DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

CANADA

OPERATIONAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS ESTABLISHMENT

DIRECTORATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

ORAE PROJECT REPORT NO. PR 250

THE REGIMENTAL SYSTEM AND COMBAT MOTIVATION

By

N.A. Kellett

OTTAWA, CANADA

APRIL 1984

National Défense
Defence nationale

ORAE 3564-96741 (DSEA)

Operational Research and
Analysis Establishment
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0K2

16 May 1984

Distribution List

DISTRIBUTION OF ORAE PROJECT REPORT NO. PR 250

Reference: A. ORAE Project Report No. PR250, ''The Regimental System and Combat Motivation'', by Mr. Anthony Kellett, May 1984 (Unclassified)

1. Reference A is forwarded for your consideration.

2. This project report is an expanded version of a paper to be presented to the Amt für Studien und Übungen der Bundeswehr - ORAE Symposium, Trier, 28-30 May 1984. It assesses the role the regimental system plays in motivating troops in combat. In doing so it also examines the origins and development, as well as some of the salient characteristics, of the regimental system.

3. The paper is being published in the present format with a view to eliciting comments, corrections, and suggestions from addressees for possible inclusion in a larger ORAE report, The Regimental System and the Canadian Army, which is currently nearing completion.

4. Comments on this project report should be addressed to Mr. Anthony Kellett at 992-6744.

J.J. Conn
Director Social and Economic Analysis
for Chief
Operational Research and Analysis
Establishment

attachment: 1

DISTRIBUTION LIST (attached)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

External

ADM(Pol)
DGOM
ADM(Per)
DPSRSC
CLDO
DGLDO
DGLDO (Attn: Maj A.G.T. Hughes)
DLCD/D Armd
DLOT/D Inf
DLR/D Arty
D Hist (Attn: Dr W.J. McAndrew)
DSIS
Commander, Mobile Command
Commandant, RMC
BDLS
CFPARU
OMD HQ (Attn: Maj K.P. Bloom)
MGen C.G. Kitchen

Internal

CORAE
DCORAE
DGGA
DGOR
DSEA
D Strat A
DMS
D Man A
D Log A
DLOR
DMOR
DAOR
ORAE Library

National Defence / Defence nationale

ORAE 3564-96741 (DSEA)

Operational Research and
Analysis Establishment
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0K2

24 May 1984

Distribution List

ORAE REPORT NO. PR 250

Reference: A. ORAE Project Report No. PR250, ''The Regimental System and Combat Motivation'', by Mr. N.A. Kellett, May 1984 (Unclassified)

1. A copy of the subject report was sent to you for your consideration.

2. Unfortunately, in the printing process page 5 was inadvertently omitted.

3. A copy of page 5 is attached for insertion in the report.

J.J. Conn
Director Social and Economic Analysis
for Chief
Operational Research and Analysis
Establishment

attachment: 1

DISTRIBUTION LIST (attached)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

External

ADM(Pol)
DGOM
ADM(Per)
DPSRSC
CLDO
DGLDO
DGLDO (Attn: Maj A.G.T. Hughes)
DLCD/D Armd
DLOT/D Inf
DLR/D Arty
D Hist (Attn: Dr W.J. McAndrew)
DSIS
Commander, Mobile Command
Commandant, RMC
BDLS
CFPARU
QMD HQ (Attn: Maj K.P. Bloom)
MGen C.G. Kitchen

Internal

CORAE
DCORAE
DGGA
DGOR
DSEA
D Strat A
DMS
D Man A
D Log A
DLOR
DMOR
DAOR
ORAE Library

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

CANADA

OPERATIONAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS ESTABLISHMENT

DIRECTORATE OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

ORAE PROJECT REPORT NO. PR 250

THE REGIMENTAL SYSTEM AND COMBAT MOTIVATION

By

N.A. Kellett

ORAE Project 96741

Approved By _____

Director,
Social and Economic Analysis

OTTAWA, CANADA APRIL 1984

ABSTRACT

This report is based on a paper prepared for presentation to the Amt für Studien und Übungen der Bundeswehr - ORAE Symposium, Trier, Federal Republic of Germany, 28-30 May 1984.

It assesses the role the regimental system plays in promoting combat motivation among Canadian and British troops, and is a corollary of an earlier report on Combat Motivation (ORAE Report No. R77, November 1980). It first examines the origin and development of the modern regimental system in Europe and in the British and Canadian armies. It then analyses those characteristics of the regimental system which build esprit de corps and a sense of community along the following dimensions: operational-administrative; institutional; symbolical; and attitudinal. And finally it examines the influence of esprit de corps and unit loyalty on motivation in combat.

The paper is being published in the present format with a view to eliciting comments, corrections, and suggestions from addressees for possible inclusion in a larger ORAE report, The Regimental System and the Canadian Army, which is currently nearing completion.

RÉSUMÉ

Ce rapport est basé sur une communication qui sera présentée à un colloque entre CAR Op et l'Amt für Studien und Übungen der Bundeswehr à Trier, République Fédérale d'Allemagne, les 28-30 Mai 1984.

Il évalue le rôle que joue le système régimentaire dans l'éncouragement de la motivation au combat parmi les soldats Canadiens et Britanniques, et il constitue un corollaire d'un rapport antérieur, Combat Motivation (Rapport CAR Op N°R77, Novembre 1980). D'abord il examine le début et le développement du système régimentaire contemporain dans l'Europe et dans les armées Canadiennes et Britanniques. Puis il analyse les aspects du système régimentaire qui crée l'esprit de corps et la solidarité, selon les aspects suivants: l'administration et les opérations; les institutions; les symboles; et les attitudes. Et enfin, il examine l'influence de l'esprit de corps et la fidélité à l'unité sur la motivation au combat.

Le rapport est publié dans le format actuel avec l'intention d'obtenir des commentaires, des rectifications, et des suggestions des destinataires pour l'inclusion possible dans un rapport élargi concernant le système régimentaire et l'armée Canadienne, qui est en voie d'achèvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL

1. While most armies in the world organize their combat arms on the basis of the regiment, it is probably fair to say that it is in the armies of the British Commonwealth that regiments have evolved into administrative, operational, and psychological structures without parallel anywhere else in the world.

2. During the 1960s the regimental system, in both Canada and Britain, appeared to be increasingly threatened by organizational reform and manpower cuts. In Canada, the unification of the three services and, along with it, a much higher degree of centralization, was expected to erode what were regarded as being the traditional characteristics of the regimental system. Nonetheless, the continuing vitality of the regimental system has been demonstrated in the past decade and a half.

3. In 1968 the (British) Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders were ordered to be disbanded. A vigorous public campaign was launched to save the Argylls, and after a two year battle the regiment was saved. In the process a petition containing over a million signatures was submitted to the government. Since that time the British government has been careful not to attack the regimental system head-on. Recent initiatives of the US Army provide perhaps more striking recognition of the motivational appeal of the regimental system. After the Vietnam War there was considerable concern about the commitment and cohesion of American troops. Therefore, in 1979 the US Army launched a major programme to change its focus from the individual soldier to the company or battalion. In July 1980 the Chief of Staff ordered the development of a plan to move the army to a regimental system similar to that of the British and Canadian armies. The New Manning System, of which the regimental system is only a part, is designed to keep junior ranks within their units for three years and thus to prevent a constant turnover of personnel, and also to provide for unit rotation. The regimental system is being introduced in order to generate cohesion

and esprit among officers and NCOs. Officers and NCOs will be attached to a regiment throughout their careers, and those regiments will be invested with the traditional characteristics and institutions of Commonwealth regiments. The first new regiments were activated in 1983. Thus the American perception - developed from the standpoint of a highly centralized, non-regimental organization - appears to be that the regimental system of the Canadian and British armies is not only effective in promoting cohesion, commitment, and effectiveness, but is also transferable to a different military culture.

4. Surprisingly, despite all the attention it has received recently, the regimental system has rarely been analyzed, and even where it has, the analyses have usually been limited in scope. Perhaps this is because the Canadian and British armies have tended to take it for granted in times of organizational stability, and to be reluctant to study it too closely in times of turmoil. The Americans have not considered the subject relevant until recently, and even now their adoption of the regimental system does not appear to have been presaged by much in the way of detailed analysis of it (perhaps because the production of regimental lineages, etc, is a demanding enough activity in itself, and because the regimental system is only a part of a larger manning system, whose implementation is a highly complex matter).

5. Furthermore, there seems to be a tendency among regimental soldiers to regard the regimental system as a ''gut thing'', comprehensible more by intuition than by analysis. Certainly the subject has strong emotional overtones, and as one Canadian general - a combat-experienced infantryman - put it, ''Too often our approach to this organizational concept has been so overlaid with emotion that meaningful communication has broken down under the heat of passion.''[1]

6. This lack of detailed analysis can have repercussions, because in an army like Canada's there are important considerations of policy involved in promoting or discarding a system whose roots spread throughout the whole of the military culture.

7. Attacks on the regimental system tend to concentrate on operational,organizational, and managerial concerns such as problems of inter-arms cooperation, manpower allocation, the financial cost of maintaining traditions, and so on. Defence of the regimental system revolves more around psychological and sociological considerations, and tends to be put in more emotional terms. In 1974, for instance, a senior officer claimed that abandonment of the regimental system would be disastrous, not only for the army but for the country itself.[2] The ultimate defence of the regimental system rests on the claim that esprit de corps contributes significantly to morale in battle (and also to commitment in peacetime). Thus a British artillery general, although critical in many ways of the regimental system, recently wrote that ''If morale is the prerequisite for waging war, the regimental system is justified.''[3]

8. Before examining the role of esprit de corps in battle, it would be appropriate to summarize some of the findings of an earlier study[4] in this series concerning combat motivation, and also to outline the evolution, development, and characteristics of the regimental system.

COMBAT MOTIVATION

9. Although it would doubtless be convenient for military planners if one single motivator encouraged all soldiers to carry out their combat assignments whenever required, obviously human behaviour is not that simple. Just as there is no ''typical'', or ''average'', soldier, so motivation varies not only from soldier to soldier, but also, for each individual, from situation to situation, and from time to time. Furthermore, the motivations that influenced a soldier in entering the army may well be changed by combat. After the Second World War S.L.A. Marshall, the famous American combat historian, wrote that ''All values are interpreted in terms of the battlefield itself.''[5] Probably the majority of soldiers are neither especially aggressive nor particularly prone to defection. Defection is in fact rare because the alternatives to fighting are few. The performance of this majority is guided by the individual and group demands of self-preservation and a variable commitment to the tasks imposed on the individual and the group.

10. If one motivator has been stressed more than any other in the past forty years, it is the influence of the primary group, the small group of soldiers in intimate contact with each other at the section level. Soldiers derive not only comradeship, but also a sense of security and protection, and a measure of self-esteem, from membership in the primary group. The power of the group is shown by the tendency of soldiers to bunch together under fire, although their training stresses dispersion, and by the effect of loneliness and isolation in unnerving a soldier. Studies have shown that soldiers who are well integrated into a cohesive group are less likely to suffer psychiatric breakdown or to desert than men who have not integrated into the group. To be cohesive, a group must have a mission or an objective.

11. However, strong as primary group bonds are, they do not always promote the military mission, and there are plenty of examples where primary groups have acted in opposition to army requirements.

Where army goals are seen as being less legitimate than those (notably survival) of the group, assassination of aggressive combat leaders can occur, as well as other forms of dissent.

12. Given the importance of primary group cohesion, and the possibility that it can turn against the military mission, something is needed to link the primary group with the army as a whole, and with organizational goals. Both structurally and psychologically the regimental system fills this role, thus in a sense formalizing the primary group.

13. Socialization, training, and discipline all have a role to play in building a soldier's confidence and in reinforcing his natural tendency to obedience. A recent study of bomb disposal personnel indicated that training, along with small group support, makes an important contribution to courageous performance (it must be noted, however, that a group of this sort is characterized by a high degree of self-selection).[6] Effective training and specialist roles encourage a sense of professionalism and even elitism that is a corollary of esprit de corps. Special force units undoubtedly have a high esprit, but it is based on rather different foundations than regimental esprit.

14. One of the most striking features of battle is the tendency toward inaction, confusion, and paralysis that occurs when a unit first comes under fire. The tendency is compounded when a soldier "goes to ground", and it is very difficult to get soldiers moving once they have found shelter. In these circumstances, leadership, or simply action of any sort, can have a tremendous influence. In threatening situations people tend to copy the behaviour of others. Marshall investigated a number of Second World War panics and found instances where men going to the rear for valid enough reasons failed to explain those reasons to their comrades, and panics resulted. By the same token, one man rushing forward can activate the rest of the men in his unit by removing their uncertainty as to what to do. Second World War surveys, Marshall's findings, behavioural studies of the Korean War, and the experiences of the

Israelis all indicate the importance of example, both in terms of immediate battlefield behaviour and in terms of morale in a rather broader context.

REGIMENTAL SYSTEM

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION - EUROPE

15. Although the Greeks, to some extent, and the Romans, to a greater extent, created military organizations which in many respects resembled the modern regimental system, regiments, as we now understand them, did not appear until the mid-sixteenth century. In 1569 Pierre Strozzi reorganized the old French infantry bands into regiments, which took their names from the localities in which the old bands had been raised. Battalions began to be formed at about the same time, and regiments numbered from one to four battalions. Regiments first appeared in England in about 1572.

16. In their early years regiments were semi-private enterprises under the control of their colonels and their officers. Appropriately, given their commercial flavour, the main administative unit was called the company.

17. England's first peacetime standing army was raised in 1660. The military administration was small and rudimentary, and regiments were remarkably independent, being largely responsible for their own discipline, drill, clothing, and a range of other activities. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries regiments tended to be dispersed into sub-units. From the mid-eighteenth century greater attempts at standardization began to be made, regiments were numbered, colours were regulated, and so on.

18. The system by which offficers' commissions could be purchased had an important influence on the development of the regimental system by encouraging unit autonomy. Officers regarded themselves, in effect, as shareholders in a business, and the regiment was therefore treated as an independent and self-contained possession. Most armies of the eighteenth century, including those of Prussia and Austria, were organized on the basis of proprietary regiments, but the system lasted longer in the British army, where the purchase of commissions was only finally abolished in 1871. Unit autonomism

was further encouraged in the British army by the need to garrison isolated imperial stations. In 1840, for example, only 22 out of 103 battalions were stationed in Britain.

19. Given that the regimental system fosters an important distinction between administrative and tactical organization, it is interesting to find that Frederick the Great's battalions had two separate kinds of organization. For administrative purposes each was divided into six companies, while for tactical purposes the battalion was formed into four divisions of two platoons each. The adjutant was responsible for making the change. This transformation could result in men serving in battle under officers whom they scarcely knew. There were usually two battalions in Prussian regiments of this period and, as in the British army, the company was the fundamental administrative unit. The Prussian army was recruited on a cantonal, or territorial, system, and one French observer commented that "the men of the same regiment all know each other, being drawn from the same province. This makes life much more agreeable, and creates a comradeship which is most useful on the day of battle."[7]

20. Perhaps the single most important set of reforms concerning the regimental system was that effected by Edward Cardwell and Hugh Childers in Britain. Between 1871 and 1881 they abolished purchase, linked battalions in pairs, tied regiments to a specific geographic area, and linked the reserves with the regular army. Although it took a fairly long time for a new regimental esprit de corps to be established to replace that of the old numbered regiments, a modern military writer has asserted that the modern regimental system dates from the Cardwell reforms[8], a view shared by other analysts.

21. There seems to be a tendency among the more ardent advocates of the regimental system to assert that at a certain point in the past - in Canada, prior to unification - the regimental

system reached its highest expression, and that to recapture its essence, and thereby to promote esprit de corps, the organizational clock should be turned back. Such a view would obscure the fact that the regimental system is a remarkably dynamic form of organization - perhaps because it has not been closely examined, defined, or legislated - which has successfully adapted to major changes in its environment. Nonetheless, probably the only book to examine in depth a case study of the workings of the system - John Baynes' study of morale in a regular battalion in 1914-15 - asserted that regimental pride was the single most important factor in the battalion's high morale,and contended further that such pride will never again be as strong or as widespread as it was seventy years ago. Therefore, it may be illuminating to close this section with a description of the army of 1914, written by an officer of the time:

> ''But small-minded and parochial as some of the manifestations of esprit de corps might appear, it was realised that the very foundation of regimental life and efficiency depended on it and every possible means was taken to increase and foster it. He lived in an atmosphere of tradition and moulded his life and conduct in accordance with what was, or was not, done in the Regiment. His barracks room was named after some Regimental victory .... the glorious past of the Regiment was constantly before him and officers and men alike could not escape from the responsibility of their inheritance. Instead of, and more difficult to break than the tie of blood, was the tie of the Regiment.... A magazine told news of past and present members of the Regiment, their wives and children. Old Comrades Associations were an annual opportunity for meeting; and should a little capital be needed for a start in life, the Aid Fund would provide it; if killed in action a man's name was recorded in the Regimental Chapel - alive or dead he belonged to his Regiment.''9

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION - CANADA

22. Before 1755 the defence of Canada rested almost entirely in the hands of troops of the French Ministry of Marine and of the local militia. Both forces were organized on a company basis, and the companies of marine troops were so autonomous that they were called compagnies franches, or free companies. For almost the first time, in 1755 regular army troops - six battalions- were sent to New France, and soon after even the Marine troops were organized on a battalion basis. However, the regular battalions, both army and marine, remained on the scene for a very short time and were returned to France in 1760 after the capitulation of Montréal. Thus, from a regimental point of view, the impact on Canadian organization of French practices was fairly small.

23. The militia of New France, however, was used by the British in the years immediately after 1760 for both combat and labour duties, and the French-Canadian militia captains were an important part of British civil administration. For almost a century after the British conquest of Canada the defence of the country relied largely on British regulars backed by locally-raised but temporary regular units and a sedentary militia founded on universal service. Over the years a considerable myth was built up around the militia, and its role in beating back American attack in 1812 was greatly exaggerated. How far the sedentary militia owed its shape and development to the parish militia of New France, and how much to contemporary British methods or to local conditions (geography, the Indian threat, social conditions, and so on) can only be conjectured. In peacetime during the century between 1760 and 1855 almost the only purely Canadian units were militia regiments which varied greatly in strength, were ill-armed, virtually withoutuniform, poorly trained, and very infrequently mustered. Some volunteer units of more enthusiastic citizens did exist, but their influence was slight.

24. A major change occurrred in 1855 when it appeared that the British garrison would be greatly reduced due to the Crimean War. A Militia Act was passed which for the first time gave active support

to the formation of a volunteer militia. Originally this was organized on a company basis, but in 1859 battalion organization was introduced. Between about 1873 and 1900 the volunteer units experienced considerable difficulties. Financial restraint meant that little training could be done, and units usually had to rent buildings - often very inadequate ones - in which to drill and to conduct their social activities. There was also a fairly high turnover of personnel, particularly in rural units. The companies of the rural battalions were frequently dispersed over wide areas, and therefore the only training such units could do was once a year at summer camp; similarly their social life was very restricted. Urban units did most of their training at local headquarters, and tended therefore to place a great deal of emphasis on ceremonial. They also had an active social life, which helped retain their members' interest during the long training lulls.

25. The bulk of the British garrison of Canada was withdrawn by 1871. But the British troops had a lasting influence on the volunteer militia, and it was largely through the urban battalions of the volunteer militia that the regimental system was introduced to Canada in the late nineteenth century. British uniforms, disciplinary regulations, drill movements, training manuals, mess practices, and so one were all copied by the volunteers. However, outside a few units it was not really until the late 1880s and the 1890s that a really perceptible esprit de corps began to develop. The gradual establishment of officers' and sergeants' messes played an important part in this process, as did a major programme of armoury-building which was begun in 1903 and which greatly facilitated unit links with the community. The first double-battalion regiments of the militia were created in 1906 when two over-strength city regiments were reorganized.

26. The Canadian regular army was begun in 1871 with the creation of two full-time artillery batteries to guard ordnance stores and to train militiamen. Until 1911 the function of the small regular force was to train the militia, and so the companies and batteries

were widely scattered, and it proved very difficult to build up esprit de corps. But gradually the regular units established regimental institutions and symbols - messes, bands, honorary colonels, colours, badges and uniform distrinctions, and so on. It was a slow process, and if high desertion rates suggest weak motivation and esprit, the process was still far from complete by 1914, although the separation of instructional duties and regimental activities in 1911 helped the development of unit identification.

27. To a large extent the existing regimental structure of the militia was ignored in the mobilization of the Canadian Expeditionary Force (CEF) in 1914. But despite the creation of completely new units, the CEF rapidly built up its own very high esprit de corps. The ingredients of this esprit were not so much regimental as situational; they included a newly-awakened national pride, self-confidence, trust in the leadership of the Canadian Corps at all levels, and unit cohesion. So high was the esprit de corps of the CEF that it was difficult to integrate the new battalions back into the old militia structure after the First World War. In the Second World War, in contrast to 1914, the militia regimental structure was used as the basis for mobilization, and the wartime units were therefore able to draw strength from traditions and esprit de corps of long standing. Thus postal censors in England in 1944 detected a high degree of regimental pride among Canadian units. When units went overseas reserve battalions and regiments were formed in the regimental areas in order to supply replacements and to maintain a link between the active service units and their home communities.

28. Between 1945 and 1970 the militia went through six major reorganizations, and the regular army led an equally unstable existence of rapid expansion and contraction before it was unified with the navy and air force in 1968. The events of this period, and in particular unification, inevitably influenced the attitudes of combat arms soldiers towards Canada's contemporary land forces organization. And yet, for both the regulars and the militia the past fourteen years have been perhaps the most stable comparable period since 1855. In many ways unification has been less damaging to the regimental system than critics of unification will admit,

although to some extent this is only because some of the centralizing and standardizing tendencies or intentions of unification - such as the base system and the centralized training system - have not been pursued to their logical conclusion. Regimental dress distinctions are being restored, unit rotations are being reintroduced, on some bases commanding officers have unofficially taken over some of the functions they lost to the base system, and so on. The survival of the regimental system was clearly evident in 1983 when the RCDs and the RCR celebrated their centennials with great panache; furthermore, a 1979 survey of all ranks of the land forces showed strong acceptance of the regimental system among combat and support personnel alike.[10]

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIMENTAL SYSTEM

29. The regimental system is far more than the assignment of soldiers to units and sub-units of given sizes, roles, and capabilities, and it cannot adequately be defined solely by reference to organizational charts.

30. In many ways the regimental system is not only a complex but also a contradictory form of organization that attempts to reconcile very different requirements. It strives to balance administrative, operational, motivational, and even political and social requirements within a single structure. However, when combat soldiers discuss the regimental system they are essentially referring to two things:

a) an organizational structure, both operational and administrative; and

b) a focus of pride, commitment, and belonging which is intended to enhance motivation and morale.

There is obvious imprecision in a term - ''regimental system'' - which refers equally to structural and metaphysical properties, but such imprecision may be one of the strengths of the system since it allows regimental soldiers to define their environment, at least in part, in their own individual terms. In regiments of the non-Commonwealth armies operational requirements have tended to be more clearly paramount.

Thus German regiments of the 1930s were permanent groupings. The battalions were termed Abteilungen, or ''Detachments'', and they were very different from the independent British battalions, which were never grouped with their sister battalions.

31. The characteristics of the regimental system will be examined in operational-administrative, institutional, symbolical, and attitudinal terms. Naturally, many of the factors will overlap these dimensions and many factors and events will be omitted or discussed only briefly in the short compass of this paper.

Operational-Administrative Factors

32. Size: In a recent paper on regimental ideology, John Keegan remarked that ''armies...have long recognized, well before it was discovered by social psychologists, that effective human groups are subject to laws of scale; that the group of regimental size, about 600 to 1,000 strong, has a particular tactical value; and that its value is enhanced by stability and its by-products: reputation, corporate self-image, tradition...''[11] The rifle company was generally considered in the nineteenth century as being too weak to carry out a battlefield mission, and thus the battalion was regarded as the ''tactical'' unit, or the smallest body of men that could safely be employed independently. The operational independence, and self-enclosed world, of nineteenth-century British battalions undoubtedly reinforced cohesion and identification. During the present century the tactical unit has become ever smaller, from the battalion to the company, to the platoon, and now (in counterinsurgency warfare, especially) the section or patrol. Nonetheless, the battalion-sized unit offers advantages of administration, control, and firepower. Brigadier Bidwell recognized the important role of the section and platoon in the modern British army, and the relative isolation of the major regimental figures (the CO, adjutant, and RSM), but felt nonetheless that the regiment is a very real entity, whose members are bound together by various ties of similarity and distinguished from all others.

33. Length of Service: Long service in a single unit has frequently been shown to be an important element in cohesion, and personnel turbulence

to undermine cohesion. Long unit service contributed, for example, to high morale in the 2nd Scottish Rifles at Neuve Chapelle (1915) and in the 30th Brigade at Calais (1940). A feature of the regimental system is its promotion of a career-long identification with a particular unit, whether a soldier is regimentally or extra-regimentally employed. One of the major thrusts of the US Army's New Manning System is the ''stabilization'' of personnel within units, to enhance cohesion.

34. Rotation: The US Army used a system of individual rotation in Korea and Vietnam, and it has been widely identified as a source of breakdown in unit cohesion. Along with the introduction of ''stabilization'' and the establishment of permanent regiments, each having a home base, the New Manning System provides for unit rotation - without which ''stabilization'' would be impossible - as another element in building cohesion. The British and Canadian armies generally rotated soldiers between the front and rear areas on a unit basis in the wars of the present century. In the early 1950s, and again from 1968 to the present, the Canadian land forces have used individual replacement in place of unit rotation. By contrast, the British use unit rotation, and in 1984 two Canadian infantry battalions are going to rotate. Man-for-man rotation has been particularly hard on the esprit of armoured personnel, for whom postings to and from Europe generally require re-badging. A hundred or more men re-badge each year (both ways); the RCDs' historian felt that whatever the resulting damaging to regimental spirit, it was probably compensated for by a realistic mission orientation and combat capability[12] - but the RCDs' partners in re-badging do not share these compensating advantages, and the effect on their esprit of individual rotation can be surmized.

35. Training: Man-for-man rotation is paralleled by centralized training systems, which place the accent on individual rather than collective training, and which reduce the potential for recruit socialization which the regimental depots used to supply. Traditionally, military training largely centred on drills of various sorts, and naturally this tended to emphasize both corporativeness and ceremonial,

and thus probably contributed to esprit in a way that modern training, which is more varied and individualistic, probably cannot. The important role of the depot in fostering esprit de corps is indicated by a broadcast given by Field Marshal Slim in the 1950s, in which he stated that "It is to foster this pride of Regiment that we put the training of infantry recruits back into their Regimental Depots again, in the hearts of their own counties ."[13] Regimental depots were closed in Canada in 1968, but regiments try to participate in the training of recruits in the centralized recruit schools; also the infantry regiments reintroduced battle schools for post-recruit training in 1981.

36. Autonomy: Historically regiments were given considerable autonomy because of the lack of a developed central administration, staffs, and formations. Recruiting, training, discipline, promotion, pay, welfare, recreation, spiritual and medical welfare, feeding, and so on, were, until recently, wholly or largely regimental concerns in both the Canadian and British armies.

37. With battalions often being posted to remote imperial garrisons, the nineteenth century British regiment was fairly independent administratively, with its own medical officers (wearing unit insignia), paymasters, and so on. More recently, the provision of other services - postal, for example - within the unit underlined the relative self-sufficiency of regiments and battalions. However, the trend in the past twenty years has been away from unit administrative autonomy, and some combat service support activities, such as pay and finance, personal records, supply, welfare, and food services have become integrated with supporting base functions.

38. The British disciplinary system, which the Canadian army closely emulated, was rooted in the regimental system, and commanding officers had extensive disciplinary powers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Unit autonomy in disciplinary matters was reinforced by the provision of a section of regimental police, who had an extensive local jurisdiction. The activities of unit police sections have been somewhat restricted in recent years vis à vis

their base counterparts, but they continue to form a part of the establishment. Increasingly ramified appeals procedures, charters of rights,and so on, have also narrowed the range of unit disciplinary autonomy.

39. In the Victorian army much of the initiative for improving soldiers' welfare - quarters, dependants' well-being, education, etc - came from regimental officers, and British regiments still have an important welfare role that reinforces the community orientation of the regiment. A recent study of the British army concluded that soldiers and their families are ''sheltered by the regimental system with its paternalistic overtones.''[14] However, in 1976 the Army Welfare Inquiry Committee reported that the regimental system was no longer adequate for an army in which dependants outnumbered the soldiers. The army responded by improving welfare services, and a system of Unit Families Officers was set up to assist families in adjusting to new quarters, postings, separations, and so forth. In the Canadian army some of the ''welfare'' role of unit officers vis à vis their men has been assumed by base staffs (social workers, financial counsellors, personnel selection officers, and so on). Traditionally, most units had (and many still have) an informal welfare structure, usually consisting of senior NCOs with experience of, or knowledge in, financial or legal matters relevant to the kinds of problems soldiers faced. Changed social and economic conditions contributed to problems for which it was felt that more professional counselling than was available at the unit level was needed, and the base structure facilitated the provision of such services. Again, as in other areas, units fought to recover some of the influence and control they had earlier exercised over their soldiers' welfare.[15]

40. Morale Triumvirate: It has been said that regiments possess an organic ''morale committee'' in the triumvirate of CO, medical officer (MO), and chaplain.[16]

41. Lieutenant-General Simonds, a former Chief of the General Staff, argued that ''There can be no such thing as a good unit without a good commanding officer, and tradition by itself will not compensate for a bad one.''[17] In his study of morale, Baynes was insistent about the

importance of the CO in creating the spirt of a unit.[18]

42. Part of the self-sufficiency of British and Canadian regiments in the nineteenth century stemmed from the integral part MOs played in them. Before 1873 the medical service of the British army was entirely regimental, as was that of the Canadian army up to the end of the century. The regimental medical service was abolished in 1909, but evidently not without a fight - one correspondent to the Canadian Military Gazette claimed that "A regiment in the field, whether on active service or undergoing training, could get along better without its adjutant than without its regimental medical officer."[19]

43. In the eighteenth century the appointment of chaplains in the British army was a regimental concern. The Canadian army followed suit, and the official historian of the Canadian Chaplain Service commented: "It is interesting to note that only with the outbreak of World War II did the Canadian Chaplain Service shake itself from the regimental system."[20] The QOR appointed a chaplain as early as 1885, but formal authority was not given for regimental chaplains until 1897. The consolidation of the chaplain services in 1958 presaged unification. Currently, although chaplains are posted to bases, and wear the insignia of their branch, every major unit normally has a chaplain attach-posted to it on virtually a full-time basis. The role of the chaplain in providing moral as well as religious support for soldiers is evidently appreciated by advocates of the regimental system, because some of the criticism of the base concept has included calls for chaplains to be reoriented towards units.[21]

44. Other Regimental Personnel: A number of other individuals play an important role in fostering unit esprit. The adjutant, as the CO's staff officer on all matters connected with the organization, discipline, and routine work of the battalion, has always had an influential role in the battalion or regiment. Describing a British

battalion of 1914, Baynes wrote: ''For the young officers and all the other ranks the Adjutant was the person who had the most influence on standards of bearing, turn-out, and behaviour.''[22] The RSM had a similar impact in shaping the characteristic spirit of a unit, both directly and through his influence on the NCOs (and junior officers): ''In the Mess the Regimental Sergeant-Major is absolute master, and the members take their lead from him not only in matters of etiquette and behaviour, but in the whole pattern of their lives.''[23]

45. Territoriality: Some of the major reforms of the British regimental system, most notably the Cardwell reforms, were largely predicated on the need to resolve pressing manpower problems. It was thought that linking regular battalions with specific areas would stimulate recruiting. Because the main element of Canada's army for a century before 1950 was the volunteer militia, territorial affiliation has played an important part in Canadian military practice. In his book, The Regiment, Farley Mowat stressed how important local ties were in recruiting the Hastings and Prince Edward Regiment in 1939.

46. Naturally, soldiers recruited from a particular area can be effective recruiters among their peers, and men drawn from a specific locality usually have common interests and backgrounds, which helps to establish cohesion and fosters regimental identity. Geographic links tend to be mutually beneficial for both community and regiment. In 1939 the RCR did not enjoy the advantage of a single regimental area, as did the militia regiments, and as a result it did not receive the same whole-hearted community support on active service. The effect of heavy casualties on some American communities led the US Army to abandon geographic recruitment after the First World War, but the possibility of returning to some kind of regimental-regional links in order to boost esprit is being considered in the context of the New Manning System. Important as territoriality is in developing cohesion and esprit, it is not a sine qua non of unit pride, as the French Foreign Legion clearly demonstrates.

Institutional Characteristics

47. In his study of fighting spirit, Major-General F.M. Richardson, a wartime British medical officer, noted of regimental spirit that, although ''a sturdy plant'' in the British army, it ''cannot be left to look after itself. It must be tended, fertilized and watered. Simply to give a recruit the badge and shoulder titles of his regiment will not fill him with its spirit and traditions.''[24] Over the past century, particularly, regiments have developed a network of institutions and symbols through which their ethos could be propagated.

48. Honorary Ranks: At the centre of regimental life is to be found the Colonel of the Regiment, whose appointment is honorary but who is looked upon as the guardian of regimental traditions. A distinguished serving or retired officer, normally with service in the regiment, his duties and functions are largely representational and advisory. He is concerned with the ceremonial, social, and ''family'' aspects of regimental life, and his prestige can be of great value to the unit. A number of Canadian and British regiments also boast a Colonel-in-Chief, an appointment which can only be held by a member of the Royal Family. The first honorary appointment in Canada was made in 1895.

49. Regimental Headquarters: The work of the Colonel of the Regiment in fostering regimental identity is supported by a regimental headquarters (RHQ). The British Ministry of Defence defined the RHQ's functions as being ''to assist the Colonel of the Regiment in accordance with his charter and to coordinate regimental affairs as the focal point of the Regiment's activities.''[25] Manned by a small staff of both active and retired members of the regiment, the RHQ is concerned with the same aspects of regimental life as is the Colonel, and its activities might include the publication of regimental periodicals and histories, the operation of a museum and kit shop, administrative support for the Colonel, public relations, liaison with allied regiments, and so on. Usually the RHQ staff includes a regimental major, regimental adjutant, and clerical staff, who are normally increments on the battalion

located at the home station. The RHQ function tends to be more informal and on a smaller scale in armoured regiments.

50. Executive Bodies: In addition to having Colonels of the Regiment and RHQs, regiments boast a variety of bodies designed to foster their traditions and esprit. In the RCR, for example, the Colonel heads the RCR Council, which groups together an Advisory Board, a Senate, and a Regimental Executive Committee. Between them these bodies advise on such matters as promotions, customs, drill, dress, museum, publications, and so on. Again, armoured regiments have a less ramified advisory organization, but nonetheless the Regimental Society of the Lord Strathcona's Horse, for example, runs the museum and the kit shop, and keeps up the mounted troop. Similar organizations have been set up in the combat support arms, with the Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, for instance, setting up a Corps Committee in 1965 to oversee any matter that was not dealt with exclusively through normal military channels.

51. Associations: When British regiments first acquired permanent homes in the late nineteenth century they began to establish old comrades' associations to provide for the welfare of former members as well as to bring them together with serving members on social and ceremonial occasions. Such associations not only fostered the spirit of regimental comradeship, but also promoted oral traditions within the regiment as veterans recalled active service and garrison memories. Perhaps the first old comrades' association formed in Canada was that of the Royal Highlanders of Canada in 1906. Naturally, veterans' associations proliferated in the wake of the two world wars.

52. Other Regimental Organizations: In addition to the above organizations, regimental life has been enhanced by such organizations as ladies' auxiliaries, officers' clubs, and so on, which often undertake responsibility for raising funds for memorial, welfare, and other regimental projects. Cadet corps are also normally affiliated with a regular or reserve unit, and wear the insignia of those units. In turn the sponsoring regiments try to promote the regimental aspects of the affiliated corps.

53. Messes: Officers', senior NCOs', corporals' and men's messes play a singularly important role in regimental socialization, the promotion of esprit de corps, and the development of a sense of community. Morris Janowitz, an American military sociologist, wrote that the military profession is more than an occupation, being a complete style of life: ''any profession which is continually preoccupied with the threat of danger requires a strong sense of solidarity if it is to operate effectively. In good measure, military indoctrination has been effective because of the relatively closed community environment in which the military have lived.''[26]

54. British officers' messes evolved in an ad hoc fashion in the late eighteenth century, the first purpose-built mess being the artillery one at Woolwich, built in 1777. NCOs' messes were a more deliberate creation. In 1822 regulations ordered the formation of sergeants' messes in order to give NCOs added status in their regiments. Men's canteens began to appear at about the same time as officer's messes.

55. Over the years messes developed an elaborate etiquette which reinforced the social homogeneity of officers and senior NCOs to produce a high degree of attitudinal conformity. This socializing role of the mess was further reinforced by the fact that, certainly before 1914, but also probably in the inter-war period, the majority of officers were bachelors, and many ''lived in'', so that the mess was regarded as a home; officers also tended to share a common social background, which made for homogeneity.

56. After the adoption of the base system at the end of the 1960s, Canada's land forces effectively lost their regimental mess system, although units which were stationed away from the major bases were able to retain their own messes, at considerable cost. A 1977 survey found that of the three services, army support for messes was the greatest, and additional comments to the questionnaire showed a strong desire for a return to regimental or unit messes, several of the respondents stressing the socializing role of the mess.[27] Canadian Forces Administrative Orders require that all members of the forces

belong to a mess, in effect constituting official recognition of the motivational and professional role of the mess.[28] A Canadian Forces publication notes that messes assist in ''building 'esprit de corps' and comradeship which are essential for an efficient and professional Armed Force.''[29]

57. Home Stations: As was noted earlier, the localization of British regiments contributed greatly to the development of esprit de corps. This has been true, too, of Canadian regiments. City militia units felt the benefit of the great armoury-building programme between 1903 and 1914. Units of the regular army took longer to establish geographically, with the exception of the R22eR, which has been based at La Citadelle, Québec, since 1920. The RCR was still dispersed among four stations in 1939, although RHQ was established at the present home station in London. The RCCS was established in Kingston in 1937, but the engineers and artillery did not establish home stations until after the Second World War. The armoured corps has been the least settled of the combat arms.

58. The establishment of roots greatly facilitates the development of unit identity. The RCCS historian felt that the opening of the corps' new home at Vimy Barracks ''did much to heighten the morale of the corps.''[30] A militia officer asserted during the inter-war period that ''local pride is the only thing that will keep the militia together.''[31] The role of local pride seems to have been particularly important in the rural militia. The historian of one rural battalion analyzed the various factors which contributed to a decline in interest in the militia during the late nineteenth century - pay rates, lack of training, and so on - and concluded: ''the real cause was the disappearance of the smaller centres with their intense local patriotisms and rivalries.''[32]

59. The possession of a home station or armoury facilitates the establishment of depots, messes, museums, memorials, association branches, and named roads and buildings, all of which boost regimental pride. In 1908 the 24th Chatham Regiment was reported to be exhibiting ''considerable ginger'': ''The new armouries have had much to do with the enthusiasm that has been aroused.''[33]

60. Their organization as single-unit regiments makes it harder for armoured units than for multi-battalion infantry regiments, or for ''corps'' regiments (such as the RCHA) to supplement unit with geographic identification. While unit rotation was in effect, armoured regiments returning from Germany went to the stations vacated by their relieving units, and thus it was difficult to build links with a particular locality. Even if such links existed, man-for-man rotation has meant widespread re-badging, and hence the probable dilution of geographic unit loyalties. The RCDs, as the armoured component of 4CMBG, have no real home station, and their centennial history commented on the lack of permanent unit messes and the separation from old comrades, disadvantages which were offset, however, by the regiment's status as the only armoured unit in Europe. However, it is possible for single-unit regular regiments to maintain geographic and sentimental links with an area. British armoured regiments have regimental recruiting areas, in which home headquarters and museums are located, and most of them sponsor a territorial squadron in the regimental area, so that although the soldier is very unlikely to serve in the regimental area, he does have a territorial and social focus.

61. Museums: Even in the British army few regimental museums existed prior to the First World War. In Canada museums came to be established on a wide scale only after the Second World War, with museums being set up by the Black Watch (1949), the Canadian Grenadier Guards (1950), the QOR (1957), the RCR (1959-60), and the RCA (1962).

62. Over a period of eight months in 1981 there were 697 visitors to the Strathconas' museum, of whom 158 were serving members of the regiment and 247 were members of the association.[34] That recruits are expected, or obliged, to visit the museum, and thereafter often have little to do with it, is suggested in the museum entry of The Strathconian in 1978: ''A surprising thing is that few of our newer Strathconas (not the new recruits) have visited the Museum.''[35]

The patterns of museum usage revealed by regimental journals suggest that museums play a supportive rather than a primary role in fostering esprit de corps, but that they are an intrinsic part of the mosaic of symbols, traditions, and institutions that, combined, produce an ambience conducive to esprit, and hence to commitment.

63. Bands: Possibly the first regimental band of the British army was that of the Royal Artillery in the 1760s. Thereafter every regiment gradually acquired its own band, first on a private basis, later paid for from public funds.

64. Military bands have lengthy roots in the Canadian army. The provincial and fencible regiments raised during the American Revolutionary, French Revolutionary, and Napoleonic Wars would have had bands. Even units of the sedentary militia sometimes had them. The QOR band was started in 1860 on the basis of a band fund established by the officers, and the RCR band was formed in 1900. In 1968 there was a drastic reduction in the number of regular force bands, and a number of militia units have likewise lost theirs.

65. The stirring presence of bands, whether on parade or at mess or other functions, undoubtedly contributes a great deal to regimental identification. In 1915 Rudyard Kipling commented that ''No one, not even the adjutant, can say for certain where the soul of the battalion lives, but the expression of that soul is most often found in the band.''[36]

66. Regimental marches were not officially approved in the British army until 1881, although prior to that most regiments had a march which they considered particularly their own. The regimental marches of Canadian regiments are often adopted from those of allied regiments, as in the case of the QOR and les Fusiliers Mont-Royal. Some marches are unique to particular regiments, others reflect geographical links (the Fort Garry Horse's ''Red River Valley'', for example). The playing of regimental marches, whether on parade or at regimental dinners, can be very evocative of esprit.

67. Alliances: The first officially-sanctioned alliance between Canadian and British regiments was probably that between the Civil Service Rifle Corps (Canada) and the Civil Service Regiment in 1863. The idea lapsed until 1900 when the governor-general, Lord Minto, proposed a system of affiliating Canadian and British regiments be established; Lord Dundonald, the General Officer Commanding the Militia, actively supported this proposal, and from 1903 an increasing number of alliances was approved. Such alliances tended to be based on historical links, on working relationships, or on similarities in name and number. Recently existing alliances have in some cases been expanded by new affiliations. The Supreme Allied Commander Europe instituted a Partnership Program to foster interoperability, whereby, for example, the RCDs, already allied to the Blues and Royals, became affiliated with West German, French and American regiments.

68. Such alliances have often been warm and close, with exchanges of officers between regular force units and the adoption of items of uniform, of traditions, of mascots, of anniversaries, and of other characteristics of the allied regiments. Ties of this sort reinforce distinctiveness, and with it esprit.

69. Regimental Publications: The earliest British regimental journals seem to have appeared in the 1850s and 1860s, but they were short-lived affairs. After 1863 such journals began to appear in numbers, aided by the spread of literacy and the establishment of home areas, so that by 1914 they had become an important medium for unifying the separate battalions, for linking former with serving members, and for boosting pride and inter-regimental rivalry.

70. War service tends to promote regimental journals - The Strathconian appeared as early as November 1914 - but peacetime journals were largely a post-1918 phenomenon in the Canadian army. The RCR began distributing a mimeographed sheet soon after the war, and The Goat, the journal of the RCDs, started appearing on a monthly basis in 1922. Modern regimental journals sustain the sense of ''family'' that regiments seek to create with, typically, messages from the Colonel of the Regiment, the CO, and the RSM (all of which will tend

to emphasize esprit), accounts of the activities of sub-units, descriptions of ceremonial activities, comments from the exchange officer, sections on regimental sports and mess and social life, reports from the association, ladies' auxiliary, and affiliated cadet corps, museum reports, and articles of historical interest. By relating the activities of all elements of the regiment a journal can contribute a great deal to a sense of pride and belonging. Thus The Signals Monthly Bulletin, which began life in 1923, was ''instrumental in fostering the esprit de corps (of the RCCS) which developed between the wars.''[37]

71. The value of regimental histories seems to have been recognized early in the nineteenth century, and between 1836 and 1853 the War Office in London published short histories of all the existing cavalry, and of 42 infantry regiments. In the last half of the century a large number of regimental histories appeared, most of them written by former or serving officers. In Canada a few militia histories appeared before 1900, but it was after the two world wars that they proliferated.

72. The meaning of regimental history to soldiers is well illustrated in the words of a trooper who enlisted in the 19th Royal Hussars at the turn of this century: ''On the drum banners of the regiment, on our cap badge, are names to conjure with... sure the soldier's heart is stirred by his inheritance.''[38]

73. Other publications which serve to promote the regimental aspects of a unit's existence include regimental standing orders and regimental catechisms (pocket-sized aides-mémoires of an inspirational nature). The catechism of the RCR informs the soldier of such matters as the name of the Colonel of the Regiment, the formation and services of the RCR, the colours, honours and awards won by the regiment, the regimental march past, regimental days, and so on. One of the concluding paragraphs urged: ''You must have pride in yourself and in your Regiment... Think of the past history of The Royal Canadian Regiment. It is your privilege to make present and future regimental history every bit as glorious, perhaps even more so; it depends on you, for YOU ARE 'THE ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT'.''[39]

Symbolical Characteristics

74. Just as the institutions of a regiment provide the vehicle for fostering a sense of regimental community and for propagating its traditions, so its symbols foster its mystique and its uniqueness, with the intention, and very frequently the effect, of inculcating a pride of belonging in its members. Thus in great measure the regimental system confers the sense of self-esteem (and also of ritual) that all successful groups - from motorcycle gangs to football and service clubs - give to their members.

75. Dress Distinctions: In fostering esprit de corps the regimental system also promotes uniqueness and competitiveness. As centralization increasingly eroded the independence of British regiments, some compensation for the tradition autonomism was found in the assertion - which the War Office tried to check - of symbolical uniqueness, which is most visibly expressed by dress distinctions. When Private Frank Richards enlisted in 1901 he resisted blandishments to join another regiment and insisted on joining the Royal Welch Fusiliers, partly because it was the only regiment in the army privileged to wear the ''flash.''[40] When uniforms first came into use at the end of the seventeenth century, they were valuable for distinguishing friend from foe, but a smart uniform was soon recognized as a source of esprit de corps, as well as an aid to recruiting. Badges began to be worn on British headdress in the 1790s (and possibly earlier), and launched a trend towards the wearing of badges. The cap-badge is perhaps the most potent of dress distinctions - Bidwell called it ''that great talisman.''[41] During the nineteenth century even more distinctive - and commemorative - items of dress came into use, such as the ''flash'', or the ''Back Badge'' of The Gloucestershire Regiment. Canadian regiments have followed in this tradition, often adopting the dress distinctions of their allied regiments. An officer of one Western regiment stationed in England between 1940 and 1943, remarked that the adoption of the dress distinctions of their allied regiment provided a tremendous boost to morale.[42]

76. However minor, dress distinctions are identified in the soldier's mind with military tradition and constitute an important element in the building of morale. Thus, despite frequent alterations in uniform, the retention of regimental insignia and other distinctions is jealously guarded. A Canadian military historian has argued that the adoption of British uniforms has had a particular significance for the Canadian army because it was associated with the adoption of the regimental system.[43]

77. The value of dress distinctions has been recognized by the military authorities in both Canada and Britain. When the Canadian Forces uniform was first introduced consideration was given to replacing regimental badges with a general Canadian Forces badge or with branch badges, but the idea was abandoned. In Britain regimental cap-badges were withdrawn in favour of a ''Brigade'' cap-badge in 1959, but this aroused such strong opposition that by 1970 the regiments had successfully recoverd the use of their individual and traditional badges. The British Army Dress Committee meets three times a year to consider applications from units for changes to items of dress. The Ministry of Defence is generally tolerant of sartorial whims, on the basis that the morale benefits outweight the financial costs (provided that these are kept reasonable).

78. Colours: Sir John Fortescue, the great historian of the British army, described colours as ''the ark of (the) covenant'' for regimental soldiers.[44] A recent study of the customs and traditions of the Canadian Forces argued that the

> ''regimental colour is probably the most cherished possession of a fighting force. This is because it embodies a whole spectrum of ideas, beliefs and emotions which together may be characterized as 'the spirit of the regiment'. The regimental colour symbolizes in a very visible way the pride a man feels in serving in a unit whose reason for being is one of worth, the proud heritage of those of the regiment who have gone before, and the record of achievement of the regiment, perhaps enshrined on the colour in the battle honours displayed within its folds. There is a mystique about the colours which constantly reminds every officer and man how dependant he is on his comrades-in-arms and makes it extremely difficult for him in battle to fail in his duty, and as often spurs him on to undreamed of exploits of valour.''[45]

79. The Romans used standards for their legions, and they developed a similar value to that held by modern colours. The use of flags became widespread in the West in the late eleventh century, and they were used throughout the medieval period as a means of identification. The process of standardization and regimentation of military flags probably began in the early seventeenth century, when regiments were divided into three wings - two of musketeers and one of pikemen - each of which displayed a distinctive flag so that it might act separately from, yet remain identifiable as part of, the regiment. After the disappearance of pikemen by the end of the seventeenth century regiments ceased to be divided into three wings, and gradually the third flag was laid aside.

80. Probably the first formal regulations dealing with colours in the British army were those issued in 1747. The rules prescribed at that time are, broadly speaking, those that prevail today. A main purpose of colours was to provide a rallying point on the battlefield (just as guns, which are now regarded in the same light as colours, were a natural rallying point for gunners), but they have not been carried in action by the British army since 1882;* however, the loss of their tactical utility has not resulted in a diminution of their inspirational value. Much of the special significance of colours is derived from the battle honours inscribed upon them. The earliest Canadian battle honour is that of Eccles Hill (1870), won by the now-defunct Victoria Rifles of Canada. Serious perpetuation difficulties, and disputes over the award of battle honours, after the First World War meant that militia units were not awarded battle honours until 1929-31, and those for the Second World War still had not been granted in 1954.

81. Anniversaries: Most regiments celebrate one or two days a year with particular enthusiasm. The RCR, for instance, celebrates Paardeberg Day and Pachino Day (which both commemorate active service achievements of the regiment), as well as the anniversary of the regiment's formation. Fiftieth anniversaries, from that of the QOR

---

* The PPCLI's ''camp colour'', presented in 1914, came under fire in the First World War.

(in 1910) to those of the R22eR (in 1964) and the RCD and RCR (in 1983), are celebrated with particular panache. Naturally, the celebration of ''birthdays'' and ''anniversaries'' reinforces the familial aspects of the regiment.

82. Mess Customs: Although the mess was traditionally regarded as a home for living-in personnel (which, Baynes has shown[46], probably meant the great majority of British officers in 1914),mess activities have always been invested with a good deal of ceremony. Somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, this emphasis on custom and etiquette, enhances rather than inhibits comradeship by accentuating the closed ''family'' world of the regiment (its ''in-group'' orientation).

83. The symbolical nature of mess life is evident on both formal and informal occasions. When officers of the 48th Highlanders of Canada come to attention before entering the mess, the act is a mark of honour for the colours displayed in the anteroom. The Calgary Highlanders' toast to the regiment is ''The Glorious Memory of the Twenty-second of April'', commemorating the battle of St. Julien (1915). Other units recall their cavalry background, like the Royal Canadian Hussars (Montreal) whose dinners end with a noisy ceremony called ''The Ride.'' Les Fusiliers Mont-Royal wear the sash and tuque of the habitant over their mess dress and, following an old Québec custom, officers of le Régiment du Saguenay share la lampée de caribou.

84. Regimental Memorials: In some ways the unit past is recalled in a more immediate fashion than in the museum by a variety of memorials and commemorative items which are daily made familiar to soldiers garrisoning the home station. Such memorials might take the form of a tank or a gun mounted near regimental headquarters, or of a more conventional obelisk; an example of the latter is the RCR's memorial column at Wolseley Barracks, erected for the regiment's 75th anniversary and unveiled in 1959 by the Colonel-in-Chief. The Hastings and Prince Edward Regiment has a plaque in its armoury which commemorates those members of the regiment who have been transferred to the regiment's ''White Battalion.''

85. Just as memorials usually commemorate the active service achievements and the honour rolls of regiments, so their unit lines often also recall the unit past. When Wolseley Barracks was reconstructed in the 1950s, the barrack blocks and other buildings were named after events and personalities from RCR history, a practice followed by the QOR at Currie Barracks, by the RCHA at Shilo, and by other regiments.

86. Mascots: Mascots are yet another assertion of regimental distinctiveness. The custom of maintaining a regimental mascot is over two centuries old - the Royal Welch Fusiliers had the honour of passing in review preceded by a goat at least as early as 1775. British regiments in Canada kept mascots, among them a bear and a goose. Animals seem to win particular affection in wartime, and the 8th Hussars' famous mascot, Princess Louise, was acquired under shellfire in 1944.

87. In 1955 Vincent Massey, the governor-general, presented a goat to the R22eR, and told the men of the regiment that

> ''Acts of bravery of a Regiment such as yours can only come from a deep-rooted esprit de corps and a sense of tradition...You are affiliated with a very famous British Regiment. It is important, I feel, that you should share with The Royal Welch Fusiliers a tradition which has been theirs for centuries - that of having a Royal Goat as a member of your Regiment....''[47]

88. Ceremonial: Uniforms and ceremonial have a universal appeal to the theatrical parts of man's nature - outside the military various professional groups, service clubs, and other groups use dress and custom to reinforce corporate identity. The trooper of the 19th Royal Hussars quoted earlier evidently loved parades: ''And oh! the lump in one's throat, the tingle of the spine, the tautening of the shoulders as the regiment, in full dress, marches to church on a Sunday morning...''[48]

89. Canadian militiamen have always spent large sums of their own money to provide themselves with ceremonial items of

dress. In the late nineteenth century there was perhaps too much emphasis on ceremonial. Training funds were restricted, and much of the time available was spent by the smarter and more social city units in drill, less for its tactical than for its ceremonial usefulness. As a result of the Boer War, increased training funds, the creation of central camps (Petawawa opened in 1907), and so on, greater emphasis began to be placed on the more practical aspects of soldiering in the early years of the present century. Nonetheless. ceremonial has continued to play an important role in the activities of both regular and reserve units, and much about that ceremonial continues to be deliberately evocative of esprit de corps.

90. Precedence: Precedence can mean the difference between survival and extinction during periods of budgetary restraint when the most junior regiments tend to be those that are disbanded. However, seniority is probably as much prized for status as for security by regimental soldiers, and disputes over it can fuel the competitiveness inherent in the regimental system. When the Canadian Guards was formed in 1953 it automatically, as a Guards regiment, became the senior infantry regiment, which ''did not sit very well with (the RCR)...or with the PPCLI....''[49] The order of precedence of branches and regiments is regulated from time to time by the Department of National Defence.[50]

Attitudinal Characteristics

91 The organizational format, administrative policies, institutions, and symbols examined above all contribute to the formation of a set of attitudes by which the regimental system is often defined, by supporters and critics alike. In fact, regimental soldiers themselves are probably more likely to define the system in metaphysical terms rather than in purely organizational ones.

92. Family: The term that seems to come up more than any other in describing the regiment is ''family'' (or ''tribe'').[51] In describing the regimental system for American readers, the Canadian and British liaison officers to the US Army Training and Doctrine

Command wrote in 1980 that ''The regiment can perhaps best be described as a family or tribal organization that a member joins for the duration of his service career, and which can be extended into retirement through regimental associations.''[52] The tendency to use familial terms - ''The Old Man'' (CO), ''Auntie '' (second-in-command), and so on - is further indication of the family orientation of regiments. The sense of family was also expressed in a high degree of paternalism in officer-man relationships in nineteenth century regiments, as well as in the practice of generations of many families following each other into their ''family regiments.''

93. The concept of the regiment as a family is a very old one. Saint-Simon, who served in the French army at the end of the seventeenth century, suggested that in order to win the esteem of his regiment, the colonel should conduct himself as a good paterfamilias.[53] In the Victorian army usually six men in a hundred were allowed to marry, while general orders for the Canadian army permitted a married establishment in 1911 of only 8% of the rank and file, and 30% of the sergeants.[54] Not surprisingly therefore, a soldier's social life revolved around the battalion or regiment. This is much less the case in the modern army. 61.7% of the members of the Canadian Forces were married in 1983. Similarly, a significant proportion of forces personnel now live in DND-rented accommodation outside bases, in rented civilian accommodation, or else in their own homes.[55] Reduced use of mess facilities, and the increased role of base welfare agencies, are further factors working against the sense of regimental community. The 1979 Cotton Report on contemporary army attitudes showed that most junior combat troops, in contradistinction to their officers, accept administrative control from the base, partly because turnover among unit officers is so high that a base can appear to offer more predictable support.[56]

94. In these circumstances, regiments seem anxious to recover some of their earlier autonomy - particularly in terms of their capacity to promote the welfare of their members and their dependants - in order to counter the eroded sense of family. Ceremonial occasions

and regimental symbols are also promoted as being supportive of the family characteristics of the regiment. Some aspects of the institutional framework of regiments - notably associations, ladies' auxiliaries, and special mess functions (such as Christmas parties) - continue to play a role in creating the image of an extended family.

95. Comradeship: In many ways comradeship in military units is a function of small (primary) groups and of danger (participation in a combat event was considered the basic factor in establishing a ''buddy relationship'' by two-thirds of the men of an American platoon studied during the Korean War). If esprit de corps is an attitude of large, formal groups or units (although a somewhat different variant of it can obviously apply to sub-units), cohesion is an attribute of small, often informal, groups (although again battalions can be very cohesive - but not on the primary group basis of face-to-face interactions). Montgomery remarked on this distinction when he wrote: ''There is a difference between comradeship and regimental spirit. Comradeship is the spirit of fellow-feeling which grows up between a small group of men who live and work and fight together. Regimental spirit is the soldier's pride in the traditions of his regiment and his determination to be worthy of them himself.''[57]

96. Perhaps the intimate comradeship of the kind found in the primary group can only be found at the regimental level among the officers and senior NCOs. Although representing all sectors of a battalion or regiment, the officers and senior NCOs are few enough to develop group mores and loyalties - and the mess is perhaps the principal venue where such group ties are developed (as was noted earlier, CFP 110 states that messes are formed for the purpose of building esprit AND comradeship).

97. Competition, Pride and Rivalry: As was noted above, regiments go to great pains to establish distinctions between themselves and all other units. A good indication of the importance of seemingly minor distinctions occurred in the 1930s. In order to assert its

independence of the 1st Battalion, The Canadian Scottish Regiment, the newly-formed 2nd Battalion sought permission to display some distinct emblem on its colours. Although the Inspector of Regimental Colours insisted on the rule that the battalions of a single regiment should conform to one regimental design in their colours, the 2nd Battalion somehow contrived to alter the shade of the maple wreath on its regimental colour.

98. Such distinctivenss is reflected by both pride and rivalry, attitudes which tend to be mutually - reinforcing. An American researcher has pointed to the way in which group identification can be heightened by stressing groups which are different - different Australian and American military customs in Vietnam, for instance, injected a competitive spirit that helped to boost morale.[58] Similarly, Bidwell argues that ''The empirical rule is that the sharper and more numerous the distinctions from other regiments are, the stronger the esprit de corps.''[59]

99. Competitive assertion is an important part of group activity and identity, and thus competition is harnessed by the military to promote esprit. Towards the close of the nineteenth century the military authorities began to encourage inter-regimental competition both in sports and in military activities. In 1891 the General Officer Commanding the Militia reported that ''The spirit of emulation, aroused by the competitions in military efficiency, established in connection with the inspection of the Active Militia, has had a good effect on the training both of the rural and city Battalions.''[60] Where previously competition had mostly been internal to units (inter-company), battalions and regiments became increasingly outward-looking, especially after the Militia Department introduced an inter-battalion efficiency competition in 1895. The attention devoted to competitive success in regimental histories and journals demonstrates the continuing importance in regimental esprit of competition.[61]

100. Pride and distinctiveness are valuable sources of morale. In 1903 Field Marshal Lord Wolseley wrote that ''It is this intense feeling of regimental rivalry that is the lifeblood of our old

historic Army, and makes it what it is in action.''[62] However, some rivalries were so intense in the nineteenth century that certain regiments could not be bivouacked near each other, while fights were often deliberately provoked by slighting references to another regiment. Brigadier Bidwell commented forcefully on the role in the British military culture of such rivalry:

> ''Anyone familiar with the British regimental system knows that mere rivalry and honourable emulation are easily and frequently overtaken by acute jealousy, dislike and tension between various regiments and that the basic cause of this is the degree of exclusiveness, allegedly inflated military reputation, privileged position or snobbery that regiments may display. This is seldom publicized because British soldiers consider it perfectly natural and a worthwhile penalty for the advantages in terms of cohesion and fighting spirit the regimental system confers: If anything, such rivalries are fostered. To the uninformed and unscientific oberver the trivial differences between regiments in custom and dress are absurd. In reality they are of the greatest importance, for ...(they) are each quite sufficient to mark off one military group from another, and serve to trigger off the whole machinery of group behaviour. It is noticeable that if such differential signs are not provided the men will invent their own.''63

101. Esprit de Corps: The value of esprit de corps has long been recognized. Frederick the Great put it thus: ''Everything that one can make of the soldiers consists in giving them an ésprit de corps, or, in other words, teaching them to place their regiment higher than all of the troops in the world.''[64] However, Frederick would seem to have equated esprit de corps with honour, and to have regarded it as something that could be lost rather than won or increased. After the Anhalt-Bernburg Regiment was broken in an action in 1760 officers and NCOs lost the braid from their hats and the men were deprived of their swords. In a battle soon thereafter, the humiliated regiment, ignoring orders to remain in line, launched a furious attack on the Austrians, crying ''Honour or death'', and broke the enemy line. The regiment was restored to favour, and the king undertook to pay for new braid out of his own pocket.

102. Although regimental pride was a factor to be conjured with in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries - Napoleon kept files on his regiments as a source of exhortation - it appears to have become ascendant in the second half of the nineteenth century. The hussar trooper previously quoted wrote that he ''enjoyed the honour of serving in a famous Hussar regiment. Unlike today, esprit de corps was then a passionate emotion. We knew the history of our regiments from the day they were founded. We could recite every battle honour, quote every landmark in the history of the 'Old Mob'.''[65]

103. As has been noted, esprit was slow to develop in the Canadian Permanent Force before 1914, but was becoming characteristic of many of the city militia units in the 1880s and 1890s (the willingness of many militiamen to sign their pay over to regimental funds, and often to pay for expensive uniform items, is indicative of such esprit). Naturally, few Canadian units had battle honours prior to the Boer War, and their traditions were quite new. Therefore unit pride was probably based less on the invocation of the past - as in Britain - as on a very active social and ceremonial calendar, community pride, admiring references from the normally uncritical Canadian Military Gazette and other journals, competitive success in shooting or in other military tournaments, the prestige of regimental bands, and so on. Local pride was an added dimension of militia esprit. One officer of the inter-war militia claimed that ''Our prime object is to make what we have as efficient as we can, and local pride is the only thing that will keep the militia together.''[66]

104. War brought a whole new dimension to Canadian esprit. Active service by regiments, or their members, in the Boer War, the two world wars, and Korea reinforced the institutional and symbolical aspects of regimental life: associations were formed, battle honours awarded, memorials built, histories written, anniversaries created, museum artifacts acquired, and oral traditions were launched. The mechanisms of peacetime esprit de corps were

so well understood by the mid-1950s that the short-lived regular units raised during that decade rapidly developed an esprit of their own. The Black Watch and QOR (as later the 8th Hussars, Fort Garry Horse, and 12e RBC) were able to build on the basis of a strong militia tradition; the Canadian Guards built on the basis of the Guards tradition.

105. It is far from easy to determine the extent and influence of esprit de corps in a particular unit. Plenty of references to esprit can be found, but such references tend to be overwhelmingly positive (it would seem unlikely that observers would link demoralization with weak esprit de corps, which is a much less obvious factor than some of the others to which such demoralization can be attributed*, whereas high esprit tends to be more evident and hence more likely to evoke comment). Therefore, producing references to esprit will tend to skew the inquiry in a positive direction, and also cannot establish the generality of such esprit. It seems improbable that all members of a unit will share equally strong feelings of pride and identification, even in regiments which appear to be characterized by high esprit. Although Baynes implied that esprit de corps was general in the 2nd Scottish Rifles and, by inference, in the regular regiments of 1914, attrition was high in the army of that period, and a large number of men took their discharges at the end of their first term of colour service.[67] The willingness of men to leave their regiments after seven years' service suggests that esprit was not as high, as general, or as motivating as Baynes (or Maitland) indicated.

---

* Low morale among the Argentinians on the Falklands in 1982 is usually ascribed to the weather, the large number of conscripts, poor leadership, and so on - rarely to low esprit de corps.

THE REGIMENTAL SYSTEM AND COMBAT MOTIVATION

106. The previous section discussed the administrative, institutional, and symbolical means by which esprit de corps is built up and a sense of community developed. The earlier section on combat motivation in general demonstrated the importance of group cohesion (at usually the section level), of leadership and example, and of such factors as socialization, training, and discipline. These and other motivational factors are influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the regimental system. It was also noted earlier that perhaps the strongest defence of the regimental system rests on the motivational power attributed to it.

107. Thus, having outlined the origin, development, and characteristics of the regimental system, it is time to turn to an assessment of the psychological role played by the regimental system in combat. This role will be examined along two main dimensions (which, of course, are not mutually exclusive): esprit de corps, and a sense of community.

ESPRIT DE CORPS

108. In Morale John Baynes sought an explanation for why a regular battalion maintained its cohesion and morale in the face of extremely heavy casualties (especially among the officers and NCOs) in a 1915 battle, and he concluded that ''if the actions of the soldiers of the Scottish Rifles at Neuve Chapelle are to be explained in a few words one can only say that they did it for the Regiment.''[68]

109. The perceived relationship between regimental pride and battlefield behaviour was summed up by the CO of a battalion of the Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry, who told his men before their

first battle (probably in the Second World War) that

> ''as descendants of the men who gained such splendid victories in so many battles from 1702 onwards we are simply unable to be cowardly. We've got to win our battles, whatever the cost, so that people will say 'They were worthy descendants of the 32nd' and that's saying a hell of a lot.''69

110. One of the components of battlefield esprit is the invocation of the regiment's past, as Montgomery noted. Baynes examined its influence, and Lord Moran (Churchill's doctor and a First World War medical officer who wrote a seminal study of soldierbehaviour) was convinced of its importance: ''There were battalions which were more than usually resistant to the corroding effects of strain and battle... These men had resolved to do nothing to besmirch the name of their Regiment, however fearful they might be in their hearts.''[70] Baynes and Moran were not alone in ascribing to esprit de corps an important role in influencing combat motivation in the First World War. Robert Graves, the author and poet, served as an instructor at a base school in France after service in the front line. He and his combat-experienced fellow instructors frequently debated the topic of morale, and they concluded that regimental pride was a far stronger moral force in keeping a battalion going as an effective fighting unit than were such other values as patriotism or religious belief.

111. The importance of success and self-confidence in boosting esprit was mentioned previously in the context of the CEF's high morale between 1915 and 1918, and further indication of the significance of such success is provided by the recollection of a Canadian veteran of the war: ''And when a soldier thinks that his army is better than anybody else's and his Division is better than the other Divisions, and his Platoon's the best in the Battalion, well obviously he's the best soldier in the world... His morale must be high. Everybody believed that the Canadian Corps, all by itself and single-handed, was...winning the war, and you could see it.''[71] It is also clear from this passage that pride is not

solely the product of battalion- or regimental-sized units.

112. Regimental pride undoubtedly played an important role in the Second World War also, but analyses of motivation in that war seem to accord it a lesser role than similar analyses of the First. Again plenty of examples of high esprit de corps can be cited - despite the squalid conditions in which the men of Wingate's ''Chindit'' columns operated in Burma in 1944, the 2nd Battalion, The Black Watch remained fiercely regimental and maintained high standards of appearance and deportment in the most difficult circumstances - but studies of soldier attitudes tended to concentrate on other factors. After a careful study of attitudes in the Second World War, John Ellis concluded that, despite evidence of a high degree of pride in some units, the gradual transformation of battalions into heterogeneous collections of replacements made it unrealistic to claim that loyalty to a mere organization was sufficient to keep men going (Ellis believed that comradeship was the bedrock of endurance).[72] However heterogeneous, battalions could demonstrate a ''strangely persistent esprit''[73], but its roots were probably different from those underlying the regimental pride Baynes detected among First World War regulars, and it was probably less generalized (a yeomanry officer in North Africa remarked that many of the men in his regiment disliked the CO because they never understood his devotion to the regiment[74]). The cap-badge remained an important source of attachment, but possibly this was in part because the cap-badge provided some hope of organizational stability, allowing men at the section, platoon, and company levels to anticipate that they would remain with their fellows, even after such absences as convalescent leave.

113. From a Canadian perspective, Mowat's The Regiment conveys the strong sense of community and of regimental pride felt by members of the Hastings and Prince Edward Regiment. During the Italian campaign a poll was taken to ascertain how many men would serve in the Pacific after the European war was ended: ''more than

eighty per cent volunteered - with one vital proviso - that they go with the unit, and that the Regiment remain intact.''[75] On the eve of the Normandy landing the postal censors who read letters written by the Canadians in 21st Army Group reported that ''Regimental pride and a fine esprit de corps is evident...''[76] (this assessment was, of course, written before the units went into battle, when they were at full strength and highly trained). Nonetheless, an impressionistic assessment suggests that esprit de corps was not as overt- or as advertized - as it had been in the First World War (one subaltern commented that the self-satisfaction and truculence of the CEF would have been unpleasant in ordinary life[77]), although this was offset by other factors.

114. After the experience of mobilization in 1914 and 1939, Canadian army policy for the limited Korean intervention was to try to harness the esprit embodied in the existing regimental structure. In order to ''instill regimental esprit by osmosis, rather than by the long and often painful method of creating team spirit in new units''[78], the infantry units for the Canadian Army Special Force were designated as second battalions of the three regular regiments (a similar policy was followed in the artillery). Thus, in the words of the Adjutant-General, recruiting for these units relied largely upon ''the prestige of Active Force regimental titles.''[79] Every effort was made to promote esprit de corps, and the historian of the PPCLI (who had himself served in both the Second World War and Korea) contended that ''There was not a man in the PPCLI who did not firmly believe that the Patricias were the best soldiers in the Canadian Brigade.... He knew too, that any action fought by the Regiment was watched and discussed by every other unit of the Brigade as well as by the British, Australians, New Zealanders and Indians of the Division. It mattered greatly to him what they thought of the Patricias.''[80]

115. Esprit de corps is not unique to the regiment or battalion, although in Commonwealth armies it is always at this level that it

has flourished most strongly. In the US Army formations - for example, Patton's Third Army, the 1st Infantry Division (the ''Big Red One''), and the 82nd and 101st Airborne - have often developed a high esprit, perhaps because in the past half-century they have been more stable, organizationally, than regiments (as Merrill's Marauders discovered in Burma in 1944, it is difficult to identify with apparently transient organizations). After the Somme battles (1916) coloured divisional patches appeared on the sleeves of Canadian uniforms. The historian of one of the CEF battalions commented: ''The patches at once became vested with a significance that passed into tradition. They came to mean almost as much as regimental colours.''[81] Divisional (and corps) pride may have been facilitated by the fact that the CEF had been largely formed outside the existing regimental structure, and was in the process of creating its own esprit, which was only in part derived from that structure and which was in large measure a result of situational factors.[82] Similarly, Calvert's 77th Brigade in Burma in 1944 built a strong esprit de corps that was a compound of the regimental system and of General Wingate's peculiar organizational methods (Wingate originally proposed to discard the regimental system and to create ''groups'' with fresh titles, but he was dissuaded from so drastic a step). The Chindit columns developed their own esprit, ''but the cap-badge and the regimental identity was retained, to be fiercely cherished.''[83]

SENSE OF COMMUNITY

116. As has been noted, the institutions, symbols, and traditions of the regimental system are designed to foster a sense of community as well as to develop esprit de corps. Like cohesion and comradeship this sense of community encourages the soldier to fight to protect something of which he feels himself a part.

117. One historian has argued that the regimental tradition is not ''solely, or even in considerable part, a celebration of victory;

it was much more a tradition of sacrifice within a brotherhood. The deeds it commemorated were not bloody and vengeful triumphs over a hated enemy, but heroic though hopeless last stands, and the sacrifice of brother for brother, officer for private soldier, private soldier for officer.''[84] Liddell Hart felt that it was the corporate sense of the old regular army that enabled it to endure so well at First Ypres (November 1914): ''The family spirit was its keynote, and the key to the apparent miracle by which, when formations were broken up and regiments reduced to remnants, those remnants still held together.''[85] Describing the US Army in the Second World War, Bidwell wrote that ''Their units were soulless things known by numbers and letters and their re-inforcements....were brought up to the front like cattle and introduced into a decimated unit of sullen and perhaps hostile strangers. (In contrast, British soldiers) were rejoining their own 'tribe' and expected to see again, not only their own cap badge - that great talisman - but the familiar faces of comrades.''[86] The expectation of rejoining their own units was such that soldiers returning from convalescent leave could be greatly upset if, as a result of manpower problems, they were assigned to other units,[87] and on one occasion this feeling resulted in a mutiny (at Salerno in 1943).

THE ROLE OF THE REGIMENTAL SYSTEM IN BATTLE

118. The foregoing has demonstrated the part that esprit de corps plays in motivating soldiers in battle. Its influence is by no means always general or widespread, and it is possible, as Baynes has suggested, that, by virtue of the social and situational factors that operated in 1914, it was a more significant factor, vis à vis other motivators, for the British regular of the First World War than at any time before or since. Changing social attitudes, greater education, the fielding of mass armies drawn from a wide social spectrum, technological advances, and other twentieth century developments, have all influenced the attitudes of combat soldiers. Echoing Marshall's views on the immediacy of battle, Montgomery (who was a regular infantry

subaltern in 1914) contended after the Second World War that regimental spirit could be a powerful factor in the building of high morale, but that nonetheless it is a contributing factor rather than an essential condition of morale: ''it is not...a basic factor of morale, because in the crisis of battle the majority of men will not derive encouragement from the glories of the past but will seek aid from their leaders and comrades of the present.''[88] However, if Montgomery was correct, the development of a sense of community in a battalion or regiment is clearly an important reinforcer of cohesion at the primary group level. And for all the social changes of the past half-century, the evidence of recent wars - from the Second World War to the Falklands campaign - indicates that, for an important minority at least, esprit de corps does continue to be an important motivator.

119. In the preceding quotation from Montgomery, he referred to the behaviour of the majority of soldiers. The study of combat motivation indicates,however, that the behaviour of a minority of men will often exert a disproportionate influence on the performance of whole units. As a major study of soldier attitudes in the Second World War observed, ''officers and men must be motivated to make the organization work, but not all of them need to be so motivated...''[89] There is perhaps a majority of men who will remain in the front line yet not display high commitment or marked aggression, but such men are suggestible to acts of leadership - hence the importance in combat of example. The factors that conduce to commitment and aggression in (probably) a smaller number of men are therefore crucial to the effectiveness of the whole, and the record of modern combat is clear that unit pride and loyalty is a powerful source of motivation for many soldiers. If the desire to sustain the honour of their regiments, or to protect their unit communities, induces such men to leadership acts, then esprit de corps constitutes a valuable indirect, as well as a direct, motivator. ''The honour of my battalion and its opinion of me. Those are now my sustaining motives...'', one officer wrote in the First World War,[90] and it is probable that if such motives propelled him

forwards, his men would follow, whether or not their commitment or motivations matched his own.

120. Furthermore, the parochialism of the regimental system is a barrier against the spread of demoralization. General Horrocks argued that the regimental system is well adapted to coping with the disintegrative effects of retreat. He felt that the escape of the BEF from Dunkirk in 1940 owed a great deal to the toughness of the regimental soldiers, who seemed indifferent to the chaos and demoralization that enveloped the retreat.[91]

CONCLUSION

121. This paper has sought to assess the role of esprit de corps, and of unit affiliation, in battle, and to determine the means, practical and symbolical, by which the regimental system seeks to enhance and harness esprit and to develop a sense of community among the members of battalions and regiments.

122. Although the administrative, operational, institutional, and symbolical aspects of modern Commonwealth regiments* are clearly designed to enhance motivation and morale, it should be noted that esprit de corps can exist without many of them, although usually in different social or operational environments. Thus, esprit was recognized as an important motivator (although probably not the primary one) by eighteenth century military leaders and writers, among them Frederick the Great. Esprit de corps in regiments of that period is rarely examined, even in regimental histories, although it was obviously an important factor in such battles as Fontenoy (1745) and Minden (1759). Yet many of the regimental characteristics described in this paper were lacking in eighteenth century regiments, whose officers often looked upon their men largely as a source of profit, an attitude that sometimes led to serious consequences.[93] It would appear likely that esprit de corps in the eighteenth century was a function as much of discipline, training, success, and exemplary leadership as it was of the more modern concept of unit honour being something held in trust (and symbolized by battle honours and colours), although a fear of corporate disgrace also played a (perhaps somewhat negative) role. Modern special force units also demonstrate a high esprit de corps which is not largely dependant on the regimental system. Although they share many of the institutional and symbolical characteristics of line regiments, their esprit is also a function of elitism and of professional pride.

---

* The regimental system flourishes in the Australian and New Zealand armies, as well as in the Canadian and British armies, and Keegan has suggested that the Indian army is more ''regimental'' even than the British (partly because regimental distinction is fortified by the caste system, and regiments are given considerable autonomy by the government in return for being apolitical).92

123. The regimental system is not solely a mosaic of organizational format, administrative practices, ''regimental'' institutions, and symbols. These aspects of the modern regimental system also conduce to a set of attitudes, including the sense of family, comradeship, competition, and pride in, and loyalty to, the unit. Together, these characteristics and attitudes establish a strong link between the regiment, in all its facets, and esprit de corps as a source of motivation in both peace and, more particularly, war.

124. Early in this paper it was noted that perhaps the strongest argument advanced in defence of retention of the regimental system rests on the role claimed for it in developing combat motivation and morale. The focus of the present paper is on this behavioural role, and thus it does not examine other operational considerations, although some of these should, perhaps, be briefly noted.

125. The historical homogeneity of regiments had a corollary in a high expectation of conformity (just as family members are expected to adhere to a unifying set of values). In noting the tribal nature of British regiments Bidwell observed that ''A regiment IS a tribal, or social, group with its own mores of a rigid kind, imposing group objectives and group standards of behaviour on its members and disciplining or ejecting non-conformists.''[94] Equally, there has been a tendency to conservatism among regimental soldiers that was particularly evident between the wars. They clung to their autonomy and resisted not only mechanization[95] but also the development of an all-arms doctrine and of central branch schools. In turn, these undermined the development of inter-arms cooperation and fostered inter-unit jealousy. As the Canadian Army Special Force found in Korea, adherence to the regimental system can also result in manpower problems - in this case, overseas battalions had only one source of replacements (the home service battalions and replacement companies of their regiments) and thus vacancies were often filled by under-trained men. From time to time it has also been asserted that the regimental system has constituted an obstacle to organizational reform, to the creation of formations and staffs, to technical training, and

to professional development.[96]

126. Weaknesses of the sort described here have tended to flourish in peacetime, only, usually, to be corrected - often gradually and painfully - in war. Analysis of the regimental system suggests that, for all its apparent conservatism, it is a remarkably adaptive form of organization that has successful adjusted itself to major changes in its social, operational, and organizational environments. An example of this occurred during the British defence cuts of the late 1960s, when efforts were being made to form ''large regiments''. The four light infantry regiments - Durham, Shropshire, Yorkshire, and Somerset and Cornwall -sensed the impending reduction of one of their number and hastily arranged a merger (forming The Light Infantry in 1968) which has preserved the existence of all at the expense of some blurring of their individual identities.

127. After the turmoil of the 1960s, both Canadian and British regiments have enjoyed more than a decade of stability, and small but significant gains to the ''regimental'' way of doing things have been realized. In part this was a natural correction after the reforms of the 1960s when new managerial techniques were being tested, and new technologies absorbed (and, in Britain, national service was being ended), but it was also a result of the American experience in Vietnam which produced a reassessment by the US Army of the role of human factors in war. Despite such phenomena as high turbulence, reduced use of messes, off-base living, and so on, which militate against the development of esprit and of a sense of community, a number of indicators, noted earlier,[97] suggests that the Canadian regimental system is in better shape today than at any time since 1970.

REFERENCES

1. Loomis, LCol. D.G., The Regimental System, address to the officers of 3 RCR, 15 September 1969, p.1

2. Beveridge, Col. J.R., ''In Defence of the Regimental System'', in Canadian Defence Quarterly, vol. 4, no. 3, Winter 1974, p.47

3. Bidwell, Shelford, Gunners at War. A Tactical Study of the Royal Artillery in the Twentieth Century, London: Arms and Armour Press, 1970, p.48

4. Kellett, Anthony, Combat Motivation, Ottawa: Operational Research and Analysis Establishment, Report No. R77, November 1980

5. Marshall, S.L.A., Men Against Fire, New York: William Morrow & Co., 1947, p.161

6. Rachman, S.J., Development of Courage in Military Personnel in Training and Performance in Combat Situations, London: London University Institute of Psychiatry, March 1982

7. Quoted in Duffy, Christopher, The Army of Frederick the Great, New York: Hippocrene Books, 1974, p.56

8. Stanhope, Henry, The Soldiers. An Anatomy of the British Army, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1979, p.13

9. Quoted in Bond, Brian, British Military Policy Between the Two World Wars, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980, pp.58-59

10. Cotton, Maj. C.A., Military Attitudes and Values of the Army in Canada, Willowdale: Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit, Report 79-5, December 1979

11. Keegan, John, Regimental Ideology, paper presented to the Leadership Symposium on Commitment in the Military Profession, Royal Roads Military College, Victoria, 11-13 June 1983, p.13

12. Greenhous, Brereton, Dragoon. The Centennial History of the Royal Canadian Dragoons, 1883-1983, Guild of the Royal Canadian Dragoons, 1983, p.487

13. Slim, Field Marshal Sir William, Courage, and Other Broadcasts, London: Cassell & Co. 1959, p.86

14. Stanhope, p.267

15. See, for example, Liston, LCol J.T., Evaluation of Base Concept-Army Field Units, 1977; and Study Team on Unit Administration, Land Force Combat Development Study on Unit Administration, 3 vols, St. Hubert: Mobile Command Headquarters, December 1981, vol. 3, p. 13-3-3, para. 12

16. Richardson, Maj-Gen. F.M., Fighting Spirit: A Study of Psychological Factors in War, London: Leo Cooper, 1978, p.125

17. Simonds, Lieut.-Gen. G.G., ''Commentary and Observations'', in Massey, H.J., ed, The Canadian Military: A Profile, Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing, 1972, p.273

18. Baynes, John, Morale: A Study of Men and Courage, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967, p.110

19. Canadian Military Gazette, vol. 24, 13 April 1909, p.10

20. Steven, H/Maj., In This Sign, Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1948, p.2

21. Liston, pp.13-14

22. Baynes, pp.22-23

23. Ibid, p.37

24. Richardson, pp. 15-16

25. Quoted in Watson, Lieut.-Col. R.S.B., ''A Look at the British Regimental System'', in Military Review, vol. LXI, no. 7, July 1981, p.50

26. Janowitz, Morris, The Professional Soldier. A Social and Political Portrait, New York: Free Press, 1960, p.175

27. Brett, Maj. A.H., The Canadian Forces Officers' Mess in Troublesome Times, Toronto: Canadian Forces Command and Staff College, June 1978

28. CFAO 27-1, para. 6

29. CFP 110, para. 403, section 7

30. Moir, John S., ed., History of the Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1903-1961, Ottawa: Corps Committee Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1962, p.65

31. Quoted in How, Douglas, The 8th Hussars. A History of the Regiment, Sussex: Maritime Publishing Co. Ltd, 1964, p.77

32. Bull, W. Perkins, From Brock to Currie, Toronto: George J. McLeod Ltd, 1935, p. 288

33. Canadian Military Gazette, vol. 23, 24 March 1908, p.12

34. The Strathconian, 1981, p.49

35. Ibid, July 1978, p.44

36. Quoted in Barnard, Lieut.-Col. W.T., The Queen's Own Rifles of Canada 1860-1960. One Hundred Years of Canada, Don Mills: The Ontario Publishing Company Limited, 1960, p. 366

37. Moir, p.66

38. Maitland, Francis Hereward, Hussar of the Line, London: Hurst & Blackett Ltd., 1951, p.32

39. The Royal Canadian Regiment, Regimental Catechism, c. 1982. These words closely echo those of the wartime RCR catechism.

40. Richards, Frank, Old-Soldier Sahib, London: Faber & Faber Limited, 1936, p.21

41. Bidwell, Shelford, Modern Warfare: A Study of Men, Weapons and Theories, London: Allen Lane, 1973, p.139

42. Mitchell, Howard, My War With the Saskatoon Light Infantry (M.G.) 1939-1945, n.p., n.d., p.15

43. Preston, Richard A., ''The Transfer of British Military Institutions to Canada in the Nineteenth Century'', in Hamilton, William B., ed., The Transfer of Institutions, Durham: Duke University Press, 1964, pp. 96-97

44. Quoted in Richardson, p.14

45. Russell, E.C., Customs and Traditions of the Canadian Armed Forces, Ottawa: Deneau & Greenberg, 1980, pp. 170-71

46. Baynes, p.117

47. Quoted in Russell, p.130

48. Maitland, p.23

49. Galloway, Strome, The General Who Never Was, Belleville: Mika Publishing Company, 1981, pp. 274-75

50. According to Canadian Army Order No. 220-3, 17 February 1964 the Cadets of the Canadian Service Colleges take precedence over all corps and regiments when parading as a unit representing their college, but in most circumstances the RCHA, with their guns, constitute the ''right of the line.''

51. Interviews conducted in March 1983 with officers of an infantry battalion reflected this communal orientation. The concept of the regiment as a family has been most effectively put by Loomis, BGen, D.G., The Regimental System, St. Hubert: Mobile Command Letter, Special Supplement, c. 1974

52. Faith, Lieut.-Col. P.W., and Ross, LCol, D.I., Application of the Regimental System to the United States Army's Combat Arms, Fort Monroe: Headquarters Training and Doctrine Command, April 1980, p.9

53. Quoted in Craplet, Général, 5 Siècles d'Infanterie Francaise, Paris: A.D.D.I.M., 1967, p.12

54. General Order No. 100, 3 July 1911

55. Data from a 1983 survey of Canadian Forces families showed that 38.9% of the 3040 respondents (who all had dependants) lived on-base - data held by DSEA

56. Cotton, p.51

57. Quoted in Serve to Lead. An Anthology, Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst, c. 1976, p.14

58. Cited in Watson, Peter, War on the Mind: The Military Uses and Abuses of Psychology, London: Hutchinson & Co., 1978, p.118

59. Bidwell, Modern Warfare, p.102

60. Militia Report, 1891, p.5

61. See Greenhous, pp. 481-83, 485

62. Wolseley, Field-Marshal Viscount, The Story of a Soldier's Life, London: Archibald Constable & Co., 1903, vol. 1, p.309

63. Bidwell, Modern Warfare, p.103

64. Luvaas, Jay, ed., Frederick the Great on the Art of War, New York: The Free Press, 1966, p.78

65. Maitland, p.15

66. Quoted in How, p.77

67. See Richards, p.331 ff

68. Baynes, p.163

69. Quoted in Richardson, pp. 21-22

70. Moran, Lord, The Anatomy of Courage, 2nd ed., London: Constable, 1966, p.33

71. Quoted in Mathieson, William D., My Grandfather's War. Canadians Remember the First World War 1914-1918, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1981, p.269

72. Ellis, John, The Sharp End of War. The Fighting Man in World War II, London: Corgi Books, 1982, pp. 332-34, 344-46

73. Pearce, Donald, Journal of a War: North-West Europe 1944-1945, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965, p.157

74. Douglas, Keith, Alamein to Zem Zem, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd, 1969, p.81

75. Mowat, Farley, The Regiment, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1967, p.246

76. Quoted in Stacey, Col. C.P., Six Years of War. The Army in Canada, Britain and the Pacific, Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1965, p.427

77. Burns, Lieut.-Gen. E.L.M., General Mud, Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1970, p.69

78. Wood, Lieut.-Col. H.F., Strange Battleground. The Operations in Korea and Their Effects on the Defence Policy of Canada, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1966, p.34

79. Quoted in Urquhart, G.M., The Changing Role of the Canadian Militia, 1945-1975, unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Victoria, 1977, p.40

80. Williams, Jeffrey, Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, London: Leo Cooper Ltd, 1972, p.78

81. Quoted in Wood, Herbert Fairlie, Vimy!, London: Corgi Books, 1972, p.48

82. See above, p.10

83. Bidwell, Shelford, The Chindit War. Stilwell, Wingate, and the Campaign in Burma: 1944, New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1979, p.116

84. Connell, John, Wavell. Scholar and Soldier, London: Collins,1964, p.75

85. Liddell Hart, B.H., History of the First World War, London: Cassell & Company Ltd, 1970, pp. 177-78

86. Quoted in Richardson, p.20

87. See, for example, Mowat, p.112

88. Quoted in Serve to Lead, p.14

89. Stouffer, Samuel A., et al, Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, vol. 2: ''The American Soldier: Combat and its Aftermath'', Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949, p.101

90. Quoted in Ellis, John, Eye-Deep in Hell, London: Croom Helm Ltd, 1976, p.98

91. Horrocks, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Brian, A Full Life, Glasgow: Fontana Books, 1962, p.71

92. Keegan, John, verbal presentation on Regimental Ideology given at the Leadership Symposium on Commitment in the Military Profession, Royal Roads Military College, Victoria, 11-13 June 1983

93. See, for example, Vale, Col. W.L., History of the South Staffordshire Regiment, Aldershot: Gale & Polden Ltd, 1969, pp. 8-9

94. Bidwell, Gunners at War, p.46

95. See, for example, Macksey, Maj. K.J., Armoured Crusader. A Biography of Major-General Sir Percy Hobart, London: Hutchison, 1967, p.159, and Greenhous, p.284

96. See, for example, Harries-Jenkins, Gwyn, The Army in Victorian Society, London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1977, passim; and Bond, Brian, British Military Policy between the Two World Wars, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980, pp.35-71

97. See above, p.11

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF EVOLUTION OF CANADIAN REGIMENTAL SYSTEM

1627	Males of Port Royal enrolled for defence of settlement
1636	Militia of Québec formed
1663	Maisonneuve raises Montréal militia, divided into 7 man squads - ''first regularly organized militia unit in Canadian history'' (Stanley)
1665	Régiment de Carignan-Salières arrives in Canada; most of regiment has returned to France by 1668
1669	Louis XIV orders formation of a militia, to be divided into companies
1683	First troupes de la marine arrive; independent company structure
1714	Incipient brigade structure for militia established in three governmental districts
1717	40th Regiment raised in Nova Scotia from New England troops
1752	Duquesne initiates militia reform
1755	6 battalions of French line infantry arrive
1757	8 companies of troupes de la marine grouped into a battalion called ''La Marine''; 2nd Battalion added 1760
1760	Regular regiments and large proportion of colonial regulars return to France
1775	American Revolution; Royal Highland Emigrants raised (2 battalions), disbanded in 1783
1777	First militia legislation of British regime
1783	End of American War; Loyalist regiments settled as units in Canada
1793	First militia act for Upper Canada
1793-1803	4 provincial regiments raised (3 became fencible); also 2-company Queen's Rangers raised in Britain for service in Upper Canada (1792-1802)

1803	3 disbanded Maritime fencible regiments reactivated, and new fencible regiment raised in Canada
1812	War with America; Canadian Voltigeurs, Glengarry Light Infantry raised; 6 battalions of selected embodied militia raised in Lower Canada, flank companies and one incorporated militia battalion (1813) in Upper Canada
1816	Fencible and provincial units disbanded; defence of British North America based on British regulars and sedentary militia
1822	Thorough reorganization of county militia battalions of Upper Canada
1837-38	Rebellions in two Canadas; large number of provincial units raised
1837	New Brunswick Regiment of Artillery formed from 10 scattered companies - first artillery unit to be regimented
1840	Royal Canadian Rifles, a ''colonial corps'' of British veterans, raised
1846	Militia Act - vague acknowledgement of volunteer principle
1848	New Brunswick Regiment of Yeomanry Cavalry formed from 9 scattered troops
1855	Militia Act - gives volunteer militia new status and organizational framework, and in process creates conditions for adoption of British-style regimental system
1858	100th Royal Canadian Regiment of Foot raised for imperial service
1859	New militia act authorizes volunteer companies to be formed into battalions - 1st Battalion Volunteer Militia Rifles (Montréal) formed in 1859, 2nd Battalion (Toronto) in 1860
1863	Two militia acts, one of which provided for creation of military schools, with British battalions providing instructional model
1869-71	Most of British troops withdrawn; Royal Canadian Rifles disbanded (1870)

1870	Red River Expedition; composite 1st (Ontario) and 2nd (Quebec) Battalions raised from volunteer militia units
1870	Regulations and Orders for the Canadian Militia - drawn directly from British regulations
1871	''A'' and ''B'' Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, formed - effectively become a regular force in 1875 when 3 years' continuous service authorized
1883	Revision to 1868 Militia Act authorized infantry and cavalry schools, forerunners of RCR and RCD
1883	''A'', ''B'', and newly-formed ''C'' Batteries formed into Regiment of Canadian Artillery
1885	North-West Rebellion
1885	Mounted Infantry School formed in Winnipeg
1892	Permanent Force infantry and cavalry regiments formed from schools
1895	First honorary appointment made in Canada
1899-1901	Boer War; 1st Canadian Mounted Rifles (soon redesignated RCD) and 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th CMR, Lord Strathcona's Horse, 3 artillery batteries, and 2nd and 3rd (Special Service) Battalions, RCR, raised for service in South Africa and Canada
1900	All militia infantry battalions redesignated ''Regiments''
1901	Canadian Mounted Rifles formed as a Permanent Force unit; became Strathcona's Horse (Royal Canadians) in 1909
1903	Armoury-building programme begun; also system of alliances with British regiments
1906	5th Royal Highlanders of Canada and QOR of C become first volunteer militia regiments to acquire second battalions; former unit established ''The Royal Highlanders Reserve'', possibly the first old comrades' association in Canada
1911	Permanent Force divided into regular units and instructional cadre; units free to concentrate on regimental activities

1914	Canadian Expeditionary Force raised; existing regimental structure relegated to supporting role
1917	Territorial regimental system established to link provinces and field units
1919-20	Demobilization of CEF units and reconstitution of Permanent Force and Militia; Otter Committee; PPCLI and R22eR become Permanent Force units
1929-31	After delays due to perpetuation and other disputes, battle honours for the First World War were awarded to militia units
1936	Militia reorganized
1939	Canadian Active Service Force raised within existing regimental structure
1940	Reserve Army created - second battalions and reserve regiments for active service units
1946	Disbandment of CEF units; Interim Force (regular); Active Force reconstituted largely on lines of pre-war Permanent Force; Reserve Force reorganized
1950	Korean War; Canadian Army Special Force created; 2nd and 3rd battalions raised for regular infantry regiments; 2nd Field Regiment, RCHA formed; composite armoured squadron formed
1951	27th Canadian Infantry Brigade Group set up for NATO service in Germany - ranks filled through militia
1953	NATO battalions re-mustered into regular army as Canadian Guards, Black Watch and QOR; 2 artillery regiments re-mustered as 3rd and 4th Regiments, RCHA
1953	Depots set up for regular infantry and artillery regiments
1953	Kennedy Committee - militia reorganized
1957	2 out of 4 regular battalions of Canadian Guards disbanded
1957	8th Canadian Hussars (Princess Louise's) formed as regular unit
1958	Fort Garry Horse formed as regular unit
1964	Suttie Commission recommendations lead to major militia reorganization

1965	Mobile Command formed
1968	Unification - Canadian Army ceased to exist as separate service
1968	1st Battalion, The Canadian Guards, and 2nd Battalion, QOR of C reduced; 12e RBC and 5e RALC, and Canadian Airborne Regiment formed; 5 service battalions formed
1968	Regimental depots closed; number of regular force bands disbanded or amalgamated
1969	Further reductions in militia
1970	1st and 2nd Battalions, The Black Watch, 1st Battalion, QOR of C, 2nd Battalion, Canadian Guards, Fort Garry Horse, and 4th Regiment RCHA reduced; 3rd Battalions, RCR and PPCLI re-established; 3 Mechanized Commando formed
1970	Policy of replacing regimental messes by base messes launched
1971	White Paper Defence in the '70s; period since one of comparative organizational stability for land forces, regular and militia