

**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
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.

**THE QUEST FOR MORAL FIBER AT THE
SENIOR LEADER LEVEL**

BY

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

COLONEL(P) PERRY V. DALBY
United States Army Reserve

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for public release.

Distribution is unlimited

19960610 058

USAWC CLASS OF 1996



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

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH 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.

THE QUEST FOR MORAL FIBER AT THE SENIOR LEADER LEVEL

by

Colonel(P) Perry V. Dalby
United States Army Reserve

Chaplain (COL) John W. Brinsfield
Project Adviser

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

U.S. Army War College

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Perry V. Dalby (COL), USAR

TITLE: The Quest for Moral Fiber at the Senior Leader Level

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 15 April 1996 **PAGES:** 31 **CLASSIFICATION:** Unclassified

The USAWC's objective is to prepare senior leaders to deal with a complex, uncertain, and ever changing environment--an environment filled with ethical challenges. This research study provides an assessment of the current AWC Ethics curriculum to include an analysis of ethical issues for the future. Research efforts include directed interviews with experienced General Officers who provide their collective wisdom on tough moral and ethical issues. The paper considers ethical awareness training as a vital field of study for strategic leaders. The training which reinforces moral principles must be a significant part of the curriculum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

- Assessment of USAWC Ethics Curriculum
- Analysis of Ethical Issues for the Future
- Summary of Purpose

PROCESS

- Methodology
 - * Interviews with Senior Leaders on Ethical Issues
- Results
 - * Discussion of Key Ethical Issues from Interviews
 - * Responses of General Officers to Interview Questions

PRODUCT

- Conclusions
- Recommendations

ENDNOTES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE QUEST FOR MORAL FIBER AT THE SENIOR LEADER LEVEL

*Character is like a tree and
reputation is its shadow. The shadow
is what we think of it; the tree is the real thing.
Abraham Lincoln*

INTRODUCTION

As we move into the 21st Century, the United States Army War College faces an important challenge--preparing the senior leaders of tomorrow to deal with the age old nemesis of ethical failures. The single most important message that senior leaders of tomorrow should keep in mind is that the training they receive at USAWC may be their last opportunity to equip themselves with the moral compass necessary to chart the ethical pathways of leadership. If properly approached, ethical awareness training, introduced at the strategic leader level, will assist us well into the 21st century in shaping the moral and ethical foundation of those we lead. As we update the ethics curriculum at the USAWC, it is necessary to identify which relevant ethical issues our current senior leaders believe should receive additional emphasis. One of the single most powerful sources of knowledge available to the military community is the collective wisdom of this seasoned senior leadership. Wisdom that emanates from first hand experience in positions of great responsibility, and from the contributions of such leaders as MG Max Baratz, Chief Army Reserve, over his seventeen years of service as a General Officer, is an essential component of outstanding leadership.

Therefore, through a series of directed discussions and interviews with senior military leaders on some tough moral and ethical issues I will attempt to demonstrate how important the topic of ethical preparedness is. Their replies clearly indicate the need for continued awareness of fundamental moral and ethical principles. These are the principles that senior leaders need to be equipped with throughout their military careers.

To many senior leaders, the very mention of ethics conjures up recollections of acts of immorality that sometimes have led to stern consequences, in some instances, dismissal from service. One only has to observe recent accounts of opportunistic pursuits of power, abuse of authority, and indeed, serious acts of immorality to conclude that those chosen for senior leadership positions are susceptible to and occasionally fall prey to unethical behavior. This human vulnerability is well-voiced in the following observation by Samuel P. Huntington: "No one is more aware than the professional soldier that the normal man is no hero. The military profession organizes men so as to overcome their inherent fears and failings."¹ By conceding that as senior leaders we are equally challenged in our responsibilities as individual citizens, professional soldiers, and role models, our insights can be useful tools as we look for relevant material for course design.

Likewise, highly publicized acts of immorality among senior leaders focus attention away from the many honorable, dedicated and respected officers in high

stations who, throughout history, have significantly contributed to the security of our nation. In today's saturated media environment, sensational acts of unethical conduct are usually dealt with swiftly as officer's appointments are terminated, their powers rescinded, and their future as trusted high ranking officials ruined. Therefore, as we move into the 21st century, should the United States Army War College consider ethical awareness training a vital field of study for strategic leaders? The answer to this question should be apparent. In order for the USAWC to accomplish its primary objective of preparing senior leaders to serve at the highest levels in a profession established by constitutional trust, reinforcing moral principles must be a significant part of the curriculum.

The ethical awareness training that I intend to focus on in this research paper will not include Socratic philosophy (469-399 B.C.) and the pre-modern ethical theory that arose in Ancient Greece.² However, it is well documented that Western Philosophy, including ethical theory, is rooted in this era and does provide the theoretical foundation for study. My desire is to focus my research efforts around ethics as it relates to acceptable professional behavior of Army officers at senior levels. I refer to that common-sense behavior which guides everyday judgments and complex decision making processes alike, eventually with perhaps "a formal code of ethics"³ as discussed by Chaplain (LTC) Willard D. Goodman as part of his efforts to develop a comprehensive character development program. The Army needs a program

that would be common to all its educational institutions, designed around issues that senior leaders must continually be aware of, and which would require some analysis for what constitutes acceptable rules of conduct. Therefore, to support this construct, I have designed my research format into three key functional areas: PURPOSE, PROCESS, and PRODUCT.

PURPOSE

Assessment of USAWC Ethics Curriculum:

This research paper proposes an assessment of the current Army War College ethics curriculum to determine its relevance as part of a developmental process for strategic leader preparation into the 21st century. My assessment will examine the following course requirement: during Course 1, (utilizing readings from Responsible Command, Volume I,) a three hour seminar is conducted on the subject of ETHICS IN WARTIME: Professional Conduct on the Battlefield.⁴ The basic format of this period of instruction is to introduce a topic through established learning objectives supported by defined required and suggested readings that relate to the main topic. Outside reading usually equates on a two to one ratio. In other words, for every hour of seminar the outside preparation requires two hours of reading. Seminar discussion is facilitated by Faculty Instructors as they guide student participation in covering key points that examine the subject matter in some detail. Seminar discussions usually

draw from the varied and diverse background of each participant as well as from examining the learning objectives stimulated by the outside readings. Lessons learned are directly proportional to the topics presented, outside preparation, and the free-flow discussion generated during the seminar. One way to insure the curriculum (learning objectives and readings) retains relevance and continuity within an overarching Character Development program, is to continuously update it with topics that are periodically identified through feedback from General Officers in key leadership positions. The students (senior leaders) need ethical awareness training that covers issues with which they will most likely be challenged as they assume future leadership positions.

In addition to the three-hour seminar, a three-hour lecture entitled "Ethics and the Strategic Leader" is offered for the purpose of presenting common ethical dilemmas and providing a basis for further seminar group discussions about the ethical decision making process. The importance associated with properly analyzing and understanding the correct action for discharging our moral and ethical responsibilities should not be underestimated. One of the learning objectives for this lecture supports this point: "Recognize the types of contemporary ethical problems that confront and sometimes overwhelm senior and strategic leaders."⁵ The full value of this lecture period evolves from the reading requirements and the suggested points to consider during the seminar discussion. The format for this Lecture/Seminar is essentially the

same as for the previous seminar session, with the exception being, of course, the presentation by a guest lecturer who possesses expertise or extensive experience in moral and ethical issues.

The seminar and lecture series provide a basic fundamental awareness of ethical issues that are germane to the strategic levels of the military profession. Through a series of questions and answers, and some debate, it is hoped students will arrive at their own personal reasoning ability when confronted with similar ethical dilemmas.

During Term II and Term III, students have the option of taking advanced courses to round out their professional military qualifications or gaining deeper appreciation of a topical area they know little about. The advanced course curriculum is vast and varied in subject matter and is taught in ten three-hour blocks consisting of lectures/discussions, extensive directed and suggested readings, and in most cases, a written and oral presentation. Classes vary in size from 6 to 50 students.. The purpose of the advanced course program is to supplement the advanced professional military educational program taught during Term I. In addition, the advanced courses are designed around the individual needs of the senior leader as a final preparation before assuming senior leadership positions.

Course 118, PROFESSIONAL ETHICS FOR SENIOR LEADERS, is offered during both Term II and Term III. By its definition, as outlined in the Course

Introduction, "This lesson will cover how ethical considerations could and should be a part of every senior leader's thinking and decision making. The class will explore the ethics of our profession,"⁶ the relative importance of this topic is succinctly identified. If this course is truly needed "for every senior leader" (and I personally believe that it is), then the Army is currently falling short of this goal. Upwards of 90% for the class of '96 is not receiving this instruction in the ethical decision making process. So, perhaps an adjustment in the curriculum could be accomplished in order to accommodate all of our senior leaders.

As we examine what the proper mix should be between Professional Military Education and moral/ethical character development, it would be wise to note the comments of Lieutenant General Howard Graves in a recent speech when he quoted General Maxwell Taylor: "No great soldier ever rose to eminence as a military commander who was not primarily a man of character."⁷

As senior leaders and former military commanders, how do we measure up to General Taylor's expectations and, as men of character, meet the challenge of ethical decision making inherent in our role? Interviewed senior General Officers contend that continuous character development programs designed to teach proper ethical competencies at all levels will exert positive influences on the professional conduct of our future senior leaders. My assessment is that the current USAWC curriculum needs additional studies directed towards character development and ethical awareness

training for strategic leaders in order to fully equip seasoned professional military leaders for the ethical challenges ahead.

Identification of Issues for the future:

Surely, the USAWC's goal is to produce persons of character. Therefore, perhaps one of the more difficult tasks is to develop a curriculum design that places additional emphasis on ethical awareness training, insures that the curriculum content is relevant, and requires all students to participate. Competing for time and space within the USAWC educational matrix is difficult due to the numerous departments and disciplines that are preeminent. The final outcome of curriculum changes most likely will be determined by the level of importance and emphasis given ethical awareness training by the Army's top echelons of command.

Another difficult task is developing a comprehensive character development program that addresses the needs of the Army's Professional Military Education (PME) system. The framework is currently in place at each level, beginning at pre-commissioning through senior service schools. But, the content is varied and fragmented throughout our PME and therefore provides no continuity upon which to build. This observation was supported by a colleague of mine, LTC Rita Price, during her recent evaluations of formal ethical training offered by our service academies and ROTC programs. In her report Price states: "It (ethics training) should be systematic,

reinforcing and institutionalized at all levels, beginning in the basic course. Ethical education should develop as a process, promoting gradual growth, differentiation, or evolution through successive changes to produce morally strong character."⁸ As further evidence, Price cites Chaplain (LTC) Willard D. Goldman as stating that current ethics training is "an array of isolated pieces at academies, service schools, local SJA classes on ethical conduct and a few other individual programs."⁹ Surely we can do better for future generations of officers. Imagine where we would be as a military organization if we allowed Military Tactics or the Operations Order(OPORD) to be taught in such a disjointed fashion. Our work is clearly cut out for us; the question is, are we cut out for the work?

Lieutenant General Graves advocates developing this initiative further as a joint project for all services. During a recent Professional Military Education Conference in Chicago, Illinois, LTG Graves commented: "I would like to share with you tonight a few thoughts on extending this initiative (moral-ethical development in PME) a step further to that of common character development for officers in all of our Armed Services."¹⁰ General Graves should be commended for focusing our attention on such a lofty goal. The remainder of his speech was devoted to examples demonstrating the interrelated relationship of our services and how our future is joined together to such an extent that we now have a collective moral/ethical image to uphold.

The final issue that my analysis will address is that of ownership. Who will have the primacy for design, development, and implementation of a values-based educational program that is linked from top to bottom? Once again, LTG Graves provides guidance: "The priority for such a program must be set by the senior military leadership. I also believe that the detailed content must originate at the top."¹¹ This question is currently being staffed by a working group at Department of the Army based with guidance from the Chief of Staff, General Dennis Reimer, following his approval of an initiative from DCSPER entitled "Character Development 2001." One of the working group's key points is: "A program that is controlled centrally (DA) to ensure curriculum and materials address the Army's goals for character development and consistency of implementation."¹² It is hoped the final recommendations developed by this working group and approved by the CSA will improve all ethical training.

It is clear that existing ethics curriculums are by no means standardized or adequate. By examining both the existing curriculum and future issues in the light of interviews with experienced military leaders, this paper hopes to arrive at conclusions and make recommendations for improving the future design of ethics training.

PROCESS

Methodology:

The method of data collection used was a series of directed discussions with General Officers who are knowledgeable on the subject matter and have a personal interest in promoting an environment which fosters ethical awareness training. The interviewees were asked to reflect on their careers and discuss ethical issues they believe need emphasis as we consider strategic leadership into the 21st century. Specific questions asked focused on three common themes; moral/ethical issues which can end careers, moral/ethical issues which demand attention, and moral/ethical dilemmas which can be eliminated in advance with proper training, planning, and supervision. The interviews varied in length from one to two hours and were tape recorded. Later these tapes were transcribed and coded for common themes.

Results:

The first research question focused on the issue of senior strategic leaders being forced to participate in an unjust war and was addressed by Major General Richard A. Chilcoat, Commandant, USAWC. General Chilcoat provided the following comments:

I believe that would be the ultimate ethical dilemma for any officer if he felt that he was about to enter a war which perhaps was not just, yes, that

would be the fundamental dilemma. For example, in Vietnam, there was never a question in my mind that I might have breached ethics due to my participation in that war. However, for some people there were deep feeling surrounding their participation in the Vietnam conflict. In a more current environment, I think there may be an ethical dimension associated with how the United States uses its military forces in today's world. That's why there is the huge debate as to whether or not ground troops should be sent into a peace enforcement or peace keeping operation which could degenerate into a warfighting situation where the vital interests of the United States are not at stake.¹³

This discussion led to the second question: How should we use U.S. forces? Only for vital interest? Or for peace operations? (which use (peacekeeping deteriorates our capability to rapidly respond to major regional contingencies) MG Chilcoat's response:

Some people would argue that the use of our military forces in this fashion has ethical consequences. They believe that you should only expend national treasure in terms of lives and dollars when the nation's security or vital interests are at stake as opposed to less substantial or just humanitarian interests are at stake. This is another good ethical issue. I think about the young soldier who refused to wear his United

Nations blue beret and as a result, he was court-martialed and cashiered out of the Army. You know there was an ethical dilemma there, at least from his perspective as he argues that he felt it was unethical for him to have participated in that operation.¹⁴

The third question deals with the military's subordination to constitutional authority. To what extent does that relationship put ethical strains on the loyalties of strategic military leaders? Lieutenant General Howard D. Graves, Commandant, United States Army Military Academy, offered these examples:

In the area of constitutional subordination to authority, whether this traditionally belongs in the ethical area or in the leadership area, which are closely related, we should be teaching the proper role to our senior military leaders. That role is to advise the elected leadership or appointed civilian leadership on matters related to national security and military affairs. We had a good chance to discuss that relationship here at West Point in the fall of 1993 when the Chairman and the Joint Chiefs kept our Commander in Chief, President Clinton, very specifically advised on homosexuals in the military. New York Times published an article that this was insubordination because of the strong advice provided by our senior military leadership. Their job was to advise the president and if that makes the news, and that topic became

public very quickly, that's all right. However, our role is to not tell the public what we have told our elected officials who are depending on us for straightforward advice. My hero in this area is Jack Vessey. General Jack Vessey who, as you may remember, was to be the Chief of Staff of the Army but when he went over to see President Carter, the President said, 'I expect you to support my position of drawing down American Forces in Korea.' General Vessey said, 'I'm sorry Mr. President, I can't support that.' Consequently, he was not selected to be Chief of Staff of the Army. To me, that's the solution. You do not have to roll over on issues but the principal point to remember is to give good advice to your superiors and do not try and manipulate the process. Senior military leaders are frequently called on to testify before Congress and most congressmen are very careful to ask the senior officer how do you personally feel about this specific situation. We are free then to express our personal view in answering the question. We should not be lobbying Congress against national policy for that violates this principal of subordination.¹⁵

The fourth area of discussion deals with the discovery of potential problems and subsequent attempts to suppress information pending a complete and detailed investigation in hopes that it will blow over. What is your recommended solution?

LTG Graves answered:

Do not suppress bad news. We need to have an honest relationship with the population that we serve. As a profession, as a unique profession, the military must develop a relationship of trust with America and that translates to when we make mistakes, we need to get them out in the open quickly. We need to give a full and complete explanation of the situation to include lessons learned and depending on the seriousness of the mistake, take immediate corrective action appropriate to preclude further occurrences. If in fact the nation does not trust it's military, then as a democracy, we are in trouble. We must be very careful about our perceptions from the public, we cannot be dishonest nor can we be incompetent. Without the support we depend on from a grateful nation, our effectiveness as the protector of it's people will be withdrawn.¹⁶

The fifth question was: Should the Army adopt a Code of Ethics? LTG Graves provides the following advice:

We take the Oath of Office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America and we need to understand the fundamental assumptions which our forefathers had when writing the Constitution. There were some values. There were some guarantees about domestic tranquility and the laws abiding in this country. There are also some

legal standards that we must comply with, and some moral standards that are fundamental to our supporting and defending the Constitution. My feeling about the Code is that we may be moving to the point in our profession and our society where minimum standards need to be defined. So I wouldn't object to the statement of minimum standards but we also must provide an educational program that would clearly point out to all affected by it that these are in fact the minimum standards and those who abide at the boundary are minimum ethical achievers and therefore at risk.¹⁷

The subject of Character Guidance 2001 was raised as a possibility of providing proper emphasis on specific moral and ethical educational programs. LTG Graves continued:

One of the things I believe will be imperative for any successful character development program is that it must emanate from the top down. If you teach ethics to the young soldiers and young officers, and they observe their leadership behaving in a way that is unbecoming or uncharacteristic to that teaching, then that breeds cynicism and their ability to lead will be compromised. As we decide what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable behavior, the senior leaders must buy into it first.¹⁸

The General Officers were asked: Who should be responsible for ethical awareness training? This is a practical issue, especially for organizational training, whereby the sustainment of an ethical climate is the cornerstone for trust and confidence. Major General Max Baratz, Chief Army Reserve, offers his interpretation:

I think that the ethics business is inherited in the command business and the fact that as a commander and a worthy role model, you're in the ethics business. It becomes more important as your career advances only in the sense that you become more visible and therefore your actions must be consistent with your philosophy. In that context, General Officers are the most visible of all officers and they need to view their position as examples of proper ethical conduct. Yes, my answer is that this is a commander's responsibility. The ethics business also requires technical support from lawyers who are experts in ethics laws who can provide the mechanical guidance for what I can and can't do in the procurement business. How do I handle contractors who do not perform up to the conditions of their contracts? As a General Officer, I am required to provide a statement of my annual income-that, if you will, is legal business. We have a legal staff that can assist with what the law means and what it doesn't mean. We have a moral staff in the sense that the chaplain is in the moral and to a lesser extent the ethics business.

Nevertheless, to tie that all together, we are in the troop commander business. That is what we do for a living. Our ethical and moral attributes flow from the fact that as commanders, we are in the example business, and if not, we're probably in the wrong business.¹⁹

Finally, the General was asked: When faced with an ethical dilemma, what do you do, who do you turn to? Do you rely on gut instinct when you're faced with making a tough choice? MG Baratz provides this response:

I think there are two things we turn to when we make ethical choices. The first is a broad sense of doing the right thing and I believe that is fundamentally instinctive. How we handle people, issues, money, all that's instinctive and if we do what we think is right, I would tell you that in most cases we are probably right. The second thing we turn to is expert advice, particularly in dealing with legal and technical issues. Even when you think you're right, the truth of the matter is you may inadvertently violate a legal or regulatory code. Approach the issue as a mechanical function requiring strict legal interpretation. We have the appropriate SJA staff to help us through that. Having proper ethical balance is not something that happens overnight in my term. It comes from a number of years of doing what is ethically correct and probably to a great extent from our family background.²⁰

LTG Graves, what is your assessment of the current system of ethical awareness training? Are you satisfied that our senior leaders are receiving the appropriate academic focus that will preclude their ending up in a potentially compromising ethical dilemma?

The indicators are clear that improvement is needed. The more public instances--and they are found in each of our services--include adultery and fraternization by some of our most senior officers; failure to hold officers accountable for friendly fire incidents that cost the lives of soldiers, sailors, and airmen; personal use of military aircraft; as well as the more intrusive "zero defects" syndrome during the current drawdown that puts a severe strain on principled performance at all ranks. These all tell us that we must get better.²¹

LTG Graves, what are some suggestions or improvement that you think would strengthen the ethics curriculum and prevent serious acts of immorality that you have just described?

First of all, you need to be aware that there are people in the system who do not want a proscriptive ethics program.

When I was teaching at Carlisle, this was in 1986 and 1987, we had Lieutenant Colonels (future general officers) who deep down inside felt that they ought not be imposing their ethics on

someone else. That was getting into the deeper religious part of oneself and that should be private. That is why we should have professional ethics training that is well understood and clearly represent the important values that need continuous reinforcement. This is why the Chief is stressing the Character Development 2001 program and that it should get down into the fundamentals of dealing with money, dealing with sexual misconduct, dealing with gender issues, and dealing with subordinates. The fundamentals of how the military profession should operate and it must be stated in our journals and other military publications such as FMs and TMs. But the higher we get into the abstract, such as our study about competencies, courage, and candor, we in fact get less specific about the fundamental issues of moral misconduct that allows our soldiers to feel no obligation at all to enforce the professional ethic. There is room for improvement--there is a lot of room for improvement. There is also room for implementation, such as changing case studies, and updating course curriculum to deal with our changing culture. I believe we are on the right track with programs such as CD 2001 and I support that effort fully.²²

After the senior leader reaches the rank of General Officer is there a mentoring relationship among GOs whereby feedback is provided on human vulnerabilities that continue to exist regardless of the higher status? MG Chilcoat answered:

That's a very good question and the answer is basically they do not. In fact, I worked for Dave Meade in the Army Headquarters and we were talking about this subject one time while I was still a Brigadier and still pretty wet behind the ears. We were discussing about how General Officers get counseled and the fact of the matter is they do not. They get OERs under the same rules as all other officers, but I have never heard of a General being counseled unless the General Officer was guilty of some moral or ethical infraction. The Chief, after obtaining a report from the Inspector General, would personally call that General Officer and have a counseling session. In effect, the Chief of Staff of the Army is their personnel officer. General Wickham used to call them his Battalion of Generals. At that time he had 411 General Officers under his care. With that many, he did not get the opportunity to routinely mentor, but I will say this, if a GO's performance was negative they would receive counseling. There is not a lot of feedback because as a

General, you are expected to be sensitive enough to your surroundings and aware of yourself to the extent that you do self assessment. That has both advantages and disadvantages associated with it.²³

LTG Graves was asked the question if General Officers, in his opinion, were held to a higher standard than other officers, and this was his response:

I believe the consequences of violation are higher simply because we are more in the public view and in some ways that's probably right. Young officers should be allowed to develop if they do not commit a violation that is repetitive, or is so heinous that we shouldn't allow it at all. The young officer can recover from mistakes and even some mistakes in the moral/ethical area. But, by the time we become General Officers, we should have learned our lesson well and be prepared to accept the ultimate consequences should we violate principles of trust and confidence.²⁴

There is an underlying consensus among the senior leaders who were interviewed that as officers we are worthy of respect and that we must endeavor to act on that belief, both by commanding the respect of others and by confirming respect for self.

CONCLUSIONS

The Officer Corps did not invent the moral/ethical system which now serves as our guide and helps us cope with problems we encounter throughout our military career. Our belief system evolved from a fundamental philosophy of right vs wrong, good over evil. Because the belief system we have today is self-directed, we must continually update the ethics curriculum to reflect the complex, uncertain moral environment in which we operate. To fully accomplish the objectives of building a moral and ethical foundation for our senior leaders, the ethics curriculum should be a consistent multi-layered design building on itself and relevant to the perceived needs of each level. The program must address the simple, everyday professional conduct as viewed by our seasoned senior leaders.

In addition, we need to establish a method of archiving the thoughts of our General Officers who, as a result of these interviews, have demonstrated their knowledge in these areas. We have a great opportunity to take advantage of their collective wisdom on important ethical issues along with strategic thought processes and creating a force structure for the Army of the 21st century. Using their collective memories, there currently exists sufficient case studies of real life dilemmas that hypothetical situations need not be written to illustrate improper conduct.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this research paper support the need for additional ethical awareness training within the existing USAWC educational framework. This research advocates several important recommendations. First, all Army students should be required to enroll in the ethics awareness advance course during Phase II or Phase III. This recommendation could be implemented without major revisions to the core curriculum. Although it would use one of the elective choices of students, the findings of this research paper strongly support its inclusion.

Once instituted, a second recommendation is to annually update the ethics curriculum from interviews and discussions with selected senior leaders. These senior leaders, as demonstrated in this research project, can provide first-hand knowledge and awareness on topics that are relevant to the needs of senior leaders for the remainder of their careers.

Another recommendation that echoes from the interviews is the need for an overarching ethical awareness program. This program would provide a consistent platform from which to build a values-based educational experience, beginning at the onset of one's career and continuing until retirement.

This research further pointed to another recommendation: the oversight for a service-wide ethics awareness program should emanate from the Army's top leadership and be delegated down the chain of command to the lowest echelon of

command. Without the support of the Army's top leadership, an ethics program will be ill fated. It is the senior Army leadership that must take a strong stand in this area for the message to be communicated down the chain of command. *Walking the talk* is critical to the success of this program.

A final recommendation based on an analysis of the findings indicates the need for renewed emphasis on the value of moral and ethical training. The needs of our officer corps are now only being met in a nonintegrated fashion. This need focuses on the human vulnerabilities rather than on strategic level performance. In the end, our true test will be our ability to be the *tree* rather than the *shadow*. For as MG Baratz stated: "he (the officer) has to be much more ethical...if you tell the truth, you can always remember the story, I believe that."²⁵

ENDNOTES

1. Samuel P. Huntington, "The Military Mind: Conservative Realism of the Professional Military Ethic," in War, Morality, and the Military Profession, ed. Malham M. Wakin, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), 39.
2. David Seiple, "Examples in the History of Moral Theory" in Ethics Applied, ed. Michael L. Richardson and Karen K. White, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993), 68-69.
3. CH LTC) Willard D. Goldman, "Character Development in the U.S. Army: A Proposal to Change the Future." Paper presented at the CD 2001 Planning Meeting, Washington, D.C., 23-24 January 1996, 1.
4. U.S. Army War College. "Ethics in Wartime: Professional Conduct on the Battlefield." In Core Curriculum Course 1: Responsible Command, Volume I. Carlisle Barracks, PA., 1995 (Student Initial Issue).
5. U.S. Army War College. "ETHICS AND THE STRATEGIC LEADER". Course 1: Responsible Command, Volume I. Lesson No. 1-14-L/S, AY 1996.
6. U.S. Army War College. "PROFESSIONAL ETHICS FOR SENIOR LEADERS." Advanced Course Program, Term II, Course 118: Syllabus, (Student Initial Issue) AY 1996.
7. LTG Howard D. Graves, "Perspectives on Character Development for the Future Military Professional." Speech to PME Conference, Chicago, Illinois, 13 March 1996.
8. LTC Rita Price, "The Quest for Moral Fiber at the Precommissioning Level," unpublished manuscript, U. S. Army War College, Carlisle, 1996.
9. Ibid.
10. Graves, "Perspectives."
11. Ibid.

12. LTC Gary F. Petrich, "Character Development 2001;" Strategic Planning Concept, unpublished manuscript, Pentagon, January 1996.

13. MG Richard A. Chilcoat, interview by CH (COL) John Brinsfield, 20 February 1996, Carlisle Barracks, PA.

14. Ibid.

15. LTG Howard D. Graves, interview by author, 3 March 1996, West Point, NY.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. MG Max Baratz, interview by author, 26 February 1996, Washington, D. C.

20. Ibid.

21. Graves, interview.

22. Ibid.

23. Chilcoat.

24. Graves, interview.

25. Baratz.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baratz, MG Max. Interview by author, 26 February 1996, Washington, D.C.
- Chilcoat, MG Richard A. Chilcoat. Interview by CH (COL) John Brinsfield, 20 February 1996, Carlisle Barracks, PA.
- Goldman, CH LTC Willard D., "Character Development in the U. S. Army: A Proposal to Change the Future." Paper presented at the CD 2001 Planning Meeting, Washington, D.C., 23-24 January 1996.
- Graves, LTG Howard D. Interview by author, 3 March 1996, West Point, NY.
- Graves, LTG Howard D. "Perspectives on Character Development for the future Military Professional." Speech to the PME Conference, Chicago, Illinois, 13 March 1996.
- Huntington, Samuel P. "The Military Mind: conservative Realism of the Professional Military Ethic." In War, Morality, and the Military Profession, ed. Malham M. Wakin. Boulder: Westview Press, 1986.
- Petrich, LTC Gary F. "Character Development 2001: Strategic Planning Concept." Unpublished manuscript, Pentagon, January 1996.
- Price, LTC Rita. "The Quest for Moral Fiber at the Precommissioning Level." Unpublished manuscript, U. S. Army War College, Carlisle, 1996.
- Seiple, David. "Examples in the History of Moral Theory." In Ethics Applied, ed Michael L. Richardson and Karen K. White. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.
- U. S. Army War College, "Ethics and the Strategic Leader," Course 1: Responsible Command, Volume I, Lesson 1-14-L/S, AY 1996.
- U. S. Army War College, "Professional Ethics for Senior Leaders," Advanced Course Program, Term II, Course 118: Syllabus, (Student Initial Issue) AY 1996.