airborne regiment disbanded," *UPI Archives*, accessed January 26, 2019, https://www.upi.com/Archives/1995/01/23/Disgraced-airborne-regiment-disbanded/5605790837200/.

[67] Windsor, "The Medak Pocket," 336.

naval Task Group in the Arabian Sea and another frigate as part of a United States Aircraft Carrier Battle Group under Operation Altair.[68] While these forces were relatively small, Canada was still contributing and supporting a major ally, commensurate with its way of war. The major problem was that the CAF had reached a breaking point.

Balanced with all the ongoing operations in the Balkans and the commitment of an additional 2,500 soldiers to Operation Apollo in Kabul beginning in 2003, the CA was unable to generate a second battle group to replace 3 PPCLI in support of Operation Anaconda. The RCAF's fleet of C-130 Hercules aircraft was at the end of its life cycle and suffered from major maintenance issues resulting in extensive efforts to keep them in the air. The RCN experienced difficulty sustaining its destroyers and frigates at sea and required an operational pause in June 2003.[69] The CAF lacked the required sustainment capabilities to support its own ground forces and was reliant on US and other allied support to function.[70] If Canada wanted to remain a trusted and competent ally capable of properly supporting its allies, it was clear something needed to change.

Chapter 3: Canadian Forces Transformation

After years of restrained funding, the War in Afghanistan demonstrated the CAF's inability to operate independently and in a more volatile context than previous peace support operations. Previous efforts to enhance and sustain operational capabilities by adopting United States doctrine in turn challenged and misrepresented Canada's way of war. In 2005, the GoC deliberately re-focused its national security policy to address operational shortcomings, leading to

[68] The full naval Task Group consisted of three frigates, a destroyer, and a replenishment ship. Canada, "History of Canada's Engagement in Afghanistan 2001-2014," last modified, June 19, 2014, accessed January 28, 2019, https://www.international.gc.ca/afghanistan/history-histoire.aspx?lang=eng.

[69] Canada, "History of Canada's Engagement in Afghanistan 2001-2014"; Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military*? 171-172.

[70] Rick Hillier, *A Soldier First: Bullets, Bureaucrats and the Politics of War* (Toronto, ON: HarperCollins, 2009), 109.

CF Transformation championed by newly appointed CDS General Rick Hillier. Concomitant with these changes were efforts to pursue operational art within the Canadian context.

Interpreting Decline

Canada's performance in the World Wars solidified the heroic image of the Canadian soldier and Canada's way of war. But following the collapse of the Soviet Union, a narrative evolved asserting civil-military relationships had undermined Canada's military power and capacity to provide for Canada's security. This view of "decline" was grounded on the numerous cuts to equipment and funding sustained by the CAF.

A prominent advocate for a declining Canadian military is historian Jack Granatstein, who sees the beginning of the Cold War as the apogee of Canadian military power.[71] In his book, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* Granatstein provides a detailed, yet succinct overview of the civil-military debates and decisions since CF Unification. Granatstein ascribes the "death" of Canada's military to the "disconnect between the military and the politicians" representative of the incongruent relationship between the CAF and the Canadian public who the politicians represent.[72] Granatstein asserts the Canadian population's belief in values and discounting of military and diplomatic capabilities ignores the fact that military force is for fighting and winning wars to protect national interests.[73]

Advocates of 'decline' commonly focus on the defense budget. Douglas Bland discusses the impact of a decreasing defense budget on the development of military capabilities in his book *Canada Without Armed Forces?* His thesis revolves around the impact of not investing capital funds towards their intended purpose of force development and procurement. Bland demonstrates the CAFs history of spending capital investment funds to support current operations and

---

[71] Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* 15-16.

[72] Ibid., 1.

[73] The notion of values is explained in more detail below. Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military*? 204.

maintenance budgets. He characterizes the problem of spending money earmarked for future capabilities on current equipment as a "national crisis of the future force" where there has been neither enough attention nor funding provided to support the development of credible military capabilities in the future.[74]

Implicit in these decline narratives is a pejorative sentiment stemming from resentment of limited military budgets and degradation of capabilities. But it is more beneficial to understand governmental choices as a deliberate balancing of military capabilities with competing priorities to meet the needs and desires of the Canadian population. Most important is the fact that these choices reflect Canada's way of war, and the CAF has always achieved what the GoC has asked of it. CF Unification increased the level of "discord and controversy" between the CAF and the GoC as pointed out by Granatstein and his followers.[75] The GoC was aware of the impact of choices on the military yet continued to limit funding best seen as a political readjustment in line with Canada's broader way of war. Without major support for large military capabilities, the GoC limited resources in order to support other initiatives demonstrating the primacy of Canadian political will over the development of military power. Even with a deliberate limiting of capabilities, the CAF still achieved assigned national defense aims.

Additionally, Canadians' tendency to put values first drives defense choices and is a fundamental component of the Canadian way of war.[76] In Canada, popular support and values

---

[74] Douglas L. Bland, ed, *Canada Without Armed Forces* (Kingston, ON: Queen's University, School of Policy Studies, 2004), xi.

[75] Daniel Gosselin, "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old – Part One," *Canadian Military Journal* 9 no. 2 (2009): 6, accessed September 27, 2018, http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo9/no2/03-gosselin-eng.asp#n3.

[76] The GoCs, *Securing an Open Society: Canada's National Security Policy* from 2004 captures well enduring Canadian values. The 2004 policy identifies some of Canada's most prevalent values as "a deep attachment to democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and pluralism . . . openness to ideas and innovations, and to people from every part of the world . . . and a steadfast rejection of intolerance, extremism and violence." Canada's strong participation in numerous international peace support operation demonstrates the commitment to these values. Canada, Privy Council Office, *Securing an Open Society: Canada's National Security Policy* (Ottawa, ON: Privy Council Office, 2004), 1.

play an important role in what the nation does with its limited tax dollars. The Glassco Report highlighted this relationship, stating the money spent by the government "is not departmental money as of right, but public money, and the ultimate test of its spending is not of its legality but of its effectiveness in the view of the public."[77] Thus, when compared to other political initiatives such as bilingualism, or social welfare, defense and security drop in overall national priority. The key is striking a proper balance and maintaining a military force sufficient to achieve what the nation asks of it.

Proponents of decline harp on Canada's failure to always maintain the military capacity to conduct large-scale combat operations akin to major allies. But Canada has retained the ability to contribute. Based on the numerous collective defense agreements there has not always been a need to develop national operational capabilities. Providing tactical level forces to coalitions has met broader strategic and political aims. When Granatstein and others decry Canada's lack of military capabilities in certain periods, they judge past events out of context. While not every military capability required at the outset of a conflict was available, the CAF always met the underlying strategic goal of participating in some fashion. Political goals of contribution aside, the way Canada has thought about defense has always affected the ability of the CAF to employ and command its own forces above the tactical level. While the policy benefits of CF Unification came at the cost of operational level effectiveness, such was not important for the GoC political goals, which the CAF continued to meet effectively for many years thereafter. This said, the criticisms of the 'decline' authors were not without merit, and were important when the GoC realized the CAF required greater operational capacities in 2004 – and in particular for helping to generate a Canadian view of operational art required to meet strategic goals.

[77] Canada, *The Royal Commission on Government Organization, Volume 1; Management of the Public Service* (Ottawa, ON: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1962), 51.

The choices made by the GoC, while consistent with Canada's way of war and political priorities, impacted the CAF's capabilities. With a declining economy, departmental choices were between new equipment or using the capital money to subsidize recurring operations and maintenance costs. Nationally, the defense budget was secondary to other government initiatives and "most Canadian governments have provided for their defence policies whatever is available after domestic policies are satisfied."[78] The deliberate choice to spend investment money stifled the procurement and development of modern military equipment that would allow Canada to keep pace with its major allies in the event of high tempo or violent conflicts. From this viewpoint, the scope of participation in the Gulf War and Afghanistan demonstrate the pitfalls of not investing in the future force.

Recovering

There is no doubt Canadian military capabilities suffered during the "decade of darkness." The cuts applied however, were a necessity to ensure domestic priorities were satisfied and that Canadians at home were cared for. Temporary pain for the military resulted in domestic stability and future prosperity for the nation. The time for recovery came with the election of Prime Minister Paul Martin in 2003. In 2005, the GoC released *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World* that set the stage for future change. The policy explained how past neglect of international instruments was a necessary decision that allowed Canada to get "its domestic house in order."[79] Understanding the impact of previous reductions, the GoC then set a course based on Canada's now "robust economy and sound public finances" to increase Canadian capabilities and international influence in the new, more volatile global environment.[80]

---

[78] Bland, *Canada Without Armed Forces*, xvi.

[79] Canada, *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World: Overview* (Ottawa, ON: Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2005), 1.

[80] Ibid.

The 2005 policy provided a clear message to Canadians that in order to maintain international influence Canada needed to do more. The new global environment created new challenges to Canada's security, prosperity and the quality of life of Canadians and emerging threats such as terrorism made these problems tangible for every citizen.[81] A chapter dedicated to defense illustrated the planned military changes and reinforced in Canadians' minds the "threat of terrorism and the spillover effects from failed and failing states."[82] Key to maintaining Canada's security and international influence was "investing in a strong military."[83] With a new budget geared towards a sustainable defense program the stage was set to "expand the Canadian Forces and enhance operational sustainability" thereby creating "a more effective and more relevant military."[84]

The GoC vision, labeled CF Transformation was not to "replicate every function of the world's premier militaries."[85] Rather the focus was to make the military more effective, relevant and responsive, and capable of leadership both at home and abroad. Doing so required the maintenance of substantial military capabilities to ensure interoperability with Canada's allies.[86] Although not explicitly stated, the focus on readiness, equipment, and capabilities would allow Canada to fight with its allies at operational level of war. Generating this ability reshaped Canada's way of war to fit the conditions of the twenty-first century. While the concept of the operational level of war was not new, Canada's previous tactical level contributions and doctrine

[81] Paul Martin, "Forward from the Prime Minister," in *Canada's International Policy Statement.*

[82] Bill Graham, "Message from the Minister," in *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World - Defence* (Ottawa, ON: Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2005).

[83] Ibid., 3.

[84] Ibid., 4; Canada, Department of Finance, *The Budget Plan 2005* (Ottawa, ON: Her Majesty the Queen Right of Canada, 2005), accessed January 28, 2019, https://fin.gc.ca/budget05/pdf/bp2005e.pdf.

[85] Graham, "Message from the Minister," 11.

[86] Ibid.

development processes meant that Canada was not fully able to meet such operational goals prior to 2005.

The Operational Level of War and Operational Art

Late in the Cold War Canada began developing new doctrinal concepts to counter the Soviet threat. In 1979, the CA took the lead in the combat development process with a project named "Corps '86." This process examined the "concepts, organizations, materiel, doctrine, and training" needed for future forces.[87] The end concept was "a corps-sized formation based on mechanized infantry divisions that would fight a defensive battle, using infantry-heavy forces to stop and hold the enemy on a major obstacle and an armor-heavy mobile force to mount counter-moves."[88] US doctrine developed under General William E. Dupuy, the first commander of US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), heavily influenced the attritional nature of this concept. The 1976 edition of the US Army Field Manual FM 100-5 *Operations* sought to enable the United States to "win the first battle of the next war" by destroying an enemy who may be similarly equipped.[89]

Canada, expecting to fight alongside its American allies, accepted this premise to guide its development as well. However, the next commander of TRADOC, General Don Starry, championed a vastly different concept, released in the 1982 version of FM 100-5. Starry developed AirLand Battle doctrine based on a maneuverist approach designed to throw "the enemy off balance with powerful initial blows from unexpected directions and then following up rapidly to prevent his recovery."[90] To support this new construct, United States doctrine formally introduced the operational level of war as a theoretical construct to guide the planning and

---

[87] Kasurak, *A National Force*, 185.

[88] Ibid., *196.*

[89] US Department of the Army, *Field Manual (FM) 100-5, Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1976), 1-1

[90] US Department of the Army, *Field Manual (FM) 100-5, Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1982), 2-1

conduct of campaigns to "defeat an enemy force in a specified space and time with simultaneous and sequential battles."[91] The 1986 version modified the operational level construct to include the concept of operational art. The goal of operational art was to govern "the employment of military forces to attain strategic goals in a theater of war or theater of operations through the design, organization, and conduct of campaigns and major operations."[92] But the doctrine was incompatible with CAF's circumstances, in that it required capabilities that were "unimplementable due to the technical, financial, and political constraints" thus discordant with the Canadian way of war.[93]

To correct the misalignment Canada sought a revision of the Corps '86 project. A follow-on project named Corps' 96 began in 1986 to define future capabilities required for the 1996 to 2005 timeframe. Corps '96 attempted to rationalize the new operational level concepts taken from US doctrine, but failed to produce a truly detailed model to guide future development. The operational level of war and operational art, designed to connect tactics to strategy, were simply associated with the maneouvre of army or corps-level formations in order to achieve military strategic objectives within a specific theatre. On top of this strict adoption of foreign models, Corps '96 seemed to reaffirm the structures and capabilities asked for in Corps '86, relying on equipment that did not exist nor was likely to be approved by the GoC.[94]

Canada's doctrine development process seemed a whimsical exercise that lacked the introspection needed to develop military capabilities commensurate with Canada's way of war.

---

[91] The model scenario was to defeat the Russian Army in the limited space of the Fulda Gap. Ibid., 2-3.

[92] US Department of the Army, *Field Manual (FM) 100-5, Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, (1986), 10.

[93] To support AirLand Battle doctrine the US initiated the procurement of "the Big 5" capabilities: M1 Abrams tank, M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicle, the Patriot Air Defense System, the Blackhawk helicopter and the Apache attack helicopter. Landis Maddox, "Overcoming Multi-Domain Battle Sustainment Challenges though Demand Reduction Initiatives" (Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks: PA, 2018), accessed January 27, 2019, http://publications.armywarcollege.edu/pubs/3600.pdf, 3; Kasurak, *A National Force*, 197.

[94] Kasurak, *A National Force*, 212.-214.

Army colonel and historian Howard Coombs discusses the quick adoption and friction created by the CAF's approach to the operational level of war based on heavy US influence as the leading Western military power. [95] Key among Coombs' observations is that fact that adopting an operational level concept akin to the Americans was not properly nested "with developments that seemed to be taking place in Canadian defence plans and force structures."[96] In a similar vein, Peter Kasurak who specializes in the democratic control of security agencies, sums the issue up by saying "the attempt to design an army so far removed from political and financial support and without the necessary industrial capacity can only be described as a bizarre (though prolonged) episode of magical thinking."[97]

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the conclusion of the Gulf War only served to further the divide between doctrine and needed military capabilities, causing the CAF to drop the corps concept by 1994. The CAF found itself with a doctrinal gap that needed to filling. However, the multitude of peace support operations amidst the controversy of the Somalia Affair and ongoing budget cuts increasingly stretched the CAF thin. These circumstances created a culture focused on cost, rather than operational effectiveness, stalling the doctrine development process. CF Transformation enabled by the 2005 International Policy Statement provided the catalyst to initiate needed change.[98]

CF Transformation and Operational Focus

Guided by newly developed principles, CF Transformation ensured a viable and effective CAF ready to respond to Canada's needs in accordance with defense policy by properly aligning

[95] Coombs, "In the Wake of a Paradigm Shift: The Canadian Forces College and the Operational Level of War (1987-1995)," *Canadian Military Journal* 10, no. 2 (2010): 19-22.

[96] Coombs, "In the Wake of a Paradigm Shift," 23.

[97] Kasurak, *A National Force*, 287.

[98] In 1993 the Liberal government made plans to reduce the size of the CAF from 75,000 to 66,000 and cut $7 billion from the budget by 1998. Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 382.

resources, structures, and strategic guidance.[99] CF Transformation extended the fiscal benefits of CF Unification by developing an enhanced operational command and control structure.

Fresh out of commanding NATO's International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan in 2004, newly appointed CDS, General Hillier was aware of the operational hurdles caused by the CAFs climate, culture, command structure, and state of military equipment. Hillier however, now had the support of Prime Minister Paul Martin, whose ultimate goal was to make Canada a "greater player in the world."[100] As a result, the CAF received an influx of funds to revamp its operational capabilities and structure, creating a greater array of options for the GoC.

Prior to transformation, the Deputy Chief of the Defence Staff (DCDS) controlled all CAF operations on behalf of the CDS.[101] This had the effect of pulling the national headquarters down to the operational level. Countering this conflation required that the CDS and NDHQ refocus on strategy to create space for an operational-level command. CF Transformation created the Strategic Joint Staff (SJS) to realign the national headquarters and the associated governance structures to assist the CDS in strategic command and control of CAF operations and provide advice to the GoC.[102] The SJS, built out of the DCDS group, created the functional space for standing up new headquarters that assumed the latter's command functions for operations.

CF Transformation created four operational headquarters to replace the DCDS Group, responsible for employing and sustaining CAF forces both domestically and abroad. Canada Command and the Canadian Expeditionary Forces Command (CEFCOM), both led by a

---

[99] The specific principles are; Canadian Forces identity; command centric imperative; authorities, responsibilities and accountabilities; operational focus; and integrated regular reserve and civilian personnel. A full explanation of these principles is available in Jeffery, *Inside Canadian Forces Transformation*, 121 – 126; Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Report on Transformation 2011," accessed October 30, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about-reports-pubs/transformation-report-2011.page.

[100] Jeffery, *Inside Canadian Forces Transformation*, 22.

[101] Archeion, Archives Association of Ontario, "Canada. Dept. of National Defence. Deputy Chief of the Defence Staff," accessed October 29, 2018, https://www.archeion.ca/canada-dept-of-national-defence-deputy-chief-of-defence-staff.

[102] Jeffery, *Inside Canadian Forces Transformation*, 32.

lieutenant-general, were responsible for all maritime, land, and air forces in North America and overseas, respectively.[103] The Canadian Operational Support Command (CANOSCOM) provided the full range of combat service support functions and "national-level operational support for theatre activation, sustainment and termination of a CF operation" in support of Canada Command and CEFCOM.[104] Canadian Special Operations Forces Command (CANSOFCOM) mandate was to generate and deploy special operations forces around the globe. CANSOFCOM expanded the size of Canada's special operations forces capability based on Joint Task Force Two to include an additional three units.[105]

The shift of NDHQ to a strategic level headquarters and the creation of operational level commands was the first step to aligning its concept of operational art with the structure needed to practice it. Although it did not increase the overall size of the military, it allowed a more focused application of military forces to attain strategic objectives in specific theaters of operations. With the CDS better able to shape the strategic environment, supported by the SJS, operational commanders had more freedom to focus on applying specific military effort around the world.

---

[103] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Canada Command," Backgrounder, June 28, 2005, accessed 30 October, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=canada-command/hnocfoju; Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Canadian Expeditionary Forces Command (CEFCOM)," Backgrounder, September 13, 2005, accessed 29 October, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=canadian-expeditionary-forces-command-cefcom/hnocfofm.

[104] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Canadian Operational Support Command," Backgrounder, January 31, 2006, accessed October 30, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=canadian-operational-support-command/hnocfols.

[105] The CAF established Joint Task Force 2 (JTF 2) in 1993 when it assumed federal responsibility for hostage rescue and counterterrorism from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The events of 9/11 led to the employment of JTF 2 for the first time outside of Canada in major combat operations. Upon creation, CANSOFCOM assumed responsibility of the Canadian Army's Joint Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence Company, re-designated as the Canadian Joint Incident Response Unit, to provide a rapid chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear response. CANSOFCOM also assumed control of 427 Special Operations Aviation Squadron from the Royal Canadian Air Force to provide tactical aviation support to special operations task forces. Finally, CF Transformation saw the creation of the Canadian Special Operations Regiment (CSOR) whose lineage traces back to the U.S. and Canadian combined First Special Service Force. Canada, Government of Canada, "Special Operations Forces organizations structure," last modified April 25, 2018, accessed October 30, 2018, https://www.canada.ca/en/special-operations-forces-command/corporate/organizational-structure.html.

Operational Impact of CF Transformation

The CAF demonstrated its revamped capacity for operations in Afghanistan. With the reduction of its many missions in the Balkans, and an influx of funding, Canada's contribution to ISAF shifted from Kabul to the more volatile Kandahar Province and grew in size and responsibility in 2005 under Operation Athena. To complement the Battle Group deployed to Kandahar Province the CAF assumed command of a Provincial Reconstruction Team from the United States. in Kandahar City, created its first Operational Mentor and Liaison Team (OMLT), and stood up the Strategic Advisory Team - Afghanistan under Operation Argus. Additionally Special Operations Forces moved back to Kandahar to contribute to the Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force – Afghanistan, and *HMCS Winnipeg* continued Canadian participation in Operation Altair by joining the US Fifth Fleet in the Persian Gulf as part of Operation Enduring Freedom.[106] But more important than these growing military forces was an increased responsibility and global exposure for Canadian forces.

With an increase to personnel in Kandahar, it only made sense for Canada to assume greater leadership within ISAF. In February 2006, Brigadier-General David Fraser assumed command of the Multi-national Brigade (MNB) in Kandahar under Operation Enduring Freedom prior to NATO assuming command of the overall mission in August 2006. Command of the brigade provided an opportunity for Canada to lead effective operations. As the only maneouvre formation in the region, Brigadier-General Fraser was required to fulfill similar functions required of divisions or corps in coordinating a joint efforts. Starting with Brigadier-General Fraser, Canadian officers took a prominent role in planning and conducting operations, which enhanced their skill with operational art.

[106] Nancy Teeple, *Canada in Afghanistan: 2001-2010: A Military Chronology* (Kingston, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada, 2010), 26-32.

Operation Medusa 2006 is an early example of Canada's increasing international role and reputation. The operation sought to establish government control over the Panjwayi district approximately thirty kilometers west of Kandahar City. ISAF commander, British Lieutenant-General David Richards, designated Brigadier-General Fraser's MNB as the ISAF main effort.[107] Operation Medusa assigned the First Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel Omer Lavoie, as the lead element for an opposed river crossing across the Arghandab River. From September 1-17, 2006 the MNB fought an extended battle against a dug-in and determined enemy. Early actions generated large losses for the First Battalion, requiring ad hoc regrouping with flanking US units, but the MNB made excellent use of joint fires, intelligence, and electronic warfare to defeat the Taliban.[108] Operation Medusa was a prime example for both the CAF and the GoC of the new conflict environments Canadian soldiers would find themselves in and the capabilities required.

In November 2006, Canada's leadership role continued when Brigadier-General Tim Grant assumed command of Task Force Kandahar (TFK), which evolved out of the Multi-national Brigade.[109] In February 2008, Major-General Marc Lessard assumed command of Regional Command South, with responsibility for all CAF and coalition operations in Southern

---

[107] Bernd Horn, "No Small Action: Operation Medusa, Panjwayi, Afghanistan," in *Fortune Favours the Brave: Tales of Courage and Tenacity in Canadian Military History* ed. Bernd Horn (Toronto, ON: Dundurn Press, 2009), 370.

[108] The 1 RCR BG suffered over 40 injured and 5 killed in the first forty-eight hours of Operation Medusa. A large part of the casualties was from a friendly-fire incident when an American A-10 pilot accidentally strafed a Canadian position. In total 1 RCR lost nineteen members killed. Estimated Taliban casualties are 512 killed and 136 captured. Horn, "No Small Action," 390, 401; Canadian Press, "2006 'friendly fire' incident avoidable: report," *CTV News*, July 14, 2007, accessed February 2, 2019, https://www.ctvnews.ca/2006-friendly-fire-incident-avoidable-report-1.248695; Adam Day, "Operation Medusa: The Battle for Panjwai – Part 3: the Fall of Objective Rugby," *Legion Magazine*, January 26, 2008, accessed February 2, 2019, https://legionmagazine.com/en/2008/01/operation-medus-part-3-the-fall-of-objective-rugby/.

[109] Commander TFK had a duel responsibility as commander Joint Task Force Afghanistan and as the National Commander of all Canadian forces in Afghanistan. Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Archived – Joint Task Force Afghanistan," last modified April 11, 2014, accessed January 31, 2019, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-past/op-athena-jtf-afghanistan.page

Afghanistan. Along with expanded leadership came increased operational capabilities, such as additional air and aviation assets. October 2006 saw the arrival of newly acquired Leopard II tanks and armored engineer assets and the addition of an armored squadron to the battle group structure. Then in August 2008, the government had agreed to purchase a series of UAVs and CH-47D Chinook helicopters to support ground forces and ISR, with six Chinooks arriving in early 2009. [110] The GoC also obtained additional strategic and theatre airlift, purchasing the CC-177 Globemaster III and C-130J Hercules aircraft to support theatre sustainment.[111] With the increased airframes came the creation of the Joint Task Force Afghanistan Air Wing in December 2008, to control all Canadian air assets from tactical to strategic levels in South West Asia. Canada was increasing its operational capabilities, growing into a joint operational force.

Operation Medusa occurred too early to reap any real benefit from CF Transformation, but the experience helped to shape future changes and provide a positive image of the CAF in the eyes of allies. Operation Jalay in March 2009, led by then Brigadier-General Jonathan Vance, demonstrates the improvements in both the scope of Canadian led operations and the capabilities procured to support such an increase. Vance's Joint Task Force Afghanistan commanded the US 2nd Battalion, 2nd Infantry, the Third Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment, and an Afghan Army Kandak from 1/205 Brigade, mentored by a Canadian OMLT. The operation was a combined air assault and mechanized effort to clear an area of the Zahrey and Arghandab districts used to support ongoing Taliban operations in the region.[112] Operation Jalay not only critically

[110] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Archived – Government of Canada's Acquisition of Chinook Helicopters for the Canadian Forces," August 10, 2009, accessed January 29, 2019, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=government-of-canada-s-acquisition-of-chinook-helicopters-for-the-canadian-forces/hnps1un7.

[111] Canada, Royal Canadian Air Force, "CC-177 Globemaster III," last modified June 26, 2017, accessed January 29, 2019, http://www.rcaf-arc.forces.gc.ca/en/aircraft-current/cc-177.page; Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "CC-130J Hercules Tactical Airlift procurement project," accessed January 29, 2019, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/business-equipment/cc-130-hercules.page.

[112] Sean M. Maloney, *War in Afghanistan: Eight Battles in the South* (Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press), 322.

disrupted the Taliban but also reinforced the ability of the CAF to lead operations of increased the size and complexity.[113]

CF Transformation enabled the CAF to lead and function at the operational level. New operational commands buffered the policy and strategic levels from the tactical, allowing task force commanders to focus on specific theatre level aspects of operations in Afghanistan until Canada's combat role ended in 2011. CF Transformation also provided the impetus for new equipment and capabilities to make the CAF a modern force capable of operating and leading allies in a theatre of war. However, CF transformation was not without its challenges, and a break in combat operations provided an opportunity for proper reflection and further changes.

Continued Transformation

In 2011, the CAF released the Report on Transformation, led by Lieutenant General Andrew Leslie, assessing the need for additional change. The 2011 initiative provided an opportunity to leverage and maintain the CAFs reinvigorated effectiveness while also making the CAF and DND more efficient. The report acknowledged the trend of military spending based on perceived threats and the desire to spend the minimum Canada could afford. To that end, the goal of the 2011 transformation was to "identify areas where we [the CAF and DND] could reduce overhead and improve efficiency and effectiveness to allow reinvestment in future operational capability despite constrained resources."[114] The second round of transformation further streamlined the operational effectiveness of the CAF without increasing overall costs to allow a better investment of the still limited funds allocated to defense.

The creation of an additional four operational headquarters increased the burden on the CDS' span of control.[115] Priorities set by the CDS and the SJS directly balanced operational

[113] For a more detailed account of Operation Jalay see Maloney, *War in Afghanistan*, 315-339.

[114] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Report on Transformation 2011."

[115] The 2005 Transformation shifted the amount of what the CAF calls L1 Headquarters from three to seven. The CA, RCAF, and RCN are known as Force Generators, whereas, Canada Command,

disputes and resources creating additional strain on a headquarters designed for strategic level guidance. Not to mention the force generators, the RCN, CA, and RCAF needed to balance commitments to two operational headquarters and support CANOSCOM requirements. The most telling statistic in the 2011 Report in Transformation is the forty percent increase in 'tail' or headquarters and non-operational positions, compared to the ten percent increase in 'tooth' or personnel in operational and / or deployable positions.[116] Such disproportionate growth was misaligned with the ultimate goal of increasing operational capacity creating a number of redundancies and institutional inefficiencies.

Fixing the identified problems called for a reduction of overhead and a reinvestment of human and fiscal capital for the future. Major recommendations of the 2011 report were to reduce the number of headquarters and group like functions together, accept risk in the elimination of some organizations all together, and reduce approximately 3,500 current positions and reallocate them to areas identified for future growth. In addition to the recommendations that most affected operational levels was a refocusing on corporate military organizations such as the Vice Chief of the Defence Staff (VCDS) and military personnel on strategic management and policy.[117] The major outcome of the recommendations was another restructuring of the CAF and the creation of the Canadian Joint Operations Command (CJOC).

Established in May 2012, CJOC amalgamated the functions of Canada Command, CEFCOM, and CANOSCOM under a single lieutenant-general. Three major-generals responsible for continental and expeditionary operations and operational support respectively assumed the functions fulfilled by the three, now defunct, operational commands. With a single chain of

CEFCOM, and CANOSCOM are known as Force Employers. Based on the nature of special operations CANSOFCOM fulfills the role of both Force Generator and Force Employer.

[116] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Report on Transformation 2011."

[117] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Report on Transformation 2011."

command for most operations reporting directly to the CDS, CJOC is responsible to plan and conduct all CAF operations less those run individually by NORAD or CANSOFCOM.[118]

Like operations run under Canada Command or CEFCOM, CJOC operations are better equipped to plan and lead CAF and coalition operations. While preparing to stand up CJOC, the CAF completed Operation Mobile in 2011, Canada's contribution to NATO's Operation Unified Protector off the coast of Libya. The CAF provided air, ground and maritime forces, and the NATO operational commander, Lieutenant-General Charles Bouchard.[119] Since the creation of CJOC, the CAF has conducted numerous small missions at home and around the globe.[120] Major ongoing contributions include Operations Impact and Reassurance. Operation Impact based on 850 personnel deployed to Iraq and Syria to degrade and defeat Daesh.[121] Operations Reassurance is comprised of 1025 personnel across air, ground, and maritime forces deployed as part of NATOs deterrence in Eastern Europe.[122] Each of these operations conducted in a coalition construct allows Canada to foster international relationships and garner increased security through a forward defense of Canada and the international community while remaining true to Canada's way of war.

---

[118] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Canadian Joint Operations Command," last modified, July 7, 2018, accessed October 30, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about-org-structure/canadian-joint-operations-command.page.

[119] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Operation Mobile," last modified January 22, 2014, accessed October 31, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-past/op-mobile.page.

[120] A full list of current and recently completed operations is available at Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Operations," last modified August 16, 2018, accessed October 31, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations.page.

[121] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Operation Impact," last modified October 30, 2018, accessed October 31, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-current/op-impact.page.

[122] Canada, National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Operation Reassurance," last modified October 24, 2018, accessed October 31, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad/nato-ee.page.

Chapter 4: Conclusion

The ongoing success of Canada's military operations is not the end of the CAF's transformation. As always, such contributions are a matter of political decisions and ongoing funding, and even today there is potential for continued change to ensure the CAF remains postured to maximize resources while maintaining international relevance. Since 2003, the number of Canadian general and flag officers have steadily increased to 136. Current CDS General Jonathan Vance recently mandated a study to explore options for restructuring certain branches, and how better to command and control the CAF in the future.[123] Vance is driven by the desire to "be prepared when the world calls . . . to be able to give the minister [of National Defence] options."[124] Increasing the number of generals and improving command and control structures and processes creates the ability operate alongside counterparts in other countries while increasing flexibility should Canada increase its military contributions in future conflicts.

Current defense policy reflects the continual review of the CAF structure and roles, which sees a continuing role for the CAF throughout the world to increase security at home.[125] With new policy comes an influx of opportunity and capabilities to support military employment. CF Transformation and the continuing desire to have a credible fighting force demonstrate what is required to meet Canada's security requirements in the twenty-first century.

The resources and opportunities inherent at the operational level of war are key to fulfilling the CAFs obligations. Without credible fighting forces capable of keeping pace with its allies Canada runs the risk of handing pieces of its sovereignty and security to those who command larger operations. To combat this, policy decisions must balance the need for

---

[123] Charlie Pinkerton, "Number of generals will grow, says Canada's top soldier," iPolitics, November 8, 2018, accessed November 10, 2018, https://ipolitics.ca/2018/11/08/number-of-generals-will-grow-says-canadas-top-soldier/.

[124] General Jonathan Vance, quoted in Pinkerton, "Number of generals will grow."

[125] Canada, Department of National Defence, *Strong, Secure Engaged: Canada's Defence Policy* (Ottawa, ON: Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2017), accessed February 1, 2019, http://dgpaapp.forces.gc.ca/en/canada-defence-policy/docs/canada-defence-policy-report.pdf.

appropriate capabilities that allow Canada to fight in sufficient size, creating the opportunities for operational art and the ultimate goal of connecting tactical actions to strategic goals.

Analyzing the evolution of Canada's way of war reveals a few major facets of Canada's military. First, Canadian values and interests are more apt to support priorities other than defense and are a main factor in determining military size and capabilities. Despite some calls for a larger and more powerful military, drastic increases are not congruent with Canada's way of war and approach to security. Secondly, despite criticism from advocates of 'decline,' the CAF has not failed its government and has always fulfilled assigned missions. Finally, the CAF has proven to be an adaptable and evolving force who generates strength from its alliances. It is this facet of adaptability and evolution however, that requires constant internal analysis to ensure outward actions are consistent both with Canada's way of war while meeting national security aims in an evolving global context.

With the proper policy oversight, funding, and capabilities the CAF is able to operate effectively alongside major allies. What that contribution looks has varied over time. The creation of a single operational command in CJOC reinvigorated the CAFs capacity to conduct and lead international operations. With the external factors properly aligned, the CAF must now look inward to adjust internal procedures and policies to ensure its operational longevity. If the future requires military force, the CAF has an obligation to be ready to fight and win across the spectrum of conflict in the defense of Canada and her allies and there is no escaping that international relevance comes with the price tag of a credible fighting force.

This no-fail mandate leads to some major areas for continued research. First is to examine the impact of shifts in allied doctrine. With the United States re-focusing on large-scale combat operations, Canada must seek to understand how this will shape the global security

environment.[126] The obligation to be able to fight with major allies means Canada must be able to fight a large-scale war; something Canada has a history of doing. This does not mean an unrestrained or non-judicious application of Canadian military power and resources in all circumstances. It requires a tempered and appropriate response balanced with other political goals and objectives. The GoC must continually make decisions based on current threats and competing priorities. While supporting allies is expected, whether it is the provision of large, well-equipped combat forces, or niche capabilities is a major point of discussion.

The second item for consideration is how Canada should prepare for future conflict. This is more a matter of funding choices than types or locations of operations. The CAF is likely to remain a small military force operating in a resource-constrained environment. Canadian values and available resources will continue to force the prioritization of government initiatives. A drastic increase in the military budget at this stage, with the absence of a true existential threat is not a prudent approach. Doing so would unduly effect the quality of life of Canadian citizens for no tangible benefit.

The CAF is a capable fighting force and continues to modernize. Policy choices in recent history have taken into account the value of having a capable and well-equipped military and the benefit of such a force to foreign policy. These choices set the conditions for the CAF's capacity to provide meaningful military contributions. Moving forward the CAF will continue to play an integral role in providing options to the GoC and securing Canada's place in the world. It behooves the Government to maintain its commitment to the CAF and its development. In return the CAF must not squander the opportunities presented and must ensure continued success in achieving its primary role of protecting Canadians and their national interests.

[126] US Department of the Army, *Field Manual (FM) 3-0, Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017); US Department of the Army, *TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-1, The U.S. Army in Multi-Domain Operations 2028* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2018).

Bibliography

Archeion. Archives Association of Ontario. “Canada. Dept. of National Defence. Deputy Chief of the Defence Staff.” Accessed October 29, 2018. https://www.archeion.ca/canada-dept-of-national-defence-deputy-chief-of-defence-staff.

Appleton, Stephen Brent. “The US and Canadian Army Strategies: Failures in Understanding.” Research paper, US Army War College, Carlisle, PA, 2003.

Australia, Director General Military Strategy. *The Strategy Framework 2010*. Canberra ACT: Defence Publishing Service, 2010.

Bercuson, David J., Jack L. Granatstein, and Nancy Pearson Mackie. *Lessons Learned? What Canada Should Learn from Afghanistan*. Calgary, AB: Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, 2011.

Bentley, Bill. “Canada’s Way in War.” In *Institutional Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Contemporary Issues*, edited by Robert W. Walker, 83-97. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2007.

———. *Military Strategy: A Primer*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2011.

———. *“We Murder to Dissect:” A Primer on Systems Thinking and War*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2012.

Berton, Pierre. *Marching as to War: Canada’s Turbulent Years 1899-1953*. Canada: Anchor Canada, 2002.

Bland, Douglas, L., ed. *Canada Without Armed Forces*. Kingston, ON: Queen’s University, School of Policy Studies, 2004.

Boukhtouta, A., F. Bouak, J. Berger, A. Guitouni, and A. Bedrouni. *Description and Analysis of Military Planning Systems*. Valcartier, QC: Defence Research and Development Canada, February 2006. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc95/p523922_A1b.pdf.

Bruyn, L., T. Lamoureux, and B. Vokac. *Function Flow Analysis of the Land Force Operations Planning Process*. Guelph, ON: Humansystems Incorporate, 2004. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a630692.pdf.

Burt, Alfred Leroy. *A Short History of Canada for Americans*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1944.

Canada. *The Royal Commission on Government Organization, Volume 1; Management of the Public Service.* Ottawa, ON: Queen’s Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1962.

———. *The Royal Commission on Government Organization, Volume 4.* Ottawa, ON: Queen’s Printer and Controller of Stationary: 1962.

———. *1994 White Paper on Defence*. Canada, 1994. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2012/dn-nd/D3-6-1994-eng.pdf.

———. *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada, 2005.

———. "History of Canada's Engagement in Afghanistan 2001-2014." Last modified June 19, 2014. Accessed January 28, 2019. https://www.international.gc.ca/afghanistan/history-histoire.aspx?lang=eng.

Canada. Canadian Armed Forces. B-GJ-005-000/FP-001, *Canadian Forces Joint Publication (CFJP) 01 Canadian Military Doctrine*. Ottawa, ON: Department of National Defence, 2011.

———. B-GJ-005 FP-000, *Canadian Forces Joint Publication (CFJP 5.0): The Canadian Forces Operation Planning Process (OPP).* Canada: Department of National Defence, 2008.

———. B-GJ-005-300/FP-001, *Canadian Forces Joint Publication (CFJP) 3.0 Operations*. Canada: Department of National Defence, 2011.

———. B-GL-300-003/FP-001, *Command in Land Operations*. Ottawa, ON: Department of National Defence, 2007.

———. *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution*. Canada: Canadian Defence Academy — Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2007. Accessed January 31, 2019. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/dn-nd/D2-313-5-2007-eng.pdf.

Canada. Canadian Army. B-GL-300-000-FP-000, *Canada's Army: We Stand on Guard for Thee*. Ottawa, ON: Department of National Defence, 1998.

———. Canadian Army Doctrine Note (CADN) 16-01, *Land Operations Doctrine - An Updated Summary*. Ottawa, ON: Department of National Defence, 2016.

———. *Waypoint 2018: The Canadian Army Advancing Toward Land Operations 2021*. Kingston, ON: Army Publishing Office, 2015. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://deslibris.ca/ID/248646.

Canada. Chief of the Land Staff. B-GL-321-001-FP-001, *Land Force Multinational Corps Operations-Corps Operations*. Ottawa, ON: Director Army Doctrine, 1998.

———. B-GL-300-001-FP-001, *Land Operations*. Kingston, ON: Army Publishing Office, 2008.

Canada. Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World*. Ottawa, ON: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2005.

Canada. Department of Finance. *The Budget Plan 2005*. Ottawa, ON: Her Majesty the Queen Right of Canada, 2005. Accessed January 28, 2019. https://fin.gc.ca/budget05/pdf/bp2005e.pdf.

Canada. Department of National Defence. *White Paper on Defence*. Ottawa, ON: Queen's Printer, 1964.

———. *Canada First Defence Strategy*, 2008. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/assets/FORCES_Internet/docs/en/about/CFDS-SDCD-eng.pdf.

———. *Canadian Defence Policy*, 1992. August 11, 2018. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2012/dn-nd/D3-7-1992-eng.pdf.

———. *Challenge and Commitment: A Defence Policy for Canada*. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2012/dn-nd/D2-73-1987-eng.pdf.

———. *Defence in the 70s: White Paper on Defence*. Ottawa, ON: Information Canada, 1971.

———. *Defence Update 1988-89*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1988.

———. "Report on Transformation 2011," July 12, 2013. Accessed October 30, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about-reports-pubs/transformation-report-2011.page.

———. Canadian Forces Air Doctrine Note 14/01: Royal Canadian Air Force Air Task Force Commander Definitions, Roles and Responsibilities. Canada: Canadian Forces Aerospace Warfare Centre, 2014.

———. *Strong, Secure, Engaged - Canada's Defence Policy*, 2017. February 1, 2019. http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/201/301/weekly_acquisitions_list-ef/2017/17-23/publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2017/mdn-dnd/D2-386-2017-eng.pdf.

———. "Details/Information for Canadian Forces (CF) Operations ATHENA," August 7, 2015. Accessed October 1, 2018. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/od-bdo/asia/ATHENA-eng.asp.

———. "Operation ATHENA," February 20, 2013. Accessed August 14, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-past/op-athena.page.

———. "Canadian Forces Operations in Afghanistan," February 28, 2006. Accessed August 14, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=canadian-forces-operations-in-afghanistan/hnocfo7c.

———. "Archived - Joint Task Force Afghanistan." Last modified April 11, 2014. Accessed January 31, 2019. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-past/op-athena-jtf-afghanistan.page.

———. "The Canadian Armed Forces Legacy in Afghanistan," November 15, 2017. Accessed August 14, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-past/cafla.page.

———. *Strong, Secure Engaged: Canada's Defence Policy*. Ottawa, ON: Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2017. Accessed February 1, 2019. http://dgpaapp.forces.gc.ca/en/canada-defence-policy/docs/canada-defence-policy-report.pdf.

Canada. Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. "Canada's Engagement in Afghanistan - Fourteenth and Final Report to Parliament." Accessed August 11, 2018. http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/205/301/afghanistan/www.afghanistan.gc.ca/canada-afghanistan/documents/r06_12/index.aspxlangeng.htm.

———. “History of Canada’s Engagement in Afghanistan 2001–2014.” Last modified June 19, 2014. Accessed January 28, 2019. http://www.international.gc.ca/afghanistan/history-histoire.aspx?lang=eng.

Canada. Director Army Staff. *Advancing with Purpose: The Army Strategy*. 3rd ed. Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 2014.

Canada. Directorate of Land Concepts and Designs. *Designing Canada’s Army of Tomorrow: A Land Operations 2021 Publication.* Kingston, ON: Directorate of Land Concepts and Designs, 2011.

Canada. Government of Canada. “Special Operations Forces organizations structure,” last modified April 25, 2018. Accessed October 30, 2018. https://www.canada.ca/en/special-operations-forces-command/corporate/organizational-structure.html.

Canada. Global Affairs Canada. “Canada’s Engagement in Afghanistan.” GAC. Accessed August 14, 2018. http://international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_development-enjeux_developpement/priorities-priorites/where-ou/afghanistan.aspx?lang=eng.

Canada. Library of Parliament. “Canada and NATO: Key Outcomes from the Warsaw Summit.” HillNotes, September 26, 2016. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://hillnotes.ca/2016/09/26/canada-and-nato-key-outcomes-from-the-warsaw-summit/.

———. “Canada’s G7 Presidency.” HillNotes, June 7, 2018. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://hillnotes.ca/2018/06/07/canadas-g7-presidency/.

———. “Parliamentary Involvement in Foreign Policy.” In Brief. Library of Parliament, Ottawa, ON, August 10, 2008. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://lop.parl.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/2008-60-e.pdf.

Canada. National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces. “Canada Command.” Backgrounder, June 28, 2005. Accessed 30 October, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=canada-command/hnocfoju;

———. “Canadian Expeditionary Forces Command (CEFCOM).” Backgrounder, September 13, 2005. Accessed 29 October, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=canadian-expeditionary-forces-command-cefcom/hnocfofm.

———. “Canadian Operational Support Command.” Backgrounder, January 31, 2006. Accessed October 30, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=canadian-operational-support-command/hnocfols.

———. “Archived – Government of Canada’s Acquisition of Chinook Helicopters for the Canadian Forces,” August 10, 2009. Accessed January 29, 2019. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=government-of-canada-s-acquisition-of-chinook-helicopters-for-the-canadian-forces/hnps1un7.

———. “Archived – Joint Task Force Afghanistan.” Last modified April 11, 2014. Accessed January 31, 2019. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-past/op-athena-jtf-afghanistan.page

———. “Battle Honours – War of 1812.” Modified July 15, 2015. Accessed October 23, 2018. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/gal/bh-hd/wg-1812/index-eng.asp.

———. “Report on Transformation 2011.” Accessed October 30, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about-reports-pubs/transformation-report-2011.page.

———. “Canadian Joint Operations Command.” Last modified July 7, 2018. Accessed October 30, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about-org-structure/canadian-joint-operations-command.page.

———. “Operation Reassurance.” Last modified October 24, 2018. Accessed October 31, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad/nato-ee.page.

———. “Operations.” Last modified August 16, 2018. Accessed October 31, 2018, http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations.page.

———. “CC-130J Hercules Tactical Airlift procurement project.” Accessed January 29, 2019. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/business-equipment/cc-130-hercules.page.

———. “Operation Mobile.” Last modified January 22, 2014. Accessed October 31, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-past/op-mobile.page.

———. “Operation Impact.” Last modified October 30, 2018. Accessed October 31, 2018. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-current/op-impact.page.

Canada. Parliament of Canada, House of Commons Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs. “Minutes of Proceedings (Meeting No 51),” April 27, 1998. Accessed January 25, 2019. http://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/36-1/NDVA/meeting-51/minutes

Canada. Privy Council Office. *Securing an Open Society Canada’s National Security Policy*. Ottawa, ON: Privy Council Office, 2004.

Canada. Royal Canadian Navy. *Commander’s Guidance and Direction to the Royal Canadian Navy: Executive Plan - 2013 to 2017*. Canada: Department of National Defence, 2013.

Canada. Royal Canadian Air Force. B-GA-400-000/FP-001 *Royal Canadian Air Force Doctrine. Canada:* Canadian Forces Aerospace Warfare Centre, 2016.

———. B-GA-401-000/FP-001, *Canadian Forces Aerospace Command Doctrine*. Canada: Canadian Forces Aerospace Warfare Centre, 2012.

———. “CC-177 Globemaster III.” Last modified June 26, 2017. Accessed January 29, 2019. http://www.rcaf-arc.forces.gc.ca/en/aircraft-current/cc-177.page;

Canada. Senate Standing Committee on National Security and Defence. *Military Underfunded: The Walk Must Match the Talk.* Ottawa, ON: Senate of Canada, April 2007. Accessed

August 11, 2018. https://sencanada.ca/content/sen/committee/421/SECD/reports/DEFENCE_DPR_FINAL_e.pdf.

———. *Reinvesting in the Canadian Armed Forces: A Plan for the Future*. Ottawa, ON: Senate of Canada, May 2017. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://sencanada.ca/content/sen/committee/421/SECD/reports/SECDDPRReport_FINAL_e.pdf.

Canada. Statistics Canada. "Canada's population estimates, second quarter 2018." Last modified September 27, 2018. Accessed November 1, 2018. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/180927/dq180927j-eng.htm?HPA=1&indid=4098-1&indgeo=0.

Canada. Veterans Affairs Canada. "Canada's Hundred Days." Last modified October 23, 2014. Accessed January 25, 2019. https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/history/first-world-war/canada/Canada15.

———. "UN Protection Force (Yugoslavia) (UNPROFOR)." Last modified May 10, 2017. Accessed January 25, 2019. https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/medals-decorations/details/149.

Canada History. "Peace Keepers." Accessed September 25, 2018. http://www.canadahistory.com/sections/war/Peace%20Keepers/peacekeeping.html

Canadian Press. "2006 'friendly fire' incident avoidable: report." *CTV News*, July 14, 2007. Accessed February 2, 2019. https://www.ctvnews.ca/2006-friendly-fire-incident-avoidable-report-1.248695

The Canadian War Museum. "Voluntary Recruitment." Accessed November 9, 2018. https://www.warmuseum.ca/firstworldwar/history/life-at-home-during-the-war/recruitment-and-conscription/voluntary-recruitment/.

CBClearning. "Turmoil on the Homefront: The Conscription Crisis," *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*. Accessed November 9, 2018,. https://www.cbc.ca/history/EPISCONTENTSE1EP12CH2PA3LE.html.

Clark, Robert. "The Canadian Forces Operational Planning Process: A Maturing Process or Continued Improvisation?" Canadian Forces College, 2000. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://www.cfc.forces.gc.ca/259/260/263/clark.pdf.

Clarkson, Adrienne. "Her Excellency the Right Honourable Adrienne Clarkson Speech on the Occasion of the Presentation of the Commander-in-Chief Unit Commendation to the 2nd Battalion, Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry Battle Group." Governor General of Canada, December 1, 2002. Accessed January 26, 2019. http://archive.gg.ca/media/doc.asp?lang=e&DocID=1036.

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

Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia. *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair, Executive Summary*. Ottawa, ON: Minster of

Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997. Accessed January 26, 2019. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/bcp-pco/CP32-66-1997-eng.pdf, ES-34.

———. *Dishonoured Legacy: The Lessons of the Somalia Affair*. Vol 5. Ottawa, ON: Minster of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997. Accessed January 26, 2019. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/bcp-pco/CP32-65-1997-5-eng.pdf.

Cook, Ramsay. "The Triumph and Trials of Materialism (1900-1945)." In *The Illustrated History of Canada*, edited by Craig Brown, 377-472. Kingston, ON: McGill Queen's University Press, 2012.

Cook, Tim. *At The Sharp End: Canadians Fighting the Great War 1914-1916*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Canada, 2007.

———. *Shock Troops: Canadians Fighting the Great War 1917*-1918. Vol. 2. Toronto, ON: Penguin Group, 2008.

———. "The Battle of Vimy Ridge, 9-12 April 1917." The Canadian War Museum. Accessed January 25, 2019. https://www.warmuseum.ca/the-battle-of-vimy-ridge/

Coombs, Howard G. "Canada's Army and the Concept of Maneuver Warfare: The Legacy of the Twentieth Century (1899-1998)." US Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 2002. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://doi.org/10.21236/ADA402696.

———. "In the Wake of a Paradigm Shift: The Canadian Forces College and the Operational Level of War (1987-1995)." *Canadian Military Journal* 10, no. 2 (2010): 19-27.

Coombs, Howard G., and General Rick Hillier. "Planning for Success: The Challenge of Applying Operational Art in Post-Conflict Afghanistan." *Canadian Military Journal* 6, no. 3 (Autumn 2005): 5–14.

Cudmore, James. "Canadian Military Explored Plan to Fully Integrate Forces with U.S." *CBC News*, September 30, 2015. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canada-election-2015-military-integration-canada-us-1.3248594.

Day, Adam. "Operation Medusa: The Battle for Panjwai – Part 3: the Fall of Objective Rugby." *Legion Magazine*, January 26, 2008. Accessed February 2, 2019. https://legionmagazine.com/en/2008/01/operation-medus-part-3-the-fall-of-objective-rugby/.

Dickson, Richard N. "Operational Art in a Middle-Power Context: A Canadian Perspective." US Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 2004. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://doi.org/10.21236/ADA435827.

Dewar, J. S. "The Impact of the Evolution of the Operational Level of War on the Structure of the Canadian Forces: A Sailor's Perspective." In *The Operational* Art, edited by Allan English, Daniel Gosselin, Howard Coombs, and Laurence M. Hickey, 201-223. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2005.

Engen, Robert. *Canadians Under Fire: Infantry Effectiveness in the Second World War*. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009.

English, Allan D., Daniel Gosselin, Howard Coombs and Laurence M. Hickey, eds. *The Operational Art: Canadian Perspectives: Context and Concepts*. Winnipeg: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2005.

English, Allan D., ed. *The Operational Art: Canadian Perspectives: Leadership and Command*. Winnipeg: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2006.

Fowler, T. Robert. *Courage Rewarded: The Valour of Canadian Soldiers Under Fire 1900-2007*. Victoria, BC: Trafford Publishing, 2009.

Fuller, J.F.C. *The Reformation of War*. London, UK: Brookhaven Press, 1923.

Galloway, Gloria. "Hillier decries military's 'decade of darkness.'" *The Globe and Mail*. Last updated April 25, 2018. Accessed January 25, 2019. https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/hillier-decries-militarys-decade-of-darkness/article20393158/.

Geddes, John. "The Limits of Canadian Military Strategy." *Maclean's*, May 12, 2009. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/our-top-soldier-in-kandahar-on-the-limits-of-canadian-strategy/.

Gimblett, Richard. "The Canadian Way of War: Experience and Principles." Paper Presented to the Dalhousie University Centre for Foreign Policy Studies (CFPS) Seapower Conference, Dalhousie University, 2002. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://www.cfc.forces.gc.ca/259/300/gimblett.pdf.

Gosselin, Daniel. "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old – Part One." *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 6-15. Accessed September 27, 2018, http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo9/no2/03-gosselin-eng.asp#n3, 6.

Granatstein, Jack L. *Canada's Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

———. *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* Toronto, ON: HarperPerennialCanada, 2004.

Halliday, Hugh A. "Canada's Air Force in War and Peace." Canadian War Museum. Accessed January 20, 2019. http://www.warmuseum.ca/learn/dispatches/#tabs.

Hennessey, M. A., and B. J. C. McKercher. "Introduction." *The Operational Art: Development in the Theories of War*, edited by B. J. C. McKercher and M. A. Hennessy, 1-5. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1996.

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

Horn, Bernd. *Establishing a Legacy: The History of The Royal Canadian Regiment 1853-1953.* Toronto, ON: Dundurn Press, 2008.

———. “No Small Action: Operation Medusa, Panjwayi, Afghanistan.” In *Fortune Favours the Brave: Tales of Courage and Tenacity in Canadian Military History,* edited by Bernd Horn, 361-415. Toronto, ON: Dundurn Press, 2009.

Jackson, Aaron P. *Doctrine, Strategy and Military Culture:* Ottawa, ON: Department on National Defence, 2013.

Jeffery, Michael K. *Inside Canadian Forces Transformation: Institutional Leadership as a Catalyst for Change*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2009.

Johnston, Paul, Chris Madsen, Paul Mitchell, and Steven Moritsugu. “A Canadian Approach to Command at the Operational Level.” *Canadian Military Journal* 14, no. 4 (Autumn 2014): 6–17.

Kasurak, Peter. *A National Force: The Evolution of Canada’s Army, 1950-2000*. Vancouver; Toronto: UBC Press, 2013.

Kelly, Justin, and Mike Brennan. “The Leavenworth Heresy and the Perversion of Operational Art.” *Joint Forces Quarterly* 56 (January 2010): 109–16.

Kirkey, Christopher, and Nicholas Ostroy. “Why Is Canada in Afghanistan? Explaining Canada’s Military Commitment.” *American Review of Canadian Studies* 40, no. 2 (May 14, 2010): 200–213. Accessed August 14, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1080/02722011003734779.

Langholtz, Harvey J. ed. *Principles and Guidelines for UN Peacekeeping Operations*. Williamsburg, VA: Peace Operations Training Institute, 2010. Accessed January 25, 2019. http://cdn.peaceopstraining.org/course_promos/principles_and_guidelines/principles_and_guidelines_english.pdf.

Lauer, G Stephen. “The Tao of Doctrine: Contesting an Art of Operations.” *Joint Force Quarterly* 82, no. 3 (2016): 118–24.

Laura Barnett. “Canada’s Approach to the Treaty-Making Process.” Background Paper, Canada, Library of Parliament, Ottawa, ON, May 8, 2018. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://lop.parl.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/2008-45-e.pdf.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *Strategy*. 2nd ed. New York: New American Library, 1974.

Luttwak, Edward. *Strategy: The Logic of War and Peace*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.

MacNamara, W. D. and Ann Fitz-Gerald. “A National Security Framework for Canada.” *Policy Matters* 3, no. 10 (October 2002): 1–28.

Mackenzie King, Lyon. Letter to King George. Accessed 14 September, 2018. http://data2.collectionscanada.gc.ca/ap/c/c140955.jpg.

Maddox, Landis. “Overcoming Multi-Domain Battle Sustainment Challenges though Demand Reduction Initiatives.” Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 2018. Accessed January 27, 2019. http://publications.armywarcollege.edu/pubs/3600.pdf.

Maloney, Sean, M. *War in Afghanistan: Eight Battles in the South*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press.

Manley, John, Derek H. Burney, Jake Epp, Paul Tellier, and Pamela Wallin. *Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan [Final Report]*. Ottawa, ON: Public Works and Government Services, 2008. Accessed August 14, 2018. http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pco-bcp/commissions-ef/independent_panel_afghanistan-ef/final_report-e/index.html.

Mansoor, Peter R., and Williamson Murray, eds. *Grand Strategy and Military Alliances*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Mass, Frank. "'From Beetle to Porsche:'" The Purchase of the Leopard C1 Tank for the Canadian Army." *Canadian Military Journal* 16, no. 4 (Autumn 2016): 16-27.

McDonnough, David. "Canada, NORAD, and The Evolution of Strategic Defence." *International Journal*, no. 3 (Summer 2012): 797–811.

Morton, Desmond. *A Military History of Canada: From Champlain to Kosovo*. 4th ed. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart Inc., 1999.

National Air Force Museum of Canada. "Royal Canadian Air Force (1925-1968)." Accessed October 23, 2018. http://airforcemuseum.ca/en/the-display-gallery/royal-canadian-air-force-1924-1968.

Naveh, Shimon. *In Pursuit of Military Excellence: The Evolution of Operational Theory*. London: Frank Cass, 1997.

The Nobel Prize. "Lester Bowles Pearson Facts." Accessed September 20, 2018. https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/1957/pearson/facts/.

O'Leary, Michael, The Regimental Rogue. "Battle Honours of the Canadian Army; The Royal Canadian Regiment 4th Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment." Accessed January 25, 2019. http://regimentalrogue.com/battlehonours/bathnrinf/01-rcr.htm;

———. "Battle Honours of the Canadian Army: Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry." Accessed January 25, 2019. http://regimentalrogue.com/battlehonours/bathnrinf/02-ppcli.htm.

Off, Carol. *The Ghosts of Medak Pocket: The Story of Canada's Secret War*. Toronto, ON: Vintage Canada, 2005.

Oliver, Dean F. "Canada and NATO." Canadian War Museum. Accessed November 1, 2018. https://www.warmuseum.ca/learn/dispatches/canada-and-nato/#tabs.

Olsen, John Andreas, and Martin van Creveld, eds. *The Evolution of Operational Art: From Napoleon to the Present*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Paris, Roland. "Afghanistan: What Went Wrong?" *Perspectives on Politics* 11, no. 02 (2013): 538–48. Accessed August 14, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592713000911.

———. “The Truth about Canada’s Mission in Afghanistan.” Centre for International Policy Studies. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://www.cips-cepi.ca/how-canada-failed-in-afghanistan/.

Pinkerton, Charlie. “Number of generals will grow, says Canada’s top soldier.” *iPolitics*, November 8, 2018. Accessed November 10, 2018. https://ipolitics.ca/2018/11/08/number-of-generals-will-grow-says-canadas-top-soldier/.

Pennie, Ken. “Strategic Thinking in Defence.” *Canadian Military Journal* 2, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 21–28.

Robertson, Scot, and Michael Hennessy. “The Canadian Forces of Tomorrow: Maintaining Strategic Effectiveness and Relevance in the 21st Century.” *Canadian Military Journal* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2003): 54–56.

Rouleau, Mike. *Between Faith and Reality*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2012.

Sarty, Roger. “The Royal Canadian Navy and the Battle of the Atlantic, 1939-1945.” Canadian War Museum. Accessed January 20, 2018. http://www.warmuseum.ca/learn/dispatches/#tabs.

Schneider, James J. “Vulcan’s Anvil: The American Civil War and the Foundations of Operational Art.” School of Advanced Military Studies Theoretical Paper, US Army Command and General Staff College, 1992.

Scott, Trent, and Land Warfare Studies Centre (Australia). *The Lost Operational Art: Invigorating Campaigning into the Australian Defence Force*. Duntroon, A.C.T.: Land Warfare Studies Centre (Australia), 2010.

Sherman, Ian. “Operational Art and the ADF Experience.” US Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 2017. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1039930.pdf.

Siegfried, André. *Canada: An International Power*. Translated by Dorris Hemming. 2nd ed. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1949.

Simoneau, Erick. “From an International Strategy to Tactical Actions: How Canada Could Run Campaigns.” *Canadian Military Journal* 17, no. 1 (Winter 2016): 15–24.

Stacey, C. P. *Canada and the Age of Conflict Volume 2: 1921-1948 The Mackenzie King Era*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Stanley, George F. G. *Canada’s Soldiers, 1604-1954: The Military History of an Unmilitary People*. Toronto, ON: Macmillan, 1954.

Stevens, Michael A. *Canadian Armed Forces Operations from 1990-2015*. Ottawa, ON: Valcom Consulting Group Inc. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc214/p803179_A1b.pdf.

Stogran, Pat. “Levels of War: Understanding Defence Strategy and Its Impact on Military Decisions.” *espritdecorps,* June 8, 2016. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://espritdecorps.ca/levels-of-war/2016/6/8/levels-of-war.

———. “Strategy: Should Canada Not Be More Concerned With ‘Tactical Outcomes’: Than ‘Political Advantages’?” *espritdecorps,* December 15, 2016. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://espritdecorps.ca/the-armchair-colonel-2/strategy-should-canada-not-be-more-concerned-with-tactical-outcomes-than-political-advantages.

Tracy, Nicholas. *A Two Edged-Sword: The Navy as an Instrument of Canadian Foreign Policy*. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2012.

Taylor, R. K. “2020 Vision: Canadian Forces Operational-Level Doctrine.” *Canadian Military Journal* 2, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 35–42.

Taylor, Scott, ed. *Canada at War and Peace, II: A Millennium of Military* Heritage. Ottawa, ON: Esprit de Corps Books, 2001.

Nancy Teeple. *Canada in Afghanistan: 2001-2010: A Military Chronology*. Kingston, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada, 2010.

Tremblay, Eric and Bill Bentley. “Canada’s Strategic Culture: Grand Strategy and the Utility of Force.” *Canadian Military Journal* 15, no. 3 (Summer 2015): 5–17.

United Nations. “List of Peacekeeping Operations 1948-2013.” Accessed September 24, 2018. https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/operationslist.pdf.

———. “Middle East — UNEF I: Background.” Accessed September 26, 2018. https://peacekeeping.un.org/mission/past/unef1backgr1.html.

United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. “World Population Prospectus 2017.” Accessed November 1, 2018. https://population.un.org/wpp/DataQuery/.

United Nations. Department of Peacekeeping Operations. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines.* New York: Department of Peacekeeping Operations, 2010. Accessed January 25, 2019. https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/peacekeeping/en/capstone_eng.pdf.

United Nations. Department of Public Information. “Former Yugoslavia – UNPROFOR.” Last modified September 1996. Accessed January 25, 2019. http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unprof_b.htm.

United Kingdom. *Statue of Westminster*. Accessed September 14, 2018. http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1931/4/pdfs/ukpga_19310004_en.pdf.

United States. Central Intelligence Agency. “The World Fact Book” under Canada. Accessed November 1, 2018. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ca.html.

UPI Press. “Disgraced airborne regiment disbanded.” *UPI Archives*. Accessed January 26, 2019. https://www.upi.com/Archives/1995/01/23/Disgraced-airborne-regimentdisbanded /5605790837200/.

US Department of the Army. *Field Manual (FM) 100-5, Operations.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1976.

———. *Field Manual (FM) 100-5, Operations.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1982.

———. *Field Manual (FM) 100-5, Operations.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1986.

———. *Field Manual (FM) 3-0, Operations.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017.

———. *TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-1, The U.S. Army in Multi-Domain Operations 2028.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2018.

Vance, Jonathan. “Tactics Without Strategy or Why the Canadian Forces Do Not Campaign.” In *The Operational Art: Canadian Perspectives, Context and Concepts*, edited by Allan English, Daniel Gosselin, Howard Coombs, and Laurence M. Hickey, 271-291. Kingston: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2005.

———. “Canada’s Departure from the Classic Doctrine of Operational Art.” Research Project, Canadian Forces College, Toronto, ON, 2004. Accessed August 11, 2018. https://www.cfc.forces.gc.ca/259/260/267/vance.pdf.

Walker, Robert William, ed. *Institutional Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Contemporary Issues*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2007.

Wass De Czege, Huba. “Thinking and Acting Like an Early Explorer: Operational Art Is Not a Level of War.” *Small Wars Journal* (March 14, 2011).

The World Bank. “Military Expenditures (% of GDP).” Accessed January 29, 2019. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.GD.ZS?locations=CA.

Windsor, Lee. “The Medak Pocket: Professional Soldiers’ Discipline and Aggressive Use of the Camera.” In *Fortune Favours the Brave: Tales of Courage and Tenacity in Canadian Military History*, edited by Bernd Horn, 333-359. Toronto, ON: Dundurn Press, 2009.