

The Profession of Arms: Ideological Codes and Dominant Narratives of Gender in the Canadian Military

Nancy Taber, Brock University, served for 13 years in the Canadian military and her recently completed doctoral work from the University of South Australia draws on her military experiences while exploring mothering and warring in the military.

Abstract

This article discusses the ways in which specific Canadian military policies work as boss texts that construct a gendered narrative of the military as a way of life. This narrative is perpetuated through the ideological codes of duty, honour, and service before self.

Résumé

Cet article discute des façons dont des politiques militaires canadiennes spécifiques fonctionnent comme textes modèles qui construisent une narration du militaire basé sur la différence entre les hommes et les femmes comme un mode de vie. Cette narration est perpétuée par le truchement de codes de devoir idéologiques, de l'honneur, et du service avant soi-même.

Historically, despite a few exceptions, it has been men who served and been acknowledged as full members of military services (Goldstein 2001). Those women who have served have often had their stories eclipsed, one example being Canada's military nurses in World War One (Mann 2001). Although women now serve in most All-Volunteer Forces (AVF), they still comprise a small percentage of members, and most often serve in non-combat roles (Goldstein 2001; Winslow and Dunn 2002). Even in the Israeli military, which has mandatory conscription for women as well as men, women are a minority, are overrepresented in clerical roles, and are required to serve two years versus men's three (Sasson-Levy 2007). Furthermore, married women and mothers are exempted from the draft. As Orna Sasson-Levy states, "Military service was seen as preventing women from fulfilling their most important duty, namely, motherhood" (2007, 485). Women in the Canadian military (an AVF) were once also restricted under similar terms as they were encouraged to maintain a "feminine ideal" (Davidson 2001) and were forced to retire if they married or became pregnant (Dundas 2000). Gradually, the regulations preventing married women, and then mothers, from serving have been removed (Dundas 2000).

Early changes in these regulations were precipitated by the successful service of nursing sisters in World War One and "manpower" shortages beginning in World War Two (Dundas 2000). Later changes resulted from the final report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women released in 1970, equality rights in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1985, and the Canadian Human Rights Commission Tribunal in 1989 (Dundas 2000). The Canadian military has responded by conducting trials related to the integration of women, establishing a Standing Committee on National Defence and

Veteran Affairs, creating a Minister's Advisory Board on Canadian Forces Gender Integration and Employment Equity, and conducting research into the quality of life of military members, their spouses, and families (Dundas 2000; National Defence 2007; National Defence Minister's Advisory Board 2001).

The Canadian Forces (CF) is now considered an equal opportunity employer, stating on its website that it "takes pride in being a leader in the field of equality and women's rights" (Canadian Forces 2008: ¶ 1). The CF does acknowledge that "arriving at this juncture was not easy" (¶ 2) and that "women were faced with many obstacles as they entered what was traditionally a man's arena" (¶ 4), but the wording here is in the past tense, as if there were no more obstacles to be faced: "there is truly no limit to career opportunities to women" (¶ 2). The CF has been responsive to societal change, has made efforts to become more inclusive of women and visible minorities, and has made changes to better support spouses and family members. The demographics of the military are also changing (although women comprise only 15% of CF members according to CBC News In depth 2006) as are policies related to family support.

However, as Deborah Harrison and Lucie Laliberte state, the Canadian "military has always resisted changes in the composition of military personnel, or in military family structure, that would move toward greater liberalism" (1994, 36). Furthermore, research that is conducted does not generally critique military culture itself, largely "proceed[ing] from misleading assumptions and [resulting in] little essential change in military life" (241). I therefore argue that the gendered nature of the Canadian military, although constantly evolving, is embedded in military policy documents and practices. First, I discuss gender relations in western militaries. Second, I explain my use of textual analysis to analyze CF policies, orders, and a public relations video. Third, I explore my research findings using examples of ideological codes, warrior narratives, and gendered orders, concluding that, although many women do serve successfully in the military, they are nonetheless represented as outside the military's dominant narrative of ideal service.

Military Gender Relations

Western militaries are prime examples of "institutions of hegemonic masculinity" (Kronsell 2005, 281) which historically "have exclusively included male bodies and norms of masculinity have dominated their practices" (Kronsell 2005, 281). Paul Higate argues that there is a variety of types of masculinities enacted in militaries but there remains an "archetypal warrior figure [who] tends to be constructed in opposition to a range of others, marginal masculinities, femininities, and civilians" (Higate 2003, 201). It is this ideal of an "archetypal warrior figure" that perpetuates the gendered and hypermasculine nature of military organizations.

Military cultures throughout the world have many differences, and even within the same military there are differing perspectives. Nonetheless, "there appears to be something like an overarching international and homogeneous military culture" (Soeters, Winslow and Weibull 2006, 241). This culture demands dedication to the organization, and members are required to be available to work seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day, and may be called to deploy at a short notice. Personal and family needs are not to interfere with military service (Harrison 2002; Norris 2001).

Although women have undoubtedly been successful in military service, women military members still face particular challenges (Harrison 2002; Sjoberg 2007; Winslow and Dunn 2002) due to military gendered relations wherein "men are soldiers, but women are female soldiers" (Kronsell 2005, 283). Recruits are often called "women" until they measure up (Snyder 2003) and up until the 1990s, training chants historically denigrated women (Feinman 2000). Furthermore, women are often associated with pregnancy and parenthood (Taber 2005) which are seen as "stigma" (Franke 1997, 129) that inhibits unit combat readiness. Karen Davis, in exploring the CF's failure to retain women at the same rate as men, states that "the continuous exit of women from male-dominated environments at a higher rate than their male counterparts is one indication of the failure to achieve full integration" (Davis 1997, 183). A more recent

document generated by the CF (National Defence Minister's Advisory Board 2001) also states that the attrition rate of women remains higher than men.

Women are represented in contradictory ways by the Canadian military, in particular as being able to serve successfully in the military and yet not able to seamlessly fit into the prevailing norm of a tough male unencumbered warrior (Taber 2007). These contradictory representations are embedded in military policy, affecting cultural practices and the service of both men and women. The Canadian military is not alone in this, as is evidenced by the work of such authors as Laura Sjoberg (2007) in relation to the American military. Due to the uniqueness of western militaries' mandates and their warrior histories, it is not surprising that there is a privileging of men and hypermasculinity (which can be enacted by women as well as men). These "gendered norms have been built into the 'walls' of institutions, whose structure appears so natural and 'supportive' that it becomes difficult to see them also as exclusionary barriers" (Kronsell 2005, 291). My aim is to explore how these norms function to exclude women despite equal employment rhetoric.

Methodology:

Boss Texts and Ideological Codes

My research basis for this article stems from an institutional ethnography (IE) of the CF (Taber 2007). IE is a research methodology developed by Dorothy Smith (1987; 2006) to explore the ways in which women's lives are hooked into societal ruling relations by beginning from the standpoint of their everyday lives. In my IE, I used my own experiences as a military family member and later as a military member as entry-level data to explore the gendered ruling relations of the Canadian military. This entry-level data led me to analyze textual documents (second-level data) that work to generalize the lives of military members. Two of the documents in my analysis were not in existence when I was in the military. However, as they are "defining documents[s]" (National Defence 2003, 1), they represent ideological codes and dominant narratives that have been historically valued and propagated in

the CF, interacting with the lives of past and current CF members. It should be noted that although institutional ruling relations work through textual documents to attempt to generalize people's lives, they do not reflect the reality of their lives. The texts act as signifiers and normalizing influences to present ideal representations of military membership which are structured to benefit the institution itself. People have agency to resist the perpetuation of normalizations but, due to their embeddedness in accepted practices and policies, they are by their very nature difficult to contest.

In this article, I focus on my textual analysis (Smith 1999; 2006) of military boss texts, in order to discover "how the conduct of people's lives is coordinated in relation to ruling ideas and practices" (Campbell and Gregor 2002, 99). My use of the word "text" follows from Smith's (2006), who states that she uses "the notion of text to refer to words, images, or sounds that are set into material form...from which they can be read, seen, heard, watched, and so on" (66). In this section, I discuss the methodological underpinnings of my research: boss texts and ideological codes. The ideological codes are embedded within the boss texts and serve as interconnected messages of ideal membership that are continually communicated to members.

I have selected three texts as "boss texts" in my analysis of military policies: the CF publication, "Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada" (National Defence 2003); a video that was developed from the original document (National Defence 2006); and orders relating to Universality of Service. The publication, video and orders are analyzed as boss texts (a term discussed by D. Smith at a post-graduate Workshop, May 16, 2006) because they regulate other texts and everyday practices in their institutional context. Smith (2006) has also termed this "intertextual hierarchy" (79). She states, "higher-order texts regulate and standardize texts that enter directly into the organization of work in multiple local settings" (79). These texts in particular were identified as boss texts over others because of their status as defining documents, the ways in which these texts state that they are the basis for other texts, their codification of values, and

their establishment of essential expectations of military service.

The publication, "Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada" (National Defence 2003), is an 82-page manual discussing fundamental principles of CF service. The manual is prefaced by General Henault, who was the Chief of Defence Staff in 2003. Henault states that "*Duty with Honour* is a defining document for Canada's profession of arms and must be read and understood by all who wear the uniform" (1, italics in original). The Foreword of the manual states that it "presents the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of the profession, shows how in practice it serves Canada and Canadian interests, and *codifies*, for the first time, *what it means to be a Canadian military professional*" (2, italics added). In other words, this document is supposedly representative of each and every member - it purports to dictate the meaning of members' service. The manual also states that it "establishes the intellectual and doctrinal basis for all personnel and professional development policies in the Canadian Forces" (2). These statements signify that the manual is a boss text residing at the top of the CF's intertextual hierarchy. It is a higher-order text that works to "regulate and standardize texts that enter directly into the organization of work in multiple local settings" (Smith 2006, 79).

The video, "Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada" (National Defence 2006) is an extension of the "Duty with Honour" manual and is therefore also explored as a boss text. It has several segments, with an introduction by the Chief of Defence Staff in 2006, General Hillier, and testimonials by serving members. The tenets in the video are similar to those in the manual; the former sets up the ideological codes of the ideal member while the latter gives examples of the dominant narrative and prevailing norms of military service.

Finally, CF orders¹ relating to Universality of Service (Finance and Corporate Services 2006a; 2006b) are explored. These orders dictate the minimum operational standards that each military member must meet in order to be employed by the CF. As such, they are boss texts that delineate the

expectations to which military members are subject throughout their entire career, and are linked to the ideological codes and dominant narratives in the manual and video. I discuss the implications these orders have for women, particularly as relates to Pregnancy Administration (Finance & Corporate Services 2001).

In my analysis of these boss texts, I searched for ideological codes. Smith (1999) explains that an ideological code is a "schema that replicates its organization in multiple and various sites" (159). It "is a constant generator of *procedures for selecting syntax, categories, and vocabulary in the writing of texts and the production of talk and for interpreting sentences, written or spoken, ordered by it*" (1999, 159 - italics in original). The ideological codes represent common themes that work within the texts to normalize understandings of military membership. My analysis of the texts entailed asking: What themes appeared as givens, as accepted, and as "essential" to military service? What themes were not up for debate? What themes, if deleted, would render the boss texts meaningless, or at the very least markedly different? These themes qualified as ideological codes if they served as "constant generator[s]" of military membership ideals. I then mapped the themes in the boss texts, grouped similar themes together, and found myself continually returning to three main themes that were at the core of each boss text: duty, honour, and service before self.

Dominant Narratives of Military Membership

The words "duty," "honour," and "service before self" appear individually in two of the boss texts in my analysis, the manual and video, along with the corresponding words of loyalty, courage, and integrity, but it is the concepts they encompass together that make them ideological codes. They underpin military policy and understandings of military membership, working together to interact with prevailing norms that frame a dominant narrative - the story that the military as an organization wishes to promulgate and support. Dominant narratives can be difficult to contest as there is a "stock of acceptable life paths the

constraints of which have been painfully experienced by many who do not 'fit' one of the given patterns" (Rossiter and Clark 2007, 22).

The dominant narrative does not necessarily reflect the realities of peoples' lives, but is nonetheless a powerful cultural expectation. I explore what is considered "normal" (i.e., expected and accepted) in the military and what is considered "other than normal" (i.e., outside the prevailing norms) with reference to military membership and gender. I argue that members do not necessarily conform to prevailing norms, but that the norms nonetheless affect their lives. The dominant narrative of the military as a way of life is perpetuated through the prevailing norm of an ideal soldier and enacted through adherence to the ideological codes of duty, honour, and service before self.

An Overriding Ethos and Sense of Duty

The "Duty with Honour" manual (National Defence 2003) discusses the nature of the relationship between militaries and the nations for which they work, stating that military professionalism, as expressed through an ethos of service, must be an established norm that structures military members' service. The ethos "embodies the spirit that binds the profession together" (National Defence 2003, 21) and encompasses duty, loyalty, integrity, and courage. "Ultimately, it is the ethos, which incorporates fundamental Canadian values, that distinguishes a member of the Canadian profession of arms from ill-disciplined irregulars, mercenaries or members of another armed force that lacks defining values" (2003, 22).

These statements about the ethos are very powerful. Without it, the claim above suggests that the CF would be dishonourable, as if it were only the ethos that stands between a good/evil binary, separating the CF from militaries in the countries with which we disagree. By setting the ethos up in this way, it becomes impossible to critique. To engage in critique would be to collude with "ill-disciplined irregulars, mercenaries, or members of another force that lacks defining values." I argue that the ethos "limits...the sayable" (Butler 2004, xvii), constructing acceptable ways of being,

believing, and speaking. As "Duty with Honour" "establishes the intellectual and doctrinal basis" of the CF (2), to disagree with this boss text is to disagree with the presented essence of military service.

Segment one of the video (National Defence 2006) starts with General Hillier, the Chief of the Defence Staff in 2006, describing service members using words such as "courage," "commitment," "valour," "loyalty," "dedication," and "professionalism," interspersed with historical and contemporary footage of military operations. He states that "a sense of duty marks each man and woman serving." Segment three is a testimonial by another high ranking officer and military leader, Major General Leslie. The testimonial states:

We are empowered to use lethal force...you need...disciplined, fit and...tough soldiers, sailors and airmen....*If you don't, the mission will fail.* The results of the mission failing will be potentially *horrendous* for Canada, and...those who we are charged to protect, *the weak and the innocent*, will lose their lives. (italics added)

Leslie uses a very linear argument: The country needs its soldiers (men) to use force in order to protect weaker citizens (at home and abroad) and its own existence, leading us to believe that using military might will make us safe; without the military, the world would descend into violent chaos.

This line of reasoning is inherent in the argument that the military is a vital societal institution that is required for the safety of its citizens and that the use of force is justified. If "we subscribe to these assumptions," as Harrison and Laliberte (1994) point out, then "Canada needs a continued strong military, and militarism is an essential service" (19). Leslie's words make perfect sense when viewed through the lens of protection of Canadian citizens at home, military members, and noncombatants, as well as through the lenses of combat ideology and hypermasculine military culture. At the same time, his words also work to eliminate alternative understandings and to suppress critique.

The remaining sections are testimonials by military members. In analyzing their testimonials, my aim is not to critique their lives

and their expressed beliefs, but to explore how military ideological codes are hooked into their testimonials through military ruling relations. Segment four is a testimonial by a Master Warrant Officer who relates an event that occurred in Sarajevo in 1992, when a soldier saved a civilian woman who was caught in a sniper's fire. He states that the soldier was "a *real fighter*" who acted "without even thinking of his life, he risked his life. So *that's what a Canadian soldier is*, is ready to do, to perform *his task... at a certain price, you don't think, you don't think about your life*" (italics added). The actions of this one soldier are represented as encompassing the expected norm: "A Canadian soldier is" a "real fighter," saving the "weak and innocent" referred to in Segment three by Major General Leslie, and is male.

Segment eight is a testimonial by a Major, and directly relates to his, and the CF's, sense of duty. It is worthwhile to quote his entire testimonial.

When the mission was ordered to be cut from 2500 to 270 soldiers...General Dallaire basically wanted volunteers to stay on the ground [in Rwanda]. One evening he called me in to his office and he told me that you know because I had a wife who was pregnant at home, I had a three year old child, I had a one year old child, that if I wanted to I could leave, and I told him *absolutely not*, as long as you are here I will remain here and I certainly felt that *it was my duty and I would have felt that I was deserting to have left him regardless of personal considerations*. That's one of those few times or one of those times in your career where you do have to *put your family second* to the mission and in this case it was a *life or death* situation for him, for the rest of my friends and comrades, for the people in Rwanda who were depending upon us, and that's one where I had to *put personal considerations aside and put the mission first...* I've never regretted that decision, actually staying in Rwanda. *It cost me a lot in physical health it cost me a lot in psychological health*, but at the end of the day I think I have a sense of *satisfaction that I did my job*, and that's what, that's the *ultimate reward for a soldier*. (italics added)

My analysis demonstrates that the Major's testimonial demonstrates all four interlocking values in the military ethos.

1.) DUTY to the mission at the expense of himself and his family.

2.) LOYALTY to the CF, his Commanding Officer, his "comrades," and the people "who were depending on us."

3.) INTEGRITY to "put personal considerations aside and put the mission first."

4.) COURAGE to make tough decisions, risk his life, and his physical and psychological health.

His story is immersed in the rhetoric of heroism. He is represented as an ideal soldier who made the tough choice to do the right thing. In his testimonial, he states that he was given a choice about continuing his service in Rwanda. However, when viewed through the lens of an ethos that defines and controls military professionals' beliefs and actions, it becomes apparent that perhaps there was only one choice to be made. To decide to leave the operation in Rwanda to be with his family and protect his own health would have been to demonstrate a lack of duty, loyalty, integrity, and courage. It would have gone against duty, honour, and service before self, and would have marked him as not dedicated to the CF and his country.

Where Do Women Fit?

The ideological codes of duty, honour, and service before self have direct implications for women in the military because the codes are set up in ways that work to exclude women as full members. It seems irrelevant that, in practice, many women may conform to this narrative, and also that many men may not. What is relevant is the representation of women as not fitting into the dominant narrative of warriors dedicated to the military as a way of life. Arguments against women in the military have been based on the "facts" that women are physically and mentally weaker than men (Cohn 2000), that the presence of women in combat would destroy unit cohesion (Rosen, Knudson, and Fancher 2003), and that women always have the potential to become pregnant (Franke 1997; Taber 2005). In this section, I explore how the latter argument relates to military policy, as the first two have been largely refuted by the authors cited. Furthermore, the ways in which resistance to pregnancy has surfaced in official military orders illuminates how women are represented.

The tenets in "Duty with Honour" are

supported by Defence Administrative Orders and Directives (DAODs) relating to universality of service. The DAODs "Universality of Service" (Finance and Corporate Services 2006a) and "Minimum Operational Standards Relating to Universality of Service" (Finance and Corporate Services 2006b) lay out requirements specific to military service for all members. The principle of universality of service reflects the "open-ended nature of military service [that] is one of the features that distinguish it from the civilian notion of employment governed by a contract, which obliges employees to perform only those duties specified in their job description or contract" (Finance and Corporate Services 2006a, Context²). Universality of service is also framed as a "soldier first" principle" (Principle of Universality of Service). Members must meet minimum operational standards in order to "contribute to, and be ready for, operational duty in the service of the nation when required. The inability of CF members to do so reduces the capability and flexibility of the CF to mount and sustain operations" (Finance and Corporate Services 2006b, Context). Members must *always* be ready and willing to be deployed and participate in military operations. Members are subject to the concept of unlimited liability, and must demonstrate service before self.

Women who become pregnant are put under orders dictating certain restrictions, as they can no longer be classified as meeting the requirements of universality of service. There is a statement, however, that "a restriction on duty imposed on a CF member...is not a breach of the minimum operational standards" (Finance and Corporate Services 2006b, Restriction on Duty). Under the orders, then, a woman who is pregnant does not conform to the principle of universality of service, but based on the restriction on duty order, she is perceived as only "unfit" for a certain period of time, and therefore is not required to be released, but to perform other duties as she is able until she is "fit" to return to her original duties. It should be noted that the same categorization of fit and unfit would apply to any soldier with an injury, such as broken leg, who cannot perform duties without restriction.

Although the "Pregnancy

Administration" order (Finance and Corporate Services 2001) states that "Decisions regarding duty during pregnancy shall be the result of a consultative process between the commanding officer (CO), MO [Medical Officer] and the member" (General), there is a specific list of "Mandatory Duty Limitations," including "unfit for United Nations or isolated duties," "regular sleep and meals," "rest at reasonable intervals while on duty," "no duties that entail serving in the field," and "no participation in duties that require physical exertion" (Mandatory Duty Limitations). These limitations are designed to "pose no threat to the health of the member or the foetus" (General), but also serve to medicalize pregnancy (pregnancy is "diagnosed," and "confirmed") and make a sharp division between what pregnant women can and cannot do. Words such as "unfit" are used, and the need for "sick leave" is discussed (Sick Leave). The pregnant member also loses a significant amount of control over her medical status and her fitness for duty, because if she "does not request maternity leave, sick leave is granted for any period during which she is, in the opinion of an MO, unfit for duty" (Sick Leave). Furthermore, the listing of requirements to get "regular sleep and meals," and "rest at reasonable intervals" highlights the belief that true soldiers, who fit into universality of service and the dominant warrior narrative, do not need to get regular sleep, meals, and rest.

These orders do serve to benefit pregnant women and their babies, and to officially protect women's jobs with the CF, but the orders also separate pregnant women as not fitting the prevailing norm of a military member. They work to shape the lives of military members in very specific ways. Pregnant women are "unfit," under "mandatory duty limitations," require "sick leave," and must wear maternity uniforms. There is also a section that addresses release. "Regular Force pregnant members may request their release" (Release). As any member may request release at any time during their service, the inclusion of the section on release in the "Pregnancy Administration" order functions as a subtle reminder that pregnant women may not want to serve in the military – being a mother does not appear to fit into the dominant narrative of

military membership.

Implications

Military policies and cultural practices are complex, changing, and often contradictory. The CF promotes the success of its female members and encourages the recruitment of women into any military occupation. However, there are overriding ideological codes embedded in boss texts that work to structure and support prevailing norms as well as a dominant narrative of what it is to be a military member that work to exclude women. The ideological codes that run through military policies such as "Duty with Honour" (National Defence 2003; 2006) illuminate expectations of military members. Members are expected to embody the concepts of duty, honour, and service before self by embracing the military as a way of life and acting in stereotypical masculine ways. The ideological codes work to obstruct critique and prohibit other understandings or alternatives from surfacing and perhaps taking hold in military life. The military is portrayed as a necessary positive force, and members' complete dedication to their service is portrayed as essential to protecting Canada's interests. The requirements for military members to sacrifice their lives are codified in the CF ethos as described in "Duty with Honour."

The effect of these boss texts and the ideological codes embedded within is to define what is perceived as important to military service. For instance, the military and service to the country is more important than family life and personal health. A military member is valuable only as long as he can dedicate his entire body and being to the military. Military members must be willing and able to deploy at any instant, and be a "soldier first."

Naturally, not all service members enact the prevailing norm of the male warrior, regardless of gender. However, military ruling relations work to generalize the experience of members through ideological codes and textual representations embedded in CF policies, texts, and practices. The documents analyzed here serve to eclipse the uniqueness of each member and each situation, normalizing and objectifying them under an expected ideal; the

documents suggest specific interpretations of military service and relay specific stories (dominant narratives) that are intended to shape how members understand their experiences, express their attitudes, and shape their professional identity by promoting a hegemonic masculinity of a "real fighter." Referring again to Higate and applying his work to the ideological codes and dominant narratives I have analyzed here, the "archetypal warrior figure tends to be constructed in opposition to a range of others, marginal masculinities, femininities, and civilians" (2003, 201). The employment equity policies of the Canadian military do not counteract the embedded ideology of the warrior narrative.

The CF boss texts perpetuate the idea that military members must act and think within very narrowly defined ideological codes and textual representations, supporting ruling relations that work to exclude competing ideas and anyone who does not fit the military's dominant narrative. These codes are apparent in the testimonial about the soldier, who was "a *real fighter*....That's what a Canadian soldier is...*ready to perform his task...you don't think about your life*" (National Defence 2006, Segment four, italics added). So while the CF states that it "takes pride in being a leader in the field of equality and women's rights and is actively recruiting women for dynamic, rewarding positions" (Canadian Forces 2008: ¶ 1), the gendered nature of the organization and its combat occupations become apparent when analyzing the "Duty with Honour" manual, video, and "Universality of Service" orders. Military members are represented as honourable male warriors who are willing to sacrifice self and family, and to risk their lives for their country. The Canadian military works to control its own narrative and those of its members, offering certain understandings of membership as the norm, while ignoring or refuting others. "What it means to be a Canadian military professional" (National Defence 2003, 2) is strictly defined and maintained. Only "real fighters" need apply.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to Elaine Butler and Donovan Plumb for their assistance in this research. Thank you also to the *Atlantis* anonymous

reviewers for their helpful suggestions.

Endnotes

1. The publication dates of these orders do not necessarily reflect the original date they were published as the DAODs supersede previous orders.

2. As these orders are non-paginated, I use section headings to identify quotation locations.

References

Butler, J. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso, 2004.

Campbell, M. and F. Gregor. *Mapping Social Relations: A Primer in Doing Institutional Ethnography*. Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press, 2002.

Canadian Forces. Unlimited Opportunities. Retrieved June 12, 2008 from www.forces.ca/Default.aspx?bhcp=1#en224-38, 2008.

CBC News In depth. *Canada's Military: Women in the Canadian Military*. Retrieved November, 5, 2006 from www.cbc.ca/news/background/cdnmilitary/women-cdnmilitary.html, 2006.

Cohn, C. "How Can She Claim Equal Rights When She Doesn't Have to Do as Many Push-ups as I Do?": The Framing of Men's Opposition to Women's Equality in the Military," *Men & Masculinities* 3.2 (2000): 131-51.

Davidson, T. "A Woman's Right to Charm and Beauty': Maintaining the Feminine Ideal in the Canadian Women's Army Corps," *Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal* 26.1 (2001): 45-54.

Davis, K. "Understanding Women's Exit from the Canadian Forces: Implications for Integration?" *Wives and Warriors: Women in the Military in the United States and Canada*, L. Weinstein and C. White, eds. Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 1997, pp. 179-98.

Dundas, B. *A History of Women in the Canadian Military*. Montreal: Art Global, 2000.

Feinman, I. *Citizenship Rites: Feminist Soldiers & Feminist Antimilitarists*. New York: NY University Press, 2000.

Finance and Corporate Services. *DAOD 5003-5, Pregnancy Administration*. Public Works and Government Services Canada. Retrieved November 25, 2008 from www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/admfincs/subjects/daod/5003/5_e.asp, 2001.

_____. *DAOD 5023-0, Universality of Service*. Public Works and Government Services Canada. Retrieved February 14, 2007 from www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/admfincs/subjects/daod/5023/0_e.asp, 2006a.

_____. *DAOD 5023-1, Minimum Operational Standards Related to Universality of Service*. Public Works and Government Services Canada. Retrieved November 25, 2008 from www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/admfincs/subjects/daod/5023/1_e.asp, 2006b.

Franke, L. *Ground Zero: The Gender Wars in the Military*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997.

Goldstein, J. *War and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Harrison, D. *The First Casualty: Violence Against Women in Canadian Military Communities*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Publishers, 2002.

_____ and L. Laliberte. *No Life Like It: Military Wives in Canada*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publishers, 1994.

Higate, P. "Concluding Thoughts: Looking to the Future," *Military Masculinities: Identity and the State*, P. Higate, ed. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2003, pp. 201-16.

Kronsell, A. "Gendered Practices in Institutions of Hegemonic Masculinity: Reflections from Feminist Standpoint Theory," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7.2 (2005): 280-98.

Mann, S. "Where Have All the Bluebirds Gone? On the Trail of Canada's Military Nurses,

1914-1918," *Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal* 26.1 (2001): 35-43.

National Defence. *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada*. A-PA-005-000/AP-001. Ottawa: Chief of Defence Staff, 2003.

_____. *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada* (Video). Retrieved June 12, 2008 from www.recruiting.forces.gc.ca/v3/engraph/aboutus/dutyhonour_en.aspx?count=1&id=19&bhc p=1, 2006.

_____. *Quality of Life Research and Reports*. Retrieved November 19, 2008 from www.forces.gc.ca/qol/engraph/survey_e.asp, 2007.

National Defence Minister's Advisory Board. *Minister's Advisory Board on Canadian Forces Gender Integration and Employment Equity*. Final Report. Ottawa: Author. Retrieved June 12, 2008 from www.dnd.ca/site/Reports/CFGIEE/INDEX_e.asp, 2001.

Norris, D. "Working Them Out...Working Them In: Ideology and the Everyday Lives of Female Military Partners Experiencing the Cycle of Deployment," *Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal* 26.1 (2001): 55-64.

Rosen, L., K. Knudson and P. Fancher. "Cohesion and the Culture of Hypermasculinity in U.S. Army Units," *Armed Forces & Society* 29.3 (2003): 325-51.

Rossiter, M. and C. Clark. *Narrative and the Practice of Adult Education*. Malabar, Florida: Krieger Publishing Company, 2007.

Sasson-Levy, O. "Contradictory Consequences of Mandatory Conscription: The Case of Women Secretaries in the Israeli Military," *Gender & Society* 21.4 (2007): 481-507.

Sjoberg, L. "Agency, Militarized Femininity and Enemy Others," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 9.1 (2007): 82-101.

Smith, D. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1987.

_____. *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory, and Investigations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

_____. "Incorporating Texts into Ethnographic Practice," *Institutional Ethnography as Practice*, D. Smith, ed. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006, pp. 65-88.

Snyder, R. "The Citizen-Soldier Tradition and Gender Integration of the U.S. Military," *Armed Forces & Society*, 29.2 (2003): 185-204.

Soeters, J., D. Winslow and A. Weibull. "Military Culture," *Handbook of the Sociology of the Military*, G. Caforio, ed. New York: Springer, 2006, pp. 237-54.

Taber, N. "Learning How to Be a Woman in the Canadian Forces/Unlearning It Through Feminism: an Autoethnography of My Learning Journey," *Studies in Continuing Education* 27.3 (2005): 289-301.

_____. "Ruling Relations, Warring, and Mothering: Writing the Social from the Everyday Life of a Military Mother." Unpublished dissertation. Adelaide: University of South Australia, 2007.

Winslow, D. and J. Dunn. "Women in the Canadian Forces: Between Legal and Social Integration," *Current Sociology* 50.5 (2002): 641-67.