

# Two Solitudes, One War: Public Opinion, National Unity and Canada's War in Afghanistan

John Kirton, with Jenilee Guebert  
University of Toronto

Paper prepared for a conference on "Quebec and War," Université de Québec à Montréal, Montreal, October 5–6, 2007. I gratefully acknowledge the research assistance of Madeline Koch, Harry Skinner, Lindsay Doyle, Hana Dhanji, and Kalyna Kardash. Version: October 8, 2007.

## Abstract

Why did Canada, with its linguistically and regionally based strains of national unity, fight its longest war in Afghanistan from 2001 to 2007? Amidst the many external, societal and governmental determinants that cause Canada and other countries to go to war, this study focuses on the puzzle of why a country, with no national interests directly at stake, a distinctive national value of anti-militarism and enduring political memories of the conscription crises of 1944 and 1917, fought for the first time, for so long, in the lead, in far-off Afghanistan, despite the mounting opposition of its public, particularly its French-speaking citizens and their federal representatives from Quebec. Externally grounded explanations featuring the September 11 terrorist attacks on North America, the involvement of American and British allies, and the approval of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the United Nations do not explain a Canadian participation that went through several stages of involvement, withdrawal and leadership, and the general expansion of Canada's increasingly costly commitment, even as the memories of the catalytic 9/11 *cause célèbre* faded into an ever more distant past. Nor do governmentally grounded explanations, based on the party and prime minister in power, their regional and linguistic base, and their majority-minority status fit well the multi-stage, generally expansionist trend.

To seek a satisfactory explanation at the societal level, this study develops and tests the model of the "1939–41 myth," first constructed to explain the Canadian government's domestic mobilization of consent for its first post-Cold War combat engagement in the Gulf War of 1990–91. Here support for the war among converging anglophone and francophone communities rose when national media, in both of the "two solitudes," showed Canada going to war with Britain and France without the United States to successfully stop a totalitarian dictatorship and the Holocaust-like devastation it would bring. This study hypothesizes that to go to war in Afghanistan Canada needed to mobilize consent from a public that was substantially permissive but had a bottom line, do so in both largely francophone Quebec and the largely anglophone Canada outside, and do so as the initial rally turned to reluctance and the conscription constraint arose. The Canadian government secured such consent when polling questions and media portraits offered to a "mythologically rational" mass public the "right allies," reminders of the "right wars," support from the right "hometown" leaders, and the "right death ratio" of Canadian civilian victims over Canadian soldiers killed abroad. The empirical results show mild support for the classic 1939–41 myth based on the "right ally" combination (now revised to add the directly attacked "Pearl Harbor" Americans), show strong support for the reinforcing "right war" reminder (as the increasingly wrong 2003 Iraq contaminated the Afghanistan cause), some support for the "right leaders" at home and strong support for the right death ratio.

## Introduction

On September 12, 2001, Canada led the alliance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) into declaring war on Afghanistan, in response to the terrorist attacks on North America the day before. Canada soon backed its diplomatic declaration with deadly force, dispatching naval, air, special and regular ground combat troops to fight alongside its American NATO allies in Afghanistan — a theatre half a world away, where Canadian forces had never fought before. Six years later, Canadian forces are still fighting and dying in what has become Canada's longest war. With no victory still in sight, Afghanistan could become the first major war in Canada's long and war-drenched history that Canada would lose.

To fight for so long, so much, so far away and amidst such frustration, the Canadian government needed to mobilize consent from its citizens for the cause. Given Canada's distinctive linguistically divided demography and history, defined by two divisive conscription crises, Ottawa faced the further challenge of mobilizing consent from both its francophone citizens, concentrated in Quebec, and its anglophone citizens, concentrated in the rest of Canada (ROC) outside.<sup>1</sup> The September 11 terrorist attacks may have “changed everything” for some. But for Canadians, still scarred by the searing memory of the conscription crises of 1917 and 1944, arising amidst worldwide wars of long duration with many deaths, the familiar threat to national unity, and thus to Canada's legitimacy and very survival, had not been blown away. Indeed, with the separatist/sovereigntist Bloc Québécois as a major party in the federal House of Commons, a separatist/sovereigntist Parti Québécois governing the province of Quebec and a Quebec referendum on separation very narrowly defeated only six years before in 1995, the national unity challenge was far closer to the surface than it had been in August 1990, when a post-Cold War Canada went to war for the first time in 40 years.

Of the two challenges the Canadian government faced in mobilizing consent, securing support at the start from Canadians as a whole was the easiest one it faced. After all, 24 innocent civilian Canadians had been deliberately murdered on 9/11, in the twin towers of a city that was far closer to Canada than Pearl Harbor had been in 1941, when the last bolt-out-of-the-blue attack had hit the soil of its American neighbour. The conditions were thus especially ripe for the familiar “rally effect” to spring to life in Canada, as in so many other countries when they first go to war. But it was also subject to the “rally turned reluctance” syndrome as the war dragged on. Richard Falk (1996, 496) is one of many observers who note, on the whole accurately, that “if the state is democratic ... it must persuade its citizenry of the merits of an interventionist policy, especially if resistance is expected in the target society, casualties are anticipated as a distinct possibility, and there is no assurance of a rapid end to hostilities.” Such consent is relatively easy to secure at the start, but much more difficult to maintain as the combat continues, the coffins accumulate and the victory celebrations fade into a far-off future that may never come.

In the mobilization and maintenance of consent, Falk (1996, 496) further notes that “historical memory is also of crucial relevance, as is its most authoritative construction.” That is certainly true in Canada where the politically constructed, publicized and remembered “Somalia syndrome” of defeat in 1992–93, as opposed to the real material but socially unconstructed success of Medak Pocket in September 1993, helped prevent any forceful Canadian reaction to the genocide in Rwanda in April 1994 — in part, presumably, because Canadians had come to believe that the inherent racism in their own armed forces was worse than that in Rwandan society at large. More broadly, the 1917 and 1944 memories, which dictate “do not conscript

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “francophone” in this paper refers to Canadians whose first language is French and who speak French at home. “Quebecers” refers to residents of Quebec, whether French or English.

Canadians for overseas service,” have reigned as a defining parameter constraining Canadian foreign policy ever since (Stairs 1970–71; 1976; 1977–78).

Within these constraints, in the post-Cold War decade leading up to 9/11, the Canadian government proved many times it could successfully mobilize the consent of its citizenry to go to war. Its first and most formidable challenge came during the first Gulf War of 1990–91 when Brian Mulroney, as the most unpopular Canadian prime minister in Canadian polling history, had to convince his fellow citizens in the “peaceable” “peacekeeping kingdom,” to go to war for the first time in 40 years. Not only that, but they had to do so alongside the Americans, under the leadership of President Bush, in a distant theatre where Canadians had never fought before (Kirton and Munton 1992). Mulroney met this challenge. In the campaign’s final days, when Canadian forces went on the offensive to kill Iraqis, a majority of Canadians — anglophone and francophone alike — approved. The government’s success on the home front was not due to any skilled communications strategy from the start. Indeed, government efforts to convince Canadians that this was just like peacekeeping, or like their effort in Korea from 1950 to 1953, had none of the desired effect. Rather, without their government quite realizing it, anglophone and francophone Canadians came to support Canada’s war in the Gulf when their media showed them this was yet another case of Canada going to war, with and for France and Britain, without the United States, against a totalitarian dictator (whose name began with H) who was devoted to murdering innocent children and babies, and even gassing civilians to death innocent merely because they were Jews. In the real material world it was a hard fact that the President George Bush’s USA was involved in the war — indeed, was leading the coalition against Saddam Hussein to which Canada contributed in a minor military way. But only when Canada’s media — above all, their television network news that most defined public opinion on such issues — mythologically constructed this war as a replay of 1939–41 did Canadians increasingly unite to support their government’s decisions to go to war.

To be sure, Afghanistan in 2001–07 is not Iraq in 1990–91. Canadians’ firsthand experience of 1939–41 is far more limited. Moreover, a battle-hardened Canada had gone to war regularly for over a decade when the World Trade Center and Pentagon were struck, giving Canadians much more material with which to construct new myths. Afghanistan was far from the doorstep of a Holocaust-shrouded Israel, and the latter’s Jewish citizens were far away from any gas-laden SCUD missiles that the Taliban could ever send their way. Most prominently, Gulf War I was a short, inexpensive, victorious conflict, to which no Canadian ground combat forces were sent, and in which not a single member of the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) died. In sharp contrast, Afghanistan has become a long, costly, casualty-ridden conflict with no clear-cut victory, or even stalemated end, in sight. On the other hand, as the Canadian government’s media messaging highlights, Canada is fighting in Afghanistan under the auspices of NATO, as well as the UN, to secure and develop one of the world’s poorest peoples and countries, and educate its young girls. Amidst all these differences, is the 1939–41 myth, in its classic, adjusted or extended form, still a dominant driver of when and why Canadians, from both solitudes, give their consent to their government’s longest war?

The existing scholarly and popular literature does not think so, but offers no convincing or consensus alternatives about why Canadians’ support for the war, and with it national unity, goes up or down (Dawson 2003; Pigott 2007; McDonough 2007). Rather, it generates a great debate, conducted with much passion but little analytical discipline or detailed evidence, about why Canada is at war in Afghanistan and what part public opinion, media coverage and the overall mobilization of consent plays. Grant Dawson (2003, 180–84) argues that Canada’s initial “diplomatic pause,” “ambiguous approach” and “robust” but “controlled and measured” military response “reflected the domestic” mood that wanted to fight terrorism and support the U.S. but

pulled back when told by pollsters that civilian or military Canadian casualties might be involved. This domestically driven diplomacy of restraint pushing a cautious Prime Minister Jean Chrétien is countered by Peter Pigott (2007, 203), who emphasizes the enthusiasm of the Canadian government and people for war at the beginning and the expanded Canadian government commitment six years later, but a Canadian public that by November 2006 wanted their troops out in February 2009. Others declare that Canada went to war because of and for the Americans, and perhaps their transatlantic allies, but their effort may come to poison the atmosphere for future adventures back home (McDonough 2007).

## **The Model of the Mythological Mobilization of Consent**

To add analytical discipline and detailed evidence to this debate, this study explores the relationship among the government's decisions to go to war in Afghanistan, domestic public support for the war and the portrait of the war on Canadians' national media in its anglophone and francophone parts. To conduct this analysis, this paper constructs the following chain of hypothesis, based on the best available argumentation and evidence to date, about how the relationship among governors, publics, and media has operated in Canada over issues of war in the past.

### **The Mobilization of Constrained Consent**

First, Canada was not driven to, but constrained in, going to war in Afghanistan by mass public opinion and the dominant media portrait of the war that lay behind. This is to say, the Canadian government was given considerable latitude from its permissive public; but within these broad boundaries, it was ultimately bounded in its behaviour, rather than given a blank cheque, by their views. This hypothesis will be confirmed in its first component if government decisions to go to war, to go to war more, or to continue at war at high levels, generally preceded public support, rather than followed supportive public opinion that was known, and unfolded even as that support declined, a minority government came, and general elections loomed.<sup>2</sup> It will be confirmed in its second point if the government stopped going into war and moved away from it when public support for the war was very low, was low enough to approach or fell below Canadians' "bottom line."

### **The Unified Mobilization of Constrained Consent**

Second, these permissive boundaries narrowed, and the constraints mounted, as public opinion and media portraits diverged into "two solitudes": between Canada's francophones/Quebecers and the anglophone ROC. Ultimately, this relationship arose because the war itself and the 9/11 attack on North America that catalyzed it did not directly relate to Canada's national interests of survival, security, sovereignty, legitimacy, territory and relative capability, in the view of its governors, publics or objective observers focused on hard facts (Kirton 2007, 17–20). However, a growing, gaping gap in national unity caused by the war did threaten Canada's national interests of legitimacy and, ultimately, even survival itself, especially with memories of the 1995 near-

---

<sup>2</sup> This hypothesis suggests that Canadian governments decided to go to war, or to go to war more, if and when there was little or no public opinion to direct them; or if there was public opinion, it was unknown to them. Therefore, if public opinion had been adamantly against going to war, the government likely would not have gone, or gone in more.

death referendum still fresh, and with the separatist/sovereigntist Parti Québécois and Bloc Québécois still a serious political force. Far more than in 1990, when the Gulf War began just after the death of Meech Lake and the domestic insurrection of Oka, national unity was in doubt in 2001. Canada thus needed at least minimum levels of consent from its francophones/Quebecers to continue its war. This hypothesis will be confirmed if Canada does not go to war more, or goes to war less, as francophone/Quebec support dropped to low levels and showed few signs of rising as the months and years went on.

### **The Rally-to-Reluctance Cadence of Consent**

Third, Canadians, like citizens of most other countries most of the time, rally freely and spontaneously to offer massive consent when war begins. At that moment they typically “rally around their flag” and country, trust their civilian and military leaders, and assume that whatever their gender the “boys will be home by Christmas”, or equally quickly, after they have won the war hands down. As Geoffrey Blainey (1967) notes, “recurrent optimism is a vital prelude to war.” However, as the war drags on — and with it disappears the near-term prospects for the delivered victory in the field and the victory parades for the returning troops back home — the initial rally turns increasing to reluctance. Public support and political consent erode. In Canada’s case, this hypothesis can be tested against and confirmed more broadly by the record in Canada’s short winning wars of the post-Cold War period (starting with Gulf War I in 1990–91) and Canada’s long, unwon war in Korea from 1950 to 1953. In the case of Afghanistan, this hypothesis is confirmed if pan-Canadian, anglophone and francophone public support fades as time goes by and the war remains unwon.

### **Canada’s Conscription Constraint in Consent**

Fourth, Canadians in general, and francophones/Quebecers in particular, offer less consent throughout than citizens in other countries (or Canadians before 1917) because of Canada’s distinctive conscription constraint created by the threat to national unity in 1917 and again in 1944. In the words of the conclusion of the classic article by J.I. Gow (1979, 120–21), “les Québécois étaient alors beaucoup plus prêts à voir le Canada jouer un rôle actif dans le monde. Comparés avec les autres Canadiens ils étaient, cependant, toujours plus hésitants à l’égard d’engagements de forces canadiennes à l’étranger, de la conscription, du Commonwealth et de la coexistence pacifique.” The strength of this conscription constraint is reinforced by its status as a core component of Canada’s distinctive national value of anti-militarism, which checked the other distinctive national values of openness, multiculturalism, globalism and international institutionalism propelling Canada in 2001 into this directly value-driven war (Kirton 2007, 20–25).<sup>3</sup> Thus, pan-Canadian support for the war, particularly among francophones/Quebecers and the unity between them and their fellow Canadian citizens, will diminish as:

- a. Canada moves from dispatching air and naval forces to mainstream ground combat forces;
- b. Canadian ground combat forces are sent to the dangerous front;
- c. Canadian ground combat forces engage in combat with the enemy; and

---

<sup>3</sup> Anti-militarism is now in its modern, most virulent expression of anti-nuclear weapons and now weapons of mass destruction (WMD) more generally (including the chemical and biological ones, with which Canadians had firsthand experience in World War I). As such, it was engaged in Gulf War I (Saddam Hussein’s nuclear weapons), Iraq War II (his assumed terrorists and WMD at the start) and Afghanistan, with the anthrax attack on America and a Talibanized Pakistan.

- d. Canadian ground combat forces are killed in ever larger numbers, on a cumulative and individual incident count.

Each of these changes makes it more likely, in the accurately remembered conscription myth, that more ground combat forces from Canada will be required from Canada to win the war, and that Canadians might ultimately need to be conscripted to meet this need.

This overall hypothesis, and its individual components generating 12 (three by four) relationships, will be confirmed if evidence arises in the specified ways.

### **The Mythologically Rational Mass Public**

Fifth, it does strain the credulity of outside objective analysts, as optimally rational calculators, to imagine that Ottawa might introduce conscription for overseas service to feed its diminished-by-death war machine in Afghanistan.<sup>4</sup> But the mass Canadian public is not rational in this particular, ideal-type way. To be sure, there is a rational mass Canadian public, whose views about distant wars in Afghanistan are sufficient internally consistent, detailed and accurate, to provide autonomous, self-contained opinions that governors take seriously in considering whether they have mobilized sufficient consent to go to and stay at war. But this is a mythologically rational mass public. It is this mythologically guided “bound rationality” or set of “satisficing” shortcuts that matters in the end.

#### *A. The Right Allies*

Thus, Canadians’ rely, in the first instance, on what might be termed “trusted rationality.” They provide consent when they are told or shown they are going to war with the right allies, who have been the time-tested trusted allies they have always won with in their victorious war-drenched past. References to the enemy (e.g., Hitler, Saddam Hussein, Al Qaeda, the Taliban, terrorists) might also matter at the margins, but ultimately what counts is who Canada is going to war with and alongside, rather than against. Thus, as the classic 1939–41 myth affirms, Canadians will support going to war with Britain and France without the United States.

Moreover, in an adaptation of the classic myth, references to international organizations are unlikely to matter much, unless they are sufficiently small to connote the country actors who compose the club and thus are involved in the war. Therefore today’s UN, and even NATO, with so many members, should make little difference in evoking country connotations — of reminding Canadians of the right allies contained within the club. To be sure, the UN mattered back in Gulf War I because the UN and its secretary general were central in the drama of providing and enforcing the authorizing resolution to use force, Canada was serving on the UN Security Council (UNSC), and its permanent representative was the very francophone Yves Fortier. In sharp contrast, after 9/11, the UN was missing in action from the start, as it shut down and disappeared, Canada was not on the UNSC and the critical collective decision to use force from an international organization came much more quickly and almost invisibly from elsewhere — NATO in distant Brussels, rather than from nearby New York through an organization whose precursor did not exist in 1939.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is, however, worth noting that the option of reintroducing compulsory military service and the practice of compelling reservists and guards to serve for longer overseas has reappeared in the neighbouring U.S., as a result of the still unwon Afghanistan and Iraq wars.

The G8, with only eight major powers that are easy to remember, should be more potent. But it contains the right allies from World War II of Britain and France, the Johnny-come-lately allies of the U.S., Russia and Italy, and the enemies of Germany and Japan. G8 member Germany was an enemy in both 1914 and 1939, and not an active ally in 1950 or at the start in 1990. Its presence through the G8 or even individually should make far less difference in evoking the supportive mythological memory and right actor configuration than Britain and France, who were almost always fighting alongside Canada from the very start.

### *B. The Right War*

Second, to arrive rationally at their opinions that politically matter, mass publics rely on what might be termed “remembered rationality” brought alive, in the current case and context, by references to the well-remembered “winning wars” — the “right wars” — that they recall favourably from the past. Small, short wars from the recent past matter, but more massive ones from the ever distant past matter more, for they have had more time to solidify into deeply embedded national myths. Here, Canada has an abundance of wars and especially wars it has won: World War I, World War II, the Cold War, Gulf War I, the “Turbot War,” Kosovo. But it also has also one war that it did not win — Korea — and several lesser conflicts that lie below the war threshold and public radar screen that it has won (Medak Pocket 1993), tied (Zaire 1996) and lost (Somalia 1992–93).

### *C. The Right Leaders*

Third, when Canadians are told and shown by trusted individuals — the “right leaders” — whom they treat as authorities on such matters at home, that this is a good war that they should support, they will do so — especially if these authorities come from their linguistic and geographic “hometown.” At the start, francophone Quebecer prime minister Jean Chrétien, anglophone Albertan opposition leader Stockwell Day and francophone Quebecer Gilles Duceppe as third party leader all said “support the war.” By the autumn of 2007, anglophone Albertan prime minister Steven Harper alone said they should, while francophone Quebecer opposition leaders Stéphane Dion and Gilles Duceppe said they should not.

Importantly, the actor configuration that matters is not that of trusted individual military authorities from any American-like “iron triangle” of the White House, State Department and Pentagon who ask their fellow Canadians to support or oppose the war. Rather, in contrast to the U.S., it is the civilian leaders in Parliament, not military leaders in the Pentagon, State Department (e.g., generals George Marshall, Colin Powell) or White House (e.g., generals George Washington, Dwight Eisenhower) whom the anti-militaristic Canadians trust, treat as authorities and pay attention to about going to war abroad.

### *D. The Right Death Ratio*

Fourth, when the rational Canadian public is told and sees the “right death ratio” of many Canadians civilian victims killed at home in North America by the enemy, relative to the few Canadian soldiers killed fighting the enemy abroad in Afghanistan, they are more likely to support the war. In an optimally rational world, it would be the real 24 Canadians killed in New York on 9/11 relative to the initially none but now 71 soldiers killed in Afghanistan that matter. But to the mythologically rational Canadian public, it is the much magnified numbers offered in their pollsters’ questions or on their newscasts that really count. This hypothesis will be

confirmed if support is high when reported (possible and confirmed) Canadian civilian deaths in North America are high, while reported deaths of Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan are low.

Methodologically, in an extension of the first version and test of the 1939–41 myth, this mythologically remembered rationality and trusted actor configuration is now hypothesized to be directly relevant at the (often intervening) public opinion surveying stage, in the question framing, wording and ordering, as well as in the sometimes more distant (independent and either mediated or directly connected) media portrait stage.

## **Canada's Real War in Afghanistan**

### **Charting Canada's Combat Involvement**

To determine the part played by Canadian public opinion and media portraits in Canada's war in Afghanistan, it is important first to identify in considerable detail the dependent variable — the cadence of Canada's combat involvement in the war. That cadence can be continuously charted, over its six long years, over several dimensions, such as the number of CAF services involved, number of combat troops deployed in the theatre, the number deployed in dangerous areas, the number given offensive combat roles, the number of combat operations conducted, the number of deadly encounter resulting, and the number of enemies, civilians, allies and Canadians killed.

A superior specification, for a study concerned with over-time change, and the push or pull of domestic determinants, is a tight focus on Canada's sequence of major decisions to go to war. Charting Canada's move into and away from war in Afghanistan can thus be done by focusing on the dozen major decisions — rather evenly spaced throughout the six-year period — that defined the cadence of Canada's combat involvement in the conflict (Pigott 2007; McDonough 2007). In each case the decision revolves around the degree and durability of Canada's deadly combat involvement, including what branches of the armed forces were dispatched, to the rear or front lines, and to engage in actual deadly combat or not.

Amidst the many decisions regarding Canada's combat involvement in Afghanistan, taken by the governments of Jean Chrétien (September 12, 2001, to December 12, 2003), Paul Martin (December 12, 2003, to February 6, 2006) and Stephen Harper (February 6, 2006, to the present) the following “decisive dozen” stand out.

### **Jean Chrétien's Decisions**

#### *1. September 12, 2001: Declaring War*

The first and most fundamental decision was to declare war. This was done at Canadian initiative, through NATO, starting on the day the terrorists struck. The terrorists hit the twin towers in New York at about 3:00 p.m. Brussels time. At that moment, the Canadian permanent representative to the North Atlantic Council, David Wright, serving as the dean of the council with the responsibility for setting its agenda, was at the normal, private, weekly working lunch between the ambassadors and the secretary general of NATO — the meeting where the most difficult matters are dealt with and the real work gets done.

When news of the attack came, Wright and U.S. ambassador Nick Burns, who had arrived at NATO just ten days earlier, met privately with the secretary general. There Wright spontaneously



proposed that Article 5 on collective action be invoked.<sup>5</sup> After some discussion, Burns made a few phone calls to Washington to make sure the U.S. wanted this done. It did, but on condition that all NATO allies agreed and that it be proven that the attacks were directed from abroad. Wright phoned Ottawa to tell them what was involved and what NATO's role in a war would be.

NATO held an emergency session overnight. Art Eggleton, Canada's defence minister, and Ray Henault, the chief of the defence staff, were both in Eastern Europe, due to fly home on September 11. But when all the flights were cancelled they went to Brussels instead. That same night Wright briefed them. The Canadians set about convincing the 19 NATO allies, with a statement that the secretary general had prepared and the Canadians had seen. The council agreed that if it were determined the attack came from abroad, it would invoke Article 5. It was quickly determined that the attack had indeed come from abroad.

### *2. October 7, 2001: Attacking Afghanistan*

The second decision came on October 7, 2001, when Chrétien announced that Canada, in Operation Apollo, would contribute air, sea and land forces to the war against terrorism in Afghanistan (Pigott 2007, 82–84; McDonough 2007). Canada contributed ships (four frigates, one destroyer and one supply ship), special forces, and transport and surveillance aircraft to the so-called coalition of the willing. Henault explained that Operation Apollo would run to October 2003, with Canadian warships already in the region since August (HMCS *Halifax*) and heading for the Persian Gulf (HMCS *Toronto* and HMCS *Charlottetown*, due to arrive in December 2001) joined by two maritime patrol aircraft, four strategic airlift planes and a Canadian Battle Group to work with American forces in and around Kandahar in Afghanistan.

The decision may in part have been taken because of America (McDonough 2007, 621), but by no means because of America alone. On September 28, 2001, the U.S. unilateral military mission in Afghanistan, Operation Enduring Freedom, had been sanctioned by the UN. NATO's Article 5 decision was announced by Secretary General Lord George Robertson on October 2, five days before Chrétien made his move. At home, all parties in the House of Commons strongly endorsed Chrétien's decision, save for small group of social democrats in Alexa McDonough's NDP.

### *3. November 14, 2001: Sending Soldiers under American Command*

The third decision came on November 14, 2001, when Canada sent soldiers in some force. It expanded Operation Apollo by announcing it was deploying troops to Kandahar to fight under American control. It put 1,000 members of the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry (PPCLI) based in Alberta on 48-hour standby. In February 2002 Canadian forces started arriving in Afghanistan. A total of 880 soldiers were sent in the first wave.

---

<sup>5</sup> Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states: "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area" (see <[www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/treaty.htm](http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/treaty.htm)>).

#### *4. March 2002: Conducting Ground Offensive with the Americans*

The fourth decision came in March 2002 when these Canadian forces joined their special forces' colleagues in going on the offensive to find and kill the Taliban. In Canada's largest ground offensive since the Korean War, more than 500 Canadian forces swept a valley in eastern Afghanistan and mounted a midnight rescue mission for a downed helicopter.

On December 20, 2001, UNSC resolution 1386 had authorized the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). It consisted of the 6,000 troops of the Kabul Multinational Brigade (KMNB), designed to secure Kabul and its Bagram air base, from many NATO members and likeminded outsiders, and financed by the Troop Contributing Nations (TCN).

#### *5. May 21, 2002: Coming Home from Kandahar*

The fifth decision marked a major reversal of this four-fold cadence of going to war ever more. On May 21, 2002, Ottawa announced its troops would return home in July, at the end of their six month tour. To be sure, the Joint Task Force Two (JTF2) Special Forces would be replaced and the air and naval forces in the region would remain. Moreover, Eggleton indicated it was possible that Canadian troops might return in their former force in 2003. But Canada's main ground combat forces that had fought and killed the enemy alongside the Americans were being brought back home. The PPCLI Battle Group arrived back at their base in Edmonton on July 28–30, 2002.

Analysts have identified several possible causes for the May decision to largely withdraw. The announcement came one month after Canada had suffered its first casualties, when four Canadian soldiers had been killed by American pilots in a friendly fire incident on April 18, 2002 (Pigott 2007, 89–91; Friscolanti 2005). Moreover, Canada had no soldiers in reserve to spare to replace its unit in the field. Eggleton noted his forces were "stretched."<sup>6</sup> The U.S. had wanted Canada to stay but its view did not prevail. Canadian military casualties and lack of the relevant specialized capability, rather than American preferences, now seemed to be the cause.

#### *6. February 12, 2003: Returning Multilaterally to Kabul*

The sixth decision constituted the second reversal. For on February 12, 2003, the same majority government of Prime Minister Chrétien's Liberals sent the troops back in. On that day Canada announced it would send 2,000 troops to Afghanistan for one year as part of the UN-mandated ISAF in Kabul. A day later, it announced it would send the *Iroquois* command ship and two frigates to the Afghanistan effort. Canada was thus sending its mainline ground combat forces back in, but this time under the UN-legitimated, NATO-led ISAF mission in Kabul, rather than for offensive combat missions with the Americans alone from Kandahar.

John McCallum, now minister of defence, explained in Brussels at a NATO gathering that Canada would send 1,900 troops that summer to the mission in Kabul, and take command of the KMNB in July (Pigott 2007, 92–93). In Parliament on March 17 Chrétien justified the decision as

---

<sup>6</sup> With a limited number of troops, Chrétien's Canada decided to redeploy the existing pool back home rather than expand it by more active measures, including potentially compulsory ones, even though Canada, with its fiscal surplus, had the cash to expand the ranks. If francophone/Quebecers were still scarred by the conscription crisis, they could have breathed a collective sigh of relief. There is good evidence that Chrétien remembered the conscription crisis very well (Martin 2003).

follows: “Our commitment to the war against terrorism is well known. We have already agreed to send troops, thousands of them, next summer, to fight terrorism in Afghanistan. We will keep our duty to do that.” The decision was widely seen as a clever minimum necessary side payment to avoid Canada having to fight in the war in Iraq that George W. Bush was about to launch and to minimize the diplomatic damage done in America from the decision to largely stay out.

### **Paul Martin’s Decisions**

#### *7. April 14, 2004: Extending the Mission*

Canada’s seventh decision, and the first under the new Liberal prime minister Paul Martin from Montreal, came on April 14, 2004. Then Canada extended its existing mission for another term. On February 9, 2006, Canada’s Lieutenant-General Rick Hillier had taken command of ISAF for six months. Canada’s 2,000-plus troops at Camp Julien then constituted the largest country contribution to ISAF. Relative capability and command were rising, and seemed to cause the Canadians to stay in.

#### *8. March 21, 2005: Expanding and Returning to Kandahar*

The eighth decision was to expand the force and move it to Kandahar once more. The decision was an extension of a announcement by defence minister Bill Graham on February 13, 2005, that Canada would double its troop strength in Afghanistan by the summer and shift the force from relatively safe Kabul to the former Taliban heartland of Kandahar (Pigott 2007, 102). There it would run the Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT).

The March 21 decision was taken in Ottawa in a meeting among Martin, Hillier and Jonathan Fried, Martin’s foreign policy advisor (Pigott 2007, 102–04). Hillier wanted to move a full battle group to Kandahar. Martin and the others were reluctant. But Martin, about to meet Bush at his ranch for the first Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) summit, agreed. Canada thus moved to the most dangerous front, where only the Americans, British and Dutch as allies also ventured. The Canadian redeployment to Kandahar airfield began on June 29, 2005. American preferences catalyzed by North American summitry, combined with Hillier’s Vimy Ridge logic, seemed to be the dominant causes.

#### *9. November 2005: Conducting Combat in Kandahar*

The ninth decision came in November 2005, when the Canadian force in Kandahar went on the offensive against the Taliban there. As they did, the casualties began to mount. On January 25, 2006, Canadian diplomat Glyn Berry was killed in a suicide attack.

### **Stephen Harper’s Decisions**

#### *10. March 13, 2006: Promising Leadership*

The tenth decision was taken by the new Conservative prime minister Stephen Harper. From the moment he was elected on January 23, 2006, Harper signalled that Afghanistan was a major issue and that Canada was there for the long haul. On March 13, just six weeks after he was sworn in as

prime minister on February 6, he flew to Kandahar and promised that Canada would be a leader in the war being waged there.

*11. May 17, 2006: Extending to 2009*

The 11th decision came on May 17, 2006. Then Parliament approved by a narrow margin the decision of “Canada’s new government” to extend the existing combat mission in Kandahar, at essentially the same force levels through to February 2009. In September, Harper reinforced the battle group with Leopard tanks when a military need for heavier armour became evident during the deadly but victorious summer battle with the Taliban at Panjawai.

*12. June 22, 2007: “Parliament Will Decide”*

The 12th and most recent major decision came on June 22, 2007. Then Harper indicated at a news conference that he would seek an all-party agreement in the House of Commons and a consensus among Canadians about what Canada’s role should be after February 2009. He thus opened the possibility that the Canadian forces might taken on a different, less dangerous task, while expressing his hope that Canada would remain, rather than just abandon Afghanistan by coming home.

Harper’s decision came immediately after he met with NATO secretary general Jaap de Hoop to discuss at length how Canada could help expand the training of the Afghan army and police. It also came a month before the deployment to Afghanistan in force of the francophone Royal 22nd Regiment from Quebec (Van Doos) for the first time. Given the timing of the announcement — almost two years before the February 2009 deadline, domestic political rather than external military determinants seemed to be the dominant cause. While there was some frustration with the failure of Canada’s ranking allies to contribute combat troops for combat missions in the unstable south, several had done so since the NATO summit at the end of 2006 had called for this. Moreover, France’s recently elected president Nicolas Sarkozy, whom Harper had just met at the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, was about to take a more supportive stance. Indeed, Harper’s signal reflected a calculation that his party did not wish to fight the next election, coming ever closer, on the issue of Afghanistan. Rather it wished to neutralize this problematic issue by spreading responsibility for the government’s singular and unpopular position, by having the opposition Liberals, and ideally the Bloc Québécois from francophone Quebec, associated with a new Canadian position as well.

### **The Cadence of Canada’s Combat Decisions and Their Improbable Causes**

This review of the “decisive dozen” reveals that Canada went to war in five stages, defined by major turning points, first, in direction and, second, in degree of its military involvement, as follows:

1. September 12, 2001, to March 2002: Getting in ever more deeply with the Americans;
2. Coming Home, May 2003 to February 2003;
3. Returning multilaterally to Kabul, February 2003 to March 2005;
4. Moving expansively to Kandahar, March 2005 to June 2007; and
5. Signalling a less combative shift, June 2007.

Furthermore, Canada spent less than one of the six years getting out, compared to a full five years staying the course or getting in more. Over the full six-year period as a whole Canada's central cadence was to get in more, at least until the July 2007 signal of a shift.

These patterns poorly match the cadence of many of the standard determinants of Canadian foreign policy behaviour, which are thus unlikely to explain Canada's war. First, the external determinant of the shock of 9/11 or the war or terrorism performs poorly, for as the immediate impact and memory of 9/11 faded, Canada increasingly went to war. Similarly, American preferences perform poorly, for they remained relatively constant in wanting Canada in more, while Canada went in, out and back in.

Second, the external and societal determinant of real Canadian combat casualties performs poorly, for as the monthly and yearly cadence and the cumulative number of Canadians killed in Afghanistan went up, Canada increasingly went to war. Moreover, the many decisions to go to war more were taken knowing that more Canadian soldiers would more likely die as a result.

Third, the societal, governmental and individual determinants of prime ministerial attributes and personal beliefs, party in power, or minority or majority government seem to matter little. For francophone Quebecer Chrétien's Liberal majority initiated getting in, getting out and getting back in. Anglophone Quebecer Paul Martin's Liberal minority initiated going to war even more. And anglophone Albertan Stephen Harper's Conservative minority continued to get in ever more, until the summer 2007 signal of a shift.

Given this cadence, it further seems unlikely that the Canadian government was pushed into and kept in a great war adventure in Afghanistan by an enthusiastic Canadian mass public — unless it can be shown that Canadians were so enduringly eager to move a reluctant government with a veteran prime minister and massive majority at the start, and to move a still reluctant minority government with a new prime minister at the end. To see if the public was so eager, and what role public opinion might otherwise have played, it is important to examine the polls.

## **Canadian Public Opinion about Canada's Afghanistan War**

### **The Existence and Impact of Public Opinion**

As noted above, there is a long and ongoing debate in Canada, as elsewhere, about whether the public has any opinion that politicians should take seriously on matters as esoteric and so far removed from personal experience as going to war half a world away. Some argue that Canadians have no such opinion but make something up when the pollsters call, in order to get through whatever the particular questions might be in the most polite, socially acceptable, time-efficient way. Others argue that they may lack the detailed, accurate command of the facts that they would need to do well on a university exam, but nonetheless have a pre-existing, rational, internally logical, relatively stable command of the basics, which they authentically reproduce whenever the pollsters call (Munton and Keating 2001). Their rationality arises in their answers to individual questions and in the logical consistency of their answers to all questions within, and even across polls. In the case of Canadians and issues of war, the latter view of a "rational Canadian public" has the stronger case. But there is sufficient room for the retreat from "optimal rationality" to intrude into the world of a "satisficing public," to allow other elements, especially cues about trusted actors or authorities and cherished memories to slip in. And it has long been known that question ordering and question wording can have an important impact on the answers, due in part to the frames they set, and the actors and authorities they show and the myths that they evoke.

### **Initial Public Opinion, September 2001**

The first poll on 9/11 and Afghanistan, taken on September 17–20, 2001, showed, in overall terms, a rational Canadian public supportive of a war effort they understood in a substantially united way. In the majority, Canadians were strongly prepared to join the U.S. and declare war on international terrorism (73%), even if it would expose civilians in Canada to attack (54%) from the terrorists already in Canada waiting to hit (55%). To defend themselves, Canadians wanted to give their security services more power (53%). Above all, they strongly approved Chrétien's handling of issues related to the terrorist attacks in the U.S. (74%). Whatever the subsequently revealed accuracy of the pollsters' assertion, it was rational to believe there were terrorists waiting to attack in Canada, one week after everyone knew they had done so in the U.S. next door and one year after Ahmed Ressaam had been apprehended crossing from Canada into the U.S. to attack an airport there. It was also rational to doubt that their government and their security services could handle it (as a majority did), but not that the world was headed for nuclear war (as only 21% did), given that no weapons of mass destruction (WMD) had been used by terrorists in North America thus far (prior to the anthrax attacks that soon came). Canadians thus seemed ready to fight abroad and die at home because they trusted their veteran prime minister at the top.

But from the start there were clear signs of two solitudes. A majority of Quebecers were prepared to join the U.S. in the war (59%), but not if it would expose Canadian civilians to terrorist attack (31%) from terrorists who might or might not be already here (50%). Quebecers, perhaps with memories of October 1970, were least keen on giving the security services more power. But they led Canadians (76%) in approving of how their linguistically and geographically hometown prime minister — whom most had voted for — was handling the file. A trusted hometown prime minister could and did bring francophones/Quebecers from their solitude into a unified pan-Canadian whole.

It is difficult to know if Canadians, across both solitudes, found it easier to support the right ally combination of the 1939–41 myth, given that both Britain and France were absent from the questions asked. But the U.S. as well as Canada were there, and Canadians were prepared to join the U.S. alone — a rational response given that it had been attacked at home — in unspecified ways, for the war on terrorism in general (as distinct from specifically sending troops to fight in Afghanistan — unimaginable as Canada had never done such a thing before). And when asked only about Canada — in the question about support for Chrétien's handling — overall and unified support received the highest approval of any question in the poll. Canadians thus rallied to support Chrétien's Canada and an American ally under deadly direct attack.

### **Public Opinion, October to December 2001**

As the autumn unfolded, Canadians' unified support remained strong. The next poll, taken on October 10–14, 2001, immediately after the October 7 American attack on Afghanistan, found a majority of Canadians strongly supporting the American- and British-led air strikes on Afghanistan, against the Taliban and Al Qaeda (72%), even though they were concerned that this could lead to biological or chemical attacks aimed at civilians in Canada (66%). A still strong if somewhat diminished majority (62%) approved Chrétien's handling of "Canada's response to last month's terrorist attacks and the military action now underway in Afghanistan."

The two solitudes appeared again, but only in limited and particular ways. A majority of Quebecers supported the American- and British-led attacks (60%), were worried about attacks on Canadians (66%) and, above all, again supported Chrétien's handing of Canada's war (66%).

The 1939–41 myth receives stronger support from this October poll. Canadians and Quebecers both supported attacks led by the now present British (mentioned specifically in the question) and the Americans. The absence of any mention of the French is consistent with the 12% gap between Canada as a whole and Quebec support. However, when their own, hometown prime minister was put back into the question, which was now personalized as support for him, rather than the American or the British, the national unity gap disappeared and even reversed. For more Quebecers now narrowly supported what was presented to them as Jean Chrétien's war (66%), than did Canadians as a whole (62%) — a Chrétien who had just sent Canadian military forces to war in Afghanistan five days before.

Another mid October poll was taken by Leger Marketing on October 16–21, two weeks after Canada had sent the ships from Halifax to the theatre of war (and by no means to its front lines). Here 84% of Canadians supported (50.5% fully, 33.3% partly) Ottawa's decisions to offer military support to the U.S. in the war against Afghanistan's ruling Taliban. A lesser majority of 58.7% supported Canadian military assistance for a U.S. attack on a country other than Afghanistan — suggesting that the initial rally effect was really on a roll. In Quebec, a strong majority (78.4%) approved of Canada's military support of the U.S. in the war against Afghanistan. The classic 1939–41 myth was affirmed by the support for Canada's war, and the adjusted version by its support for the U.S., as a rational Canadian public adjusted to the reality that the U.S. had been attacked directly this time. The two solitudes had virtually disappeared. Quebecers joined their fellow Canadians in rallying around their trusted hometown prime minister, if not the Canadian flag.

By November 6–8, an Ipsos-Reid poll showed that 67% of Canadians and 59% of Quebecers agreed that, with the war on terrorism and military actions in Afghanistan, Remembrance Day had a special meaning for them this year. By November 21–25 the *Maclean's* annual year-end poll found that a strong majority of Canadians (79%) supported (41% strongly, 38% somewhat) Canada's involvement in the action in Afghanistan. When presented as solely "Canada's war," support was strong in all of Canada and also in Quebec. When military action in Afghanistan was associated with Remembrance Day — a living myth dating back to the first and second world wars and reminding Canadians of both loss of life in military action abroad, in and for France and Britain, and the ultimate victory that made it worthwhile in the end, a special meaning was evoked among most Canadians and almost as many in Quebec.<sup>7</sup>

### **Public Opinion, 2002**

Going into 2002, overall Canadian support for the war remained. In January, Ipsos-Reid asked Canadians if they would support sending 750 troops to assist the U.S.: 68% responded yes, even though a majority (56%) of Canadians still believed that there were terrorists in Canada waiting to attack. However, the two solitudes gap widened. Quebecers offered only a minority of 49% support, with 55% believing there were terrorists in Canada waiting to attack. In contrast, the ROC gave 72% support for assisting the U.S. (producing a national unity gap of 23%), even

---

<sup>7</sup> November 11 is celebrated as Remembrance Day in Canada and the United Kingdom, as Armistice Day in France, and as Veterans Day in the United States (which also celebrates Memorial Day on the last Monday in May).

though 57% of them believed along with Quebecers that there were terrorists in Canada waiting to strike.

Also of note, on January 31, 2002, Ipsos-Reid released a poll asking Canadians whether or not they would support military action against countries other than Afghanistan: 70% of Canadians responded yes, with a majority (58%) of support from Quebecers and 73% of support from the ROC.

However, in September, after Chrétien had pulled the Canadian forces out, and a real American attack on Iraq loomed, Canadians started to go soft on the Afghanistan war. When Ipsos-Reid asked if the U.S. bore responsibility for terrorist attacks against it, a majority of Quebecers and the ROC said some. Canadians, whose ground forces has already left, also felt “Canadian support for the U.S. and its war on terrorism was enough”: 62% of all Canadians responded yes, with Quebecers at 64%, and the ROC at 62%. In doing so, they rallied together behind the retreat and the flag that Chrétien brought back home.

The classic 1939–41 myth offered no help in 2002. Canadians from both of the solitudes continued to support the war at any existing level, with no mention of Britain or France; the U.S. continued to receive high levels of support. While the ROC tended to be the more supportive, Quebecers still showed substantial, if minority, support.

Around Remembrance Day, Ipsos-Reid asked which date has greater meaning, Remembrance Day or September 11: 67% of all Canadians said Remembrance Day, but only 45% of Quebecers agreed (while 71% of the ROC did). Next, they asked Canadians if they would attend a “formal Remembrance Day service” that year: 54% of all Canadians said yes, with a strong 59% from the ROC and only 33% from Quebec. Finally, they asked Canadians if they “should do more to honour those who have died in war”: all Canadians responded 84% yes, with Quebecers slightly below the national average at 74%, and the ROC slightly above at 86%.

In terms of the 1939–41 myth, it suggests that on the whole Canadians associated the war in Afghanistan with Remembrance Day — and therefore the right wars of the past. However, as this war entered its second year, Quebecers seemed to have remembered that the two big right wars of the past each contained a conscription crisis that they disliked.

### **Public Opinion, 2006**

In 2006, overall Canadian support for the war hovered around 50%. Ipsos-Reid and the Strategic Counsel both asked Canadians if they supported Canadian Forces in Afghanistan. For the year, once the polls were averaged out, Canadians had dropped below the 50% threshold to 48%. However, support went as high as 57 in the months of May and October (both Ipsos-Reid) and as low as 37%, in the month of August (Strategic Counsel). Across the two solitudes, very different patterns emerged. In Quebec, support continued to be much lower than in the ROC. On average, for 2006, Quebecers support was 34%, with the highest (45%) occurring in October and November (both Ipsos-Reid) and the lowest (21%) occurring in September (Strategic Counsel). In the ROC, support for the year averaged out at 53%, getting as high as 64% in May (Ipsos-Reid), and as low as 42% in September (Strategic Counsel). On average, there was a gap of 19% between Quebec and the ROC. The gap got as wide as 27% in May and as narrow as 8% in October (both Ipsos-Reid). Therefore, although Canadians tended to offer close to 50% of support



for the war, for most of the year the support was coming largely from the anglophones/ROC and not from francophones/Quebec.<sup>8</sup>

The wording of the question continued to be of no help in reminding Canadians of their “right” allies in the war. On September 18, Strategic Counsel released a poll in which Canadians were asked if they thought Canada was the only country fighting in Afghanistan. Only 4% of Canadians answered yes — 5% of Quebecers, and 4% of the ROC. Without the countries or organizations mentioned specifically in the question, it is difficult to say who the respondents would have thought was by the Canadian Forces’ side.

Again, wording was of no help in offering trusted authorities. In June Decima Research asked Canadians if they supported the House of Commons decision to extend the Afghanistan mission by two years. Canadians, overall, responded with a mere 41%, with Quebecers responding 31% and the ROC 47%. The House of Commons as an institution, as distinct from trusted individuals, did not seem to drive support up.

In terms of which war Canadians were most likely to associate the war in Afghanistan with, no questions offered any clues in 2006. However, with respect to the right death ratio, Strategic Counsel asked Canadians if the casualties were too high a price to pay. On the whole, Canadians responded 52% yes, with the number getting as high as 58% in August and as low as 39% in March. Quebecers (67%) were much more likely to respond affirmatively than the ROC (48%), suggesting that francophones/Quebecers were even more opposed to the war than anglophones/ROC, and that the two solitudes were becoming divided on the issue — something newly appointed anglophone Albertan prime minister Stephen Harper could not afford.

### **Public Opinion, 2007**

In 2007, support for the war in Afghanistan was much the same as it had been in late 2006. It continued to be higher in the ROC than in Quebec, and Canada’s trusted allies continued to be largely absent from the polling questions. In April 2007, when Ipsos-Reid asked Canadians if they “support Canadian Forces efforts in Afghanistan,” 54% of all Canadians said yes, but only 37% of Quebecers did; the ROC responded 58% yes. Asked the same question in July, Canada as a whole still responded at 51%, but Quebecers’ response was also slightly lower (30%), and the ROC also declined slightly (57%). This was a slight decline across the board, although the national unity gap remained. Angus Reid Strategies asked Canadians if they thought “Canada was shouldering too much of the burden of the Afghanistan mission.” In February, Canada as a whole responded 65% yes, Quebecers responded 73% yes and the ROC responded 62% yes. In April, Canadians on the whole responded 64% yes, Quebecers responded 67% yes and the ROC responded 76% yes. By May all Canadians responded 55% yes, Quebecers 60% yes and the ROC 52% yes. In July the numbers had increased again slightly, with all Canadians responding 58% yes, Quebecers response declining to 53% and the ROC increasing to 59%. In September 2007,

---

<sup>8</sup> The two polling companies seemed to produce significantly different results. If the yearly average is determined using only the Ipsos-Reid polls, the average is 52%; if the yearly average is calculated using only the Strategic Counsel polls, the average is 44%. The numbers for each polling company were as follows: Ipsos-Reid — beginning of March 54%, end of March 52%, May 57%, July 47%, September 51%, October 57%, November 44%; Strategic Counsel — March 55%, May 40%, August 37%, September 42%, October 44%. Both show the same drop after March or May, and the drop to 44% support by October–November, but only Strategic Counsel shows support coming back during the intervening time.

the numbers had increased again back to 67% of all Canadians responding yes, 64% of Quebecers responding yes and 68% of the ROC responding yes.

The polls seemed to be saying that Canadians, on the whole, continued to support the war, but that Canada was playing too much of a role. Amongst the two solitudes, anglophone Canadians appeared more supportive of the war effort than francophone Canadians; however, the strongest feelings regarding “Canada bearing too much of the burden” fluctuated between Quebecers and the ROC. The wording of the polling questions for 2007 indicated that the war in Afghanistan was becoming increasingly Canada’s war, for questions continued to focus on Canada’s efforts, not those of the Americans, or the British or French. This emphasis suggests that the classic or adjusted 1939–41 myth had, more or less, disappeared.

Canadians were also repeatedly asked by Angus Reid Strategies if they thought the “Harper government explained the Afghanistan mission clearly.” In February, all Canadians responded 27%, Quebecers responded 22% and the ROC responded 30%. In April, all Canadians responded at a lower 23%, Quebecers also at a lower 20% and the ROC at a lower 23%. In May, all Canadians responded the same as in April (23%), Quebecers responded slightly higher than the previous time (23%) and the ROC had risen slightly (24%). In July, all Canadians responded 19%, Quebecers 17% and the ROC 20%.

A Leger Marketing Poll, conducted in May, asked Canadians if they “trust the Harper government to manage the Afghanistan war.” A total 35% of all Canadians responded yes, but only 27% of Quebecers did, while 39% of the ROC did. A poll taken by the Strategic Counsel for *The Globe and Mail* and CTV in July asked Canadians “which leader would be trusted the most for decisions in Afghanistan.” While Canada as a whole gave the highest rating to Prime Minister Harper at 32%, Quebecers gave a higher rating to their hometown, francophone Gilles Duceppe (24%) than to Harper (21%), while the ROC gave a higher rating to Harper at 35%. No single actor was given an overwhelming amount of support or trust from Canadians — Harper, the highest of all, at 32%, was a far cry from the 70% that Chrétien had received in 2001.

For 2007, none of the polls analyzed gave questions with “right” or “wrong” war reminders. However, the Strategic Counsel did ask Canadians if the price of Canadian casualties was too high. The response was affirmative for 60% of all Canadians, 72% of Quebecers and 56% of the ROC. It appeared that the more dead bodies coming home (with no reminders of the initial Canadian victims), the less supportive Canadians, especially francophones, were.

## **Canadian Media Portraits About Canada’s Afghanistan War**

### **The Primacy of Media Portraits in Public and Political Opinion on War**

It has long been known through disciplined, detailed empirical studies that on the subset of foreign policy issues — such as Canada’s war in Afghanistan — that unfold in far-away places — where few Canadians have been — and that involve matters such as military combat — where they have little first-hand ability to judge — Canadians depend primarily on the media to form their views (Dewitt and Kirton 1989). It has also long been known that traditionally, in both the United States and Canada, the primary determinant of mass public opinion in the immediate to medium term (three months out) is television network news (Kirton 1993). The media portrait of the war on national television news is thus what largely determines the thinking of Canadians from the mass citizenry through to the political elite. Given the unique power of television rather than radio or print (and perhaps the internet) to arouse citizens to politically consequential

behaviour, national television news determines what they will ask about and for, and how they will act. At the same time, national newspapers remain relevant, especially in opinion formation and in political calculation and action for the foreign policy and political elite.

In regard to Canada's war in Afghanistan, these facts have been affirmed or accepted, if with less precision and evidence by scholars. Most notably, Mark Yaniszewski (2007, 363) writes that "the primary source of military and defence-related information for most Canadians is not parliament, academic journals, specialized university courses, or personal experience (e.g., service in the military or defence administration), but the popular media" and notes that "the media's central role in shaping public attitudes." It is plausible that in the case of Afghanistan parliamentarians, and even their Cabinet members and prime minister subset, were also importantly moved by media portraits through direct acquisition, without mass public opinion, measured by polls or other mechanisms, required to bring the media message to them.

For some purposes it may be relevant to worry about whether the media portrait is accurate in getting the hard facts right, or in giving the right facts the right prominence, context and case in a causal chain that leads to a conclusion, explicitly or implicitly judged correct for most or all. Concern and laments about the Canadian media's poor performance in this regard abound. Thus Yaniszewski (2007, 362) asks, as his central question, "how effective is the media in providing accurate and meaningful information."

The accuracy of the information delivered by the media might matter more if the audience were like students taking a course with an exam at the end, where knowledge of the facts, right or wrong, were the primary or only concern. But Canadians most clearly are not in that category. Canadian television network news broadcasts, with a grade seven vocabulary and a comparable level of comprehension to viewers who are assumed to be somewhat tired (at 9:00 p.m., 10:00 p.m. or 11:00 p.m.), distracted by several household tasks, if not actually dozing off, and dependent on the visuals and voice tones more than the words spoken to interpret what the story is all about. Each story, as well as the overall newscast, is constructed as a mini-drama, to keep the easily distracted, dozy audience emotionally and cognitively involved. To do so the newscast offers symbols and stories of what the audience already knows, believes and feels. Meaningful information is thus that which retells well-known myths in new contexts or terms.

Canadians, overall, and in their two solitudes, share some very distinctive myths with one another, as well as with some people in the rest of the world. Where going to war is concerned, over a century of recurrent experience has made the central myth not about peacekeeping (the transitory 1956–90 pastime), the Cold War, the decolonization crusade, about the UN, NATO or the defence of Canada from terrorists or anyone else, or even about democratizing and developing a distant poor country and educating its young girls. It is, above all, about the 1939–41 myth where, from 1914 to 1917 in World War I, from 1939 to 1941 in World War II, from 1990 to 1991 in Gulf War II, from 1992 to 1999 in the Balkans and Kosovo, and 1996 in Rwanda, Canada went to war with and for France and Britain, often without the United States at first, and before or without any conscription crisis erupting to attack national unity at home.

To capture the presence and power of this dominant war justifying myth, each story in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's (CBC) *The National*, Société Radio Canada's (SRC) *Téléjournal* and, occasionally, CTV's nightly newscast is coded for the visual or verbal appearance of the following elements:

- a. Volume, portion and prominence of September 11/Afghanistan coverage (with the two fused into one in the first three and a half months following 9/11 but separated theoretically and empirically at the end in 2007);
- b. Trusted allies (Canada, Britain and France but not the U.S.);
- c. Well-remembered right wars (both world wars, Remembrance Day, the Cold War, but not Korea, Vietnam, Iraq);
- d. The right leaders; and
- e. The right death ratio: Canadian civilians at home versus Canadian military abroad, Canadian military versus allies abroad (burden sharing — whether Canadians are fighting and dying in this war alone), and the mythological media versus real-world body count.

For all of the above, attention is given to the patterns arising from all Canada, anglophone/ROC and francophone/Quebec, and the gap between the latter two.

### **The Initial Media Frame: September 11–30, 2001**

When the Al Qaeda–captured planes hit the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and a field in Pennsylvania on the morning of Tuesday, September 11, 2001, anglophone Canadians could see from the start, from their own media, that this was a war that Canada would be fighting with, and for, a France and Israel under attack, under the leadership of a popular francophone Canadian prime minister from Quebec.<sup>9</sup> That evening, CBC’s *The National* devoted its entire nightly newscast to the 9/11 story, identified Afghanistan and the Taliban as relevant in the third story, showed Chrétien calling for calm and offering condolences to the Americans in the fourth story and indicated that the Israeli embassies were threatened in Ottawa and around the world. The 12th story showed Britain’s Tony Blair calling on all democracies to defeat this evil, and Germany, Russia, NATO, and Europe acting in support. The final story began: “The French judge investigating the 1994 hijacking of an Air France jet found an international network of Islamic extremist terrorist groups, including a Canadian connection ... hooked up to Osama bin Laden’s network of terrorist training camps in Afghanistan.”

To be sure, the U.S. appeared in every one of the 16 stories, and George W. Bush himself in three. But anglophones watching the entire newscasts — and most were glued to their TV sets that day — could see the war in Afghanistan, framed from the first day, as a modern manifestation of the 1939–41 myth to a very high degree, even with Israel under attack, as in 1990–91. Those watching *CTV News* an hour later could also see the same myth develop: once again France, Israel, Britain and Chrétien appeared, and they were joined by the G8, whose next summit Canada had the responsibility to host in the summer of 2002.

The portrait on francophone Canadian media appears to be distinctly different. The first available newscasts, as distinct from continuous coverage, came on day three — September 13. All ten *Téléjournal* stories focused on the 9/11 attacks, and the second story dealt with Afghanistan itself, but France and all European countries and organizations were entirely absent. Rather, the first story led with Bush declaring the start of the first war of the 21st century, with his “*opérations militaires*” serving as the major message of this story and the next. Chrétien appeared only in the eighth story, calling on Canadians not to let their reaction erode the ethnic or religious tolerance they enjoyed. Israel appeared in the next story, which began: “*Un autre incursion israélienne a eu lieu dans les territoires palestiniens ... Israël aurait eu carte blanche pour prévenir le terrorisme sur son territoire.*” That same day, on CBC, the first story showed George Bush

---

<sup>9</sup> A Gallup poll taken September 17–24 gave Chrétien a 62% approval rating, up 7% from August.

crying, the second noted 30,000 body bags were ready for use in New York and the fourth showed Jean Chrétien declaring, “We will join all civilized nations in pledging our complete support in the days to come.”

As the initial framing gave way to the general impression created by the sheer volume of coverage in the following weeks, the two solitudes within the Canadian media and its audience narrowed. In the 43 available newscasts analyzed from September 11 to the end of the month, the U.S. appeared in every one, or 100%, almost all of which were devoted to the 9/11 terrorist attacks and their aftermath. Canada appeared in almost as many 40 (93%), with Chrétien himself in 29 (67%). References to Quebec arose in 32 (74%). Britain was present in 20 (47%) and France in 8 (19%). This was, in the first instance, America’s war, but almost as much Canada’s, largely Chrétien’s, and substantially Britain’s and France’s as well.

Within each of the two solitudes, the portrait was substantially the same. On CBC the U.S. came in at 100%, Canada at 100%, Chrétien at 80%, Quebec at 80%, Britain at 40% and France at 20%. On *Téléjournal*, the pattern was U.S. 100%, Canada 77%, Chrétien 54%, Quebec 62%, Britain 31% and France 23%. Thus, this was even more France’s war. Together the portraits were sufficiently strong, similar and mythologically authentic to engender support from a united Canada for this war. But among francophones, Canada, Chrétien — and Quebec as well — were less present, even if France was somewhat more. A greater linguistic gulf emerges if CTV serves as the anglophone Canadian newscast of choice. For its 15 summarized stories, the results were U.S. and Canada at 100%, Chrétien at 67%, Quebec at 80%, Britain at 67% and France at a fragile 13%.

The 1939–41 myth certainly seemed to be present in the right war reminders that appeared in Canadian newscasts in September 2001. Of the four war reminders, three referred to World War II and one referred to World War I. However, all four references came from anglophone newscasts, perhaps reflecting the need not to bring up reminders of the 1917 and 1944 conscription crises.

While Chrétien’s presence in the media has been accounted for, other trusted authorities also appeared. Foreign affairs minister John Manley and former Conservative prime minister Joe Clark appeared the most frequently, after the prime minister (who appeared 18 times, 13 on CBC and 5 on SRC). Manley appeared four times (three on CBC and one on SRC) and Clark also appeared four times (three on CBC and one on SRC). Stockwell Day, the opposition leader, and Paul Martin, the finance minister, tied for third place, with three appearances each. Day appeared on CBC twice and SRC once, while Martin appeared on CBC all three times.<sup>10</sup> Several other people appeared once or twice; however, as they were all on anglophone CBC, Quebecers were much more likely to see their francophone prime minister than any other authority — he appeared five times more than any other individual, suggesting that Quebecers would still be inclined to support the war efforts.

In terms of the body count, for the month of September 2001, Canadians were frequently updated with the number of civilians who had been killed in the 9/11 attacks. On September 14, CBC reported the number as high as 100 — a far stretch from the 24 who actually died. While

---

<sup>10</sup> Totals only include CBC and SRC to account for more accurate comparisons to 2007 data, where CTV was absent. Totals include references to September 11. For Afghanistan only, the counts were as follows: Chrétien (two overall, two CBC, zero SRC); Manley (one overall, one CBC, zero SRC); Clark (one overall, one CBC, one SRC); Day (two overall, two CBC, zero SRC); Martin (one overall, one CBC, zero SRC). These figures apply to all right-leaders analysis that appears in the media to follow.

*Téléjournal* was less likely to report on the specific number of Canadian civilian deaths, on September 16 it reported that the total number of civilian deaths at 5,511 — almost twice as many as actually occurred. This suggests that Canadians should have been supportive for the war efforts at this time. Innocent civilians, including a significant number of Canadians, had been directly affected by the September 11 attacks, indicating it was the time for a “rally around the flag” effect.

### **The Evolving Media Portrait: October–December 2001**

Much the same portrait remained for the two months that followed September 11, although it started to fade as time went on. In October 2001, the events of 9/11 and the war in Afghanistan continued to appear in the majority of Canadian newscasts. Of the stories that were summarized for the month, 240 contained references to 9/11-Afghanistan: 116 referred to 9/11, 144 to Afghanistan and 21 referred to both. By October, stories, rather than newscasts, had become the appropriate unit of analysis as most Canadians were no longer watching the entire newscast as one single 9/11-Afghanistan assemblage on their TV. At this level, as the data show, the war in Afghanistan was clearly starting to separate from the 9/11 terrorist attacks that provided the catalyst and *cause célèbre* at the start.

However, with the affects of 9/11 always very much in the minds of the North Americans, it remained “America’s War,” but with Canada and Britain largely present, and the French, although much fewer in number, still there. The trusted ally combination and thus the 1939–41 myth remained, but in considerably diminished form. More specifically, of the 240 9/11-Afghanistan stories, the U.S. appeared in 73%. Canada came in at a much lower 22%. Jean Chrétien had almost disappeared, coming in at 5%. Quebec had also declined, coming in at 6%. Britain was still there, but declining, at 10%, and France appeared in only one story, with a score of 0.4%.

In October, national unity remained intact, as the two networks showed their audience much the same thing. On the CBC, the U.S. appeared in 69% of the news stories. Canada came in at 29%, while Chrétien came in slightly higher than the monthly average at 9%. Quebec appeared 10% of the time. Britain still appeared in 13% of the news stories, but France had disappeared. On SRC, the U.S. came in at 73%, Canada at 10%, Chrétien at 1% (appearing in only one story), Quebec at 1%, Britain at 3% and France at 1%. Therefore, for the francophones, just as in September, Canada, Chrétien and Quebec continued to be less present, while France remained slightly more present, with Britain appearing less than in the anglophone newscasts. The results of CTV were similar to that of CBC: U.S. 76%, Canada 24%, Chrétien 5%, Britain 13% and France 0%.

Canada was still appearing in highest numbers, next to the directly attacked United States, on both English and French television. Britain was appearing in fewer numbers, but was still present in both solitudes, as was Chrétien and Quebec, on the whole. And while France had disappeared from English television, it was still present, if just barely, on *Téléjournal*.

The number of war reminders had decreased to two by October. While one still served as a right war reminder (of the Cold War), the other referred to the “wrong war” of Iraq II. However, these two reminders may not portray the 50-50 split that might appear obvious, due to the fact that the reference to Iraq was a response to the notion the U.S. striking Iraq. Moreover, at this point the decision was not as controversial and negative as it later became. Both references continued to appear on English newscasts alone.

While Chrétien still appeared more than any other trusted authority, he was no longer in the lead on *Téléjournal*. Manley appeared three times, in comparison to Chrétien's once. He even appeared more on *Téléjournal* than on *The National*, where he only appeared twice. While CBC viewers were still likely to see numerous trusted authorities — there were 31 appearances for the month of October — SRC viewers only saw four.

By October, the body counts reported by the news media started to become more accurate. On October 4, CBC reported that 23 Canadian civilians had died as a result of 9/11. At this point, SRC seemed to focus more on the war in Afghanistan, and was more likely to report on Afghan civilian deaths (200 was the highest count for the month). Again, this could suggest that the two solitudes were becoming more divided. English television media continued to focus on the Canadian civilian deaths, while French television media simply portrayed more innocent civilians, perhaps dying as a result of the war efforts.

In November 2001, 9/11 and Afghanistan continued to appear in all Canadian newscasts, but their portion of the overall newscasts declined. For November, the 25 available and summarized newscasts contained 84 new stories that referred to 9/11-Afghanistan (75 to Afghanistan, 9 to 9/11 and 0 referred to both). At the story level, Afghanistan was now completely distinct from 9/11 and had far surpassed at the newscast level in the audience's view. The reason why Canada was going to war in Afghanistan was thus in danger of dropping from the public's mind.

Overall, the U.S. was still the dominant presence, but had declined from the previous months to 45%. Canada came in at numbers consistent with October (25%). Chrétien's appearances continued to decline, coming in at 4%. Quebec came in at 7%. Britain appeared in 11% of the stories and France increased slightly from the previous months to 5%. With America down and France up, the 1939–41 myth revived. While the United States still led, Canada appeared more than half as often as the Americans, Britain half as often as Canada and France half as often as Britain.

In November, however, the two solitudes were separating. On the CBC, the U.S. appeared in 44%, Canada in 29%, Chrétien in 3%, Quebec in 6%, Britain in 15% and France in 3%. On SRC the U.S. and Quebec continued to appear in similar numbers: U.S. at 42% and Quebec at 5%. But Canada was significantly lower at 5%. Chrétien did not appear at all. Britain only appeared 5% of the time, producing a gap of 10%. And France continued to appear in higher numbers, at 5%. CTV had the U.S. at 48%, Canada at 32%, Chrétien at 6% and Quebec at 10%, but with Britain at 10% and France at 6%.

In anglophone Canada, the war was becoming more of “Canada's War” and less of “America's War.” In francophone Canada, America still dominated, but the trusted allies were still there in some force and thus the 1939–41 myth endured. A mythologically rational Canadian public may have felt it worthwhile, for the first time, to allow America to carry more of the burden as it had been attacked first this time.

In November the war references declined again to one. It referred to the “wrong war” in Iraq, and once again appeared on English TV. The body count references for the month of November were almost nonexistent. On November 4, CBC made a sole reference about enemy deaths, reporting that 6,000 Taliban troops had been killed. The “death watch” had turned from innocent Canadian civilians at home to the “military criminals” abroad.

By November, the number of trusted authorities appearing in Canadian news stories related to 9/11-Afghanistan had dwindled to five, all on CBC. Now francophones had absolutely no

guidance from their trusted authorities; anglophones were still getting some guidance, but much less than in the months before, perhaps suggesting that Canadians were forming opinions about the war through other media or means.

By December, attention to 9/11-Afghanistan diminished even more. The 17 available newscasts included 56 9/11-Afghanistan stories (50 on Afghanistan, 9 on 9/11, 3 on both). The U.S. appeared in 66% of the news stories, slightly more than in the previous month. Canada declined to 16%, while Chrétien disappeared completely. Quebec remained steady at 7%. Britain and France both appeared in 4%.

In December, the 1939–41 myth remained, if in very fragile form. Again, the U.S. continued to appear in the highest numbers, with Canada second. France and Britain remained present.

In December the two solitudes grew apart, through an inversion where the critical allies of Britain and France were concerned. CBC had the U.S. at 68%, Canada 21%, Chrétien 0%, Quebec 5%, Britain at 0% and France at 5%. SRC put the U.S. at 64%, Canada 18%, Chrétien 0%, Quebec 9%, Britain 9% and France 0%. Therefore, for the first time, France appeared in higher numbers in the English newscasts than in the French ones (where it was absent), while Britain appeared in higher numbers in the French newscasts (and was absent from the English). CTV showed the U.S. in 65% of the 9/11-Afghanistan stories, Canada in 21%, Chrétien at 0%, Quebec at 8%, and Britain and France both at 4%. CTV thus had the only newscast where both France and Britain appeared.

By December, there were no war references. There were no trusted authorities appearing in any 9/11-Afghanistan news stories. The body count references had increased somewhat, but only in an anglophone context: on December 1, CTV reported one U.S. military death; on December 16, it reported somewhere between 300 and 1,000 Taliban had been killed; and on December 26, it announced the adjusted figure of 2940 civilians who had died on September 11. This suggests that anglophone Canadians should have been supportive of the war effort, even if it was no longer associated with any right war in the past.

### **The Mature Media Portrait: August–September 2007**

By August 2007, the portrait had showed that this had become Canada's War, with Canadians appearing in 52% of Afghanistan-related news stories. The portrait also showed that it was starting to become Quebec's war, with Quebec appearing in a significant 18% of all news stories.<sup>11</sup> America was still fighting a little (it appeared in 22% of all Afghanistan-related news stories), Britain a little less (appearing in 8%) and France not at all (0%). Stephen Harper, the anglophone prime minister from western Canada, appeared in 11% of all newscasts. Therefore, there continued to be support, however, it was fairly limited and fragile — with allied support reflecting a considerable anglophone component.

This was basically the same for English Canada, although it was even more of a Canadian/Quebec-American affair. On CBC the U.S. appeared in 26% of all Afghanistan-related newscasts; Canadians were slightly above the monthly average at 58%; Harper appeared 13% of

---

<sup>11</sup> For 2007, references to September 11 are no longer considered the same as Afghanistan references, as it was less likely that Canadians continued to think of them as connected entities. To this end, there were only 2 out of 109 references (approximately 2%) to both 9/11 and Afghanistan. In 2001, 56 out of 373 references (approximately 15%) were made to both 9/11 and Afghanistan.



the time; the British were significantly below the monthly average, at only 3%; the French were not present; and Quebec showed a significant appearance at 23% — almost half of Canada’s overall appearance. On SRC, it was a little of a Canadian-American affair (Canada appeared in 47% of all Afghanistan-related stories, and Harper in 9%, while the U.S. appeared in 18%), but even more so, it was a British affair (with Britain coming in above the monthly average, at 12% — a difference of 9% from the portrait on CBC). Quebec continued to appear in significant numbers, coming in at 15%. Therefore, for Canada as a whole, in both francophone and anglophone Canada, it seemed to largely be becoming not only Canada’s war, but Quebec’s war.

Five war references were made in August 2007. Of them, four were made to “bad wars” (Iraq II in all cases) and one to a “good war” (Iraq I). *Téléjournal* made two of the five references, and there were both to “bad wars.” This would suggest that all Canadians, and even more so francophone Canada/Quebec, was beginning to associate the war in Afghanistan with bad wars, and that support for the war efforts were in decline.

In terms of the trusted authorities, the leader of the country continued to appear in the highest numbers — seven for the month of August, with four appearances on CBC, and three on SRC. Francophone authorities — opposition leader Stéphane Dion, leader of the Bloc Québécois Gilles Duceppe and Quebec premier Jean Charest — appeared next highest to the prime minister on *Téléjournal*, each twice, with all three more likely to appear on the French SRC than on the English CBC. And the gap had begun to close amongst the two solitudes, with 19 authorities appearing on CBC, and a close 14 appearing on SRC. The increase in overall appearances and the increase in francophone authority appearances both seem to suggest that it was, indeed, becoming Quebec’s war.

The body counts started to tell an even more interesting story. In August, both CBC and SRC reported significantly more deaths than what actually occurred — *The National* 20 and *Téléjournal* 17 (in comparison to the three that actually occurred).<sup>12</sup> This suggests that Canadians, both anglophone and francophone, were being highly exposed to the number of Canadians being killed in Afghanistan, indicating that overall support for the war should have been declining.

By September 2007, overall, it had become even more both Canada’s and Quebec’s war.<sup>13</sup> Canada appeared in 68% of all Afghanistan-related news stories and Harper in 18%, while Quebec appeared in 30%, almost half of Canada’s appearances. The Americans were less present (20%), the British had remained fairly consistent (7%) and the French had come back, appearing in 5% of all Afghanistan-related news stories. Nationally, it was Canada’s war two thirds of the time and Quebec’s war one third of the time, and only America’s war 17% of the time — or about half of that of Quebec. War was now being waged alone by Canada and Quebec.

Amongst the two solitudes there were notable differences, with francophone Canada signalling much less support for the war than anglophone Canada. Canada was much more likely to appear in English news stories than French ones — on CBC, Canada appeared in 79% of all Afghanistan-related news stories, while on SRC, it appeared in only 55%, a gap of 24%. Harper also produced a major gap (25%) between anglophone and francophone viewership, appearing 30% of the time on CBC, but only 5% on SRC. The U.S. appeared in 25% of the Afghanistan-

---

<sup>12</sup> The number of deaths reported by the media includes every death reported in a story for the day. For example, if there were three news stories that reported on the same death, it would count as three reported deaths. Therefore, the difference in reported and actual deaths does not reflect misinformation; it merely points out the focus and content being reported to a somewhat disengaged Canadian viewer.

<sup>13</sup> Media analysis for the month of September 2007 includes data only until September 26.

related news stories on CBC, but in only 15% of the news stories on SRC. Britain was no longer present in any of SRC's Afghanistan-related news stories, but appeared in 13% of CBC's. On the other hand, France appeared in approximately the same numbers — 4% on CBC and 5% on SRC. Quebec also appeared in close numbers, although slightly higher in anglophone Canada: 33% on CBC and 25% on SRC.

Therefore, the two solitudes were telling slightly different stories. In anglophone Canada, it was Canada's war, it was also, significantly, Quebec's war. Canada and Quebec were fighting largely with their anglophone allies, although the French were present as well. In francophone Canada, it was still Canada's war and, very significantly, it was also Quebec's war, but the anglophone allies were less significantly present, respectively 15% for the Americans and 0% for the British, while the French were still by their side at 5%. Again, in both cases, Canada and Quebec seemed to bear most of the burden.

Again, in September 2007, the war references continued to reflect upon wrong wars. Of the three references made, two referred to Iraq II, and one referred to the Korean War — the stalemate from long ago. Interestingly, it was *The National* that referred to the Korean War, while *Téléjournal's* focus had turned purely negative. In comparison to 2001, when *Téléjournal* had nothing to say, either positive or negative, with respect to war references, in 2007 all of the references were negative — perhaps suggesting that francophones/Quebecers had much more to say when they were adamantly against the war than when they were either supportive or undecided on the issue.

The number of trusted authorities had increased in anglophone Canada, with 21 appearances on the CBC. The numbers had declined on *Téléjournal* to five, but over half of them continued to be francophone: two from Dion and one from newly appointed minister of foreign affairs Maxime Bernier. Again, this seemed to suggest that it was becoming more Canada's and Quebec's war, with the continual appearance of trusted authorities on the news — many more than had been there in November or December 2001 (respectively five and zero). As well, the continued appearance of francophone authorities on *Téléjournal* seemed to suggest that francophone engagement was increasing — three might seem low, but by October 2001, which was much closer to the 9/11 attacks, there was only one, and in November and December 2001, there were none.

Again, the body counts told a similar story. Both *The National* and *Téléjournal* reported on more deaths than what actually occurred (CBC reported five and SRC reported three, compared to the one that actually occurred). Again, this suggested that support for the war was declining in both of the two solitudes. By this time 71 members of the Canadian military had been killed in Afghanistan, in comparison to the 24 Canadian civilians who died as a result of 9/11 — a connection that Canadians were less likely to draw as time went on.

### **The Mature Newspaper Portrait: August–September 2007**

For the months of August and September 2007, three key Canadian newspapers were analyzed for additional focus and measurement: two English — *The Globe and Mail* and the *National Post*, and one French — *La Presse*. On the whole, Afghanistan-related stories were likely to appear on the front page 58% of the time. They were most likely to appear on the front of *The Globe and Mail* (74%) and least likely on front page of the *National Post* (46%); they appeared 54% of the time on the front page of *La Presse*. Overall, they covered approximately 18% of the space on the

front page, with *The Globe and Mail* in the lead at 20%, *La Presse* closely behind at 19% and the *National Post* at 14%.<sup>14</sup>

Editorials were also accounted for. In August, 30% of editorials focused on Afghanistan for all of the newspapers analyzed. *The Globe and Mail* continued its leadership trend at 41%. Again, *La Presse* followed (26%), while the *National Post* had the least (23%). Overall, 14% of editorials contained a reference to Afghanistan. *The Globe and Mail* and *La Presse* both came in at 15%, and the *National Post* came in at a lower 11%.

The portrait displayed for the month of August seemed to be mixed, and depended upon which newspapers were read. All three newspapers seemed to have a dominant front-page focus on Afghanistan, suggesting that this was still Canada's war.

In September 2007, similar to August, Afghanistan-related stories were likely to appear, overall, 57% of the time. *The Globe and Mail* continued its lead (63%), the *National Post* had increased from the month before (57%), and *La Presse* remained at 50%. The amount of the front page covered decreased slightly to 15%, with all three newspapers approximately the same: *The Globe and Mail* 15%, *National Post* 15% and *La Presse* 14%. However, the figures for editorials had changed quite significantly. *La Presse* came out on top at 50%, *The Globe and Mail* at 25% and the *National Post* at 17%. The percentage of editorials had also changed accordingly, with *La Presse* again in the lead at 25%, and *The Globe and Mail* and the *National Post* both at 8%.

According to the editorials accounted for, this was increasingly becoming Quebec's war. While Afghanistan continued to receive front-page coverage similar to its anglophone counterparts, its editorials, or "care and/or concern" pieces, had come to focus much more on the war efforts.

## Conclusion

### The Mobilization of Constrained Consent

The first hypothesis of the constrained mobilization of consent is confirmed, in its first component, by the many critical decisions where government action preceded any push from mass public opinion, or persisted in the status quo or went in the opposite direction in defiance of what mass public opinion was known to be. Canada initiated its first decision of declaring war immediately after its representative in distant Brussels heard of the 9/11 attacks, long before the first polls or even the first evening newscast could be seen. Into 2002, Canada went to war more, even as still majority public opinion support declined.<sup>15</sup> Most strikingly, in the most recent period, the Harper government moved more into war, even as public support on the whole continued to decline and support from francophones/Quebecers remained firmly negative. This hypothesis is confirmed in its second component of a critical minimum constraint (rather than a completely free

---

<sup>14</sup> Percentage of articles is accounted for by the number of stories and not the actual amount of the front page or editorial section that is covered. For example, if there were four articles on the front page and Afghanistan was mentioned in two of them, it would be considered 50% of the front page. Also, if the relationship to Afghanistan was mentioned in the continuation of a front-page article elsewhere in the newspaper, this too was included in these calculations.

<sup>15</sup> It should be noted that public opinion remained well above the 50 percent margin in all of Canada, as well as in each of the solitudes — making it important to remember that this hypothesis does not necessarily hold true if there is an adamant desire from the public to not go to war.

hand) by the Harper government's June 2007 signal, at a time when public support had plunged to a new national low of 40% and showed no signs of turning upward, to seek multi-party support for extending the mission beyond February 2009.

### **The Unified Mobilization of Consent**

The second hypothesis, of the unified mobilization of consent, predicts that Canada will not go to war more, or will go to war less, as francophone/Quebec support drops to low levels and shows few signs of rising as the months and years go on. It is confirmed by the first four decisions constituting the "go to war more" phase, when francophones/Quebec offered majority support on most questions, particularly on the "trust the prime minister" one that is the most authentic test of the first hypothesis of the constrained mobilization of consent. As a result the national unity gap in the polls was either nonexistent or support in Quebec remained above the majority, especially where support for the prime minister was concerned. Moreover, in the summer and autumn of 2007, when the national unity gap grew wide and support from Quebec remained well below 40%, a previously moving-into-war prime minister indicated his shift to a bi- or multi-partisan pause and a prospective pull-back after February 2009.

### **The Rally-to-Reluctance Cadence of Consent**

The third hypothesis, of a rally-to-reluctance cadence is confirmed as well, to a strong degree with the adjustment of a "ratchet down but reversible effect," and especially for francophones/Quebec in an "early evaporation" form. Canadian support for the war eroded in a unidirectional, ratcheted, downward fashion as time went on, regardless of what was happening on the front lines, at home or in the government messages put out. The friendly fire incident of April 2002 did not itself precipitate a great plunge in public support, for blame for the incident was substantially shared and shrugged off. Nor did the great force-on-force victory at the Battle of Panjawai in the summer of 2006 push support up to high levels once again. To be sure, the single, downward direction of support, in somewhat steady fashion, is broadly consistent with the cumulative death toll among Canadian soldiers in the field. But there is sufficient inconsistency in the cadence of the two trends to doubt that it was the cumulative death toll from the front, rather than a more general war weariness, that drove the downward trend.

### **Canada's Conscription Constraint in Consent**

The fourth hypothesis, of Canada's distinctive conscription constraint in consent, has 12 components, as follows: Three factors — pan-Canadian support for the war, that of its francophones/Quebecers in particular and the unity between them and their fellow Canadian citizens — are each predicted to diminish as four forces arise: as Canada moves from air and naval forces to mainstream ground combat forces, as Canadian ground combat forces are sent to the dangerous front, as Canadian ground combat forces engage in combat with the enemy and as Canadian ground combat forces are killed in increasing numbers on a cumulative and individual incident count. With only 12 cases of major decisions to test 12 relationships (formed by multiplying the four causes by the three effects), no conclusive answers can be given. Yet the available evidence is consistent with the hypothesis that greater combat and combat deaths lessen support for the war from francophones/Quebecers and thus increase the national unity gap. However, the major moves away from war — in May 2002 and June 2007 — did not appear, with the evidence available, to produce any converse, corresponding support for what the government had done on the first occasion, but did on the much milder second one.

## **The Mythologically Rational Mass Public**

The fifth hypothesis, of the mythologically rational mass public model, and its four components, is confirmed, if in varying degrees.

The first component of the right allies, based on the 1939–41 myth, is supported in its modified form that makes allowance — in the first stage — for the presence as a leading ally of an America that had been directly attacked (that is, when 1941 extended to embrace Pearl Harbor at the end). In this phase, when pan-Canadian and anglophone/ROC support was strong, francophone/Quebec support substantial, and the national unity gap small, France and Britain appeared alongside Canada and America, as allies on both the CBC's *The National* and SRC's *Téléjournal*. The U.S. appeared along with Canada and even Britain in the wording of the polling questions. With these combinations, support was usually strong. To be sure, Quebec support dropped below 50% for the first time on January 8–10, 2002, for “sending 750 troops to assist the U.S.” and for the “Canadian Forces taking on a combat mission.” But it could have been the common element of sending mainstream ground troops to combat (hypothesis three), rather than the U.S. only in the first question, that evoked the opposition. And when asked in mid April who was responsible for the friendly fire incident that killed four Canadians, 53% of Quebecers and 42% of the ROC agreed that no one was to blame.

The second component, of the right war, is also supported to a high degree. Remembrance Day mattered for both solitudes in 2001 and 2002, even if Quebecers (who may well have remembered not just the victory, but conscription the year before) said that 9/11 mattered more (53%). By September 2002, as the prospective American attack to start the wrong war against Iraq came more into view, 66% of Quebecers and 71% of the ROC agreed that the U.S. bore some responsibility for the terrorist attacks against it. The *causis belli* of 9/11, and with it the justification for American and Canadian military action in Afghanistan, was starting to wear off. Most strikingly, in 2001, when unified support for Canada's war was strong, it was primarily associated on English TV with the right wars of World War I, World War II and the Cold War. In 2007, when support for the war, particularly in Quebec, was weak, it was primarily associated on French TV with the wrong war — the U.S. fighting and now losing in Iraq.

The third component, of the right leaders or trusted authorities, is confirmed to a reasonable degree. At the start when support was high, francophone Quebecer prime minister Jean Chrétien was there on TV, leading all of Canada, as well as the two solitudes in support. But by 2007, with anglophone Albertan prime minister Stephen Harper leading the war, Quebecers support had dropped. Overall, Canadians showed less support for the war — with Harper appearing less often on Canadian news in August and September 2007 combined than Chrétien had in September 2001 alone.

The fourth component of the right death ratio is strongly confirmed by the available evidence thus far. In 2001, when support for Canada's war was high, Canadian TV told Canadians that up to a 100 Canadians might be dead and that 24 eventually were, whereas no Canadian troops had died, and none in combat with the enemy would through 2002. By 2007, however, 71 Canadians had died in the real world, but many more had, in the mediated magnification of TV, if one added each Afghanistan story that referred to such a death on Canadian TV. References to the 9/11 victims had disappeared, and those to how many Canadian soldiers had died to win the right wars of the past and thus put the current body count into a comparative historical context had as well.

## References

### Media and Public Opinion

Adams, Michael (2004), *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada and the Myth of Converging Values* (Toronto: Penguin).

Blainey, Geoffrey (1967), *An Introduction to Contemporary History* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Buckley, Brian (1998). *The News Media and Foreign Policy: An Exploration* (Halifax: Centre for Foreign Policy Studies, Dalhousie University).

Burton, B.E., W.C. Soderlund and T.A. Keenleyside (1995), "The Press and Canadian Foreign Policy: A Re-examination Ten Years On." *Canadian Foreign Policy*, 3(2): 51–69.

Burton, B.E., and T.A. Keenleyside (1991), "Of Mice and Monsignors: The Press and Canadian policy towards the Middle East," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 16(3/4): 367–379.

Burton, B.E., W.C. Soderlund and T.A. Keenleyside, (1985–85), "The Press and Foreign Policy: Canadian Newspaper Coverage of Relations with the United States, October–December 1982." *International Journal* 61(Winter): 189–220.

Dewitt, David, and John Kirton (1989), "Canadian Foreign Policymaking toward the Middle East: Parliament, the Media and the 1982 War in Lebanon." In David Taras and David Goldberg, eds., *The Domestic Battleground: Canada and the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), pp. 167–185.

Donneur, André (1971), "La presse du Québec et les pays étrangères," *Etudes Internationales*, 2(3): 410–423.

Douglas, Ab (1993), *On Foreign Assignment: The Inside Story of Journalism's Elite Corps* (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises).

Falk, Richard (1996), "The Complexities of Humanitarian Intervention: A New World Order Challenge," *Michigan Journal of International Law* 17: 491–513.

Fortmann, Michel, and Pierre Martin (1998), "The End of Internationalism? Public Opinion and Canada's Foreign Commitments in the 1990s." Paper prepared for the Conference on Internationalism and Retrenchment in Canadian Foreign Policy, Toronto, April 24–25.

Gecelovsky, Paul, and T.A. Keenleyside (1995), "Canada's International Human Rights Policy in Practice: Tiananmen Square," *International Journal* 50(3): 564–593.

Gow, J.I. (1970), "Les Québécois, la guerre et la paix, 1945–60," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 3(1): 88–122.

Hibbard, Ann L., and T.A. Keenleyside (1995), "The Press and the Persian Gulf Crisis: The Canadian Angle," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 20(2): 255–266.

Harvey, Frank P., and Ann L. Griffiths, eds. (1999), *Foreign and Security Policy in the Information Age* (Halifax: Centre for Foreign Policy Studies, Dalhousie University).

Keenleyside, T.A., B.E. Burton and W.C. Soderlund (1985–86), “The Press and Foreign Policy: Canadian Newspaper Coverage of Relations with the United States, October–December 1982,” *International Journal* 41(Winter): 189–220.

Keenleyside, T.A., W.C. Soderlund and B.E. Burton (1985), “A Tilt to Indifference? The Press and Canadian Foreign Policy in the Middle East, Autumn 1982” *Middle East Focus* 8(July): 6–14.

Keenleyside, T.A. and Peter Gatti (1992), “Still the Great White Blank? Canada in the American, British and French Press,” *American Review of Canadian Studies* 22 (1) (Spring):39-64

Keenleyside, T.A. (1988), “Images of Canada in the British and French Press,” *International Perspectives* 17(6): 9–12

Kirton, John (1993), “National Mythology and Media Coverage: Mobilizing Consent for Canada’s War in the Gulf,” *Political Communication* 10: 425–441.

Kirton, John, and Virginia W. Maclaren, eds. (2002), “Introduction.” In John Kirton and Virginia Maclaren, eds., *Linking Trade, Environment, and Social Cohesion: NAFTA Experiences, Global Challenges* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Kirton, John, and Don Munton (1992), “Liberating Kuwait: 1990–91.” In John Kirton and Don Munton, eds., *Canadian Foreign Policy: Selected Cases* (Toronto: Prentice Hall).

Laulicht, Jerome (1965), “Public Opinion and Foreign Policy Decisions,” *Journal of Peace Research* 2: 147–160.

Martin, Pierre, and Michel Fortmann (1995), “Canadian Public Opinion and Peacekeeping in a Turbulent World,” *International Journal* 50 (Spring): 370–400.

Martin, Pierre, and Michel Fortmann (2001), “Public Opinion: Obstacle, Partner or Scapegoat?” *Policy Options* (January–February), 66–72.

Mendelsohn, Matthew, and Robert Wolfe (2001), “Probing the Aftermyth of Seattle: Canadian Public Opinion on International Trade, 1980–2000,” *International Journal* 56 (Spring): 234–260.

Michaud, Nelson (2002), “Foreign Policy News in Times of Crises: Canadian Political Executive, Media and Kosovo.” Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Studies Association, New Orleans, March 23–27.

Munton, Don, and Tom Keating (2001), “Internationalism and the Canadian Public,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 34(3): 517–549.

Rogel, Jean-Pierre (1974), “La presse québécoise et l’information sur la politique internationale,” *Etudes Internationales* 5 (December): 693–711.

Stairs, Denis (1977–78), “Public Opinion and External Affairs: Reflections on the Domestication of Canadian Foreign Policy,” *International Journal* 33 (Winter): 128–49.

Stairs, Denis (1976), "The Press and Foreign Policy in Canada," *International Journal* 31 (Spring): 223–243.

Stairs, Denis (1970–71), "Publics and Policymakers: The Domestic Environment of Canada's Foreign Policy Community," *International Journal* 26 (Winter): 246–47.

Waddell, Chris (2005), "The Communications Revolution and Canadian Foreign Policy." In David Carment, Fen Olser Hampson and Norman Hillmer, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2004: Setting Priorities Straight* (Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press), pp. 189–208.



## Afghanistan

“Beyond Peace: Canada in Afghanistan,” *Canada World View* 20 (Autumn 2003).

Brunée, Jutta, and Stephen Troope (2004), “Canada and the Use of Force: Reclaiming Human Security,” *International Journal* 59 (Spring): 247–260.

Chrétien, Jean (2007, forthcoming), *My Years as Prime Minister* (Toronto: Random House).

Cohen, Andrew (2003), *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World* (Toronto: Random House).

Dawson, Grant (2003), “‘A Special Case’: Canada, Operation Apollo and Multilateralism.” In David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson and Norman Hillmer, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus* (Toronto: Oxford University Press).

Fawn, Rick (2003), “Reluctant Moral Middle Power: Canada.” In Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn, eds., *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan and Beyond* (New York: Routledge).

Friscolanti, Michael (2005), *Friendly Fire: The Untold Story of the U.S. Bombing that Killed Four Canadian Soldiers in Afghanistan* (Toronto: John Wiley).

Gimblett, Richard (2002), “A Strategic Overview of the Canadian Security Environment,” *Canadian Foreign Policy* 9 (Spring):7–20.

Goldenberg, Eddie (2006). *The Way It Works: Inside Ottawa* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart).

Gordon, Nancy (2005–06), “Canada’s Position on the Use of Force Internationally,” *International Journal* 61 (Winter): 129–134.

Granatstein, J.L. (2007), *Whose War Is It? How Canada Can Survive in the Post-9/11 World* (Toronto: HarperCollins).

Granatstein, J.L. (2004), *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* (Toronto: HarperFlamingo).

Kirton, John (2007), *Canadian Foreign Policy in a Changing World* (Toronto: Thomson Nelson).

Kirton, John (2007), “A ‘Made in Canada’ Foreign Policy for Harper’s First Year.” In Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowlands, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2006: Priorities and Minorities* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press).

Martin, Lawrence (2003). *Iron Man: The Defiant Reign of Jean Chrétien* (Toronto: Penguin).

McDonough, David (2007), “The Paradox of Afghanistan,” *International Journal* 62 (Summer): 620–641.

Pigott, Peter (2007), *Canada in Afghanistan: The War So Far* (Toronto: Dundurn Press).

Rolston, Bruce (2006), “Why Are We in Afghanistan?” *Literary Review of Canada* 14(3): 29–30.

Sands, Christopher (2006), "The Rising Importance of Third Country Issues in Canada's Relations with the United States." In Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowlands, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2006: Minorities and Priorities* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), pp. 125–144.

Stein, Janice Gross, and Eugene Lang (2007), *The Unexpected War: Canada in Kandahar*.

Wright, David (2006), "Darfur and Afghanistan: Canada's Choices in Deploying Military Forces," Munk Centre Distinguished Lecture Series, September 22 <[webapp.mcis.utoronto.ca/resources/MCIS\\_Briefings/Oct2006WrightBriefing.pdf](http://webapp.mcis.utoronto.ca/resources/MCIS_Briefings/Oct2006WrightBriefing.pdf)> (October 2007).

Yaniszewski, Mark (2007), "Reporting on Fratricide: Canadian Newspapers and the Incident at Tarnak Farm, Afghanistan," *International Journal* 62 (Spring): 362–382.

## Appendix A: Public Opinion Polls

### Public Opinion Polls: Measuring Support for Canada's War in Afghanistan, 2001–2007

Date (YMD)	Company	Question Wording	All	ROC	Quebec	Gap
010912 D1: Declaring War						
011007 D2: Attacking Afghanistan						
010917-20*	IR	Support with U.S.	73%	78%	59%	<b>19%</b>
011016-21*	LM	Support with U.S.	84%	86%	78%	8%
011114 D3: Sending Soldiers under American Command						
020113	IR	Support with U.S.	<b>68%</b>	72%	49%	<b>23%</b>
0303 D4: Conducting Ground Offensive with the Americans						
030521 D5: Coming Home from Kandahar						
030212 D6: Returning Multilaterally to Kabul						
040414 D7: Extending the Mission						
040321 D8: Expanding and Returning to Kandahar						
0511 D9: Conducting Combat in Kandahar						
060304	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	<b>54%</b>	58%	33%	<b>25%</b>
060309-12*	SC	Support for Canadian Forces	55%	59%	43%	<b>16%</b>
060313 D10: Promising Leadership						
060325	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	52%	57%	37%	<b>20%</b>
060505	SC	Support for Canadian Forces	<b>40%</b>	44%	27%	<b>17%</b>
060517 D11: Extending to 2009						
060520	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	57%	64%	37%	<b>27%</b>
060729	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	<b>47%</b>	50%	35%	<b>15%</b>
060814	SC	Support for Canadian Forces	<b>37%</b>	42%	21%	<b>21%</b>
060909	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	51%	53%	45%	8%
060918	SC	Support for Canadian Forces	<b>42%</b>	47%	27%	<b>20%</b>
061006	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	57%	63%	45%	<b>18%</b>
061016	SC	Support for Canadian Forces	<b>44%</b>	49%	30%	<b>19%</b>
061104	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	44%	50%	31%	<b>19%</b>
070424	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	54%	58%	37%	<b>21%</b>
070514-17*	SC	Support for Canadian Forces	<b>40%</b>	45%	24%	<b>21%</b>
070622 D12: "Parliament Will Decide"						
070712-15*	SC	Support for Canadian Forces	36%	41%	22%	<b>19%</b>
070716	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	51%	55%	30%	<b>25%</b>
070825	IR	Support for Canadian Forces	53%	57%	35%	<b>22%</b>

Notes:

\*Dates refer to when poll was conducted, all other dates refer to when poll was released.

IR=Ipsos Reid; SC=Strategic Counsel, LM=Leger Marketing.

Bold indicates a drop of 9 or more percentage points. Italics indicates a new low (outside the 3% margin of error).

Questions include the following wording: "Support Canadian Forces in Afghanistan," "Support troops in Afghanistan," "Join U.S./declare war," "Support Canadian military for U.S.," "Send troops to assist U.S.," "Support Canadian Forces efforts in Afghanistan," "Support sending troops" and "Support Canadian troops for combat in Afghanistan."

## Appendix B: Percentage of Trusted Allies That Appear in Canadian Television News

### Percentage of References That Appear in Canadian Newscasts, September 2001

	Overall (N=43)	CBC (N=15)	SRC (N=13)	CTV (N=15)	Gap between CBC and SRC	Gap between CTV and SRC
U.S.	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
Canada	93%	73%	77%	100%	-4%	23%
UK	47%	40%	31%	67%	9%	36%
France	19%	20%	23%	13%	-3%	-10%
Chrétien	67%	80%	54%	67%	26%	13%
Quebec	74%	80%	62%	80%	18%	18%

### Percentage of References That Appear in 9/11-Afghanistan-Related Canadian News Stories, October 2001

	Overall (N=240)	CBC (N=80)	SRC (N=67)	CTV (N=93)	Gap between CBC and SRC	Gap between CTV and SRC
U.S.	73%	69%	73%	76%	-4%	3%
Canada	22%	29%	10%	24%	19%	14%
UK	10%	13%	3%	13%	10%	10%
France	0.4%	0%	1%	0%	-1%	-1%
Chrétien	5%	9%	1%	5%	8%	4%
Quebec	6%	10%	1%	6%	9%	5%

### Percentage of References That Appear in 9/11/Afghanistan-Related Canadian News Stories, November 2001

	Overall (N=84)	CBC (N=34)	SRC (N=19)	CTV (N=31)	Gap between CBC and SRC	Gap between CTV and SRC
U.S.	45%	44%	42%	48%	2%	6%
Canada	25%	29%	5%	32%	24%	27%
UK	11%	15%	5%	10%	10%	5%
France	5%	3%	5%	6%	-2%	1%
Chrétien	4%	3%	0%	6%	3%	6%
Quebec	7%	6%	5%	10%	1%	5%

**Percentage of References That Appear in 9/11-Afghanistan-Related Canadian Newscasts, December 2001**

	Overall (N=56)	CBC (N=19)	SRC (N=11)	CTV (N=26)	Gap between CBC and SRC	Gap between CTV and SRC
U.S.	66%	68%	64%	65%	4%	1%
Canada	16%	21%	18%	12%	3%	-6%
UK	4%	0%	9%	4%	-9%	-5%
France	4%	5%	0%	4%	5%	4%
Chrétien	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Quebec	7%	5%	9%	8%	-4%	-1%

**Percentage of References That Appear in Afghanistan-Related Canadian Newscasts, August 2007**

	Overall (N=65)	CBC (N=31)	SRC (N=34)	Gap between English and French Newscasts
U.S.	22%	26%	18%	8%
Canada	52%	58%	47%	11%
UK	8%	3%	12%	-9%
France	0%	0%	0%	0%
Harper	11%	13%	9%	4%
Quebec	18%	23%	15%	8%

**Percentage of References That Appear in Afghanistan-Related Canadian Newscasts, September 2007**

	Overall (N=44)	CBC (N=24)	SRC (N=20)	Gap between English and French Newscasts
U.S.	20%	25%	15%	10%
Canada	68%	79%	55%	24%
UK	7%	13%	0%	13%
France	5%	4%	5%	-1%
Harper	18%	30%	5%	25%
Quebec	30%	33%	25%	8%

Notes:

CBC=Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

SRC=Société Radio-Canada

For September 2001, N refers to number of newscasts that were analyzed. For October–December 2001, N refers to number of 9/11-Afghanistan news stories that were analyzed. For August–September 2007, N refers to number of Afghanistan news stories that were analyzed.

## Appendix C: References to Right or Wrong Wars That Appear on Canadian Television News

### War References That Appear in 9/11-Afghanistan–Related Canadian News Stories

Date YMD	Network	P	Reference
September 2001			
010911	CTV	4	Veteran journalist ... compared the [9/11] events to <b>Pearl Harbor</b>
010911	CTV	9	U.S. stock exchange closed ... first prolonged cessation since <b>WWII</b>
010916	CTV	6	Wall Street trading ... Stopped for so long since <b>WWI</b>
010925	CBC	6	Donald Rumsfeld ... echoed <b>Winston Churchill's</b> statement that sometimes truth must be protected by lies
<i>Total: 4</i>			
October 2001			
011009	CBC	5	George Robertson (NATO secretary general): “In the <b>Cold War</b> , we spent billions of dollars to ensure our safety of future generations”
011010	CBC	8	Tony Blair met ... suggestion that the U.S. may strike <i>Iraq</i> ... full backing of the UN.
<i>Total: 2</i>			
November 2001			
011127	CTV	7	Rival Afghan factions sat down in Germany...meanwhile, in the U.S. ... keep pressure on terrorist as U.S. warplanes struck near the <i>Iraqi</i> No-Fly Zone
<i>Total: 1</i>			
December 2001			
<i>Total: 0</i> NA			
August 2007			
070805	SRC	6	Maison blanche préfèrent à concentrer ses efforts en Afghanistan, pas de question ailleurs dans la région. Trop compliquer et surtout trop cher — la guerre en <i>Iraq</i> siphonne des milliards et milliards de dollars américains.
070819	CBC	10	They said [protest] would be family friendly, and it was: hundreds of protestors, a few shadowy ones, but all well behaved, enjoying the sunshine, united against U.S. president George Bush, the <i>war in Iraq</i> , the mission in Afghanistan.”
070822	CBC	1	“one of the best ... Haiti, <i>Iraq</i> , <i>Afghanistan</i> before” [referring to Canadian soldiers’ past experiences, i.e., previous to Afghanistan].
070824	CBC	10	References to U.S. military hospitals in Germany, <i>Iraq</i> and Afghanistan
070824	SRC	7	Profile de l’hôpital en Afghanistan, <i>Iraq</i> , U.S.
<i>Total: 5</i>			

September 2007			
070905	CBC	1	Canada's biggest combat role since <i>Korean</i> war
070907	SRC	3	Bin Laden video: Al Jazeera, U.S. Bush, <i>Iraq</i>
			Changement climatique, <i>Iraq</i> , Afghanistan, Darfur — les crises qui confrontent Assemblée generale de l'Organisation des Nations Unies cette semaine, mais pour le moment c'est le président iranien
070923	SRC	2	qui retient toute l'attention a New York.
<i>Total: 3</i>			

Notes:

Bold indicates "right wars"; italics indicates "wrong wars."

War references include any references to specific wars, easily recognizable war characters, identifiable war incidents and reference to current war situations. They exclude references to countries that have previously been in wars but are not currently (unless the country is mentioned in one of the previously mentioned ways). Korea, as an unwon war, is coded as a wrong war.

Data for 2001 include news stories related to 9/11 and Afghanistan. Data for 2007 includes only Afghanistan-related news stories.

## Appendix D: References to Trusted Authorities That Appear on Canadian Television News

### Trusted Authorities in Canadian News Stories

Individual	2001																2007							
	September (N=28)				October (N=39)				November (N=17)				December (N=11)				August (N=28)				September (N=28)			
	Overall	CBC	SRC	Gap	Overall	CBC	SRC	Gap	Overall	CBC	SRC	Gap	Overall	CBC	SRC	Gap	Overall	CBC	TJL	Gap	Overall	CBC	TJL	Gap
<i>Jean Chretien</i>	18(2)	13(2)	5(0)	8(2)	8(3)	7(3)	1(0)	6(3)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Stephen Harper	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	7(7)	4(4)	3(3)	1(1)	8(8)	7(7)	1(1)	6(6)
John Manley	4(1)	3(1)	1(0)	2(1)	5(1)	2(1)	3(0)	-1(-1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Peter MacKay	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(2)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	2(2)	2(2)	0(0)	2(2)
Giuliano Zaccardelli	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Mike Harris	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	2(0)	2(0)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
<i>Maxime Bernier</i>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(3)	2(2)	1(1)	1(1)	3(3)	2(2)	1(1)	1(1)
David Harris	2(1)	2(1)	0(0)	2(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Shireen Hunter	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Joe Clark	4(1)	3(1)	1(0)	2(1)	2(0)	2(0)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Elinor Caplan	2(1)	2(1)	0(0)	2(1)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Stockwell Day	3(2)	2(2)	1(0)	1(2)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
<i>Stephane Dion</i>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(3)	1(1)	2(2)	-1(-1)	4(4)	2(2)	2(2)	0(0)
Lawrence MacAulay	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Rick Hillier	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Norman Inkster	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
John Reynolds	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Bill Blaikie	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
<i>Paul Martin</i>	3(1)	3(1)	0(0)	3(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Bill Hogg	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	-1(-1)
Alexa McDonough	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(0)	2(0)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)



Jack Layton	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(3)	2(2)	1(1)	1(1)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	
<b>Gilles Dugay</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	-1(-1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Brian Tobin	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Art Eggleton	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	3(2)	3(2)	0(0)	3(2)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Jim Peterson	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Anne McLellan	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
David Collette	2(0)	2(0)	0(0)	2(0)	3(0)	3(0)	0(0)	3(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Paul DeVilliers	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
<b>Pierre Pettigrew</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Casey McLean	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Anthony Cordesman	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
<b>Hercule Gosselin</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
John Baird	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)
<b>Denis Coderre</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(2)	2(2)	0(0)	2(2)
<b>Remy Landry</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
<b>Josee Verner</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	-1(-1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
<b>Richard Marceau</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)
Bernard Lord	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
<b>Jean Charest</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(2)	0(0)	2(2)	-2(-2)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
<b>Gilles Duceppe</b>	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(3)	1(1)	2(2)	-1(-1)	2(2)	2(2)	0(0)	2(2)	
Gordan Campbell	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
James Moore	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Allan Rock	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(0)	2(0)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Allan Gottlieb	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Ward Elcock	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Lloyd Axworthy	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	
Bill Graham	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)
Lyle Vanclief	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	

Don Cherry	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1)	1(1)	0(0)	1(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Diane Ablonczy	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)

Notes:

N refers to the number of newscasts analyzed for the month. Numbers in parentheses refer to Afghanistan-related news stories; others include 9/11-related news stories. For 2007, the numbers inside and outside of parentheses are identical, as 9/11 stories were not included in the analysis. “Trusted individuals” includes political or civilian characters who are considered to be civilian leaders and would be easily recognizable to Canadian viewers or who are identified by title to Canadian viewers. It excludes individuals who would not be easily recognizable to Canadian viewers or who are not identified by title and/or name in the news story. It also excludes individuals who would not be considered civilian leaders, such as academics and specialists on such subjects.

## Appendix E: Repeated versus Actual Canadian Military Deaths

### Reported Canadian Military Deaths\* versus Actual Canadian Military Deaths, August and September 2007

Date (YMD)	CBC	SRC	Gap	Actual Deaths	CBC Difference	SRC Difference
August 2007						
070802	1	0	1	0	1	0
070807	1	0	1	0	1	0
070819	3	1	2	1	2	0
070820	1	1	0	0	1	1
070822	2	3	-1	2	0	1
070823	7	6	1	0	7	6
070826	2	2	0	0	2	2
070827	1	1	0	0	1	1
070829	1	1	0	0	1	1
070830	1	1	0	0	1	1
070831	0	1	-1	0	0	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>14</i>
September 2007						
070918	0	1	-1	0	0	1
070923	4	0	4	0	4	0
070924	0	0	0	1	-1	-1
070925	1	2	-1	0	1	2
<i>Total</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>
Overall Total	25	20	5	4	21	16

#### Notes:

\*The number of deaths includes every death reported in a story for the day's death stories. For example, if three news stories reported on the same death, it counts as three reported deaths. Therefore, difference in reported versus actual deaths does not reflect misinformation; it points out the focus and content being reported to the attentive Canadian citizenry.

Media analysis only includes Afghanistan-related news stories.

## Appendix F: Right Death Ratio

### Number of Deaths Reported on Canadian Television

Date	Network	P	Canadian Civil Deaths	Other Civil Deaths	Canadian Military Deaths	Allied Military Deaths	Enemy Deaths
September 2001							
010911	CBC	2		64			
010911	CBC	5	1				
010911	CBC	15		20,000–50,000			
010911	CTV	1		1,000–10,000			
010912	CBC	2		82			
010912	CBC	3		less than 800			
010913	CBC	2		30,000			
010913	CBC	2		94 bodies			
010913	CBC	2		70 body parts			
010913	CBC	3		190			
010913	CTV	3		200 firefighters			
010914	CBC	1		184			
010914	CBC	7	6-100				
010916	SRC	7		5,511			
010916	CTV	4	75				
010917	CBC	2	75	5,000			
010917	SRC	6		5,422			
010917	CTV	7		5,400			
010920	CBC	7		6,333			
010920	SRC	3		6,333			
10930	CBC	3		5,219			
October 2001							
011004	CBC	9	23				
011009	CTV	7		366 bodies identified			
011009	CTV	7		480 bodies unidentified			
011011	CBC	3		200 (Afghans)			
011011	CTV	5		4,000–5,000			
011011	CTV	6		5,160 in New York			
011011	CTV	6		384 bodies identified			
011011	CTV	6		189 in Pentagon			
011014	SRC	1		200 (Afghans)			
011015	CTV	10		15 (Afghans)			
011023	CTV	10		8,000 (Afghans)			
011028	SRC	1		15 (Afghans)			
011028	SRC	1		9 (Afghan children)			
011031	CTV	9		4,700			

011031	CTV	9		343 firefighters			
011031	CTV	9		230 VPs of major financial institutions			
November 2001							
011104	CBC	2					6,000
December 2001							
011201	CTV	6				1 U.S.	
011216	CTV	1					300–1,000
011226	CTV	6		2,940			
August 2007							
070802	CBC	7	1		1		
070806	CBC	5		1,000 (Afghans)			
070807	CBC	3			1	1 U.S.	
070817	CBC	8			? Not specified		
070819	CBC	1			1 (67th to die)		
070819	CBC	2			1		
070819	SRC	1		15 (Afghans)	1 (67th to die)		
070820	CBC	6			1 (67th to die)		
070920	SRC	1			1		
070822	CBC	6	1		2		
070822	SRC	1	1		2		
070822	SRC	2			1		
070823	CBC	1	1		2 (69th soldier killed)		
070823	CBC	2	1		3		
070823	CBC	3	1		2 (57 deaths by friendly fire)		
070823	SRC	1			2		
070823	SRC	2			2		
070823	SRC	3			2		
070824	CBC	9				3 UK	
070824	CBC	5				3 UK	
070825	SRC	6		8 (afghans)			
070826	CBC	3			2 (68th and 69th)		
070826	CBC	8		18 (afghans)			
070826	SRC	3			2 (68th and 69th)		
070827	CBC	6			1		
070827	SRC	2			1		
070829	CBC	3			1		
070829	SRC	5			1		
070830	SRC	1				3 UK	
070830	SRC	1			1		
070831	SRC	2			1		

September 2007							
070904	SRC	1			57 have died, 31 in vicious way		
070918	SRC	7			1		
070921	CBC	10				1 France	1
070921	CBC	11			? not specified		
070922	SRC	4			70 have died		
070923	CBC	3			4		
070924	CBC	3			70 have died		
070925	CBC	1			1		
070925	SRC	2			1		
070925	SRC	4			1		
070926	SRC	6		2 (Afghans)			
070926	CBC	9		2 (Afghans)			

Notes:

Data for 2001 include 9/11-Afghanistan-related news stories. Data for 2007 include only Afghanistan-related news stories.

## Appendix G: Canadian Newspapers Focus on Afghanistan

### Canadian Newspapers' Afghanistan Focus on Average, August 2007

	Overall	Globe and Mail	National Post	La Presse	Gap between Globe and Mail and La Presse	Gap between National Post and La Presse
Front-page articles	58%	74%	46%	54%	20%	-8%
Percentage	18%	20%	14%	19%	1%	-5%
Editorials	30%	41%	23%	26%	15%	-3%
Percentage	14%	15%	11%	15%	0%	-4%

### Canadian Newspapers' Afghanistan Focus on Average, September 2007

	Overall	Globe and Mail	National Post	La Presse	Gap between Globe and Mail and La Presse	Gap between National Post and La Presse
Front-page articles	57%	63%	57%	50%	13%	7%
Percentage	15%	15%	15%	14%	1%	1%
Editorials	31%	25%	17%	50%	-25%	-33%
Percentage	14%	8%	8%	25%	-17%	-17%