

STUDY PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

AD-A170 151

THE YEAR OF VALUES. PROFESSIONAL MILITARY VALUES ARE THEY RELEVANT TO TODAY'S SOCIETY

BY

COLONEL WALTER E. CRAMER III

DTIC
ELECTE
JUL 29 1986
S D
D

DTIC FILE COPY

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release;
distribution is unlimited.

17 MAY 1986



US ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013

86 7 28 046

UNCLASSIFIED

A170157

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)		TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
The Year of Values. Professional Military Values, Are They Relevant to Today's Society?		STUDENT PAPER
7. AUTHOR(s)		5. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
COL Walter E. Cramer		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050		
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
SAME		17 May 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
		19
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
<p>Professional military values--the code of standards by which American military leaders have traditionally patterned their professional lives and actions--is there today a need to re-think and update the time-honored code that has prevailed and served American soldiers so well since Bunker Hill and the Revolution? Is it possible that the set of values which has inspired and motivated military officers for over 200 years has gradually become diminished in urgency, currency, and relevance to today's Army,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(continued)</p>		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

BLOCK 20 (continued)

and in so doing has lost touch with modern military leaders?

This study deals in basic terms first with our traditional military value system, examining the reason why it was initially established by our earlier leadership, how it has evolved, and how it has inspired and sustained military professionalism over the years. Secondly, the requirements for a re-thinking and updating of our values is discussed. Modern societal conditions, as well as modern man himself, make it imperative to broaden our emphasis--maintaining the established code of Duty-Honor-Country, but focusing in on new criteria as well which must be paramount to inspire the type of truly dedicated professionalism essential for success in America's military leader of today.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

THE YEAR OF VALUES. PROFESSIONAL MILITARY
VALUES ARE THEY RELEVANT TO TODAY'S SOCIETY

Individual Study Project

by

Colonel Walter E. Cramer III, QM

Colonel Chuck Palmer, FA
Project Advisor

US Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
17 May 1986

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release;
distribution is unlimited.

UNCLASSIFIED

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Walter E. Cramer III, Colonel, QM

TITLE: The Year of Values. Professional Military Values
Are They Relevant to Today's Society

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 17 May 1986 PAGES: 17 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Professional military values--the code of standards by which American military leaders have traditionally patterned their professional lives and actions--is there today a need to rethink and update the ~~time-honored~~ code that has prevailed and served American soldiers so well since Bunker Hill and the Revolution? Is it possible that the set of values which has inspired and motivated military officers for over 200 years has gradually become diminished in urgency, currency, and relevance to today's Army, and in so doing has lost touch with modern military leaders?

This study deals in basic terms first with our traditional military value system, examining the reason why it was initially established by our earlier leadership, how it has evolved and how it has inspired and sustained military professionalism over the years. Secondly, the requirements for a rethinking and updating of our values is discussed. Modern societal conditions, as well as modern man himself, make it imperative to broaden our emphasis--maintaining the established code of Duty-Honor-Country, but focusing in on new criteria as well which must be paramount to inspire the type of truly dedicated professionalism essential for success in America's military leader of today.

made up of military personnel! Our national interest is defined by that segment of society General Kerwin spoke about, that part of society which knows little or nothing about what it takes to survive on the battlefield. Major General (Retired) Clay Buckingham said, "Only the strong can influence whether peace will be preserved or broken, because strength deters aggression and discourages conflict, and weakness invites aggression and encourages conflict."¹

Values -- do we in the Army have values? What about DUTY, HONOR, COUNTRY? When General MacArthur was presented the Sylvanus Thayer Medal by the United States Military Academy, he spoke to the Corps of Cadets about the meaning of belonging to the military profession. General MacArthur described military service in terms of three words that have become synonymous not only with West Point but with the military profession itself: "Duty - Honor - Country. These three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying points; to build courage when courage seems to fail; to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith; to create hope when hope becomes forlorn."²

How do we differentiate our American values from the values of other sovereign nations? Throughout the course of time, differences have emerged and countries have emerged with different concepts and different values from those of America. The uniqueness of a country's growth, development, and history make each approach values in a different light. Note Ralph H. Gabriel comments about American values. "The Revolutionary Continental Congress spelled out in the 18th century the inalienable rights of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; declared that governments exist to protect and ensure these rights; and insisted that rule be by consent of the governed. These values moved the men of 1776 to action. In the nearly two

centuries since the Declaration, they prove the core values of a free and open society. They become measuring rods with which to assess political action. They brought about the extension of suffrage to all adult males in the first half of the 19th century and to women in the 20th century. They called into being the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863. Threatened by external dangers in World War I and World War II, they galvanized American men and women into action. Since these values were first proclaimed in 1776 they have functioned as the conscience of the American people and nation."³

More recent research on American values has been conducted by Robin Williams. Williams' approach was the collection of major value beliefs that were salient in American culture. Williams was able to distinguish fifteen clusters or general categorical headings such as politics, law, religion, education, social, science, economy, arts, and international relations. Note the absence of a military heading. What Williams has done is to measure change within our society. Based on Williams' research, two other researchers, Light and Keller, have identified what they refer to as the "sacred triad" of basic American values: freedom, equality, and democracy.⁴ If you add the military heading, you come up with Duty, Honor, Country. It's sort of funny how when the military values are added to the values of American society we do exactly what the Constitution directed us to do, even when we are not included as a player.

The research on American values is expanding rapidly. Polling organizations such as Gallop or Harris have made it possible to take almost continuous samples from American society. Coupled with the rapid availability of television and newspaper coverage, American values are being monitored on a daily basis.⁵ Swings or shifts in Americans' views about an issue are rapidly being criss-crossed from one side of the country to the other. The media is

the issue maker and American values are being changed so rapidly that reinforcement of our basic values has to occur on a nearly routine schedule. Values, by definition, have always had a persistent, semi-permanent nature and were not considered easily changed. One impact of knowing what the majority values, could be the development of an easily swayed public, always ready and eager to jump on board with the majority. This prohibits one of our basic rights, the freedom to make up our own minds about issues, to interpret according to our values, not the values of others.

How has the Army accepted its mission of providing standards of values for its men? From the beginning the Army has accepted its responsibility as teacher. The Army has provided various programs that were designed to teach moral leadership and character development. When George C. Marshall was Secretary of Defense he issued the following memorandum to all military departments:

Subject: Protection of Moral Standards

It is in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected in the realization and development of moral, spiritual, and religious values consistent with the religious beliefs of the individuals concerned. To this end, it is the duty of commanding officers in every echelon to develop to the highest degree the conditions and influences calculated to promote the health, morals, and spiritual values of the personnel under their command.

This traditional responsibility of command is of especial importance at this time when Congress is preparing to broaden the base of inductions into the Armed Services. The people of this country have made it plain to both houses of Congress that they are determined that adequate efforts be made both

in military installations and in adjacent communities to safeguard the moral welfare of the members of the Armed Forces. The Department of Defense, sharing this determination, directs that increased efforts of commanding officers be directed to insure the accomplishment of this objective.⁶

The date of this directive was 26 May 1951. Marshall wanted to create a manpower reserve for mobilization that he knew was needed to fight the Korean War. Marshall's ultimate goal was universal military training, UMT, a program that had been shelved by President Truman at the outbreak of the war. Marshall persuaded President Truman to reintroduce UMT to Congress. This was done during January of 1951. In June of 1951 Congress postponed implementation of UMT for a continuation of the selective service system.⁷ What Marshall was preparing to do by the May 26th memo was to accept the influx of large numbers of soldiers whose moral, ethical and professional values were his responsibility if UMT had been successful. The actual product that was derived from the memo was the revalidation or, in some cases, the establishment of character guidance programs throughout the Services.

At the conclusion of the Korean War a new and more urgent training program was undertaken. The experiences of American prisoners of war indicated a new and dramatic escalation for a value system overhaul within the Army. Instructions in values had not been considered as necessary for the conduct of American soldiers. Our experience base was six years old and the conduct of World War II prisoners led us to believe the American soldier was steadfast in his abilities to withstand captivity. This flaw in our military training placed captured soldiers at the mercy of communist exploiters. After the repatriation of prisoners had been completed, details were compiled concerning the lack of knowledge of moral standards and values. The Code of Conduct for captured American soldiers was formulated to establish the basis

of military moral values. The Code of Conduct as established by Executive Order 10631, dated 17 August 1955, is as follows:

CODE OF CONDUCT

1. I AM AN AMERICAN FIGHTING MAN, PREPARED TO DEFEND AND DIE FOR MY COUNTRY.
2. I WILL NEVER SURRENDER FREELY.
3. IF CAPTURED, IT WILL RESIST, ESCAPE (IF POSSIBLE) AND AID OTHERS.
4. IF CAPTURED, I WILL KEEP FAITH WITH FELLOW POW'S, GIVE NO HARMFUL INFORMATION, OBEY LAWFUL ORDERS OF SENIORS.
5. IF CAPTURED, I WILL REMAIN LOYAL TO MY COUNTRY, NOT AID THE ENEMY.
6. I WILL NEVER FORGET, I AM AN AMERICAN, RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTIONS, DEDICATED TO U.S. PRINCIPLES AND WILL TRUST MY GOD AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

From the Korean War of the 1950's I want to transition to a more recent time. The period in particular is after the Vietnam War and General Westmoreland is Army Chief of Staff. Lieutenant Calley's conduct at My Lai has placed the Officer Corps and the Army at large open for public scrutiny. General Westmoreland has prepared a letter that will be sent to every officer. The subject of General Westmoreland's letter is Integrity. The letter follows:

"These are challenging times for those of us who share responsibility for the leadership of the Army. Faced with severe personnel turnover and reduced levels of experience, we are more than ever to draw on fundamental principles as guides for our actions. Moreover, today's society provides less support than formerly for traditional values. Thus, the individual officer bears even

more responsibility for the establishment and observance of scrupulous, ethical standards.

I want to make it clear beyond any question that absolute integrity of an officer's word, deed, and signature is a matter that permits no compromise. Inevitably, in the turmoil of the times, every officer will be confronted by situations which will test his character. On these occasions he must stand on his principles, for these are the crucial episodes that determine the worth of a man.

While basic laws underline command authority, the real foundation of successful leadership is the moral authority derived from professional competence and integrity. Competence and integrity are not separable. The officer who sacrifices his integrity sacrifices all; he will lose the respect and trust of those he seeks to lead, and he will degrade the reputation of his profession. The good repute of the officer corps is a responsibility shared by every officer. Each one of us stands in the light of his brother officer, and each shares in the honor and burden of leadership. Dedicated and selfless service to our country is our primary motivation. This makes our profession a way of life rather than just a job.

In this uncertain world our best judgment may prove wrong. But there is only one sure path to honor--unfaltering honesty and sincerity in word and deed. I charge every officer to shoulder his responsibility, as I expect every officer to earn our Nation's trust."⁸

General George Washington said, "War must be carried on systematically, and to do it you must have men of character activated by principles of honor." During the Vietnam War many things happened that should not have happened, the end justified the means. Both the ends and means must be consistent with our

fundamental values and I believe that this is the point made by the Westmoreland letter.

For a soldier the most critical time and place is the battlefield. This next portion of this document will discuss battlefield values. General Donn A. Starry in a speech made the following observations about battlefield values:

On the battlefield there are only four important values--candor, commitment, courage and competence. . . . Candor is not a very strong word. In fact it's not used very often. Too bad, for it means more than honesty; it's also openness and it's simplicity. It is the primary rule governing battlefield communications between soldiers.

Commitment is another word not used very often. In fact, we seem to be moving towards a society that is more and more reluctant to make a commitment. It means sharing an exchange of your beliefs for someone else's and vice versa. Commitment is what's written all through the citations for the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Courage is a very much talked-about value. So, let's get something clear about courage right away; it's not the absence of fear. Everyone has fears, all the time, everyday. On the battlefield they become right sharp. Courage is the controlling of your fear and the taking of a risk, even though the choice not to do so is open. Courage, most simply, is the display of candor and commitment. Courage is contagious and spreads rapidly. That's why soldiers will follow leaders into impossible situations.

The last value--competence--is the oldest value on the battlefield. It's a central value that anchors all the others. In simple terms, it means the ability to do your job.

In peacetime, we practice tactics, strategy, and weapons-firing. We must do the same with our values. We must develop the candor to display the courage to make a commitment to real competence--now, today. We can afford to do no less, for the time is short and the stakes are high.⁹

General Starry, has captured the true meaning of what General Kerwin meant by saying, "To be an effective servant of the people the Army must concentrate, not on the values of our liberal society, but on the hard values of the battlefield. These values are simple: Live or Die--Win or Lose." You cannot more clearly define an individual soldiers' values than through; candor, commitment, courage, and competence.

The authors of The United States Army in Transition, Zeb B. Bradford, Jr. and Fredric J. Brown wrote:

"The officer cannot be a member of his profession without subscribing to the operating norms of his professional community as a whole. These norms are in fact a necessity for the success of the group in fulfilling its tasks. Without a collective sense of duty, the military could not function and certainly could not be trusted. Military professionals must share a sense of duty to the nation. The professional officer must be an unconditional servant of state policy; he must have a deep normative sense of duty to do this. The rigorous demands made upon the profession by this sense of duty, and the tasks required of it, explain the premium placed upon other ' soldierly' qualities. One cannot do his duty unless he has courage, selflessness and integrity. The military profession must have these group values as a functional necessity."

They further discussed the importance of competence and commitment to the officer corps. Our reputation must be one of dedicated service, professional competence, personal integrity, and absolute honor. Bradford and Brown

support the conclusion which reaffirms that "Duty, Honor, Country," succinctly states the essential characteristics of the military professional.

Any paper that tries to deal with values within the Army would be remiss if it did not mention another paper from this institution. The paper I refer to is the 1970 Army War College "Study on Military Professionalism." The original research project was to focus on the value system of the 1970s' Army officer. The study was based on interviews, questionnaires and a seminar. Those involved were students and faculty from the U.S. Army Chaplains School, advanced classes from Benning, Knox, Eustis, and Sill. Infantry, Armor, Transportation, Artillery and Chaplains are the branches of service that provided the data for the project from outside the Army War College. Students and faculty from AWC also participated.

The outcome of the study, its findings and conclusions were incapsulated in 1980, by then Major Terry Girton in his publication, "Current Military Values." The following is the extract:

"However nebulously defined, ideal values for the Officer Corps do exist. Officers share a common view of the professional prescriptions and proscriptions which define how an officer is supposed to think, evaluate, decide and act.

Duty - Honor - Country and, to a lesser extent, the Oath of Commission, are agreed upon as general expressions of the ideal value system of the Officer Corps. These expressions, however, are not easily translatable into operable, specific guidelines for behavior.

To find a vehicle that would satisfy the need for a statement of professional values, "An Officers Creed" was proposed that would emphasize the values of selflessness, expertise, fairness, justice, dignity, candor, loyalty, integrity, welfare of soldiers, physical and moral courage."

The Officers Creed that was proposed in the study is as follows:

AN OFFICERS' CREED

I will give to the selfless performance of my duty and my mission the best that effort, thought, and dedication can provide.

To this end, I will not only seek continually to improve my knowledge and practice my profession, but also I will exercise the authority entrusted to me by the President and the Congress with fairness, justice, patience, and restraint, respecting the dignity and human rights of others and devoting myself to the welfare of those placed in my command.

In justifying and fulfilling the trust placed in me, I will conduct my private life as well as my public service so as to be free both from impropriety, acting with candor and integrity to earn the unquestioned trust of my fellow soldiers--junior, seniors, and associates-- and employing my rank and position not to serve myself but to serve my country and my unit.

By practicing physical and moral courage I will endeavor to inspire these qualities in others by my example.

In all my actions I will put loyalty to the highest moral principles and the United States of America above loyalty to organizations, persons, and my personal interests.

Sixteen years after the Army War College paper we are still dealing with the subject of military values. Is this a look into the future? Will we always have a need to adjust and relook at our current value system? The answer to the questions is yes! The changes in our society will drive us to review and redefine our values. Our Army is made up from elements of our society, our thinking and their thinking initially are not the same. Value training brings us together as one.

The research document that Major Terry Girdon published in 1980, "Current Military," contained a section dealing with Military Values in General Officer Literature. The following matrix is a breakout of the material from the document.

MILITARY VALUES
IN
GENERAL OFFICER LITERATURE*

<u>VALUE CLUSTER</u>	<u>VALUE GROUP</u>	<u>VALUES INCLUDED</u>
Duty-Honor-Country	Duty	duty, concern with subordinates, dedication, reliability, service, commitment, loyalty, success, professionalism, determination, leadership
	Patriotism	country, patriotism, loyalty, commitment, service
	Honor/Ethics	honor, ethics, justice, integrity, honesty, candor, trust, courage
Professionalism	Comraderie	community, comraderie, loyalty, group-oriented, hierarchical, commitment, trust, reliability
	Expertise	competence, expertise, self-improvement, excellence, success, leadership, professionalism, physical fitness, determination
Traditional	Discipline	discipline, obedience, hierarchical
	The Battlefield	battlefield, combat, courage, determination
Civil-Military	Civilian Control	civilian control, professionalism
	Conservative Realism	pessimistic view of mankind

*Terry A. Girdon, "Current Military Values," Naval War College, June 1980.

In 1986 the Army has chosen "Values" as its theme. The Army is continuing its program of theme years to provide a vehicle that will capture ideas and initiatives designed to support, improve, enhance, and generally focus on a particular subject area. In the past years the following "Themes" has been highlighted:

- 1981 "Yorktown - The Spirit of Victory"
- 1982 "Physical Theme"
- 1983 "Army of Excellence"
- 1984 "Army Family"
- 1985 "Leadership"
- 1986 "Values - THE BEDROCK OF OUR PROFESSION"

The "Values Theme" is based on the Secretary of the Army's two-tier concept that looks at values from a historical perspective. The first tier represents universal values that are common to all soldiers. The second tier is based on the character of our nation which makes the American soldier unique.¹²

THE FIRST TIER VALUES - UNIVERSAL SOLDIER VALUES

DISCIPLINE AND STAMINA
SKILL
LOYALTY AND DUTY
BONDING

THE SECOND TIER VALUES - NATIONAL VALUES

PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY - LIBERTY, FREEDOM, JUSTICE
JUDEO-CHRISTIAN RELIGIOUS BASE
THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

THE CONSTITUTION

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

PROFESSIONAL ARMY ETHIC - SOLDIER VALUES

LOYALTY TO THE INSTITUTION

LOYALTY TO THE UNIT

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

SELFLESS SERVICE

INTEGRITY

INDIVIDUAL VALUES - CORE VALUES

COMMITMENT

COMPETENCE

CANDOR

COURAGE 12

At the beginning of this essay it was my intention to refute the need for a new list of values for the Army. I was content with those well-established, old line, traditional values of DUTY-HONOR-COUNTRY. I saw no reason to try to adapt a new set of values simply to fit into today's environment. I kept searching for a rationale for this need to change. The old standards of "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness" rang in my ears. Had we in the Army changed our value system or was it that society had changed all around us. What about DUTY-HONOR-COUNTRY. We still hold these values sacred. But our society has changed. What about commitment, competence, candor, and courage. Are these values that reflect our American society today? Colonel

Raymond Hartjen, in his research paper entitled "Ethics in Organizational Leadership," says that values are formed as soon as the learning cycle is started. It is the parents, friends, clergy, teachers, and peers that formulate our initial set of values. It is up to the individual to recognize the need to search out new values that will improve the current environment.¹³ When a soldier enters the Army he or she already has an established set of values. They may be outstanding values that reflect the potential for leadership or they may be values that are totally foreign to good order and discipline. The task of Army leadership is to sift through the individual's values, reinforcing those necessary to be successful and eliminating those that are disruptive to the organization. This value adjustment makes the soldier a more effective member of the organization. Values must constantly be challenged. Without this challenge our value system would deteriorate. Without the constant awareness of our tradition and values our Army would become a self-serving organization destined for destruction. We in the Army have found our place in society, what we must guard against is becoming complacent and unprepared to respond when called. What the Year of Values is meant to do is to reawaken the historical traditions of our fight for independence and rekindle those values that may have been eroded in our society today. We are, by no means neglecting our steadfast values of duty-honor-country or integrity-honesty-loyalty, what we are doing is highlighting standard values that reflect the needs and concerns of our society and our Army today.

How can we do this? We have a vehicle to accomplish this goal. It is through the Professional Army Ethic outlined in Chapter Four of FM 100-1. Our Army ethic is defined with three principles of conduct and five essential values. The three principles are: (1) Loyalty to the nation, the Army and

the unit; (2) personal responsibility; and (3) selfless service. The five essential values are: (1) commitment, (2) competence, (3) candor, (4) courage, and (5) integrity.¹⁴ Because of the complexity of today's environment, those individuals that serve in today's Army must fully understand and practice the values that have been established in our Army ethic. In the 1961 Inaugural speech of President John F. Kennedy he said: "Ask not what your country can do for you -- ask what you can do for your country." The situation in 1986 for the Army in the "Year of Values" is "Ask not what your Army can do for you but what you can do for your Army."

ENDNOTES

1. Clay T. Buckingham, MG (Ret), "Ethics and the Senior Officer: Institutional Tensions," Parameters, Vol. XV, No. 3, 1985, p. 24.
2. "Duty-Honor-Country," Department of the Army Pamphlet 16-10 dated March 1973. From General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur's speech to the Corps of Cadets, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York, 12 May 1962.
3. Terry A. Girdon, Major. Current Military Values, p. 23.
4. Ibid., pp. 24-27.
5. Ibid., pp. 28-32.
6. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, Memorandum dated 20 May 1951. Subject: Moral Leadership: The Protection of Moral Standards.
7. Russell F. Wegley, The American Way of War, pp. 394-395.
8. Letter from General W. C. Westmoreland, U.S. Army Chief of Staff, to all Officers of the U.S. Army. Subject: Integrity. Letter dated 20 November 1969.
9. Donn A. Starry, Remarks, Georgia Military College ROTC Dining-In Milledgeville, Georgia. 24 January 1980.
10. USAWC Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania. A Study of Military Professionalism dated 30 June 1970, p. 55.
11. Girdon, A compilation by Chaplain Don Davidson.
12. Office of the Secretary of the Army, Values, White Paper 1986, 24 February 1986, p. 35.
13. Raymond C. Hartjen, Jr. Ethics in Organizational Leadership, pp. 116-117.
14. U.S. Department of Army, Draft Revision to Army Field Manual, FM 100-1. Chapter 4: Profession of Arms. Undated, pp. 6-8.