

AD-A170 278

2

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.

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY ETHICS:
ARE WE ON THE RIGHT TRACK?

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT E. POTTS

DTIC
SELECTED
JUL 28 1986
S D

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

DTIC FILE COPY

20 MAY 1986



US ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. <i>AD-A170 278</i>	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Professional Military Ethics: Are We On The Right Track?		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED STUDENT PAPER
7. AUTHOR(s) LTC Robert E. Potts		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS SAME		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE 20 May 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 55
		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) The intent of this study is to look at what the Army has done to improve professional military ethics since 1970 and draw a conclusion as to whether or not the efforts are on the right track. The study focused on the organizations involved and the products that they produced. The Leadership Monograph Series, along with the Military Qualification Skills and the Field Circulars that were produced, were looked at in detail. The regulations and field manuals which are the primary documents in the field of ethics (continued)		

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EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE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 leadership were examined. The first criterion used for evaluation was from the academicians outside the system. The next was the goals of the insiders charged with the responsibility. Finally the goals in the documents were considered. This three-leveled approach was used to evaluate each document. It was also discovered that the efforts to date had been from the bottom up. Agreement was found from top to bottom. Since there is agreement of what the goals are and should be, it was concluded that we are on the right track.

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 without publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY ETHICS:
ARE WE ON THE RIGHT TRACK?

INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

Lieutenant Colonel Robert E. Potts, SC

Lieutenant Colonel Donald L. Davidson, CHAP
Project Advisor

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

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

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Robert E. Potts, LTC, SC

TITLE: Professional Military Ethics:
Are We on the Right Track?

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 20 May 1986 PAGES: 61 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

> The intent of this study is to look at what the Army has done to improve professional military ethics since 1970 and draw a conclusion as to whether or not the efforts are on the right track. The study focused on the organizations involved and the products that they produced. The Leadership Monograph Series, along with the Military Qualification Skills and the Field Circulars that were produced, were looked at in detail. The regulations and field manuals which are the primary documents in the field of ethics and leadership were examined. The first criterion used for evaluation was from the academicians outside the system. The next was the goals of the insiders charged with the responsibility. Finally the goals in the documents were considered. This three-leveled approach was used to evaluate each document. It was also discovered that the efforts to date had been from the bottom up. Agreement was found from top to bottom. Since there is agreement of what the goals are and should be, it was concluded that we are on the right track.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	6
III. MILITARY QUALIFICATION SKILLS	14
IV. LEADER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM MILITARY PROFESSIONALISM	19
V. FIELD MANUALS AND REGULATIONS	25
VI. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION	32
VII. CONCLUSIONS	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDIX I. 43 LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS	47
APPENDIX II. AIDS FOR ENGAGING IN ETHICAL DISCUSSIONS	48
APPENDIX III. OBJECTIVES OF MQS II	50
APPENDIX IV. OBJECTIVES OF MQS III	51
DISTRIBUTION	52

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"As a profession it is imperative that the military embrace a professional ethic. In this ethic should be set forth those values and principles of conduct which govern our behavior both as a group and as individuals. Professional integrity demands of each soldier an uncompromising commitment to those institutional values which form the bedrock of our profession--the Army Ethic."¹

The rediscovery, or at least the renewed articulation of this premise was spurred by many things. The two most referenced military works are the 1970 Army War College study and the 1977 study by DRISKO. They both indicate a wide variance between the Army's ideal values and the actual values as practiced. They perceived that many of the internal practices and policies encouraged or helped conceal ethical violations. A frequently quoted conclusion from the AWC study puts this in focus:

"A scenario that was repeatedly described in seminar sessions and narrative responses includes an ambitious, transitory commander, marginally skilled in the complexities of his duties, engulfed in producing statistical results, fearful of personal failure, too busy to talk or listen to his subordinates, and determined to submit acceptably optimistic reports which reflect faultless completion of a variety of tasks at the expense of the sweat and frustration of his subordinates."

A great deal of concern has been shown by those outside the profession. Much of it as a result of Vietnam. However, most of

those who studied the issue looked beyond the specific problems of Vietnam and broadened their study to leadership in general as the real heart of the overall problem. Like those in the military, they recognized a problem with ethics and have looked for ways to solve the problem. Richard A. Gabriel studied the problem at length and wrote several books on the subject. A couple of his observations frame the problem particularly well.

"Over the last two decades, the military has engaged in a good deal of soul-searching concerning the behavior of its members and of the profession itself. Those of us who served during this time are acutely aware of a deep sense of unease, a sense that military may have lost its way. At the root of this sense of unease is the unspoken fear that the military may have lost its ethical compass. Many of the assumptions upon which military service rested, as well as many of the reasons for which military sacrifice was demanded, have become obscured."²

"Many officers now fear that the certainties that underpinned traditional military values are being eroded, and the replacement values are less than satisfactory. There is a feeling that something has gone seriously awry and that traditional values have been replaced."³

"The military profession realizes that whatever sense of ethics and professionalism it has clung to over the preceding decades needs reexamination and clarification. This reexamination and clarification would constitute the first step in a moral renaissance aimed at rediscovering the moral bearings of the military profession."⁴

From both inside and outside the military there was general agreement that a problem existed. The exact nature of the problem was not clearly defined. Most said it was a breakdown in leadership. Some alluded to a problem with ethics. None were able to really specify the problem, although they cited example after example where it was obvious that something was amiss.

The vagueness of the problem was not used as an excuse to

ignore it. The Army started an intensive self-evaluation to look past the symptoms of the problem and try to discover the underlying causes. This evaluation was the beginning of an intensive effort to define, examine, and study the allusive subject of leadership. The objective, while perhaps unstated, was to find the problem and fix it.

The Army spent alot of resources, time, money, and the blood, sweat, and tears of alot of dedicated people, in an attempt to study and resolve the problem. Early in the effort it was found that a big part of the leadership problem was ethics. The identification of ethics, professional military ethics, as at least a part of the problem, began a long and deliberate series of events to improve professional military ethics.

The question to be asked, and the topic of this study is, "Are we on the right track?"

To answer this question everything the Army has done and continues to do to improve its professional ethic should be examined. From the start it was recognized that the scope of this study would be limited by the time available. It is hoped, limited as it is, this study will shed some light on what is being done.

The study will look at the organizational structure that developed as the Army recognized and dealt with the increased concern over both leadership and ethics. It would be naive to say that the Army first began to study and be concerned about ethics following the 1970 AWC study. However, while research was not limited to post-1970 material, this study will use 1970 as the beginning of the current efforts.

The study of documents and publications will start with the Leadership Monograph Series. This series led to the Military Qualification Standards on Ethics and Professionalism designed for use in the military school system. To help units in the field teach ethics a series of Field Circulars followed. Each of these documents and several Field Manuals either published or in the process of being published will be reviewed.

The conclusion that we are on the right track will either bring agreement, or will provided a point of departure for disagreement.

CHAPTER I

ENDNOTES

1. US Department of the Army, Field Manual 100-1: The Army, p. 23 (hereafter referred to as "FM 100-1").

2. Richard A. Gabriel, To Serve With Honor, A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier, p. 3.

3. Ibid., p. 5.

4. Ibid., p. 7.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Before looking at the efforts made to directly impact on the ethics of individuals, it would be helpful to look at the organizations involved. An overview of these organizations and how they evolved to support the Army's attempt to improve leadership will provide an indication of the importance of the subject. The key decisions that guided these efforts should provide some insight as to why things were done the way they were.

The 1970 AWC study was followed by a concentrated effort to study and define the problem. Tracing the products produced and what was done with them will allow us to track the evolutionary development of the products they produced and the organizations. This should provide a good start to a more detailed review of the products intended to impact on the professional ethics of individuals.

In January of 1971, following the 1970 AWC study, the Chief of Staff of the Army directed the AWC to undertake a study of Army leadership. As part of this program, more than 30,000 Army personnel were surveyed to collect data on Army leadership. To analyze and disseminate the survey findings the AWC produced the first six Leadership Monographs. Table 1 lists the title and date of publication of all of the monographs.

TABLE 1

LEADERSHIP MONOGRAPH SERIES

1	Demographic Characteristics of US Army Leaders	Jun 73
2	Satisfaction with US Army Leadership	Sep 73
3	Junior NCO Leadership	Oct 73
4	Senior NCO Leadership	Jan 74
5	Company Grade Officer Leadership	Mar 74
6	Field Grade Officer Leadership	Aug 74
7	A Progressive Model for Leadership Development	Jun 75
8	A Matrix of Organizational Leadership Dimensions	Oct 76
9	Organizational Leadership Tasks for Army Leadership Training	May 77
10	A Survey of Soldiers' Opinion	Apr 77
11	The Counseling Function of the Leadership Role	Nov 78
12	Human Relations in the Military Environment	Aug 78
13	A Leadership Model for Organizational Ethics	Nov 78

The first six monographs dealt with the analysis of the tremendous data base developed by the survey. Each of monographr used the same methodology. The sample was separated into four levels, junior NCOs, senior NCOs, company grade officers, and field grade officers. Each level was looked at from six perspectives. Each level of leadership was viewed as seen by subordinates, as seen by self, and as seen by superiors. The expectations held by each level were also viewed from the point of expectations of subordinates, expectations of themselves,

and expectations of superiors.

The first monograph looked at the demographic characteristics. The second looked at satisfaction with leadership by framing the question, "How satisfied areat any given level with the overall performance of their.....?", into specific questions based on the above methodology. The questions of satisfaction and level of performance were related to 43 leadership behaviors (Appendix I) used in the study. The behaviors which raised satisfaction and those that lowered satisfaction were highlighted.

The next four monographs each addressed one level of leadership from the six perspectives and grouped the 43 behaviors into four areas:

- Most important leadership behavior
- Most frequently displayed leadership behavior
- Most desired leadership behavior
- Leadership problem areas or shortfalls

A discussion of the results and conclusions of this tremendous effort are beyond the scope of this study. Suffice it to say that the work provided the background for the work that followed.

On 1 September 1974, responsibility for the Leadership Monograph Series was transferred to the U.S. Army Administration Center, Fort Benjamin Harrison. Seven more monographs were published. They were progressive with each monograph looking at an expanded view of what the previous monograph had developed. Each monograph presented new ideas on leadership and worked toward defining a new approach to teaching leadership.

Monograph #7 developed a model of the components of leadership. A variety of definitions of leadership were outlined and approached from

a theoretical perspective. A model was developed and partitioned into four leadership components, personal skills, inter-personal skills, task skills, and organization skills. Each skill area was developed for each levels of leadership training. Officer leader development and NCO leader development was examined at the various levels of military schooling. The study concluded, "no single course entitled 'leadership' can appropriately address the entire range of leadership behavior. Rather, virtually any organizationally relevant material that is covered in the school system will impact on a person's capacity to influence other human behavior. The logical progressive development of leadership in any individual results from the total effect of knowledge and skills instilled in a school system and the opportunity to apply those appropriate knowledges and skills in the work place."¹

Monograph #8 broke leadership down into nine separate areas and discussed each area. It is significant that ethics was recognized as an integral part of leadership for the first time. Monograph #8 discussed professionalism, individual ethics, individual ethics applied at the organizational level, organizational responsibilities for ethics, ethical implications at the organizational level, and ethical implications for leaders. It also explored the ethical dimensions of leadership from first-line level to executive level.

Monograph #9 used this data to define a more detailed list of tasks in each area of leadership and listed tasks for training at the organizational levels identified in monograph #7. The result was a listing of specific tasks that needed to be taught at military schools from the precommissioning level through the Army War College level. Monograph #9 concluded, "Training developers can now take this outline

and, utilizing the appropriate instructional development methodology, complete the remaining phases, culminating in the development of instructional packages."²

Ethical problems as a part of leadership were recognized and an outline for training was proposed. As the efforts progressed, monograph #13 provided an in depth study of ethics, and made more specific recommendations for teaching ethics. The results of monograph 7, 8, 9, and 13 have been recognized as the beginning of the efforts to introduce ethics into the curriculum of military schools from the ROTC level through the War College level.

The results of monograph 10, 11, and 12 further defined other areas of leadership outside of ethics. They were important in the development of leadership, but provided details for work in areas. They are beyond the scope of this study.

In September 1980, the Combined Arms Center (CAC) at Fort Leavenworth was given proponentcy for leadership and ethics. With the designation as proponent agency, CAC was tasked to develop training materials for ethics instruction in the Army school system. That work continued to be done by the Soldiers Support Institute at the Soldiers Support Center at Fort Benjamin Harrison for several more years.

Military Qualification Skills (MQS) I, II, and III were produced at the Soldiers Support Center. These were training packages for ROTC students, officer basic course students, and officer advanced course students. These products will be discussed at length in a following chapter.

Training materials were also produced for the Sergeants Major Academy, the Advanced NCO course, and the Recruiting Command before the

mission was transferred to Fort Leavenworth in the fall of 1983. The Center for Leadership and Ethics was formed at CAC to continue the work that had been done at the Soldiers Support Center.

In June 1984, ethics was dropped from the designation, and the office became the Center for Army Leadership (CAL). This was expected to signal official recognition that ethics was an integral part of leadership. It was not to down play the importance of ethics.³

The training development program continued. Three field circulars were produced and are in the field now to assist commanders train their personnel in ethics. These field circulars will be looked at in detail in a following chapter.

Currently, DCSPER has overall responsibility for leadership to include ethics. The Combined Arms Center has been assigned as the proponent agency. CAC, specifically the Center for Army Leadership, has been given the responsibility for training, education, doctrine, and research in the area of ethics. Several field manuals are in the process of being published. FM 100-1, FM 22-999, and FC 22-102 are currently in the field for comment prior to publication.

While the CAL is hard at work producing training packages for use throughout the Army, it is also involved in the efforts to provide guidance and doctrine. For example, FM 100-1 is currently being updated. Although DCSOPS has responsibility for the manual, Chapter 4 which deals with the professional army ethic has been assigned to DCSPER. DCSPER has the responsibility, but has relied on CAL for input.⁴

Although this study is primarily concerned with the efforts made at higher levels, it is not intended to minimize the efforts made

throughout the Army. Every TRADOC school has an element responsible for instituting and overseeing ethics training. TRADOC, FORSCOM, and every major command have designated personnel responsible for leadership and ethics in their command.

Before examining the literature in depth, some of the decisions that have impacted on where we are and where we are going should be addressed. We didn't know where we were going when we started to examine this problem. It took several years of study to come to the conclusion that ethics was a part of leadership. We probably knew that all along, but hadn't pulled ethics out as a separate subject to be studied and targeted for instruction.

Once the impact of ethics on the learning and application of leadership was recognized it was necessary to develop a strategy to teach ethics. While a much greater understanding of ethics and leadership had resulted from the studies to date, there was still a lot to learn. Should the efforts begin at the top? Could the senior leadership of the Army be reeducated as to the importance and impact of ethics on leadership? This would certainly have a big impact on the organization. To attack the problem at every level at the same time would require much time and effort. On the other hand the long-range impact might be more significant if the effort was started at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy. The decision was made to go for the long-term solution: Start at the bottom. With the question of where to start answered, a bottom up effort was begun to correct and fix the problem of professional ethics.⁵

CHAPTER II

ENDNOTES

1. MAJ Stephen D. Clement and William H. Zierdt, III, A Progressive Model for Leadership Development, p. 23.
2. MAJ Stephen D. Clement and Donna B. Ayers, Organizational Tasks for Army Leadership Training, p. 2.
3. Interview with Jeffrey L. House, LTC, Ethics Branch, Center for Army Leadership, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 19 February 1986.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.

CHAPTER III

MILITARY QUALIFICATION SKILLS

In this chapter the MQS training packages will be reviewed and discussed. The review of current documentation should accomplish several purposes. The contents of the current ethics and professionalism training documents may not be familiar to many senior personnel. What is being taught to the new officers is of great importance. Knowing what is taught will make it easier to reinforce. The review will also serve as an up date on current policies and teachings and the current Army doctrine on professional ethics. This review should provide an understanding and some insight as to where we are going and whether or not we are on the right track.

Following the work on the Leadership Monograph Series, work began on the Military Qualification Skills (MQS) Training Support Packages on Ethics and Professionalism. This effort resulted in training support packages aimed at three levels of institutional education. MQS I was designed and written for use in Senior ROTC programs. MQS II and MQS III were provided for the Officer Basic Course, and the Officer Advanced Course. MQS I, II, and III will be examined to see what and how they teach.

The MQS I Ethics and Professionalism Training Support Package was sent to ROTC units 15 May 1981. It is a complete package of 12 one hour lessons designed for teaching ROTC students about ethics. It is intended to be taught in relationship with other subjects such as

military history, military justice, leadership, and Law of Land Warfare and the Code of Conduct. The four goals of MQS I are to provide:

1. An introduction to the profession of arms, its characteristics, uniqueness, roles, and responsibilities.
2. A basic understanding of the professional soldier's responsibilities, to the Army and the nation.
3. An understanding of the need for ethical conduct and a greater awareness and sensitivity to ethical issues.
4. Improved ethical decision making skills and abilities and the opportunity to apply them in real world case study situations.¹

The lesson titles are included here to give an appreciation of the scope of the instruction provided.

Lesson 1 - Introduction to Military Professional Ethics.

Lesson 2 - Characteristics of a Profession, Characteristics of the Profession.

Lesson 3 - Historical Evolution of the Profession.

Lesson 4 - Ethical Reasoning/Decision Making.

Lesson 5 - Informal Values.

Lesson 6 - Ideal Army Values.

Lesson 7 - Basic American Values - An Anchor for Military Values.

Lesson 8 - Personal and Professional Values.

Lesson 9 - Ideal and Actual Values - Value Conflicts.

Lesson 10 - Case Studies I.

Lesson 11 - Case Studies II.

Lesson 12 - Morality and War.²

The lessons are presented in a combination lecture, discussion, and analysis mode. The course presents an ethical decision making

model early and develops it as the lessons progress. The lessons also provide a frame work for applying the model. There are ten case studies, or situations, presented for discussion and analysis. There are no answers to the problems presented in the case studies, but a considerable effort is made to guide the students through to a solution using the decision making model. The conditions for ethical discussion, the characteristics of good reason, and the kinds of arguments used in ethics are detailed. These aids for engaging in ethical discussions (Appendix II) are used throughout the course.

Army values, American values, personal and professional values are all examined. To develop these values five source documents are presented and discussed. The Oath of Office, The Officers' Commission, The Declaration of Independence, The U.S. Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Value conflicts are discussed and presented for consideration in case studies. The final two subjects covered are Morality and War, and dissent.

MOS II, published in October 1981, very neatly dovetails into MOS I, and provides another 12 hours of instruction to be given to Officer Basic Course students. It follows the same methodology and provides another 18 case studies. The basic concepts introduced in MOS I are expanded and the problems become more complicated. The lessons look beyond ethical problems and include leadership responsibilities within an organization. Not only are the students to be concerned about their ethical values and how they apply them to make decisions, they are required to consider their responsibilities for providing an ethical climate in an organization. The leadership environment and institutional situations as factors in an ethical climate are

introduced and discussed and brought into play in the case studies.

MOS III, published in January 1983, is designed for Advanced Course students. It comprizes 15 lessons and 11 case studies. Again, these lessons review earlier material and expand the same basic considerations. The examples and case studies become even more complex and rely on and use the practical experience of 3-7 years as an officer and several assignments. In addition to the more complex application of the decision making model and tools for ethical reasoning, these lessons introduce the ideas of ethical responsibility, role modeling, and institutional pressure. Institutional is looked at as pressures that influence the students behavior, and as pressures that the students exert on their subordinates. Finally, the idea and responsibility of teaching professional ethics is introduced and discussed. This lesson makes it very clear that the students are now more than victims of the system, they are a part of the system. For the first time, at least in an educational situation, they are required to recognize not only the impact of the organization on them, but also the impact they have on the organization.

Each of these training packages is complete with lesson plans that should make their use fairly easy. They include most of the background material that is referenced, to include copies of the referenced articles, FMs, recommended handout material, and paper copies of the view graphs to be used. Each training package also includes an excellent instructors guide and tips and timing for the lessons. They are indeed complete training packages.

CHAPTER III

ENDNOTES

1. US Department of the Army, MQS I Ethics and Professionalism Training Support Package, p. 2 (hereafter referred to as "MQS I").

2. Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

LEADER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

MILITARY PROFESSIONALISM

Following the work on the Military Qualification Skills Training Support Packages work was began on a series of Field Circulars to help commanders in the field teach ethics. The three circulars, FC 22-9-1, FC 22-9-2, and FC 22-9-3 were drafted and sent to the field for comment. They were aimed at platoon and squad level, company and battery level, and battalion level. Just as the MQS series of training packages, these were intended to be complete training packages. The most significant difference is that they were designed to provide ethics instruction to Noncommissioned Officers and enlisted personnel as well as officers.

FC 22-9-1 is designed for use at squad and platoon level. It provides six lessons and ten case studies designed for E5 and below. This training is expected to have the following results:

1. Soldiers who will have a better understanding of the Army as a profession: its responsibilities, standards, values, and reason for existence.
2. Soldiers who will have a better understanding of their role in the Army, and their responsibilities to the superiors, peers, and subordinates, as well as to the Nation as a whole.
3. Soldiers who will have a greater awareness of ethical problems

commonly encountered in Army units, and a greater understanding of their personal ethical responsibilities.

4. Soldiers who will have an improved ability to deal with ethical problems or issues.¹

The six lessons start with a Constitutional background and establish the requirement for military values of commitment, responsibility, duty, honesty, physical and moral courage, and professional competence. These values are tied to the oath of enlistment. The lessons use simple and straight forward case studies as examples. The emphasis is on the individual and individual values rather than on organizational considerations. The last two lessons discuss Command Climate and Rules of War.

FC 22-9-2 is designed for instructing leaders in a company or battery, E6 through LT. There are four lessons and 11 case studies that are intended to be taught by the Company Commander or the First Sergeant. The objectives or goals are the same as those Listed for FC 22-9-1. Even though the goals are the same the expectations and the content are considerably more complex.

The first lesson sets the tone by matching personal values with professional values. The values introduced and discussed, loyalty, selfless service, and respect for human dignity, are specifically targeted to organizational considerations. Attention is turned to ethical leadership, rather than individual ethical behavior. The conclusion of the first lesson is, "Effective leadership is ethical leadership! The two concepts cannot be separated."²

The second lesson reintroduces the ethical decision making model used in the MDS series. The idea of conflicts between values, either

personal values and organizational values, or two or more organizational values, is examined in detail. Several methods of choosing or deciding between competing values are brought out, priority of values, least harm, golden rule, or universalness. To complicate things, or perhaps to be more realistic, the idea of ideal values versus operating Army values is also injected into the case studies.

The third lesson is primarily concerned with Ethical Behavior in War. Following some background and review of the Rules of War, the decision model is applied to war time situations calling for ethical decisions.

The last lesson is most closely associated with the day to day concerns of the students. It deals with institutional pressures and command climate. It puts the student right in the middle as it looks at both the pressures and climate that the student is influenced by, and at the pressures and climate that the students create for their subordinates. This lesson concludes "realize that you are part of the system that causes pressures on other people."³

FC 22-9-3 is designed for use at battalion level. It includes four lessons and 12 case studies designed to be taught by the battalion commander or the command sergeant major to the E7s and above in the battalion, to include the captains and majors. These lessons and case studies are much more complex and rely heavily on the past experience of the students. They also will be greatly influenced by the current experience of the students.

The first lesson, Professional Commitment, is on values and how to apply them. It is open and designed to stimulate discussion of values that the students consider important to the profession. It very

clearly espouses the "professional Army ethic" and the core values outlined in FM 100-1. It concentrates on the students responsibilities as a leader and teacher of professional ethics. The case studies are realistic examples of value conflicts set in the frame work of institutional pressures.

The next lesson focuses on integrity and personal responsibility. It uses the officers commission as a basis to develop the requirement for integrity and responsibility. Both are expanded through discussion and case studies to a much broader expression of competence and ethical behavior. This lesson concludes with a list of guidelines for leaders who have ethical responsibilities:

1. Your on- and off-duty personal conduct must be beyond reproach.
2. Seek facts about emotional issues.
3. Mean what you say and sign.
4. Accept responsibility for your subordinate's actions, when they have made an honest mistake.
5. Draw strength from your peers.
6. Be demanding and firm.
7. Implement your commander's decision as your own.
8. Officer professionalism is our responsibility.⁴

Institutional pressures is the topic of the third lesson. The concepts of formal and informal pressures and of real and perceived pressures are discussed. The student's role as a part of the system, not just as an individual in the system, is examined with ample examples of both good and bad institutional pressures. The idea of looking for a decision that best satisfies several conflicting values,

rather than simply satisfying one, is examined under the pressures that are caused by the institution.

The final lesson is an expansion of the previous lesson. Using the problems recognized in dealing with institutional pressures, the subject of command climate is developed. Although still using case studies and discussion, this lesson is somewhat more instructional or prescriptive. It specifically outlines and elaborates Elements of an Ethical Climate as follows:

- Leadership
- Communication
- Trust and Confidence
- Rewards and Punishments
- Values of Unit Members⁵

It also specifies and discusses Leadership Responsibilities:

- To inform
- To develop understanding
- To encourage appropriate behavior
- To provide feedback
- To provide the resources⁶

Each of these training packages is complete with lesson plans that should make their use fairly easy. They include an ample number of case studies and paper copies of the view graphs to be used. Each training package also includes an excellent instructors guide with tips on how to organize classes, how to use the case studies, and how to deal with and answer some of the hard issues that may be raised by the audience.

CHAPTER IV

ENDNOTES

1. US Department of the Army, Field Circular 22-9-1: Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (Platoon/Squad Instruction), p. 1-6 (hereafter referred to as "FC 22-9-1").
2. US Department of the Army, Field Circular 22-9-2: Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (CO/BTRY Instruction), p. 2-7 (hereafter referred to as "FC 22-9-2").
3. Ibid., p. 5-6.
4. US Department of the Army, Field Circular 22-9-3: Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (Battalion Instruction), p. 3-6 (hereafter referred to as "FC 22-9-3").
5. Ibid., pp. 5-3, 5-4.
6. Ibid., pp. 5-6, 5-7.

CHAPTER V

FIELD MANUALS AND REGULATIONS

This chapter will address the two field manuals that prescribe Leadership and the Professional Ethic, FM 22-100 and FM 100-1, several draft manuals and circulars that deal directly with leadership, and the newest Army regulation on leadership. Each document will be reviewed to determine what current doctrine and policies exist, where they came from, and where they are going.

FM 100-1, The Army, is considered the capstone manual. It is short and to the point and provides the basic concepts of what the Army is all about. Only chapter 4, the Professional Army Ethic, will be reviewed.

As the battlefield doctrine was being revised during the period 1977-1980, it was recognized that leadership doctrine must also be revised. The efforts on battlefield doctrine resulted in publication of the Operational Concept of the AirLand Battle in March 1981,¹ and the efforts on leadership resulted in the publication of a draft Chapter 4, FM 100-1 in January 1981.²

The new FM 100-1 described four values as the fundamentals for the Army ethic, loyalty to the institution, loyalty to the unit, personal responsibility, and selfless service. It also defined four professional soldierly qualities, commitment, competence, candor, and courage. It tied to the two together by stating "The Army ethic does not displace, but rather builds upon those soldierly qualities which have come to be recognized as absolutely essential to success on the battlefield."³ The

four values and the four soldierly qualities as they are expressed in Chapter 4 can be traced to two articles that appeared in the October 1980 edition of Army Magazine. The first, "Professional Ethics is Key to Well-Led, Trained Army," was written by Gen. Edward C. Meyer while he was the Chief of Staff, US Army. The second, "Values, Not Scores, the Best Measure of Soldier Quality," was written by Gen. Donn A. Starry while he was the Commanding General, Training and Doctrine Command. This shows the senior Army leadership involvement in establishing the Professional Army Ethic.

FM 100-1 is currently being revised with DCSPER having proponentence for Chapter 4. As previously indicated, the Center for Army Leadership, has assisted in those efforts. The effort is not to redo or redefine the Army Ethic, but rather to take advantage of all that has been learned about ethics and values and how they effect individuals and organizations. The study, research, and practical application and teaching of ethics has greatly increased the knowledge and understanding of ethics and the part that individual and organizational values play in determining the Professional Army Ethic.

The current draft Chapter 4 includes loyalty, duty, selfless service, and integrity as the values that define the professional Army ethic. It describes commitment, competence, candor, and courage as individual values required to support the Army ethic. Proposals prior to the current draft all supported these same values. In addition, many other values, such as justice, liberty, life, truth, fairness, equality of opportunity, were included in earlier proposals. Of course, many other values could have been included as well. The problem is to determine which values are included within, or as a part of, other

values and to decide whether their impact is through the individual or as institutional values. The study and discussion will go on long after the new FM 100- is published. The one thing that those involved agree on, is that any values not specifically listed or discussed are not being denied as being a part of and playing a role in determining the operating values of the Army.

FM 22-100, Military Leadership, is the basic manual on leadership. It was produced by the Center for Army Leadership. It creates cases to illustrate what it teaches. The events are fictional, but are based on real events and factual incidents. From the beginning, it involves ethics as a big part of leadership. As an example, during a case in chapter 1, a battalion commander is asking a company commander about leadership. Among his comments he says, "We talk about the real meaning of duty. Most of the men want to do their best for the company, the Army, and the country. . . . Leaders have a strong influence on the development of values and character in their subordinates . . . A leader must continually teach everything. . . I'd say this: If leaders and troops have the right professional beliefs, values, character, knowledge, and skills, they will do the right thing under the tremendous stress of battle."⁴

In chapter 2, A Concept of Leadership, it states, "The basis of effective leadership is honorable character and selfless service to your country, your unit, and your soldiers."⁵ In that same chapter a leadership framework is included that calls for leaders to "Be committed to the Professional Army Ethic, and Possess Professional Character Traits."⁶

In the summary of chapter 3 ethics is again stressed. "Beliefs,

values, and character are the most difficult aspect of leadership to explain, but they are critically important. You must work to develop them in yourself, your subordinate leaders, and your soldiers. You have no more important task as a leader."⁷

The entire chapter 4 is about values and ethics. It establishes the importance of values and ethics, relates them to professional ethics, and introduces FM 100-1. It also introduces ethical decision making using the model used throughout the MQS and FC 22-9 series and discusses ethical dilemmas.

Ethics and values are discussed and used in cases throughout the manual. The first appendix is an example of how to teach beliefs and values. It is made clear throughout this manual that ethics and values are a big part of leadership.

FM 22-999, Leadership and Command at Senior Levels, was sent to the field for comment as a draft in November 1985. Although it may undergo many changes and modifications before it is fielded as an approved manual, it is sure to contain the same emphasis on ethics albeit perhaps in different form. It is the first manual on leadership specifically targeted for and about senior leaders. It gets right to the point as it lists senior leaders responsibilities. ". . . for training and developing younger leaders; . . . and for transmitting the correct moral and ethical precepts to those who follow."⁸

In chapter 2, while discussing senior leader attributes it is pointed out that, "Effective senior leaders are also sensitive to the ethical impact of their actions. Proper ethical behavior is more caught than taught. Subordinates learn ethical behavior by observing more than by listening." Senior leaders develop the proper ethical climate, they

promote values.⁹

Chapter 3 is titled Professional Ethics and is more specific and provides methods for impacting on the ethical climate of the organization as well as individual subordinate leaders. It also looks at some of the problems and practical applications of ethics. "While the effect of ethics is certain, it is quite another thing to be bound by its imperatives on a daily basis. The ethical world and the real world never seem to match. Ethical frameworks vary from professional to professional, and ethical certainty always seems to be framed by the eye of the beholder. . . . Leaders must teach their subordinates how to reason clearly about ethical matters. While every action or decision a leader makes will not have an ethical component to it, senior-level leaders teach their subordinates how to recognize and be sensitive to those actions or decisions which do."¹⁰ A particular area spelled out to avoid is double standards. The perception that unethical acts taken for personal gain are wrong while unethical acts taken for the unit are accepted is pointed out as an example.

chapter 5, in discussing leadership as a process, confirms that to exercise effective leadership senior leaders develop organizational value systems. Values and ethics undergird the exercise of command. They are transmitted through the senior leader's attitudes.¹¹

Again, as was the case in FM 22-100, the discussion of leadership never gets very far without the topic of ethics. It is clear that ethics plays a strong part in effective leadership, and thus it also is key in readiness. FM 22-999 also is very clear that senior leaders have a major impact on ethics and a major responsibility toward ethics.

FC 22-102, Soldier Team Development, was published in October 1985

as a draft for FM 22-102. It is aimed at the lowest organizational unit in the Army, the team. Its objective is to guide leaders at the team level through the process of developing a team. It covers forming, developing, and sustaining a team. Not surprisingly, it starts with the values that are defined as Army values and individual values in FM 100-1. It shows that a good team is value based, that these values are a combination of the Army values and the individual values of the team members, and that together they make up the operating values of the team. "If soldiers are going to adapt as productive team members, they must begin to share these values that the Army has found to be important. These values will become the standards of the unit."¹²

Army Regulation 600-100, Army Leadership, is the last, and newest (April 1986), official publication to be considered. It has three purposes, establish leadership policies, provide guidance for research, doctrine, training, and evaluation of leadership, and establish responsibilities for all aspects of leadership. It recognizes three levels of leadership, the direct level, the senior level, and the executive level, and outlines the responsibilities of each. Specifically detailed for each level of leadership are the responsibilities for Army values and the Professional Army Ethic.¹³

This is not an all inclusive review of current manuals and regulations that are concerned with or deal with leadership and ethics. However, this review does cover the major manuals and regulations that set policy and establish doctrine for ethics and leadership. It is apparent that following the identification of ethics as an integral part of leadership in Leadership Monograph #9 in 1977 that ethics has become a major factor in all the policy and doctrine on leadership.

CHAPTER V

ENDNOTES

1. John L. Romjue, From Active Defense to AirLand Battle: The Development of Army Doctrine 1973-1982, p. 44.
2. MOS I, p. 6-2.
3. FM 100-1, p. 25.
4. US Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-100: Military Leadership, pp. 33, 35 (hereafter referred to as "FM 22-100").
5. Ibid, p. 44.
6. Ibid, p. 49.
7. Ibid, p. 71.
8. US Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-999: Leadership and Command at Senior Levels (draft), p. 1-2 (hereafter referred to as "FM 22-999 draft").
9. Ibid, p. 2-5.
10. Ibid, pp. 3-2.3-4.
11. Ibid, pp. 5-3, 5-11.
12. US Department of the Army, Field Circular 22-102: Soldier Team Development, p. 2-11 (hereafter referred to as "FC 22-102").
13. US Department of the Army, Army Regulation 600-100: Army Leadership, (hereafter referred to as "AR 600-100").

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

An analysis and evaluation of the material reviewed requires the use of some guidelines or parameters. These will be developed by looking into two areas that impact on the ethical condition of the profession. The first area is the teaching of ethics. The second area is the problems that have been identified. The teaching objectives and goals, and the problems the instruction of ethics is expected to resolve should provide a good set of criteria to measure the efforts to date. Each area will be examined from three levels or perspectives. The first is from a large perspective, or looking at the subject from the outside. The next is from the point of view of those responsible to accomplish the objectives or goals. And finally, the material will be examined to see if the internal goals are in line with the objectives and goals that the material is intended to meet. The congruency between each level or perspective, or lack of it, will begin the analysis.

The scope of this study rules out a complete and rigorous point by point comparison, but should provide a good intuitive comparison of where we should be going and where we are going. If we assess the goals as to their validity, and then use them to assess the efforts, we should be in a position to conclude whether or not we are on the right track.

Callahan and Bok as well as Wakin and Stromberg have provided

some guidelines and parameters that are useful in the evaluation of the material that has been produced and is currently in use. Callahan and Bok developed the following criteria to be used in evaluating ethics instruction regardless of the profession in question. "Any course in ethics must attend to at least five general goals:

1. Stimulate the moral imagination
2. Provide ability to recognize ethical issues
3. Develop analytical skills
4. Elicit a sense of moral obligation
5. Promote the tolerance of ambiguity and disagreement."¹

While general criteria are useful, they need to be complemented with criteria specifically targeted at ethics in a military setting. The military is not alone or a special case in this requirement. Every profession must relate their values to the values of those they serve. In the military this takes on special significance because it is the nation we serve. If the teaching of ethics to the military is to have a real impact on the professional ethic, it must go beyond the teaching of general ethics. Likewise to properly evaluate it some more specific criteria must be developed to address the military aspect of professional ethics.

Stromberg, Wakin, and Callahan don't specifically list goals, but do bring specific military requirements to light with the following comments. "Those who would teach military ethics must also accept responsibility for promulgating the customary rule of war and the written laws of warfare, both of which are founded on specific moral concerns. Separate from, but related to, these profound concerns about the morality of war and morality in war are conceptions of

military honor and military virtues."²

"While personal loyalty to the commander remains an important part of the code of honor, the highest loyalty as expressed in the oath of office involves allegiance to the Constitution and to the position of the President as commander-in-chief rather than to the specific person."³ "We see that in order for the military function to be carried out well, certain virtues like courage, loyalty, obedience to legal and moral orders, integrity, and subordination of the self to the good of the military unit and nation-state are essential. That is to say, these virtues are not merely supportive of the military mission; they are functional imperatives--military tasks cannot be accomplished without them."⁴

They conclude that "The task of teaching military ethics must include the challenge of enabling the military profession to rationally understand and accept these 'military virtues.' Morality and war, military honor, the military virtues--these are the traditional aspects of military ethics that must be taken into account by those who wish to examine or teach ethics in the military profession."⁵

Now that some goals and objectives have been addressed, another dimension can be added to the criteria. Many problems have been framed as ethical problems. These problems should be addressed to see if they are included in the solution. There is an indication that the ethical direction has been distorted or misguided. There is a exhortation to embrace a professional ethic and accept institutional values as a commitment. The variance between ideal values and actual values are summarized to be caused by violations of ethical standards.

Leadership is frequently blamed for the problem, even though it is usually the ethical component of leadership that is the target for concern. Improving professional ethics and making ethics a part of leadership are frequent recommendations for improvement.

From the larger perspective a set of criteria has emerged. The five general goals for any course in ethics, the more specific goals for military application, morality and war, military honor, and military virtues, and the problems of establishing values, the variance between the ideal values and actual values, and the inclusion of ethics as a part of leadership form the criteria gained from the view point of those outside the system.

A look at the next level, the inside, will examine the goals and objectives established by those responsible for implementing programs to teach and improve the professional ethic. When questioned about the goals of the Army, LTC House from CAL, was very specific.⁶ The goals throughout the Army are to:

1. sensitize individuals to ethical issues.
2. Improve the skills of individuals to reason about ethical issues.
3. Teach practical techniques to recognize ethical problems and deal with them.

These goals were established for ethics instruction throughout the Army. They are applicable at every level from NCO courses all the way through the entire Army school system, to include CAS³, CGSC, and the War College. The areas covered by the material reviewed in this study have even more specific goals. At the entry level the goals are to make clear the values of the military professional:

- * What are values, and what are the values of the institution.
- * What is a professional and what are his or her ethics.
- * Primary emphasis is on the individual.

At the mid level, for captains as company commanders and as small unit staff officers, the goals are much the same, but began to take on an organizational aspect.

- * What is their responsibility in determining and establishing ethics.
- * How do policies and directives impact on ethics.
- * How do they impact on individual and organizational ethics.

These are the specific goals of CAL, where they are going, and what their products must influence. There is a broader context for these efforts. It condenses and brings into focus the overall Army objectives. The mission of CAL is to tie all of this together. Specifically the overall program, according to LTC House, has these requirements:

1. The program must be sequential and progressive.
2. Ethics must be integrated with leadership.
3. All of it must be tied into four basic themes.
 - a. Professionalism.
 - b. Values.
 - c. Ethical decision making and reasoning.
 - d. Morality in War.

Comments by personal from DCSPER support the goals articulated by CAL. Their guidance and objectives are best summed up by this

comment. "Leadership is really a value issue. It boils down to the transmission of values. The Army values are well stated. Projects like the 'Year of Values' are efforts trying to level the stated values and operating values of the Army."⁷

The profession is barraged with countless ethical problems and recommended solutions. The number increases as the impact and understanding ethics grows. A review of the articles, letters to the editor, and the editorials in military professional journals concerning problems and recommended solutions to military and professional ethical problems shows a very real concern and an increased understanding of the ethical dimension of the military profession. To address these problems would be an extensive study, and in all likelihood many of them would fall into one of the four areas developed and discussed by Johnson.⁸ He lists the following areas as pressing ethical issues which the military must face.

1. Ethical relativism or the blurring of right from wrong. What works is right. Emphasis on getting the job done no matter what.
2. The Loyalty Syndrome. The use of fear to guarantee a sterile form of loyalty sets up an environment where suppression of truth is guaranteed.
3. Image. What becomes important is how things are perceived, rather than how things really are.
4. The drive for success. Ethical sensitivity is bought off or sold because of the personal need to achieve.

At this point it is possible to compare the criteria developed from the larger perspective with the criteria that emerged from examining the goals and objectives of those tasked to develop and

implement the programs. Each of the criteria identified was addressed by the goals and objectives established for programs to be developed throughout the Army. While they don't match word for word, the general agreement is excellent. It is clear that at this point we are on the right track.

The problems articulated by Johnson round out the criteria used to evaluate the next level. Only goals of the MQS series and the Field Circular series will be examined. The goals and objectives of the documents discussed in Chapter V were covered there in sufficient detail for this analysis and evaluation.

The goals of MQS I were listed in Chapter III. The goals of MQS II and MQS III are included in Appendix 3 and 4 for reference. A comparison of these goals against the general goals, specific goals, and the derived goals shows complete agreement. In addition, the goals to increase awareness and sensitivity, the goals to understand and improve the ethical climate, and the goal to address current contemporary ethical issues are supported by lessons which consider the problems developed by Johnson.

A comparison with the Army goals and the program goals, as articulated by LTC House, also shows agreement. Each goal is addressed. Of particular significance is the requirement for the program to be sequential and progressive. Not only do the goals support this requirement, but the lessons and the case studies in the lessons are very clearly sequential and progressive.

The goals of the Field Circulars are listed in chapter IV and are the same for all three. In addition to the stated goals, an examination of the lessons shows that command climate and morality in

war are also included even though not specifically listed as goals. Once again a comparison with the goals developed by individuals outside the system, those developed by individuals inside the system, and those derived from problems, shows that they are all addressed.

While it appears at this point that we are on the right track, perhaps some practical considerations should be addressed before making a final conclusion. The fact that the goals of the material reviewed match the criteria that was developed is only the first step. The final answer can only be found with certainty if we can make some conclusions about the actual ethical conduct and decision making throughout the Army. Although this or any real measure of how effective the materials reviewed are in actual use is beyond the scope of this study it is possible to make some conclusions based on the review of the material.

The MQS training support packages are well prepared. The lessons are logical and have integrated the case studies to provide practical examples of the points being made and provide practical experience in using the ethical decision making model. Although it must be assumed that there is a wide variation in the ability and experience of the instructors from school to school, the material is extremely well designed and should enable even the most inexperienced instructor to accomplish the goals of each lesson.

The students may be of more concern than the instructors. The students of MQS I and MQS II have little background with the military and are unlikely to have preconceived ideas of military ethics to distort or confuse the material that is presented. However, the students of MQS III will have very strong ideas about military ethics.

The ethical environment they have experienced prior to the instruction and what they experience following the instruction will have a major impact on the effectiveness of the instruction.

The Leader Development Programs in FC 22-9-1, FC 22-9-2, and FC 22-9-3 will also be strongly influenced by the ethical climate in the unit. If poor ethical conditions exist in the unit some of the lessons could be very difficult to teach and could prove to have little impact. Many of the lessons rely on group discussion. In some units this could aggravate existing problems by introducing or reinforcing existing institutional problems and bias.

The increased emphasis on ethics and ethics as a part of leadership is apparent from the review of materials in chapter 5. In light of this and the efforts being made from the highest levels and throughout the Army to improve the military ethic, it is expected that in most cases the lessons provided by the Field Circular series will be well received. Units that use these in a positive atmosphere will find that they teach more than just ethics and values. The leadership qualities and skills and the human interaction that emerges from the case studies should improve the command climate in any unit.

While the effectiveness of the programs reviewed must be based on assumptions and speculation, it is apparent that the goals of the these programs are consistent with the derived criteria. When compared to the larger perspective both the institutional goals and the goals of the material developed are in agreement. The products have the capability, if used correctly, to markedly improve the professional ethic throughout the Army.

CHAPTER VI

ENDNOTES

1. Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok, eds., Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, p. 138.
2. Peter L. Stromberg, Malham M. Wakin, and Daniel Callahan, The Teaching of Ethics in the Military, p. 12.
3. Ibid., p. 15.
4. Ibid., pp. 16.
5. Ibid., p. 17.
6. Interview with Jeffrey L. House, LTC, Ethics Branch, Center for Army Leadership, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 19 February 1986.
7. Interview with Ford F. G'Segner, CH(MAJ), Leadership Branch, US Army Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, HQ DA, 17 December 1985.
8. Kermit D. Johnson, CH(COL), Ethical Issues of Military Leadership, pp. 3, 4, 5.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

Yes! We are on the right track.

The Army recognized that many of the problems dealing with leadership were in fact ethical problems. Organizations were developed to study, define, and solve these problems. The Leadership Monograph Series started the evolutionary process. While the process is not complete it is continuing and growing. Army wide doctrine and guidance on ethics and leadership has been incorporated into manuals and regulations. Materials have been produced to incorporate ethics instruction into the curriculum throughout the military school system. Materials have also been produced for use in the field from squad level through battalion level.

The decision to begin instruction at bottom was made to impact initially on the most people. It was decided that the bottom up approach would have better long-range results than a top down approach. Reviewing the documents produced and the evolutionary process that took place, it appears that an effective program may not have been possible from the top down. The expertise required was not available to begin ethics instruction at the top. This is not to say that there were no efforts at the top, because there certainly were. Without the support and guidance at the top, and the commitment of resources, nothing would have been accomplished. The work and study accomplished to develop the program starting at

the bottom with the basics has grown the expertise to understand the relationship between ethics and leadership and the part the institution plays in establishing the professional military ethic.

It is through this evolutionary educational process that the Army has recognized that military professionals at midcareer beyond teach professional ethics by example and the policies they promulgate. They must acquire sensitivity to institutional programs that reward unethical conduct.¹ "Commitment to the teaching and learning of ethics at the bottom of the military hierarchy will sustain itself only if junior leaders see evidence of good moral reasoning at the top."² If military leaders at the top, begin to understand the ethics taught in the classes they have established, then the teaching of ethics will have been successful.³

Yes, we are on the right track. We may yet find our Army with soldiers that not only know how to fight and win, but really understand why and what they are fighting for. The value of an individual, individual values, the values of our Army, and of our Nation.

CHAPTER VII

ENDNOTES

1. Stromberg, p. 67.
2. Ibid., p. 6.
3. Ibid., p. 55.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Callahan, Daniel, and Bok, Sissela, eds. Ethics Teaching in Higher Education. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.
- Clement, Stephen D., MAJ, and Ayers, Donna B. Organizational Tasks for Army Leadership Training. Fort Benjamin Harrison: May 1977.
- Clement, Stephen D., MAJ, and Zierdt, William H., III. A Progressive Model for Leadership Development. Fort Benjamin Harrison: June 1975
- Gabriel, Richard A. To Serve With Honor, A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1982.
- G'Segner, Ford F., MAJ(CHAP). Leadership Branch, US Army Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, HQ DA. Personal Interview. Washington: 17 December 1985.
- House, Jeffrey L., LTC. Ethics Branch, Center for Army Leadership. Personal Interview. Fort Leavenworth: 19 February 1986.
- Johnson, Kermit D., COL(CHAP). Ethical Issues of Military Leadership. Paper. Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, October 1974.
- Romjue, John L. From Active Defense to AirLand Battle: The Development of Army Doctrine 1973-1982. Fort Monroe: US Army Training and Doctrine Command, June 1984.
- Stromberg, Peter L., Waken, Malham M., and Callahan, Daniel. The Teaching of Ethics in the Military. Hastings-on-hudson: The Hastings Center, 1982
- US Department of the Army, Army Regulation 600-100: Army Leadership. Washington: 17 April 1986.
- US Department of the Army, Field Circular 22-9-1: Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (Platoon/Squad Instruction). Fort Leavenworth: 4 September 1984.
- US Department of the Army, Field Circular 22-9-2: Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (CO/BTRY Instruction). Fort Leavenworth: 4 September 1984.

- US Department of the Army, Field Circular 22-9-3: Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (Battalion Instruction). Fort Leavenworth: 4 September 1984.
- US Department of the Army, Field Circular 22-102: Soldier Team Development. Fort Leavenworth: 1 October 1985.
- US Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-100: Military Leadership. Washington: 31 October 1983.
- US Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-999: Leadership and Command at Senior Levels (draft). Fort Leavenworth: 15 November 1985.
- US Department of the Army, Field Manual 100-1: The Army. Washington: 14 August 1981.
- US Department of the Army, MQS I Ethics and Professionalism Training Support Package. Fort Benjamin Harrison: 15 May 1981.
- US Department of the Army, MQS II Ethics and Professionalism Training Support Package. Fort Benjamin Harrison: October 1981.
- US Department of the Army, MQS III Ethics and Professionalism Training Support Package. Fort Benjamin Harrison: January 1983.

APPENDIX I

43 LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

HE LETS THE MEMBERS OF HIS UNIT KNOW WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM.
HE IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND.
HE TRAINED AND DEVELOPED HIS SUBORDINATES.
HE EXPRESSES APPRECIATION WHEN A SUBORDINATE DOES A GOOD JOB.
HE IS WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES IN WAYS OF DOING THINGS.
HE TAKES APPROPRIATE ACTION ON HIS OWN.
HE IS THOUGHTFUL AND CONSIDERATE OF OTHERS.
HE OFFERS NEW APPROACHES TO PROBLEMS.
HE COUNSELS HIS SUBORDINATES.
HE SETS HIGH STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE.
HE IS TECHNICALLY COMPETENT TO PERFORM HIS DUTIES.
HE APPROACHES EACH TASK IN A POSITIVE MANNER.
HE CONSTRUCTIVELY CRITICIZES POOR PERFORMANCE.
HE ASSIGNS IMMEDIATE SUBORDINATES TO SPECIFIC TASKS.
HE IS WILLING TO SUPPORT HIS SUBORDINATES.
HE KNOWS HIS MEN AND THEIR CAPABILITIES.
HE IS APPROACHABLE.
HE GIVES DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW THE JOB SHOULD BE DONE.
HE STANDS UP FOR HIS SUBORDINATES EVEN THOUGH IT MAKES HIM UNPOPULAR WITH HIS SUPERIOR.
HE LETS SUBORDINATES SHARE IN DECISION MAKING.
HE CRITICIZES A SPECIFIC ACT RATHER THAN AN INDIVIDUAL.
HE SEES THAT SUBORDINATES HAVE THE MATERIALS THEY NEED TO WORK WITH.
HE RESISTS CHANGES IN WAYS OF DOING THINGS.
HE REWARDS INDIVIDUALS FOR A JOB WELL DONE.
HE SEEKS ADDITIONAL AND MORE IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITIES.
HE MAKES IT DIFFICULT FOR HIS SUBORDINATES TO USE INITIATIVE.
HE SEES TO IT THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM WORK UP TO THEIR CAPABILITIES.
HE CRITICIZES SUBORDINATES IN FRONT OF OTHERS.
HE IS AWARE OF THE STATE OF HIS UNIT'S MORALE AND DOES ALL HE CAN TO MAKE IT HIGH.
✓ HE IS SELFISH.
HE KEEPS ME INFORMED OF THE TRUE SITUATION, GOOD AND BAD, UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES.
HE TREATS PEOPLE IN AN IMPERSONAL MANNER--LIKE COGS IN A MACHINE.
HE DISTORTS REPORTS TO MAKE HIS UNIT LOOK BETTER.
HE BACKS UP SUBORDINATES IN THEIR ACTIONS.
HE COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY WITH HIS SUBORDINATES.
HE EXPLAINS THE REASON FOR HIS ACTIONS TO HIS SUBORDINATES.
HE establishes AND MAINTAINS A HIGH LEVEL OF DISCIPLINE.
HE DRAWS A DEFINITE LINE BETWEEN HIMSELF AND HIS SUBORDINATES
HE IS OVERLY AMBITIOUS AT THE EXPENSE OF HIS SUBORDINATES AND HIS UNIT.
HE SETS THE EXAMPLE FOR HIS MEN ON AND OFF DUTY.
HE FAILS TO SHOW AN APPRECIATION FOR PRIORITIES OF WORK.
HE DEMANDS RESULTS ON TIME WITHOUT CONSIDERING THE CAPABILITIES AND WELFARE OF HIS UNIT.
HE HESITATES TO TAKE ACTION IN THE ABSENCE OF INSTRUCTIONS.

APPENDIX II

AIDS FOR ENGAGING IN ETHICAL DISCUSSIONS

A. Conditions for Ethical Discussion. Certain conditions must be met if two or more people are to engage in a serious discussion of ethics.

1. You must be willing to look closely at your values and beliefs and the values and beliefs of others.

2. You must be tolerant of the opinions and viewpoints of others.

3. You must be able to empathize with the viewpoints and positions of others.

4. You must set aside self-interest and be able to see things from the viewpoints of others; i.e., to sympathize with their circumstances.

5. You must be able to put aside the need to act while you search for reasons.

6. You must be able and willing to tolerate ambiguity and uncertainty.

7. You must be able to probe deeply and to get beneath the surface of a case situation.

8. Finally, you must be able to suspend for the time being your ethical and value beliefs in order to examine alternative views.

B. Elements of the process.

1. The ethical problem
2. The ethical reasoning process steps
3. Consideration of influencing forces
4. The response (e.g., Judgment, evaluation, decision)

C. Characteristics of Good Reasons.

1. The reason given reflects impartiality: the reason applies to anyone in similar circumstances. It is not a reason that is good for you only.

2. The reason is universalizable. It does not cover just this particular case but would apply across the board to similar cases and circumstances.

3. The reason given is consistent with other reasons and from one time to another.

4. The reason is sufficient for action. Once identified and expressed, the reason will enable the person to do something--to act.

5. The reason is teachable. A useful reason is one that can be conveyed to others so that they can change their conduct.

6. The reason is rooted in a moral rule (e.g., "thou shalt not kill"), an ethical principle or theory, or cultural practice.

D. Kinds of Arguments Used in Ethics.

1. Appeal to authority - - to the viewpoints of acknowledged experts or ethical theories; e.g., "Plato says . . ."; "Kant would contend . . ."

2. Appeal to natural law - - the arguments given are true because they appeal to the way the world is, e.g., "All people have

a basic survival instinct and therefore would kill to save themselves or their children."

3. Consensus or popular opinion - - the position taken is true because there is broad agreement that it is a true or good viewpoint; e.g., affirmative action principles.

4. Intuition - - appeal to moral sense or common sense; e.g., "hurting people is terrible."

5. Questioning - - use of questions and answers in a logical way; this is called the Socratic method. The reason is established as true by virtue of its being a logical deduction.

6. Appeal to rules or principles - - rules based in ethical theories are called into play; e.g., "one ought always to promote good and to avoid evil."

7. Appeal to consequences - - the important consideration is the effect or result of each action alternative. This is the standard of utility. The more severe the consequence, outcome, or result for the greatest number of people, the less good is the reason.

8. Appeal to higher value - - an ordering of values is determined and the value with the higher priority becomes the basis for resolving a conflict between two values; e.g., protection of life is established as more important than honesty.¹

1. MGS I, pp. 4-18, 4-19.

APPENDIX III

OBJECTIVES OF MQS II

1. An expanded understanding of the profession of arms, its foundations, characteristics, uniqueness, role, and standards.
2. An increased awareness of ethical issues and the importance of and requirement for the ethical behavior on the part of all members of the profession.
3. An ability to use the military professional ethics decision-making model, in combat and peacetime situations.
4. An understanding of how basic national values and ideal Army values underlie and support professional standards of behavior. An improved understanding of personal values and the values of subordinates, peers, and senior officers.
5. A basic ability to determine the ethical climate in a new unit of assignment and to take action to improve it by eliminating or reducing negative factors and building positive elements.
6. An ability to use the legitimate avenues of dissent in a variety of typical ethical problem situations.
7. An understanding of the customary and unwritten rules of war, their background, development, and importance; the officer's responsibility to uphold them; and the factors that can lead to violations.¹

1. US Department of the Army, MQS II Ethics and Professionalism Training Support Package, pp. 1, 2.

DISTRIBUTION

Center for Army Leadership
Ethics Branch, ATTN: LTC House
Fort Leavenworth, KS. 66027

HQ DA, ODCSPER
Leadership Branch
Washington, DC 20310