(2)

AD-A209 233

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: ANOTHER OXYMORON?

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES E. DOWNEY

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

24 APRIL 1989

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

Unclassified

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) Professional Military Ethics: Another Oxymoron?		TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Study Project
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) LTC James E. Downey		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same		12. REPORT DATE May 1989
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 36
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)

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)

This study investigates the existence of a professional military ethic and the validity of the military as a profession. Mandates regarding the training of ethics are reviewed as are current ethics training programs and other efforts. Evidence confirms the professional status of the military and points to the military's commitment to the concept of a professional military ethic. Conclusions and recommendations cite the need to add emphasis to existing policies and programs.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

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: ANOTHER OXYMORON?

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES E. DOWNEY, SC

CHAPLAIN (COLONEL) TIMOTHY TATUM
Project Adviser

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

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
24 April 1989

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: James E. Downey, LTC, SC

TITLE: Professional Military Ethics: Another Oxymoron?

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 24 April 1989 PAGES: 33 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

This study investigates the existence of a professional military ethic and the validity of the military as a profession. Mandates regarding the training of ethics are reviewed as are current ethics training programs and other efforts. Evidence confirms the professional status of the military and points to the military's commitment to the concept of a professional military ethic. Conclusions and recommendations cite the need to add emphasis to existing policies and programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY ETHICS: ANOTHER OXYMORON?

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A common dictionary definition of oxymoron is "a figure of speech that combines antithetical incongruous terms."[1] So, in essence, the title of this paper is questioning the status of the military as a profession and then questioning the existence of a relevant and realistic ethic.

Many officers and soldiers may react emotionally to these questions but a straightforward look at the issue may provide some answers to why many civilians, and even some members of the military, question the professionalism and ethics of the military.

Recent highly publicized events have centered attention on the topic of this paper:

- A Presidential appointee nominated to head the Defense Department was not confirmed by the United States Senate due to ethical and moral concerns;

- A recently retired Lieutenant Colonel is being tried in Federal Court for a number of offenses which include lying to Congress and illegal funding activities;

- A Navy Captain was found guilty of failing to

provide basic humanitarian assistance to a stranded boatload of individuals;

- Pentagon contracting irregularities continue to make headlines;

- Less newsworthy but highly significant, 133 officers of an Army corps were investigated for a myriad of violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice during 1980, and in 1984 there were more than 40 officers in confinement at the United States Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas[2]; and,

- Finally, a 1984 opinion survey of field grade officers "indicated a concern for ethical issues, an acknowledgement that attitudes of seniors influence the ethical behavior of subordinates, and reinforced the earlier perception that unethical behavior demonstrated by general officers goes unpunished, is covered up, or may even be rewarded ... The implication of this perception is that a double standard for ethical behavior exists and is condoned by the organization ..."[3]

Perhaps oxymoron is not too harsh or unrealistic a word to associate with the phrase, professional military ethics.

A number of recent authors, both military and civilian, have also expressed concern about this issue. The following quotes were extracted from Richard A. Gabriel's book, <u>To Serve With Honor, A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier</u>:

> 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 the 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.[4]
>
> 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.[5]
>
> 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 discovering the moral bearings of the military profession.[6]

Chaplain (Colonel) Kermit D. Johnson, US Army, also raises questions in his article, Ethical Issues of Military Leadership. He cites four all too common reasons for the decline of military ethics:

> 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.[7]

There definitely appears to be enough concern or disbelief about this "professional military ethic" to warrant another look

at the issue. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the validity of the U.S. Army's professional ethic by looking at the military first to determine its status as a profession and then at its espoused ethics.

ENDNOTES

1. Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary, p. 842.

2. Raymond C. Hartjen, Jr., LTC, Ethics in Organizational Leadership, pp. 11-12.

3. Ibid., p. 40.

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

5. Ibid., p. 5.

6. Ibid., p. 7.

7. Kermit D. Johnson, CH (COL), Ethical Issues of Military Leadership, pp. 3-5.

CHAPTER II

WHAT IS A PROFESSION?

Again the dictionary provides two simple definitions of a profession: (1) "an occupation or vocation requiring training in the liberal arts or the sciences and advanced study in a specialized field", and (2) "the body of qualified persons of a specific occupation or field."[1] From this very broad perspective, the military seems to fit the definition. But a more in depth look at what constitutes a profession is in order. For this I relied on the works of Samuel Huntington, a Harvard political scientist. In his book, The Soldier and the State, he states that a profession performs a specific service that is essential to the overall welfare of society and he cites three essential characteristics that must be exhibited before a group of people, engaged in a common line of work, can be considered a profession. His three characteristics are expertise, responsibility and corporateness.[2]

Expertise refers to the ability to perform that service and it involves specialized knowledge, skill or abilities that can only be acquired through extensive education and experience. Furthermore, the specialized knowledge is of a scholarly and intellectual nature and is so complex that laypersons are incapable of understanding its intricacies. This professional expertise can be broken down into three components: technical, theoretical or intellectual and broad-liberal.

The technical component refers to the understanding of and

the ability to employ various tools of the trade.

The theoretical or intellectual component separates the professional from the technician. It refers to the ability to comprehend and understand the "how" and "why" of the technical component.

The broad-liberal component is by far the most complex of the expertise characteristics. It involves an understanding of the manner in which the particular professional expertise fits in society, the role that it plays. This component requires the professional to determine when and how to employ her or his particular expertise to maximize results for society. Inherent in the broad-liberal component is an understanding of the human element to include human behavior, relationships, standards of conduct and organizational theory.

The "responsibility" aspect or characteristic of a profession refers to the special relationship that members of a profession have with their "clients."

Since the expertise of the professional is so complex and so extensive that it prevents laypersons from fully understanding what the professional does, members of the profession can be said to hold a monopoly on that expertise. This monopoly makes it difficult for the layperson to judge the competence of the professional, and the client often must rely on other professionals to make that judgement. This situation requires a special trust to exist between the professional and the client. Appropriately this relationship is called the "professional - client relationship" and it is based on two factors.

First, the client accepts the fact that the professional holds an expertise monopoly and, second, the client expects the actions of the professional to meet three specific standards:

1 - A professional does not exceed the bounds of professional competence.

2 - A professional's actions are wholly motivated by the best interests of the client.

3 - A professional's dealings with the client are marked by absolute integrity.

This responsibility or special trust that the professional enjoys in the professional - client relationship is significant and one that a less-than-professional individual could easily exploit. Two factors motivate the true professional from taking advantage of the situation.

The first one is somewhat emotional and might be difficult for a nonprofessional to understand. In most references it's referred to as "a calling" or a true desire to serve one's fellow human beings, even though doing so may very well require significant sacrifice.

The second factor is a desire for autonomy. Members of a profession feel that no one else can accomplish tasks in their area of expertise better than they can, and they want the freedom to accomplish those tasks without interference. In other words, they want autonomy. Every profession recognizes that, if society or their specific clients perceive that the professionals are not acting in accordance with the three previously mentioned standards, autonomy will be lost.

The third and last characteristic of Huntington's model of a profession is corporateness, which contends that professionals share a common bond, a sense of belonging to the profession. A number of factors cause this feeling among professionals and they include shared interests, life styles, knowledge and experiences. Often this corporateness is evidenced by the establishment of professional organizations such as the doctors' American Medical Association or the lawyers' American Bar Association. Regardless of the profession, these associations tend to accomplish similar tasks for the society and for the membership. They police the profession, control recruitment, promote professional knowledge and they represent the profession to the public.

From this brief review of the characteristics of a profession it should be relatively easy to determine the validity of the military's claim of professionalism.

ENDNOTES

1. Samuel P. Huntington, The Soldier and the State, pp. 8-10.

2. Clay Buckingham, MG (Ret), Parameters, "Ethics and the Senior Officer: Institutional Tensions."

CHAPTER III

THE MILITARY AS A PROFESSION

Does the military meet the criteria to earn the title of profession? A comparison of the military and Huntington's three characteristics should answer that question.

First, regarding expertise, the military must possess competence and knowledge in the highly complex task of successful armed combat. It must organize and equip an armed force, plan its employment, train it to accomplish successful combat, and control all of its activities. A commonly used phrase to explain the task of the military is the management of violence. Considering the complex nature of armed combat, the successful management of violence requires the study of military history, a thorough knowledge of standard management techniques, and continuous formal and informal education to stay abreast of the forever changing and increasing complexities of modern armed combat.

Regarding responsibility, the military holds a social responsibility unlike any other profession. A lawyer is responsible to her client. A doctor is responsible to her patient. But the military is responsible to society as a whole. If the military employs its expertise improperly or illegally, society itself is at risk. Only the military is directly responsible for society's military security. Major General (Retired) Clay Buckingham best expressed this responsibility in an article titled, "Ethics and the Senior Officer: Institutional Tensions."

> The moral justification of our profession is embedded in the Constitution - 'to provide

> for the Common Defense.' We are that segment of American society which is set apart to provide for the defense of the remainder of that society. The word defense is key. We are to defend our territory, because that is where our people live, but in an expanded sense, we are defending our value systems, our way of life, our standard of life, our essential institutions...[1]

Regarding corporateness, the military certainly shares a sense of unity and the recognition of its members as being different from laypersons. Apart from the obvious uniforms that distinguish the military from civilians, all members of the military are bonded by an oath "to protect and defend the Constitution" without reservation, to include the sacrificing of their lives, if required. This social responsibility is unique to the military as is the expertise required to successfully wage combat operations.

Thus, the military does possess the three characteristics of a profession, as presented in Huntington's model. That fact answers the first part of the question raised in the title of this paper. Professional military is not an oxymoron.

All that is left is to determine whether the last half of the title, military ethics, is an oxymoron.

ENDNOTE

1. P.L. Stromberg, et al., The Teaching of Ethics in the Military, p. 3.

CHAPTER IV

ARE ETHICS REQUIRED?

Before it can be determined whether the term, military ethics, is an oxymoron, a review of the need or requirement for military ethics is in order.

From a legal viewpoint Army regulations require members of the military to act with integrity and to abide by professional ethics. But before citing the specific publications that contain this charge, a non-legal requirement exists that seems to be of more significance. This requirement is best expressed in the book, The Teaching of Ethics in the Military, by Stromberg, Wakin and Callahan.

> The very reason for America's having a military force loses its validity if a ship's captain evinces no sense of moral obligation and decides not to be moral. A first sergeant betrays the military purpose if his underdeveloped moral imagination prevents his recognizing the ethical nature of an issue. A flight leader threatens American values if he cannot analyze a moral problem. A general officer damages the force that he ostensibly serves if he cannot deal fairly with differing ethical viewpoints. The morally impoverished military leader is an enemy of the constitution he has sworn to protect and defend.[1]

Regulatory requirements seem to pale when compared with that quote but a review of Army publications will still provide needed information.

Army Regulation 600-50, Standards of Conduct for Department of the Army Personnel, is very specific in its guidance.

> Government service or employment, as a public trust, requires soldiers and Army civilians

> to act with integrity and abide by the values of the Professional Army Ethic (FM 100-1). This ethic conveys the sense of purpose necessary to preserve the Nation. It prescribes that all employees and soldiers in the Department of the Army live and work using loyalty, duty, selfless service, and integrity to serve the nation and other people before personal interest.[2]

Field Manual 22-103, Leadership and Command at Senior Levels, contains the following passage.

> A firm ethical base is, therefore, the cornerstone of the Army. It is most directly expressed in FM 100-1. Ethics set the standard and the framework for correct professional action.[3]

Field Manual 22-100, Military Leadership, also refers to the Professional Army Ethic and the four "soldierly values."

> The values of the professional Army ethic flow from American ideals found in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Throughout American military history, these values have been the bedrock of our best military leaders and soldiers. It is by following professional ethics--principles of conduct, and standards of behavior--that soldiers achieve "moral" or "right" behavior that exemplifies the ideals and values of this nation.[4]

> Courage, candor, competence, and commitment are four qualities or traits of character which must be valued by all soldiers. They should be the foundation of your character. The more you build these traits in yourself and others, the more successful you will be. In order for them to become traits, you must first believe in and value them.[5]

That same field manual charges each of the Army's leaders to develop beliefs, values, and character in themselves and their subordinates.

> 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.[6]

Field Manual 100-1, The Army, is the basic document that contains what the Army calls the "Army Ethic" and this ethic is referred to as "the bedrock of our profession." This publication applies to all members of the Army and it provides a framework of ethics based on institutional and individual values.

INSTITUTIONAL VALUES

Loyalty - to the nation, to the Army and to the unit.

Duty - obedience and disciplined performance despite difficulty or danger.

Selfless Service - welfare of the nation and accomplishment of the mission ahead of individual desires.

Integrity - the thread woven through the fabric of the professional Army ethic.

INDIVIDUAL VALUES

Commitment - proud members of the Army dedicated to serving their country and imbued with patriotism and esprit de corps.

Competence - finely tuned proficiency.

Candor - honesty and fidelity.

Courage - the ability to overcome fear and continue on with mission accomplishment.

These institutional and individual values are presented as

the essential guide by which all members of the Army live their lives and perform their duties.

The following extract from Field Manual 100-1 provides an insight into the seriousness with which the Army treats this idea of a professional Army ethic.

> As a profession dealing with the very survival of the nation, the Army requires its members to embrace a professional ethic.
>
> The professional Army ethic articulates our values, and applies to all members of the Department of the Army, active and reserve. The ethic sets the moral context for the Army in its service to the nation and inspires the sense of purpose necessary to preserve the nation even by use of military force. From the moral values of the Constitution to the harsh realities of the battlefield, the professional Army ethic espouses resolutely those essential values that guide the way we live our lives and perform our duties.[7]

The U.S. Army has not limited its concern for ethical behavior to those that wear the uniform but has included the civilian workforce in a number of publications.

> Department of the Army personnel place loyalty to country, ethical principles, and law above private gain and other interests.[8]

> Public Law Number 96-303 (1980) requires the Army to display copies of the Code of Ethics for Government Service in appropriate areas of Federally owned or leased office space. Army activities must display the Code at all military installations and other facilities where at least 20 persons are regularly employed as civilian employees.[9]

A copy of the Code of Ethics for Government Service is shown at Appendix 1.

Finally, the Army prescribes the training that soldiers and civilians will receive in the area of ethics, mandates the

appointment of an Ethics Counsellor in large organizations, and specifies the duties of that counsellor. (Appendix 2 is an extract of Army Regulation 600-50, Standards of Conduct for Department of the Army Personnel, that delineates the Ethics Counsellor's responsibilities.)

> All DA personnel will be reminded at least semiannually of their duty to comply with required standards of conduct.[10]
>
> Department of the Army personnel will be advised on how to obtain additional clarification of the standards of conduct and conflicts of interest set forth in this regulation, related statutes, and other regulations. For this purpose, the Army General Counsel is designated as the Senior Ethics Counsellor for Department of the Army. He or she is responsible for proper coordination and final disposition of all matters relating to standards of conduct and conflicts of interest covered by this regulation. All ARSTAF agencies, field operating agencies, separate activities, installations, and commands authorized a commander in the pay grade of O-7 or above must designate, in writing, one or more officers or civilian employees (not necessarily attorneys) to be Ethics Counsellors for their organization.[11]

(The President's Commission on Federal Ethics Law recommended on 10 March 1989 sweeping new ethical standards for all three branches of government to include the establishment of an independent ethics officer for Congress, with support staff, to recommend to the Senate and House ethics committees appropriate remedies or punishment for ethical violations.)

> Commanders in conjunction with Ethics Counsellors will evaluate command ethics programs on a regular basis to ensure that appropriate emphasis is being given to identified problem areas and that the topic as a whole is adequately covered.[12]
>
> Like any other organized program in the

> military, the teaching of ethics needs the earnest support of the commander if it is to survive and improve. Commanders, however, might well be wary. Few of them have ever studied ethics; the very introduction of the subject might imply to military leaders a questioning of their past judgments.[13]

Army Regulation 600-100, Army Leadership, is much more direct in specifying responsibility.

> All Army leaders have a responsibility for instilling in subordinates those values that comprise the Professional Army Ethic.[14]

From these citations it is obvious that a professional military ethic is specified and that ethics training is directed. But does the military in fact ascribe to that ethic? Does the training take place? Does this training inculcate this ethic throughout the military? The next chapters will attempt to answer these questions.

ENDNOTES

1. P.L. Stromberg, et al., The Teaching of Ethics in the Military, p. 3.

2. US Department of the Army, Army Regulation 600-50, p. 3 (hereafter referred to as "AR 600-50").

3. U.S. Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-103, p. 18 (hereafter referred to as "FM 22-103").

4. US Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-100, p. 86 (hereafter referred to as "FM 22-100").

5. Ibid., p. 90.

6. FM 22-100, p. 71.

7. US Department of the Army, Field Manual 100-1, p. 22 (hereafter referred to as "FM 100-1").

8. AR 600-50, p. 3.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid., p. 8.

12. Ibid., p. 3.

13. Stromberg, pp. 72-73.

14. U.S. Department of the Army, Army Regulation 600-100, p. 3 (hereafter referred to as "AR 600-100").

CHAPTER V

ETHICS TRAINING

In the previous chapter the directives to conduct ethics training were cited. The U. S. Army has produced two primary vehicles to fulfill this requirement.

The first is the Ethics and Professionalism Training Support Packages of a training effort titled, Military Qualification Skills (MQS), which has been produced in three volumes or programs. MQS I is to be included in the pre-commissioning training of all officers while MQS II and III are designed for training at the Officer Basic Courses and the Officer Advanced Courses, respectively.

A brief review of each package indicates a significant effort in the area of ethics training.

MQS I contains a 12-hour program of instruction which attempts to meet the following goals:

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]

MQS II and III expand on these goals and basic concepts and

provide additional case studies. MQS II lessons concentrate on leadership responsibilities within an organization as they relate to ethics, and introduce the concept of command/leadership environment with emphasis on the officer's responsibilities for developing an ethical climate. MQS III reviews MQS I and II concepts and concentrates on tools for ethical reasoning, ethical responsibility, role modeling and institutional pressures.

Each of these packages has been well prepared and include lesson plans, visual aids in the form of viewgraph transparencies, and referenced articles, handouts and publications. An instructor's guide is also included with each package. Appendix 3 is a listing of the titles of the 12 lessons included in MQS I. A review of these titles provides further evidence of the comprehensiveness and scope of this effort.

The second significant effort of the Army to fulfill the ethics training requirement is a series of three Field Circulars that are targeted at the noncommissioned officers and enlisted soldiers as well as the officers.

Field Circular 22-9-1 is titled "Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (Platoon/Squad Instruction)" and it is aimed at Sergeants and below. (I disagree with the grouping of the Sergeant who is a noncommissioned officer with the Specialists and below but that's the subject of another paper.) This circular consists of six lessons and ten case studies which attempt to increase understanding of the Army's responsibilities, standards, values and reason for existence; the individual soldier's role in the Army and responsibilities; and, the

identification and awareness of ethical issues. This circular concentrates on individual rather than organizational considerations and ties individual values to the soldier's oath of enlistment.

Field Circular 22-9-2 is titled "Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (Company/Battery Instruction)" and it is aimed at the ranks of Staff Sergeant through Lieutenant. It consists of four lessons and 11 case studies and it concentrates on organizational considerations of ethical leadership vice individual ethics; the ethical decision making model; ethical behavior in times of war; and, institutional pressures and command climate.

Field Circular 22-9-3 is titled "Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (Battalion Instruction)." Its 12 case studies and four lessons have Sergeants First Class through Majors as its target audience. It is considerably more complex and designed to generate discussion and to draw on the personal experiences of the participants. This circular emphasizes the leader's responsibilities as a teacher of ethics as well as responsibilities for the development of a command climate that includes a healthy ethical climate. It also provides a list of ethical guidelines for leaders and further develops previous discussions regarding institutional pressures.

These three field circulars indicate that the Army has realized the need to teach ethics at all levels of the Army, not just to officers. Perhaps more significant is the realization that ethics training should be accomplished in units, by the unit

leadership, and should not be limited to the schoolhouse.

When added to the ethics training conducted at the Army's senior schools (Sergeants Major Academy, Command and General Staff College and the Army War College), these programs provide a comprehensive set of tools and programs to teach ethics, and indicate a strong commitment to the effort.

Some individuals insist that ethics training is a waste of time because "ethics cannot be taught." To these individuals, I commend the words of John P. Lovell and Steven C. Bok, respectively.

> Military ethics can be taught and should be taught. The fact that it is difficult to teach ... that the lessons taught may not receive social reinforcement one would like from the public at large, from national leadership, or from policy goals constitutes no argument against the necessity for teaching military ethics nor against the possibility of doing so effectively.[2]

> Formal education will rarely improve the character of the scoundrel. But many individuals who are disposed to act morally will often fail to do so because they are simply unaware of the ethical problems that lie hidden in situations they confront ... By repeatedly asking students to identify moral problems and define issues at stake, courses in applied ethics can sharpen and refine the moral perceptions of students so that they can avoid these pitfalls.[3]

ENDNOTES

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

2. John P. Lovell, Report of the Proceedings of the Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics IV, p. 18.

3. Steven C. Bok, "Can Ethics Be Taught?" Change, October 1986, p. 28.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The Army has identified the need for a professional military ethic, has developed one, has provided programs of instruction and has directed their use. Further, the Army has directed the appointment of Ethics Counsellors and charged the leadership of the Army to support the efforts and to commit themselves to this professional military ethic. In spite of all this effort, the question still remains. Is there, in fact, a military ethic that is alive and well in today's Army?

The mere existence of formal education is certainly not enough to prove the existence of a military ethic. The book, The Teaching of Ethics in the Military, stresses the need to supplement education with continuous personal example by the entire chain of command.

> If they fail to provide exemplary moral leadership, no course in ethics can be expected to overcome the power of their bad example. Worse still, a failure of moral leadership at the command level can and often does introduce a moral cynicism that no class in ethics can possibly surmount.[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]

Having junior officers that will support a military ethic is not enough.

> My experience with junior officers ... is ... they expect and are prepared to support high ethical standards but are sometimes confused, frustrated, and disappointed by what they see

> as unethical behavior on the part of some of their seniors.[3]

This last quote from General Walter F. Ulmer, Jr. identifies the one element that still must be determined before the oxymoronic question can be answered. Is the leadership of the Army committed to the military ethic? Is the leadership of the Army prepared to subject itself to scrutiny on this issue? Can the leadership of the Army afford to judge itself on this issue? After all, ethical issues in the real world are a lot tougher than they are in an academic environment. Field Manual 22-999 (Draft) cites the challenge of ethics that all professionals must face.

> 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.[4]

Yes, ethics is a difficult issue and one can point to an alarming number of incidents that indicate a lack of ethics on the part of individuals in the military, but all of my research and experience indicate the existence of the professional military ethic. Of more importance is the amount of concern for this issue that is apparent on the part of military leaders. Does the Army still have people in leadership positions who violate the Army's professional ethic? Unfortunately, yes! Will the Army ever rid itself entirely of these individuals? Unfortunately, no! There will always be a few people that successfully hide their lack of ethics, but their numbers should decrease as this

issue continues to receive attention.

Regardless of these individual and isolated imperfections, a professional military ethic does exist.

ENDNOTES

1. Stromberg, p. 48.

2. Ibid., p. 6.

3. Walter F. Ulmer, Jr., "The Army's New Senior Leadership Doctrine," Parameters, December 1987, p. 15.

4. U.S. Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-999 (Draft), p. 3-2 (hereafter referred to as "FM 22-999 (Draft)").

CHAPTER VII

RECOMMENDATIONS

The key to the continued existence and strength of the Army's professional military ethic rests with its leadership. Every leader must be thoroughly familiar with all aspects of the Army's professional ethic and must be committed to its continuance. At this time too many leaders at all levels are unfamiliar with the existence of a published Army ethic. An informal survey of Army War College students identified an alarming number of leaders (all former battalion commanders) who had never read FM 100-1 prior to its presentation at the college. A larger number had never seen or heard of the Leader Development Programs or the associated field circulars. Finally, discussions among students indicate a lack of consideration, recognition or identification of the ethical implications of routine actions and decisions. The idea that all decisions should be viewed from an ethical perspective to preclude the misperceptions of subordinates is not apparent.

The following quote from Field Manual 22-103 emphasizes a leader's need to develop the subordinates' ability to recognize ethical issues.

> While every action or decision a leader makes will not have an ethical component to it, senior-leaders teach their subordinates how to recognize and be sensitive to those actions or decisions which do.[1]

First, the Army leadership at all levels must develop that ability in themselves, and then they must teach it to their

subordinates.

The Army has developed all of the necessary tools and has published appropriate directives and guidance to promulgate an effective ethics program, but all of this appears to have been lost in the morass of Army publications.

To correct this situation and to ensure that the ethics program sustains and strengthens the professional military ethic, the entire program must receive renewed and enthusiastic emphasis from the highest levels of Army leadership.

ENDNOTE

1. U.S. Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-103, p. 20 (hereafter referred to as "FM 22-103").

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Becton, Julius W. Jr., LTG. "My Philosophy of Command," in the Proceedings of the Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics IV. Fort Benjamin Harrison: January 1982, pp. 30-39.

2. Bok, Steven C. "Can Ethics Be Taught?" Change. October 1976, pp. 26-30.

3. Braun, William W. An Ethical Army Leadership - Real or Wanting? Study Project. Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, 30 March 1988.

4. Buckingham, Clay MG (Ret). "Ethics and the Senior Officer: Institutional Tensions." Parameters, Volume 15, Autumn, 1985, pp. 23-32.

5. Cramer, Walter E. III. The Year of Values. Professional Military Values Are They Relevant To Today's Society. Study Project. Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, 17 May 1986.

6. Diehl, William F. "Ethics and Leadership: The Pursuit Continues." Military Review, Volume 65, April 1985, pp. 35-43.

7. Gabriel, Richard A. To Serve With Honor, A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1982.

8. Hartjen, Raymond C. Jr., LTC. Ethics in Organizational Leadership. Army Research Associate Program Paper. Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, May 1984.

9. Huntington, Samuel P. The Soldier and the State. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985.

10. Johnson, Kermit D. CH (COL). Ethical Issues of Military Leadership." Parameters, Volume IV, Number 2, 1974.

11. Lovell, John P. Report of the Proceedings of the Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics IV. Fort Benjamin Harrison: January 1982, pp. 18

12. Malson, Bruce Allen. Tarnished Armor Erosion of Military Ethics. Study Project. Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, 23 March 1988.

13. Marsh, John O., Jr. "Values and the American Soldier." Military Review, Volume 66, November 1986, pp. 4-9.

14. National Defense University. Institute for National Strategic Studies. Military Ethics: Reflections on Principles--The Profession of Arms, Military Leadership, Ethical Practices, War and Morality, Educating the Citizen-Soldier. Washington: National Defense University Press, 1987.

15. Potts, Robert E. Professional Military Ethics: Are We On The Right Track?. Study Project. Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, 23 March 1988.

16. Schwander, Jeffery L. A Functional Army Officer Code of Ethics. Study Project. Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, 23 March 1988.

17. Stromberg, Peter L., Wakin, Malham M., and Callahan, Daniel. The Teaching of Ethics in the Military. Hastings on the Hudson: Institute of Society, Ethics and Life Sciences, Hastings Center, 1982.

18. Ulmer, Walter F. Jr., "The Army's New Senior Leadership Doctrine," Parameters, December 1987, p. 10-17.

19. U.S. Army War College. Readings on Ethics and Professionalism. Carlisle Barracks: August 1983.

20. U.S. Army War College. Department of Command, Leadership, and Management. Readings on Ethics and Professionalism. Volume 2 of Course 1: Requirements of the Professional Leader. Carlisle Barracks: August 1985.

21. U.S. Department of the Army. Army Regulation 600-50: Standards of Conduct for Department of the Army Personnel. Washington: January 1988.

22. U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 22-100: Military Leadership. Washington:

23. U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 22-103: Leadership and Command at Senior Levels. Washington: June 1987.

24. U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 22-999 (Draft): Leadership and Command at Senior Levels. Washington: undated.

25. U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 100-1: The Army. Washington: August 1986.

26. U.S. Department of the Army. Military Qualification Standards System. Washington: 1987.

27. U.S. Department of the Army. Pamphlet 600-80: Executive Leadership. Washington: June 1987.

28. U.S. Department of the Army. White Paper 1986: Values. Washington: May 1986.

29. Wakin, Malham M., ed. War, Morality, and the Military Profession. 2d ed., rev. and updated. Boulder: Westview Press, 1986.

30. Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary. Boston: The Riverside Publishing Company, 1984.

APPENDIX I

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Any person in Government service should--

a. Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.

b. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be party to their evasion.

c. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay; giving earnest effort and best thought to the performance of duties.

d. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.

e. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept, for himself or herself or for family members, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of government duties.

f. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.

g. Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of Government duties.

h. Never use any information gained confidentially in the

performance of Government duties as a means of making private profit.

i. Expose corruption wherever discovered.

j. Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.[1]

ENDNOTE

1. FM 600-50, p. 23.

APPENDIX II

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ETHICS COUNSELLOR

Included in the responsibilities of the Ethics Counselor are the following:

Advise and assist the organization and provide information and assistance to its personnel.

Properly review, including auditing, all standards of conduct problems.

Maintain an adequate counseling, education, and training program concerning all ethics and standards of conduct matters.

Report to the Ethics Counselor of the next higher command, to HQDA (DAJA-ALG), or to the Senior Ethics Counselor any apparent standards of conduct violation which they are unable to resolve promptly and effectively.[1]

ENDNOTE

1. FM 600-50, pp. 8-9.

APPENDIX III

MQS I LESSON TITLES

Lesson 1: Introduction to Military Professional Ethics

Lesson 2: Characteristics of a 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