

Running Head: To transform or nor to transform

To transform or nor to transform: Ethic dilemmas about transformation

Polish Army into professional.

WO4 Piotr G. Smuga

USASMA

3 January 2007

Class 57

### Abstract

26 September 2006 The President of Poland signed a decision about the transformation Polish Army. This is a very controversial decision because it means the end of a long tradition of compulsory service in my country.

Today's structure of the Polish Army is 60% of professional soldiers and 40% drafted. Every man in Poland healthy enough is responsible to give his country 9 month of his life. During this time, soldiers go thru basic training. After this time, he is responsible for attending two-weeks of training every year and be prepare to protect our country on every call.

I truly believe that the country is for its citizens, not the inverse. For "its service" country is paid by taxes. The country has a right, in extraordinary situations, like war, to demand from its citizens more than usual, including sacrificing theirs life.

Modern conflict is asymmetric; it means no front line, quick movement, and frequent changes of situation. The best example of conflict conducted by compulsory service is Israel versus Palestine. The best example of conflict conducted by fully professional army is USA versus Taliban/Al Qaeda. They are both "not exactly" successful. I will try to point out the ethical dilemma connected with using compulsory and professional service.

In the Abstract, I mentioned that asymmetric type of conflict is a sign of our times. But it is not exactly true. There are some countries in the world which keep big armies. We have to rule out the possibility of symmetric conflicts. In such cases small professional armies mean nothing against the big ones. There is one point which comes from this, we have to have not only professionals but also common defense. This is possible, thanks to millions of citizens trained by compulsory service.

Compulsory service is not popular in Poland, especially among young people. This is the main question, if we are safe for the moment, what is the reason of spending money for training young citizens? Thousands of years of experience of different countries, including Poland, were allowed to say that it is necessary to continue compulsory service. Moreover, Poland proved that lack of thinking about its defense can cost us independence. The point is that we can not assuming that the country will be safe during the next couple of centuries. The former president of Czech Republic, Vaclav Havel, said: "...exactly now, when we can't see any treatment, we have to think about defense (...) we have to show off readiness to share responsibility for a peace and defense of human dignity..."

Money, money, and again money. Money is the main argument against conversion from compulsory to professional service. Basically, the professional soldier must be better trained; it means higher cost of training. Professional soldiers must be better equipped which means more expensive equipment. It's very important to provide appropriate salaries, and cover all the needs of a professional soldier.

There is an old proverb, according to which, it is impossible to make a good employee from the slave. In our times, voluntary armies will be always better than obligatory. Training compulsory service is only remembrance of oldies armies. That was effective in XVI century but later the time of professional armies would come. There were two perceptions later on: big, professional army consists of people who were drafted (often for 20 years) or small, voluntary, professional army (for example Great Britain). The first were predicted for continental wars, the second was predicted for expedition wars (with different result-Revolutionary War in North America).

Napoleonic era was a time of mass mobilization and total war. What is very significant: lowering of effectiveness of Napoleon's Army was strictly connected with replacement of old veterans (professionals) by drafted recruits. The next great example is Wesley's Army (known as a Wellington). Professional and, at least at the beginning, voluntary the army was able to fight against the French Army, couple times bigger. Two World Wars were a great example of conflict conducted by, mostly, drafted soldiers. Today, by preparing millions citizens for another WWII we make mistake. It is a false point of view. XXI century is a century of asymmetric or netmetric conflicts. For this type of conflict, we need a voluntary, expeditionary, and professional army.

What are the advantages of this solution? 1. This army diverts conflicts from our borders, because it is able to fight on the enemy's territory. 2. This army is more motivated and more effective than any draft army. 3. Because we don't have Damocles' sword above every 18, 19 or 20 year old man in country we help improve our economic situation.

### Conclusion

I found arguments for and against both types of service. I truly believe that professional service is necessary in the modern war, but what about the possible use of citizens (trained) in case of an attack? Observing specific modern warfare, we can figure out that classic forms of defense are so complicated, it seems to be impossible to prepare for. We need a complex solution in this case. I think Poland needs a mixed form of service, both compulsory and professional.