



**Who really sets the bearing on
my moral compass?
An assessment of the utility of moral
autonomy in the contemporary operating
environment**

by:
David Glendenning



**Who really sets the bearing on
my moral compass?
An assessment of the utility of
moral autonomy in the contemporary
operating environment**

by:
Lt. Col. David Glendenning

Cover image:

© wallhaven; www.wallhere.com/en/wallpaper/1196489

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the UK Ministry of Defence or any other department of Her Britannic Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom. Furthermore such views should not be considered as constituting an official endorsement of factual accuracy, opinion, conclusion or recommendation of the UK Ministry of Defence or any other department of Her Britannic Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom.

© Crown Copyright 2017
© EuroISME 2018

**Who really sets the bearing on
my moral compass?
An assessment of the utility of moral
autonomy in the contemporary
operating environment**

by:
Lt. Col. David Glendenning

student at:

Joint Services Command and Staff College
Advanced Command and Staff Course

the Defence Academy of the
United Kingdom

The jury of EuroISME's annual prize for the best student's thesis on military ethics consists of:

1. Colonel Rev. (ret) Prof.Dr. P.J. McCormack, MBE, (chairman, United Kingdom)
2. Lt.Col.(Ret) Dr. Daniel Beaudoin (France/Israel)
3. Dr. Veronika Bock (Germany)
4. MMag. Stefan Gugerel (Austria)
5. Col. (Ret) Prof.Dr. Boris N. Kashnikov (Russia)
6. Dr. Asta Maskaliūnaitė (Estonia)
7. Prof.Dr. Desiree Verweij (The Netherlands)
- Ms. Ivana Gošić (Serbia, secretary)

Enquiries: secretariat.ethicsprize@euroisme.eu

www.euroisme.eu

The prize is financially supported by:



BRILL
NIJHOFF



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	13
Introduction	16
Chapter 1: Ethics-based Leadership	20
Chapter 2: Ethics Theory	26
Chapter 3: Values	32
Chapter 4: Educating Ethics	38
Chapter 5: Contemporary operating environment	44
Chapter 6: The Moral Compass	51
Conclusion	58
Bibliography	60

**Who really sets the bearing on my
moral compass?
An assessment of the utility of moral
autonomy in the contemporary
operating environment.**

Lieutenant Colonel D C Glendenning RA

ADVANCED COMMAND AND STAFF COURSE
NUMBER 20

[Word Count: 15,000]

Abstract

Against a changing societal backdrop and the evolving character of the contemporary operating environment, this paper contends that moral advantage, gained through an enhanced aptitude in dealing with ethical dilemmas, conveys a strategic advantage. This is best achieved through the realisation of moral autonomy, delivered by an expanded ethics educational pathway that teaches philosophical theory and ethical triangulation. Underpinning the values and standards of the British Army with an explicit ethical foundation will serve as a catalyst to accelerate the realisation of moral autonomy, noting that moral autonomy can create moral armour. Ethics matter. Moral character matters. Provoked by the absence of a specified ethics based leadership framework for the British Army, this paper will run hard at that gap.

*Who really sets the bearing on my moral compass?
An assessment of the utility of moral autonomy in the
contemporary operating environment.*

Preface

The operational effectiveness of the armed forces is reliant upon the successful integration of the three inherently contextual components of fighting power; conceptual, physical and moral. Importantly, the components of fighting power are interdependent, whereby achieving excellence in all three, at a point in time, can accelerate mission success. Contrastingly, a failure to properly resource a single component can have a significant net-deceleration effect on military performance. In early September 2008 I deployed to Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Employed as a Fire Support Team Commander, the role of my team was to provide offensive support to 42 Commando Royal Marines. From a conceptual perspective, we understood how to operate. After years of focused study we were extremely well-versed in all the doctrine, practices and procedures that bound our professional application of Joint Fires. Similarly, from a fighting component perspective, we had all the necessary means to fight. Honed over a dedicated six-month period of mission specific training, we knew the technical limitations of our equipment, and, the individual and collective strengths of each member of the team. From a moral component perspective, morale was high, we were motivated, we understood the legal framework and we could recite the Army's Values and Standards. 'If in doubt, rely on your moral compass' was the oft-expressed quasi confidence building pre-deployment philosophy.

During a highly kinetic operational tour, it became evident that the conceptual and physical components continued to improve, almost unchecked. Daily patrols and multiple close-quarter firefights created a battlefield muscle-memory; as knowledge of the environment improved and the enemy behaviour became increasingly familiar, actions became instinctive. The opposite was true for the moral component. Without positive action, morality could start to fade away. Seemingly, the moral component was susceptible to corruption. Frustration, exhaustion, suffering heavy friendly forces casualties and adversaries using a

very different rulebook, can all challenge our judgement and expose dangerous tensions between and within the competing seams of the core values. I habitually replay my battlefield decisions, self-examine my leadership style, critique my moral fortitude and evaluate my spiritual foundation. When situated within the physical and emotional realities of violent combat, how reliable was the bearing on my moral compass?

Archimedes is accredited with the quote: “Give me but a spot on which to stand and a lever long enough, and I shall move the earth”.¹ This can be interpreted mathematically by using a fulcrum and a lever to physically move a large object. However, it can also be interpreted abstractly. Firm ground relates to knowing where you are, both geographically but also spiritually. To make best use of a compass, you need to know where you are and then orientate the map to the ground. To effectively use a moral compass, the same navigational principles apply. Consequently, the intentional use of the word *my* in the title of this paper recognises the uniquely personal notion of a moral code whereby each individual life is inimitable. It is not an egotistical pursuit by the author. The practical application of this research should be applied universally, through the eyes of each individual reader. This paper seeks to echo the self-examination nature of the study of ethics, encouraging an internal peek into the innermost core values that shape our internal moral monologue. It is grounded in Socratic dialogue and based on the principle that “an unexamined life is not worth living”².

Some will meet this work with scepticism: Isn't ethics just common sense? If ethics is so personal then surely it is organically happening already? Why are your values better than mine? The counter argument to these objections forms the relevance and currency of this paper. From classical beginnings there has always been a link between individual actions, the human dimension of leadership and a higher societal purpose. Plato's philosopher-king

1. Terry Breverton, *Immortal Words* (London: Quercus, 2009), 34.

2. Plato, “The Apology”, in, *The Last days of Socrates* trans. Hugh Tredennick and Harold Tarrant (London: Penguin, 1993), 63.

approach to reasoning placed a guardian emphasis on inspiring the inner spirit to create a moral equality that would turn the soul towards achieving a common purpose. Cicero's principles of right living encouraged the development of moral virtue as a fundament for human completeness by acting in the best practical interest of society. Similarly, Aristotle's teaching of moral character sits within a noble vision that prioritises humanity.³ Noting that environmental context can alter cause and effect, a study of ethics requires a cognitive embrace of impartiality; "ethics takes a universal point of view".⁴ This work seeks to retain impartiality.

3. Christopher Kolenda, *Leadership: A Warriors Art* (Pennsylvania: The Army War College Foundation Press, 2001), 6-11.

4. Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics* (Cambridge: University Press, 1993), 11.

Introduction

In 2007, Mendonca and Kanungo observed that “almost no day seems to go by without some media exposure of unethical behaviour of organisational leaders or exhortations about the need for ethics in business and public life”.⁵ Ten years on, a cursory review of national and international media would reinforce a similar trend of moral confusion within the public and private sector. Since the Wall Street decade of greed in the 1980’s, contemporary examples of disheartening ethical erosion are ubiquitous. Enron’s downfall, the financial crisis, Lehman’s bankruptcy, the government expenses scandal, Operation Yewtree and widespread phone hacking are all linked by greed, moral exploitation and dishonesty. The corresponding spike in academic literature surrounding business ethics and responsible leadership is also instructive. The drive to rectify the situation suggests that common sense and common practice are never always aligned. Likewise, the Ministry of Defence is not immune from damaging high-profile examples of ethical misjudgement, including 229 allegations of criminal activity by British troops in Iraq⁶, the December 2013 murder conviction of a British serviceman on active duty⁷ and numerous in-barracks breaches of values and standards, mostly within a bullying, harassment or initiation wrap. Ethics matter. Moral character matters. Provoked by the absence of a specified ethics based leadership framework for the British Army, this paper will run hard at that gap.

The use of lethal force, even within the regulated rules and norms that seek to govern conventional warfare, can easily be seen as a form of moral bankruptcy. “War is bad in that it makes more evil people than it takes away”⁸. For this reason, war has been, and will always be, an intensely divisive moral problem. The symbiotic relationship between morality and ethics⁹, whereby the former is determined by the latter, directs that the study of morality within the military must be anchored in a study of ethics. It is not good enough simply to do the right thing, one must also know why it is the right thing.

5. Manuel Mendonca and Rabindra Kanungo, *Ethical Leadership* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2007), x. 6. The Aitken Report, Army HQ, HQ AG Design Studio, DS13076 (25 January 2008), 2.

7. On appeal, the murder verdict has since been reduced to manslaughter.

8. Immanuel Kant, “Towards Perpetual Peace,” in, *Practical Philosophy* trans. Mary Gregor (Cambridge: University Press, 1996), 326.

9. Richard Norman, *Ethics, Killing and War* (Cambridge: University Press, 1995), 1.

This notion reinforces the importance of a moral code for soldiers, but it also applies to all human interfaces where trust is the vital ground, such as lawyers, doctors and politicians. Fisher emphasises the need for a military code of conduct that allows soldiers to easily distinguish themselves from bandits and orientate themselves in the psyche of a noble tradition of arms to protect the society they seek to reflect and serve.¹⁰ Inasmuch as human chemistry delivers battle winning physics, military ethics provide the necessary moral justification that underpins military decision making and subsequent action in the pursuit of an operational advantage¹¹.

The vast array of academic literature within the macro field of military ethics has created a rich and widespread debate. This Defence Research Paper intends to nest within the body of work examining the educational pathway of ethical leadership as a means to minimise ethical misjudgement within the procedural *ius in bello* tradition. Thus, the focus is placed on individual actions at the tactical level¹². Throughout, the British Army will be the reference point. A follow-on study could look for tri-service linkages and joint application. This paper will assess, in six chapters, the added value of achieving moral autonomy in the contemporary operating environment.

In the opening chapter, a literature review will situate ethics based leadership within the wider framework of values based leadership. The British Army's doctrinal counter-action to a changing ethical landscape will be examined and the durability of a *serve to lead* mantra will be explored. Focusing on ethics theory, Chapter 2 will analyse the military applicability of consequentialist, deontological and virtue ethics as the three dominant disciplines within normative ethics theory. The concept of ethical triangulation will also be introduced as a mechanism to shape ethical decision making. Focusing on the galvanising and bridging qualities of loyalty and courage, Chapter 3 will determine if the current British Army approach to educating values generates sufficient moral

10. David Fisher, *Morality and War: Can War be Just in the Twenty-First Century* (Oxford: University Press, 2011), 127-128.

11. Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), 13.

12. This paper acknowledges the national debate concerning the morality of the use of force, fuelled in part by the *ius ad bellum* consternations following the decision to invade Iraq in 2003 and flamed by the publication of the Chilcot Report. However, this overarching Just War debate sits outside the scope of this paper.

cohesion. Next, using public health and policing as comparators, Chapter 4 proposes a phenomenological framework to deepen the education of ethics across all ranks of the British Army. Additionally, the aspirational concepts of moral autonomy and moral equality are discussed. Chapter 5 uses the evolving character of the contemporary operating environment, courageous restraint and asymmetric morality as the key drivers to revamp the educational pathway of the moral component in order to build effective moral armour. Finally, Chapter 6 adds depth and meaning to the term moral compass within a military context and examines the competing responsibility of the individual, the British Army and society for setting the bearing on a moral compass.

The following conclusions will be offered: (1) moral advantage, gained through an enhanced aptitude in dealing with ethical dilemmas, conveys strategic advantage; (2) expanding military ethics education is critical to meet the shifting demands of the contemporary operating environment; (3) teaching ethical leadership and ethical theory triangulation will provide a functional theoretical framework to structure the delivery of ethics education in the British Army; (4) values and standards demand an explicit ethical foundation to ensure the training of character is married with the education of the mind; (5) the bearing on a moral compass is governed by the interplay of individual values, organisational culture and societal norms; (6) moral autonomy can create moral armour.

To ensure a commonality of understanding for subsequent discussion, the blurred distinction between ethics and morality must be examined. “Ethical acts are based on moral principles that are universal because they incorporate fundamental values such as truth, goodness, beauty, courage and justice”.¹³ However, differing cultural interpretation of values, coupled with the revisionist nature of cultural norms, suggests there is no universal application of right and wrong, resulting in a fluid and contested definition of morality.¹⁴ This paper will associate morality with the principles associated with discerning good human behaviour from bad human behaviour.

13. Mendonca and Kanungo, *Ethical Leadership*, 11.

14. Norman, *Ethics, Killing and War*, 3.

Ethics, by contrast, bridges character, custom and spirit to define virtuous behaviour.¹⁵ This paper will associate the term ethics with the Aristotelian and Thomist traditions of utilising reason and good intentions to pursue virtue and character.¹⁶ Establishing an overt link between leadership and ethics, General Schwarzkopf succinctly offers a grass-roots interpretation: “Leadership is a potent combination of strategy and character. If you must be without one, be without the strategy”.¹⁷

15. Peter Vardy and Paul Grosch, *The Puzzle of Ethics* (London: Fount Paperbacks, 1999), 4.

16. John Mothershead, *Ethics: Modern Conceptions of the Principles of Right* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955), 288.

17. Strategic Studies Institute. “Character Development of US Army Officers.” Accessed 15 February, 2017. www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a589452.pdf

Chapter 1 - Ethics Based Leadership

Before examining ethical leadership, it is necessary to orientate the concept within the wider framework of values based leadership. Copeland asserts that the plethora of values based leadership theories that have emerged over the past decade are a direct reaction to a recent plague of immoral conduct in the public and private sector. A renewed focus on leadership ethics and morality is the natural by-product.¹⁸ Values based leadership, at its core, is a recognition that even the most captivating and vibrant leaders require a set of responsible values to protect against ethical misjudgement. Avolio and Gardner sub-divide values based leadership into four component parts: authentic, transformational, ethical and spiritual.¹⁹

This notion can be further developed to insist that for values based leadership to be successful, there must be correspondence between the values of a leader and the cultural values of the organisation. If these are not aligned, ethical divergence can create moral ambiguity.²⁰ Therefore, the establishment of core values provide a moral golden thread between leader performance, follower discernment and organisational climate.²¹ Notably, the specific values that comprise an organisational moral code will be linked to role morality whereby the nature and output of the organisation will shape the weighting and prioritisation of specific values.

Brown and Trevino argue that values based leadership is an ethically insufficient theory to meet the intimidating demands of leadership in the 21st Century,

18. Mary Copeland, "The Emerging Significance of Values Based Leadership," *International Journal of Leadership Studies* Vol 8, No 2 (2014): 105.

19. Bruce Avolio and William Gardner, "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership," *The Leadership Quarterly* Vol 16 No 3 (2005): 315-321.

20. Jorge Fernandez and Robert Hogan, "Values Based Leadership", *The Journal for Quality and Participation* Vol 25 No 4 (2002): 25.

21. Robert Lord, Roseanne Foti and Christy De Vader, "A Test of Leadership Categorisation Theory: Internal Structure, Information Processing and Leadership Perceptions," *Organisational Behaviour and High Performance* Vol 34 (1984): 345-351.

whereby having a set of values is different from inculcating those values into every aspect of the organisation.²² Ethical leadership, by contrast, explicitly demands a positive engagement with the ethical behaviour of subordinates and to demonstratively put the interests of others before self. The antecedent lineage of ethical leadership can be traced back to the notion of reciprocal determinism within Bandura's Social Learning Theory. Published in 1976, Bandura observed that ethical actions stimulate arapid desire to emulate. Consequently, the contagion of ethical role models can transform a working environment and grow more ethically aware leaders.²³ This is echoed by Kanungo's contention that building a moral environment that encourages reciprocal ethical behaviour should be the primary responsibility of all leaders.²⁴ Den Hartog et al. went further to suggest a direct correlation between the mere perception of ethically grounded action and leadership effectiveness.²⁵

Turning perception into reality, McClelland and Burnham assert that leadership can only be truly effective when a leader is principally motivated by moral altruism, whereby practical wisdom trumps affiliative egotism.²⁶ Rooted in Pericles as the exemplar of phronesis²⁷ and sophrosyne,²⁸ ethical leaders display reasoned prudence and a sense of higher societal purpose to envisage "what is good for themselves and for people in general"²⁹. Pioneering an academic bow wave in the early 2000s promoting the importance of turning moral managers into ethical role models by stimulating cognitive trust, Trevino, Hartman and Brown focused on the importance of an ethical core, in both a personal and professional context, as prerequisite qualities for sustainable effective leadership.³⁰

22. Michael Brown and Linda Trevino, "Ethical Leadership: A review and future directions," *Leadership-Quarterly* Vol 17 No 3 (2006): 597-603.

23. Albert Bandura, *Social Learning Theory* (London: Pearson, 1976), 33-41.

24. Rabindra Kanungo, "Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders," *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* Vol 18 No 4 (2001):257-260.

25. Deanne Den Hartog, Robert House, Paul Hanges et al. "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: are attributes of charismatic transformational leadership universally endorsed?," *The Leadership Quarterly* Vol 10 No 2 (1999):219-226.

26. David McClelland and David Burnham, "Power is the Great Motivator," *Harvard Business Review* (January-February 1995):129.

27. Practical wisdom to balance personal judgement against a gathered wealth of varied experience.

28. Temperance, moderation and prudence within character excellence.

29. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. J Thomson (London: Penguin, 2004), 150.

30. Linda Trevino, Laura Hartman and Michael Brown. "Moral Person and Moral Manager: How executives develop reputations for ethical leadership?," *California Management Review* Vol 42 (2000): 128-130.

Establishing a link between ethical erosion within an organisation and reduced employee satisfaction and commitment, Kalshoven's Ethical Leadership at Work (ELW) measurement identifies the following ethical leadership criteria: impartiality, integrity, empowerment through power sharing, clarity and sustainability.³¹ The most recent academic contributions to this field assert that ethical leadership offers the most stringent forecast of team effectiveness, trumping the once heralded authentic and transformational leadership approaches.³² However, the combination of authentic, charismatic, transformational and ethical is an optimal leadership balance. This blend places morality at the heart of the organisation and ensures that the transformational energy is channelled down an ethical path. A highly dynamic, authentic and transformational leader that lacks moral substance is a toxic recipe. Against this academic backdrop, how has the British Army, grounded in servant leadership, adapted to this changing landscape?

As the spiritual home of British Army officership, the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst (RMAS) maintains a global reputation as a prominent, effective and envied centre of excellence for leadership development. The RMAS post-WW2 principal objective was the "development of the cadet's character, his powers of leadership and a high standard of individual and collective discipline".³³ The ethical expectation within this 1947 aim is mirrored some 70 years later with the current serve to lead mantra, branded on uniforms, cap badges, documentation and flags; thus illuminating a clear sense of selflessness and subordinate development.³⁴

31. Karianne Kalshoven, Deanne Den Hartog and Annebelde Hoogh, "Ethical Leadership at Work (ELW) Questionnaire: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure," *The Leadership Quarterly* Vol 32 No 1 (2011):51-69.

32. Copeland, "The Emerging Significance of Values Based Leadership", 123-124.

33. Alan Shepherd, Sandhurst (London: Hamlyn, 1980), 159.

34. The ongoing #beabetteryou and #belonging advertising campaigns inculcate an implied moral purpose.

“The servant leader is a servant first. It begins with a natural feeling that one wants to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead.”³⁵ With overt Judaeo-Christian linkages, serve to lead appears an effective ethical cornerstone that supports the moral component through character development.³⁶ Indeed, overt Sixteenth Century Christian ethics continued to provide a fundamental shapingfunction for military life, deep into the 20th Century. For example, an extract from Queen’s Regulations in 1971 reinforces this point: “all those who exercise authority should set a good example in order to lead others to an intelligent acceptance of Christian principles in the life of the Armed Forces”.³⁷

The much-hyped secular, liberal and multi-cultural revolution of the 1960s created a new ethical order that would test, for better or worse, the Army’s reputation as a moral community. A conflation between rising academic research into ethical leadership, coupled with an emerging post-Christian culture, motivated the British Army to codify an evolving moral code that retained meaning within a changing ethical environment. The British Army ethical counter-punch began in 1993 with the publication of a general instruction³⁸ that weaved together the moral dynamics of military law, personal behaviour and societalexpectation. A positive correlation was made between high institutional ethics and high operational ethics whereby leadership was the golden thread to ensure moral consistency.³⁹ Latterly, the Military Covenant, first published in 2000, sought to articulate a psychological contract between the Clausewitzian trinity of state, soldiers and society. The Military Covenant made it clear that the Armed Forces do not possess an absolute right to be different, thus emphasising ethical conduct as the means to support the moral component of fighting power.

35. Robert Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), 27.

36. The Letter of St Paul to the Philippians, Chapter 2, bounds the notion of servant leadership with humility, sincerity, self-sacrifice, obedience, service, duty and a higher purpose. Also, Matthew 20:28: “just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many”. The Bible (King James Version).

37. Queen’s Regulations 1971 (London: HMSO, J1427).

38. The Discipline and Standards Paper. *The Military Ethos (The Maintenance of Standards)* – MOD (Army) 1993.

39. Patrick Mileham, “Teaching Military Ethics in the British Armed Forces,” in *Ethics Education in the Military* ed. Paul Robinson, Nigel de Lee and Don Carrick (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), 48.

Also first published in 2000, the British Army Values and Standards handbook sought to articulate the institutional moral baseline.⁴⁰ Importantly, the language migrated away from one of ethics and morality in favour of a more neutral lexicon concerning ethos, values and morale. This allows for an avoidance of instruction in academic, potentially abstract, ethical philosophy, in favour of a focus on applied and practical spirit and character.⁴¹ Given that ethics is a form of practical philosophy whereby the necessary art is more concerned with production over action, deepening the education of ethics is therefore a viable avenue. To that end, the current British Army ethics pedagogical bypass policy is worthy of further examination.

“The focus of ethics education shifts from character development to creating an understanding of the purpose and methods of the profession and the values which underpin it”.⁴² This quotation advocates a cognitive shift within the British Army, encouraging the study of ethical theory as a mechanism to deepen the practical understanding of the core values. However, a desire to minimise abstract theory in favour of pragmatic and functional understanding must be balanced against the danger of a wave top pedagogy that unconsciously favours osmosis whereby ethics education is caught not taught. Deakin asserts that the veneer cognitive study of ethics at RMAS divorces the ethical nature of the institution from the required ethical leadership skillset demanded of its newly commissioned graduates. It is dangerous to assume moral absolutism and cultural relativism.⁴³ The clear synergistic overlap between spiritual,⁴⁴ ethical and servant leadership, most notably within the disciplined military context, stresses that officers and soldiers are altruistically duty bound to be proactive moral managers. Aligning motivation and moral origins, there is a practical rationality for establishing a formal ethical framework from which to hang ethics education.

40. Values and Standards, Ministry of Defence, The Stationary Office, 2000.

41. Stephen Deakin, “Education in an Ethos at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst,” in *Ethics Education in the Military* ed. Paul Robinson, Nigel de Lee, Don Carrick (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008): 19-21.

42. Paul Robinson, “Introduction: Ethics Education in the Military”, in *Ethics Education in the Military* ed. Paul Robinson, Nigel de Lee and Don Carrick (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), 1.

43. Deakin, “Education in an Ethos at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst,” 16.

44. Spiritual, in this sense, contends that everyone has a spirit and is therefore not necessarily a religious reference. Think of spirit like you think of health. Your health can be good or poor but never absent; the same applies for spirituality.

“To be truly successful, a leader must be committed to enforce ethical behaviour. Understanding and clarifying standards of ethical behaviour thus become critical to leadership success”.⁴⁵ Against this backdrop, it is argued that the British Army would benefit from adopting a normative theoretical ethical framework to support military ethics education within leadership development. Deakin neatly contends that RMA has a deeply formative ethical effect on the Officer Cadets, the pity is that most are left unaware of how or why.⁴⁶ Similarly, Mileham suggests that the British Army has an excellent track record in learning about the limitations and freedoms of morality, but a poor track record of teaching military ethics in a meaningful way.⁴⁷ Anchoring some intellectual muscle memory and introducing a common ethical language will better equip service personnel for an altruistic life of duty and sacrifice that will inevitably present wicked ethical dilemmas to rationalise. Noting the important bedrock properties of ethical theory as a catalytic ingredient to develop ethical decision making within the military, the next chapter will analyse ethical theory in more detail.

45. Janis Karpinski, “Ethical behaviour and ethical challenges in the complex security environment,” in *Ethical Decision Making in the New Security Environment* ed. Emily Spence and Daniel Lagace-Roy (Winnipeg: Canadian Defence Academy, 2008), 93.

46. Deakin, “Education in an Ethos at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst,” 27.

47. Mileham, “Teaching Military Ethics in the British Armed Forces,” 43.

Chapter 2 - Ethics Theory

Quoting American philosopher William James, Mileham writes: “There is nothing more practical than good theory”.⁴⁸ This provides a useful frame of reference when discussing the utility of normative ethics theory within a deeply anchored heuristic approach to military ethics education. Prior to evaluating the efficacy of introducing the education of ethics theory to help build moral armour and moral autonomy, it is important to make a distinction between ethical dilemmas and tests of integrity. The challenge within a true ethical dilemma is balancing and rationalising the competing considerations to determine the right decision; commonly associated with reference to determining the least-worst option. By contrast, the inherent difficulty within a test of integrity refers to the challenge of actually having to do the right thing.⁴⁹ Knowing what the right thing to do is, and then doing the right thing, forms the hierarchical key-chain that supports ethical decision making. Since this research paper is more aligned with pump-priming the education of ethical considerations within a military context, the focus will predominantly align with ethical dilemmas.

Ethics is commonly bracketed into three domains: normative ethics, meta-ethics and applied ethics. Normative ethics concerns the moral determination and debate involved in reaching a practical ethical decision whereas meta-ethics offers a deeply philosophical, acculturative and abstract approach to morality, unconcerned with prescribing human behaviour.⁵⁰ By contrast, the discipline of applied ethics focuses on the obligated application of moral behaviour within a specific professional environment. Noting the focus of this work is on improving the purposeful standards of ethical action, normative ethics will be studied in more detail. Prioritising the consideration between consequences,

48. Ibid, 55.

49. Stephen Coleman, “Ethical Dilemmas and Tests of Integrity,” in *Key Concepts in Military Ethics* ed. Deane-Peter Baker (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2015), 8-10.

50. Vardy and Grosch, *The Puzzle of Ethics*, 110.

principles or character broadly sub-divides normative ethics into three disciplines: consequentialist, deontological and virtue based.⁵¹ This paper will review the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, before determining the most appropriate theoretical scaffolding to help build future military ethics education in the British Army.

Contending that consequences are the primary decision making consideration, perhaps the most logical theory to understand is consequentialism. Inspired by Jeremy Bentham's view of pleasure and pain as the two sovereign masters, ethical correctness is governed by maximising happiness for the greatest number and minimising pain for the fewest. This notion of maximising utility has allowed 'utilitarianism' to dominate the consequentialist debate.⁵² Although seemingly intuitive, there are a number of challenges associated with a utilitarian calculus that allows the ends to justify the means, especially from a military perspective.

Divorcing outcomes from motives, although morally logical, can lead to ethical cul-de-sacs and may not offer firm ground when trying to appease your conscience after an event. Similarly, the unpredictable nature and fast tempo of military events removes the epistemic certainty to accurately predict the second and third order consequences of any given action.⁵³ Another danger of this approach is slipping towards ethical egoism whereby one, consciously or sub-consciously, prioritises personal utility which could be at odds with the selfless nature of military service.⁵⁴ Lastly, a strictly utilitarian reasoning model creates an analytical reliance that could constrain a flash of military brilliance and intuition within a military planning cycle.⁵⁵ In this sense, operational art and consequentialism are not necessarily mutually reinforcing.

51. Stephen Coleman, *Military Ethics* (Oxford: University Press, 2013), 12.

52. Deane-Peter Baker, *Key Concepts in Military Ethics* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2015), 12-13.

53. David Whetham, *Ethics, Law and Military Operations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 12-13.

54. Baker, *Key Concepts in Military Ethics*, 17.

55. Interview with Paul Grosch on 7 March, 2017.

Derived from the Greek *deon*, meaning duty, the deontological approach shapes ethical behaviour through an adherence to rules and duties. “Deontological ethical reasoning stresses that ends cannot be used to justify means; one must do the right thing for the right reason, regardless of what the consequences may be”.⁵⁶ Immanuel Kant’s categorical imperative provides the most prevalent theory within the deontological school. Driven by a desire to avoid logical contradiction, Kant argues for a neutrality of actions whereby behaviour is guided by a maxim that those actions could become universal law.⁵⁷ Practical reason allows human behaviour to deviate from the laws of nature and create autonomous rules-based norms that govern the conduct of humanity. This responsibility to follow a moral code, according to Kant, enshrines moral agency as the highest ethical duty.⁵⁸ “Kant holds that everyone can use the categorical imperative to reason out what they ought to do in particular cases and to see also why they ought to do it”.⁵⁹

The common problems associated with a rules-based approach to ethics include a failure to properly consider consequences and, at times, the production of a counterintuitive result where rules may inhibit a rational response. Pioneered by Thomas Aquinas, the Doctrine of Double Effect builds a conceptual framework reliant on moral agency, proportionality and good intentions to dilute the potential counterintuitive nature of deontological ethics.⁶⁰ From a military perspective, this applies to collateral damage assessments and the use of lethal force in self-defence. However, trying to overlay a set of rules to an ever changing operational context is laced with complexity.⁶¹

56. Whetham, *Ethics, Law and Military Operations*, 14.

57. Jerome Schneewind, “Autonomy, Obligation and Virtue: An Overview of Kant’s Moral Philosophy,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Kant* ed. Paul Guyer (Cambridge: University Press, 1993), 322.

58. Paula Keating, “Deontological Ethics,” in *Key Concepts in Military Ethics* ed. Deane-Peter Baker (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2015), 19-20.

59. Jerome Schneewind, *The Invention of Autonomy* (Cambridge: University Press, 1998), 522.

60. Coleman, *Military Ethics*, 22.

61. This paper will return to this theme in Chapter 5: The Contemporary Operating Environment.

By contrast, “virtue ethics focuses on the character of the moral agent”.⁶² Rather than concentrating on the consequence of decisions, the principles that govern action or the obligatory duties that must be followed, the backbone of virtue ethics is centred on developing a virtuous character disposition. It can be summarised as “not what I ought to do, but rather what sort of person ought I to be”.⁶³ Seizing on the circular nature of identity and action, noting that the logical way to express the sort of person you are is through the sort of acts that you perform, virtue ethics attempts to reverse the modern trend that allows being to be relegated below doing.⁶⁴

Virtue ethics demands a different mindset to the previously discussed approaches; the attitude is focused on achieving what is good rather than avoiding what is bad. Virtues, and therefore by implication character, can be developed, shaped, grown and nurtured. “To be virtuous is to possess the disposition to act virtuously, and the practical wisdom to know how and when to do so”.⁶⁵ Aristotle identified two types of virtues, moral and intellectual, that both depend on reason to guide action. Coupled with Aristotle’s distinction that virtues protect against unethical acts and ethical misjudgements by allowing desires to become obedient to reason, it is unsurprising that character development is an appealing and common feature of military training.⁶⁶ On face value, the strong linkage to servant-leadership, ethical leadership theory and the centrality of core values, signpost virtue ethics as the most appropriate vehicle to deliver a specified ethics educational pathway within the British Army.

However, it is likely that certain aspects within each of the three distinct approaches to normative ethics will appeal to most readers. Of course consequences matter. Of course we should adhere to a moral code that prevents individuals being treated as a means to an end. Of course strong character is attractive. Writing in 1989, Held promotes a rational smorgasbord approach

62. Coleman, *Military Ethics*, 24.

63. Vardy and Grosch, *The Puzzle of Ethics*, 113.

64. Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (London: Duckworth, 2006), 226-228.

65. Kenan Malik, *The Quest for a Moral Compass: A Global History of Ethics* (London: Atlantic Books, 2014), 37.

66. Peter Olsthoorn, *Military Ethics and Virtues: An interdisciplinary approach for the 21st Century* (Oxon: Routledge, 2011), 4.

to the application of ethical theory, advocating the selection of a particular theory depending on the context, nature or domain of the ethical dilemma.⁶⁷ In isolation, each theory will never provide the necessary information aperture. It is ostensibly difficult to separate a fiercely hierarchical organisation like the British Army, with rules, duty and discipline at its heart, from a duty-based approach to ethics. As such, deontological theories could be appropriate when drafting policy, consequentialist theories could be appropriate at the strategic and operational level and virtues are highly relevant for training and educating desired tactical actions.

Described as ethical triangulation, “the idea is to take a bearing from each of the main approaches to ethics when considering an ethically challenging question”.⁶⁸ Teaching ethical leadership and ethical theory triangulation will provide a functional theoretical framework to structure the delivery of ethics education in the British Army.⁶⁹ Promoting a form of ethical pluralism to guide a pro-social decision making process, Gosling contends that moral maturation builds internal recognition to assist the process of choosing the most appropriate course of action.⁷⁰ Recognising the various ethical lenses that will interpret dilemmas from a different perspective offers a powerful frame of reference to design an ethical educational pathway for the British Army. Motivating ethical pluralism is a necessary stepping-stone towards creating moral autonomy.

The British Army introduces ethical theory to Officer Cadets at RMAS. This is re-exposed to newly promoted Majors on the Intermediate Command and Staff Course (Land) and then again to newly promoted Lieutenant Colonels on the Advanced Command and Staff Course. The establishment of a General

67. Virginia Held, *Rights and Goods: Justifying Social Action* (Chicago: University Press, 1989), 3-5.

68. Baker, *Key Concepts in Military Ethics*, 36.

69. The navigational metaphor linking ethical triangulation and the moral compass will be deepened in Chapter 6.

70. Interview with Jonathan Gosling on 23 March, 2017

Staff Centre, a Centre for Army Leadership and close ties with the Kings College London Centre for Military Ethics provides a through-career ethics education architecture. Explicitly linking ethical theory to ethics based leadership and ensuring that the level of philosophical engagement is tailored and escalated for each rank will add meaning to the current pathway of ethics education. Importantly, a similar through-career architectural framework must be replicated for Other Ranks and Non-Commissioned Officers.

Having framed the importance of ethics based leadership within a changing political and societal landscape, examined the British Army's doctrinal reaction and reviewed the dominant ethics theories, this paper will now focus on the values of the British Army. By examining the ethical underpinning of the values, with a particular focus on the interlocutor properties of loyalty and courage, this paper will seek to determine if the current approach to educating values generates sufficient moral cohesion to inculcate an inspirational spirit that maintains morale and binds ethos.

Chapter 3 - Values

Re-published in 2008, the Values and Standards booklet has ostensibly become an ethical manifesto for the British Army. At its core are two central tenets: (1) soldiers and officers transform into better soldiers and officers with the adoption of these values: courage, discipline, respect for others, integrity, loyalty and selfless commitment; (2) the Service Test, governing the social conduct of military personnel, empowers commanders to intervene in the personal lives of subordinates when their actions harm the Army.⁷¹ Here, the utilitarian Service Test rubs against the holistic morality of values-based virtue ethics. Because man is a moral being, events involving human behaviour are rarely linear and simplistic. In certain circumstances values will compete with each other for primacy or even compete on their own axis. Loyalty to a comrade can press against loyalty to the unit. Courage can creep into recklessness or drift into cowardice. Conflict can manifest itself between personal and collective morality.

Writing in 2015, McCormack contends that the British Army fails to adequately ground its Values and Standards “on an ethical good”⁷² or to sufficiently elucidate the “ethical principles from which those values may be derived, explained or defended”.⁷³ Without a credible foundational authority, it is seemingly impossible to accurately predict the shrapnel danger zone when the relative subjectivity of the British Army values collide. MacIntyre reminds us of the antecedent lineage of this ethical dilemma through Sophocles’ classical tragedian portrayal of Antigone. Forced to prioritise love and respect for her brother, over loyalty and obedience to her royal father and the state, Antigone decides to honour her deceased brother and thus defy her father. In this example, Antigone’s virtues were at war with each other.⁷⁴ Overlaying this evergreen tension and ethical arm-wrestle between and within the British Army values, it is evident that a single, ordered, harmonious and

71. The Service Test is: Have the actions or behaviour of an individual adversely impacted or are they likely to impact on the efficiency or operational effectiveness of the Army or Unit?

72. Phillip McCormack, “Grounding British Army Values upon an Ethical Good,” Executive Committee of the Army Board (ECAB) Paper (March 2015), A-2.

73. *Ibid.*, A-2.

74. MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 142.

aligned values structure will not exist within a competing moral sphere. To that end, can the values and standards of the British Army, as expressed in Figure 1.1, sufficiently engender moral character?

Ser (a)	Values (b)	Standards (c)
1	Courage	Lawful
2	Discipline	Appropriate Behaviour
3	Respect for Others	Total Professionalism
4	Integrity	
5	Loyalty	
6	Selfless Commitment	

Figure 1.1: Values and Standards

Values represent internalised beliefs that should manifest themselves in visible standards.⁷⁵ Williams argues that without an overt and specified ethical underpinning of Army values, the official language of values and standards is both practically and intellectually naked in the context of ethical dilemmas: “instead of addressing the unavoidable, the design is to ignore it and then apologise for it later”.⁷⁶ In an attempt to overcome this cynical representation, the Army has published a Values and Standards handbook, written a leadership doctrine⁷⁷ and updated the Military Annual Training Test 6 (MATT 6).⁷⁸ The purpose of MATT 6 is to explain how values underpin the ethos and combat effectiveness of the British Army, highlighting that the values “require moral validity in order to maintain their value and it is this moral element that must be explained”.⁷⁹

The British Army ‘Values and Standards’ handbook resonates this sentiment but the following extracts are worthy of further examination and scrutiny: (1) “values are the moral principles – the intangible character and spirit – that

75. General James Bashall, “The Ethical Foundation for the British Army’s Values and Standards,” ECAB Paper – Covering Note, (March 2015), 2.

76. Andrew Williams, *A Very British Killing: The Death of Baha Mousa* (London: Vintage, 2013), 291.

77. “The Army Leadership Doctrine seeks to provide every leader in the Army with a foundation in leadership theory”. *Army Leadership Doctrine*, Edition 1, MOD (September 2016).

78. Module A of MATT 6 is ‘Values and Standards’. It is a mandatory requirement for all officers and soldiers, regardless of rank and appointment, to complete this training on an annual basis.

79. *Military Annual Training Test 6*, MOD (April 2008), 1.1.

should guide and develop us into the sort of people we should be”;⁸⁰ (2) that the British Army must uphold “the moral virtues and ethical principles that underpin any decent society”.⁸¹ This author aligns with Deakin to contend that this overtly laced moral relativity and ethical ambiguity presents more questions than it answers.⁸² What sort of people should we be? What defines and comprises any decent society? What defines the good life? What is standard in relation to human endeavour? This reinforces the need to underpin the values with ethical bedrock. As a consequence of these rhetorical questions, the blurred lines between values and ethics can allow organisational efficiency to trump moral good.⁸³ Accepting that human behaviour echoes and creates new norms, making an assumption that soldiers and officers organically and equally understand generic moral value appears inherently dangerous.

In an effort to starkly expose the hazards of perceiving a common understanding and representation of moral value, McCormack’s hypothetical experiment overlays the British Army values onto the so-called Islamic State (IS). This reveals that five of the six core values can be shared between the two vastly different organisations.⁸⁴ IS fighters continue to demonstrate physical and moral courage to attack superior forces that have considerable advantage in military equipment and fire power. President Obama, speaking in 2014, accepted that his administration underestimated the military discipline and resilience of IS to adapt and gain tactical success.⁸⁵ Linked to courage, the willingness of IS fighters to fanatically die for their cause can be interpreted, regardless of the perceived irrationality of the motive, as an expression of both loyalty and selfless commitment.

80. Values and Standards of the British Army, MOD (2008) AC63813, 2-3.

81. *Ibid.*, 2.

82. Stephen Deakin, “Ethics and the British Army’s Values and Standards,” *The British Army Review* No 140 (2006), 39.

83. Bashall, “The Ethical Foundation for the British Army’s Values and Standards,” 2.

84. McCormack, “Grounding British Army Values Upon an Ethical Good,” A-8.

85. CBS News. “Obama: US underestimated rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria.” Accessed 21 March, 2017. <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/obama-u-s-underestimated-rise-of-isis-in-iraq-and-syria/>

In terms of integrity, IS has remained steadfast and truthful to itself over the determination, at whatever abhorrent cost and however long it takes, to secure an Islamic Caliphate; “the death throes of the caliphate will therefore take time”.⁸⁶ By contrast, the IS mindset and *modus operandi* is physically and conceptually divorced from the notion of respect for others. The mini-conclusion derived from this deconstruction reveals that without an ethical foundation, values can be interpreted differently and their meaning conveniently distorted to add relative strength to a particular organisational ethical narrative. This conveys a risk to the British Army.

The concept of loyalty provides a useful frame of reference to deepen the implications of competing values within a military setting. Conspicuous by its absence from the cardinal virtues championed by Plato and Aquinas, loyalty can be regarded as a grey virtue, highlighting the tension between a notion that is difficult to define, and yet one that is commonly regarded as a key building block for character development.⁸⁷ Miller expands this discussion, contending that loyalty “can serve good and bad causes alike”⁸⁸ whereby “misplaced loyalty is still loyalty”.⁸⁹ Although the concept of whistleblowing is out of scope for this paper, the motives driving a decision centred on a potentially disloyal act define the magnitude of contemptibility. Likewise, the perceived loyalty of a conscientious objector will depend on the competing triangular interpretation of character, motivation and loyalty. Reinforcing the human aspect of ethics, pregnant with emotion, sentiment and reason, it is the conflict between expressing loyalty to a group or individual versus loyalty to a principle that exposes a fundamental debate within military ethics. Operating within an ethical vacuum, compounded by the fiercely tribal and hierarchical nature of group identity within the military, concentrates the difficulty in discerning between loyalty to a comrade over loyalty to a value. Moral cohesion and group cohesion can become a zero-sum game.

86. The Spectator. “The Truth about Islamic State.” Accessed 21 March, 2017. <https://www.spectator.co.uk/2016/01/the-truth-about-islamic-state-its-in-crisis/>

87. Olsthoorn, *Military Ethics and Virtues: An interdisciplinary approach for the 21st Century*, 67-68.

88. William Miller, *The Mystery of Courage* (Cambridge: University Press, 2000), 8.

89. *Ibid.*, 8.

In 2008, the Aitken Report published its findings following an investigation into the alleged cases of deliberate abuse and unlawful killing in Iraq between 2003 and 2004. The report suggests a failure by a small number of Army personnel to live the required values and standards. Importantly, these failures were not just manifested by direct action on the ground at the tactical level but also out of combat during the follow-up Royal Military Police investigations in what the judge presiding over the Baha Mousa case referred to as “a wall of silence from some of those who gave evidence”.⁹⁰ In a misguided effort to protect individual reputation and group cohesion, “lying to the Service police, or having selective memory loss in court”⁹¹ highlighted an inability of some soldiers to balance integrity and loyalty. Aitken inferred these actions to be dis-loyal, whereby mis-interpretation of values led to a physical breakdown in standards. The notions of lawful and appropriate behaviour were undermined.⁹²

McCormack rejects Aitken’s elucidation by stating that the soldiers involved in the ‘wall of silence’ were consciously demonstrating their interpretation of loyalty.⁹³ This reinforces the results of a 2010 study into the junior soldier interpretation of values and standards that highlighted a concrete association between loyalty and its prioritised focus on comrades and the mission.⁹⁴ In sum, labelling any human behaviour as ‘appropriate’ without a predetermined ethical baseline will inevitably expose radically different understanding and foci. In an effort to counter this, the recently published Army Leadership Code explicitly captures the necessity for loyalty to establish a purposeful bridge to the interdependent values: “loyalty is not blind and must operate within the parameters of the other values”.⁹⁵

90. The Aitken Report, 24.

91. *Ibid.*, 24.

92. *Ibid.*, 25.

93. McCormack, “Grounding British Army Values Upon an Ethical Good,” A-11.

94. Charles Kirke, *The Understanding by Regular Junior Personnel of the Values and Standards of the British Army – Final Study Report* (Cranfield University, 2005), 11.

95. *The Army Leadership Code: An Introductory Guide*, First Edition, Director Leadership, AC72021, (2015), 9.

The notion of loyalty is ethically connected to the notion of courage, whereby the courage to act and the courage to do the right thing hold equal validity; “courage by definition cannot serve an unethical end”.⁹⁶ By acknowledging the role of physical courage and moral courage, the British Army accepts the important principle of doing the right thing, but again, without a clear ethical underbelly of understanding, knowing what the right thing is can remain an elusive aspiration.⁹⁷ Moran contends that courage, as a personal commodity, erodes through use.⁹⁸ This contradicts the traditional Aristotelian determination that courage can be learned and maintained through the habitual exposure to situations that encourage acts of courage; “we become brave by performing brave acts”.⁹⁹ In a military context, realistic training is used as a credible means to create and then reinvest a courageous dividend. Applying the same principles to moral courage reinforces the requirement of an educational pathway focused on how to think. Accepting that ethical muscles can be trained and conditioned creates value in formal ethics training to strengthen and retain memory within these ethical muscles. Bridging values and action, the next chapter examines the key considerations affecting the deepening of ethics education within the British Army.

96. James Toner, *Morals Under the Gun: The Cardinal Virtues, Military Ethics and American Society* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), 113.

97. Rushworth Kidder, *Moral Courage* (New York: Harper Collins, 2006), 10.

98. Lord Moran, *The Anatomy of Courage* (London: Constable, 1945), 66-71.

99. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, 32.

Chapter 4 - Educating Ethics

Using health care and policing as alternative frames of reference, it is instructive to shine a spotlight on how other organisations within the public sector are approaching the rising demand to train and educate ethics. Similar to the British Army, both the National Health Service (NHS) and the Metropolitan Police (MET) provide a higher-purpose, society-facing force for good, constantly wrestling over where to place the fulcrum on the contract versus covenant continuum. As such they are both considered to be credible comparators. In addition, there is an evergreen tension between moral value and economic cost. Using a phenomenological approach,¹⁰⁰ relatively recent initiatives within the NHS and the MET have refreshingly rejected the “direct correlation between calculative reason and practical action such that problems can be identified and then solved according to a theoretical construct”.¹⁰¹ Instead, the learning emphasis is placed on favouring the use of non-fictional case studies and fictional thought experiments as exemplars to tease-out the key lessons within an ethical dilemma. This embraces ambiguity and accepts the unlikelihood of identifying concrete right and wrong solutions.¹⁰²

Hadot sub-divides the human biographical journey into the categories of learning to live and then learning to die.¹⁰³ Between these spiritual bookends sits a plethora of medical ethical challenges, including assisted suicide, abortion and human genome mapping. The Masters (MA) in Health Care Ethics offered by the University College of St Mark and St John, sponsored by Derriford Hospital, Plymouth, exclusively uses a phenomenological approach to inject an overt philosophical and ethical-autopsy approach to learning.¹⁰⁴ This case-study

100. Grounded in the study of consciousness, this approach uses ethical scenarios to replicate multiple complexities within an ethical dilemma.

101. Paul Grosch, “Against the Utilitarian Grain: Alternative Approaches to Health Care Ethics,” *The Proceedings of the 21st World Congress of Philosophy – Volume 1 – Ethics* (Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey, 2007): 170.

102. “Thought experiments make us more rational by purging us of bias, circularity, dogmatism and other cognitive inefficiencies”. Roy Sorensen, *Thought Experiments* (Oxford: University Press, 1992), 5.

103. Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*, trans. M Chase (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 97.

104. Grosch, Interview.

method, rich in role-play, is echoed by a recent MET initiative. Launched in December 2016, the London Police Ethics Board reviews organisational ethical dilemmas in an open, transparent and challenging environment. To develop moral cross-fertilisation, any guidance and lessons that are exposed during this monthly meeting are circulated to all members of staff within the MET, the British Transport Police and the City of London Police.¹⁰⁵ Applying ethical triangulation to each vignette, these initiatives are inexpensive, inclusive and sufficiently empowering to allow moral messaging to penetrate the chain of command hierarchy. By adopting a similar ask, discuss, advise and develop construct, the British Army could place a greater focus on real-time ethical dilemmas, stimulating rational thought and the sharing of best-practice.

The British Army represents a fiercely hierarchical structure with a clear delineation between authority, accountability and responsibility. Noting that autonomy is not a natural bedfellow with authority, the challenge to create a culture of reflective and reasoned moral autonomy is daunting within a military context, but the rewards outweigh the risks. “People are morally autonomous if they live as morally reflective people, if they live by beliefs based on rationale they understand, beliefs that are open to correction or abandonment in the presence of good reason”.¹⁰⁶ Critics of moral autonomy might contend that military personnel should dutifully obey orders from their superiors to prevent a breakdown in discipline. Although speaking truth to power is an effective antibody, translating the slogan into practice is challenging.

Using a Kantian model, O’Neil contends that most audiences have been “restricted and defined by some authority”;¹⁰⁷ this is greatly inflated within the stubbornly hierarchical military context. Skilfully linking ethical leadership and

105. London Police Challenge Forum (LPCF) Post Event Information Pack, Police Code of Ethics, V0.2 (15 December, 2016).

106. Timothy Challans, *Awakening Warrior: Revolution in the Ethics of Warfare* (New York: University Press, 2007), 139.

107. Onora O’Neil, *Constructions of Reason: Explorations of Kant’s Practical Philosophy* (Cambridge: University Press, 1989), 34.

ethical autonomy, LaPorte and Consolini define good ethical leadership as the cornerstone to embrace reasoned dialogue and create a command environment that welcomes criticism and celebrates purposeful collaboration.¹⁰⁸ Using ethical theory as a catalyst to stimulate philosophical thinking is the gateway to educating a new breed of soldier and officer in how to think and thus the key to unlocking moral autonomy. Challans' following observation of the US Army is equally applicable to the British Army: "The military should replace its heteronomous ethical paradigm of centralised authority with a model of moral autonomy".¹⁰⁹

To arm soldiers with moral autonomy, Challans proposes a formalised modular three-step model of military ethics education. Step one is classified as ideology, whereby the organisation is required to transmit the expected values, standards, cultural norms, behaviours and principles that define its work ethic and outputs.¹¹⁰ Using doctrine, mandated annual training and corrective discipline, the current British Army approach to ethical ideological indoctrination is fit for purpose. On face value, soldiers can recite the Army values, the administrative and discipline reprimands for operating outside these guidelines are sufficiently transparent and the important linkages between team cohesion and operational effectiveness are clearly communicated.

Step two of Challans' model, lifted into the normative domain, promotes the use of philosophy and ethical theory to create a common lexicon, and more importantly, instil a sense of personal ratification and reason into the decision making process.¹¹¹ From a British Army perspective, this could involve the introduction of the predominant strands of normative ethical theory into the professional education syllabus at entry level phase one training establishments for all officers and soldiers enlisting into the regular or reserve force. A regular drumbeat of continuation training on subsequent command, leadership and management courses, both residential and electronically distributed, would prevent skill fade.

108. Todd LaPorte and Paula Consolini, "Working in Practice but not in Theory: Theoretical Challenges of High-Reliability Organizations," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* (1991): 19-22.

109. Challans, *Awakening Warrior: Revolution in the Ethics of Warfare*, 141.

110. *Ibid*, 164.

111. *Ibid*, 165.

The third level of Challans' model focuses on translating philosophical ethics into practical application: "philosophical ethics can help set the conditions so that people can exercise their moral autonomy".¹¹² Exploiting actual case-study vignettes, redacted as necessary, to look at the same ethical dilemmas through the lens of differing ethical theories, is an appropriate teaching mechanism to demonstrate moral agency. This approach aligns the moral capacity, moral motivation and moral intent to act. Encouraging active role-play allows a blended learning package that presents information in a variety of ways and confronts the potentially obstructive argument contending that philosophy is too abstract for inclusion within a military machine that prioritises action.

Moral autonomy allows soldiers and officers to act instinctively. After an act of physical courage or self-sacrifice, either on the battlefield or when acting as a first responder to an unfolding emergency situation, a military professional will often proclaim in the aftermath that the training just kicked in. As an example, Captain Mike Crofts and Staff Sergeant Tony Davis were the first on the scene after police officer Keith Palmer was fatally stabbed during a terrorist attack in the UK Parliament in March 2017.¹¹³ During a BBC News interview after the event, Captain Crofts indicated that his military training to remain calm under pressure and display physical courage to react in a selfless manner "just kicked in".¹¹⁴ Designing an educational pathway that seeks to generate moral autonomy enables these merited physical instincts to be replicated in the moral component.

112. Ibid, 166.

113. The Telegraph Online. "London Terror Attack." Accessed 18 April, 2017. <https://www.google.co.uk/amp/www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/03/23/two-former-war-veterans-first-scene-used-combat-first-aid-try/amp/>

114. BBC News. "London Attack." Accessed 19 April, 2017. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-39377966>

A hallmark of the military vocation, much like any profession, lies in its aptitude to self-regulate obedience to its core ethos. To that end, any amendments to the ethics curriculum within the British Army must be associated with a suitably robust assessment mechanism that tracks performance and achieves self-regulation. Writing about the inability of the United States Armed Forces to effectively appraise and measure the ethical behaviour of its service personnel, Immel concludes that an annual ethical fitness assessment is required to confirm ethical maturation.¹¹⁵ Immel uses the four cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude¹¹⁶ as the ethics rubric to scaffold scalable objective and subjective assessment criteria to each virtue. The resultant academic evaluation framework establishes the standards for assessing levels of performance.¹¹⁷ To encourage motivational adherence, Immel recommends linking the assessment to promotion and annual appraisal.¹¹⁸ Favouring a collective approach to security, delivered through coalition and partnership,¹¹⁹ there is merit in the British Army actively engaging in how likely partners, such as the United States, approach military ethics.

Kohlberg proposes six stages of moral growth, best summarised using the following escalatory questions: (1) How can I avoid punishment?; (2) what is in it for me?; (3) What will others think of my actions?; (4) What would happen if everyone acted in this way?; (5) What values must be upheld?; (6) Can these ethical principles be applied universally?¹²⁰ Linking Immel's vision of an ethical fitness test, Challan's three-step model for ethical education and Kohlberg's stages of moral development, the content of the annual ethical assessment could be weighted to align with rank, responsibility and wisdom. Initially, utilising the totemic status of military padres could be an effective moral catalyst for a discussion on how and when to inculcate moral autonomy.

115. August Immel, "The Need for an Ethical Fitness Assessment in the US Armed Forces," *Journal of Military Ethics* 15 No 1 (2016): 3.

116. For a more detailed summation of the cardinal values see Thomas Aquinas' seminal text *Summa Theologica* c.1268.

117. Immel, "The Need for an Ethical Fitness Assessment in the US Armed Forces," 7.

118. The content, style and applicability of introducing an ethical fitness assessment into the British Army could form part of a follow-on study to this paper. Notably, the annual physical fitness standard of the British Army is assessed through press-ups, sit-ups and a 1.5

119. National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015, MOD (November 2015),

120. Lawrence Kohlberg, "Resolving Moral Conflicts within the Just Community," in *Moral Dilemmas and Ethical Reasoning* ed. Carol Harding (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2010): 72-73.

The natural derivative of moral autonomy is moral equality.¹²¹ Walzer views moral equality through a battlefield lens, using Just War theory to indicate the critical importance of soldiers viewing their adversaries as equals to prevent ethical fade.¹²² McCormack echoes this view, advocating a requirement for all soldiers to understand that every human being, including enemy combatants, have an equal moral worth.¹²³ This author contends that moral equality, as a prerequisite for moral autonomy, enables the lived application of values and standards both on operations but also within the routine activities of running the business in-barracks. Having discussed the benefits of moral autonomy, the next section of this paper will overlay these findings onto the contemporary operating environment in order to test their validity and applicability.

121. Challans, *Awakening Warrior: Revolution in the Ethics of Warfare*, 162.

122. Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, 22-31.

123. McCormack, "Grounding British Army Values Upon an Ethical Good," 2.

Chapter 5 - Contemporary Operating Environment

The Clausewitzian dualism of a changing character of conflict within an enduring nature of war remains valid: “every age has its own kind of war, its own limiting conditions and its own peculiar preconceptions”. Army Doctrine Publication Land Operations, updated in March 2017, recognises the complex and dynamic character of the contemporary operating environment. The distinction between war and peace has become increasingly blurred, the battlefield is becoming progressively decentralised, the battle for the narrative has become decisive and information manoeuvre has become pervasive.¹²⁵ Importantly, this changing character is bound by an “expectation of military restraint, as well as the complexity of the legal context”.¹²⁶ Against this strategic context, Cornish demands that any military response within the land environment must contain the intellectual adaptability and practical agility to operate in an unfamiliar paradigm that lacks accustomed patterns or trends.¹²⁷ Nestled within a congested, cluttered, contested, connected and constrained battlespace,¹²⁸ that is increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous,¹²⁹ this chapter intends to frame an environment that demands a refreshed look at how the British Army educates the moral component. Using the concepts of asymmetric morality and courageous restraint, this paper will expose some specific challenges associated with moral responsibility in the contemporary operating environment.

“Arguably the world is becoming more complex with, inter alia, the rapid movement of ideas, people, capital and information”.¹³⁰ Hawley reflects that the close-quarter clearance of Argentinean positions during the Falklands War

124. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, trans. M Howard and P Paret (Princeton: University Press, 1989), 593.

125. Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) Operations, Land Warfare Development Centre, AC 71940 (March 2017), i.

126. *Ibid.*, i.

127. Paul Cornish, *Strategy in Austerity: the Security and Defence of the United Kingdom* (London: Chatham House, 2010), 16–21.

128. Future Character of Conflict (FCOC), Strategic Trends Programme, DCDC (February 2010), 21-25.

129. For more details on a VUCA world, see Dawna Jones, *The Leadership Challenges of VUCA: Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity* (London: Insight to Action, 2011), 1-29.

130. DCDC, Joint Concept Note 2/12: Future Land Operating Concept (London: MOD, 2012), 2.

would have been immediately recognisable to the rank and file of Wellington's and Haig's armies.¹³¹ Whilst the essential capability of the land component remains to fight adversaries, the modern battlefield is likely to require a soldier to perform a fight function alongside the functions of engage, secure and support.¹³² Coined a 'three block war', soldiers must now be prepared to confront the reality of acting as warriors and nation builders, rapidly escalating and de-escalating across the entire mosaic of conflict.¹³³ Peters neatly summarises the conundrum: "Officers will always need the killer instinct. But today, they also need the discipline of a saint, the insight of an anthropologist, and the acrobat's sense of balance".¹³⁴ In 2017, this challenge is not contained within the officer cohort, it pervades every rank in the British Army, commissioned and non-commissioned.

It is impossible to predict the exact contours that will map the character of the next land operation. However, analysing trends and anticipating the likely drivers of instability and conflict should allow tolerable adjustment to occur when the character is revealed. Urbanisation, globalisation, the rise of non-state actors, climate change, technological advancement, energy security and disease are only some of the factors that will shape the employment of land forces in the near term.¹³⁵ Retaining the decentralised execution benefits of a mission command philosophy, the contemporary operating environment will inevitably ask soldiers and officers at the lowest tactical level to decipher "wicked problems"¹³⁶ and "ethically insoluble dilemmas".¹³⁷ Facing assorted, rapidly changing, socially divisive and increasingly lethal threats, a modern soldier has to be

131. Alan Hawley, "People not Personnel: The Human Dimension of Fighting Power," in *The British Army, Manpower and Society into the Twenty-First Century* ed. Hew Strachan (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000), 216.

132. ADP Operations, 1-8.

133. General Charles Krulak, "The Strategic Corporal: Leadership in the Three Block War – Operation Absolute Agility," *Marines Magazine* (January 1999): 1-2.

134. Ralph Peters, *Fighting for the Future: Will America Triumph?* (Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 2001), xii.

135. *Global Strategic Trends – Out to 2045*, Strategic Trends Programme: 5th Edition, MOD (April 2014), xiii-xxiii.

136. Christopher Coker, *War in an age of Risk* (Cambridge: Polity, 2009), 128.

137. Marcus Schulzke, "Ethically Insoluble Dilemmas in War," *Journal of Military Ethics* Vol 12 No 2 (2013): 96.

more than the sum total of his training. “Moral responsibility for the soldier operating in such contexts and environments is not as straightforward as it might first appear”¹³⁸.

Operating without rules, inhibitions or limitations, Irwin argues that insurgents and terrorists hold a moral and legal advantage. The absence of principled obstacles creates moral asymmetry.¹³⁹ Post-modernism, through a westernised democratic lens, represents a post-truth society, riddled with misgivings, that helps to create a reluctance to reach into the narrative to test assumptions or facts.¹⁴⁰ This cognitive phenomenon serves to assist the longevity of a false assertion and can therefore indirectly support an adversarial propaganda campaign. Facing an opponent that lies, tortures and uses fear as a weapon exposes soldiers to starkly counter-cultural ideals. Without emotional understanding, moral confidence and ethical leadership, prolonged exposure can lead to ethical fade.

It is the role of the moral component to provide the moral armour to ensure that the forces opposing an adversary that flouts international law remain loyal to the laws and conventions that govern just war. Operating within a goldfish bowl, the connected power of social media forces soldiers to comprehend that their actions at the tactical level can be immediately broadcast to a global audience.¹⁴¹ This combination of increased moral responsibility within a highly complex and transparent counter-cultural operating environment expands the notion of the strategic corporal from the physical component into the moral component. This author contends that introducing the term strategic moral corporal into the lexicon will reinforce the reputational dangers associated with ethical misjudgement.

138. Nigel Crossey, “To what extent is the modern operational soldier responsible for his moral decisions?,” Farmington Institute (Harris Manchester College: Oxford University Press, 2006), 8.

139. General Sir Alistair Irwin, “The Ethics of Counter-Insurgency,” *British Army Review* 166 (Spring 2016): 123.

140. Christopher Nash, *The Unravelling of the Postmodern Mind* (Edinburgh: University Press, 2001), 77-81.

141. ADP Operations, i.

Demonstrating wider employability, greater utility and an awareness of the upstream conflict prevention qualities of defence engagement, the British Army has marked its transition out of a persistent era of campaigning by showing greater appetite for Short Term Training Team (STTT) deployments. Operating in a train, advise and assist capacity, land force elements have increased their international touchpoints in recent years. Although operating out of contact, officers and soldiers will still be exposed to counter-cultural ideologies, behaviours and norms that will manifest as alien moral code; the notion of a strategic moral corporal still prevails.

Kahneman asserts that individuals, by design and for advantage, depend on pre-formed and self-selected heuristic principles when confronted with a complex moral problem.¹⁴² Left unchecked, this sub-conscious approach can amount to the “emotional tail wagging the rational dog”.¹⁴³ Although a detailed analysis of the role of arousal in military decision making sits outside the scope of this paper, it is important to note that emotional understanding can be developed and trained so as to reduce the biased cognitive desire to favour rule of thumb verdicts over reasoned and deliberate judgement.¹⁴⁴ When deployed within a small team on a remote self-reliant STTT task, where pre-formed ethical principles do not apply, officers and soldiers will need to be equipped to face unfamiliar moral dilemmas with confidence. This moral self-reliance is built through training and education.

142. David Kahneman, *Thinking Fast and Slow* (London: Penguin, 2012), 7.

143. *Ibid*, 140.

144. Margaret Heffernan, *Willful Blindness* (London: Simon & Schuster, 2012), 58-60.

Rawls argues that military commanders should wear a metaphorical “veil of ignorance”¹⁴⁵ when considering an ethical dilemma to reduce the likelihood of unwittingly prioritising selfish motives. The notion of courageous restraint, widely employed by British troops in Helmand Province to limit collateral damage and avoid civilian casualties, offers a recent example of where political leaders and military commanders actively imposed cognitive conditions and restricted the allocation of battlefield resources. Within a cauldron of competing objectives, a requirement to maintain public support on the home front and preserve host-nation political support through the avoidance of civilian casualties, the British Army embraced a Socratic morality whereby sometimes “it is better to suffer harm than to do harm”.¹⁴⁶

Rooted in a perceived unselfish, but by no means harmless, trade-off between own force protection and the legitimacy of the mission, presents second-order ethical considerations that might be prevalent in future conflict within the contemporary operating environment that features war amongst the people.¹⁴⁷ Most notably, if one accepts Olsthoorn’s notion that “in modern war, the chances of psychological harm are a lot greater than the chances of physical harm”¹⁴⁸ the long-term mental health impact of courageous restraint remains unknown.¹⁴⁹ Grossman develops this notion further by examining the finite nature of emotional stamina and emphatically claiming that “98 percent of all soldiers in close combat will ultimately become psychiatric casualties”.¹⁵⁰

145. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), 137.

146. Challans, *Awakening Warrior: Revolution in the Ethics of Warfare*, 184.

147. Rupert Smith, *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World* (London: Penguin, 2005), 4.

148. Olsthoorn, *Military Ethics and Virtues: An interdisciplinary approach for the 21st Century*, 47.

149. The psychological impact on British Army personnel during the imposed period of ‘courageous restraint’ during the counter insurgency campaign in Afghanistan is outside the scope of this paper. It would be an interesting and revealing follow-on study. Notably, this work could be linked to the energetic public debate surrounding the mental health architecture for serving and retired military personnel.

150. Dave Grossman, *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society* (New York: Back Bay Books, 2009), 82.

Nevertheless, philosophically regulating the appropriate integration of ends and means is universally applicable both on the battlefield and in barracks. Likewise, the application of restraint at the strategic, operational and tactical level can be applied throughout the moral component to engender a reasoned approach that helps to frame and understand an ethical dilemma.¹⁵¹ As such, a structured military ethics pedagogical framework, based on vignettes to unpack ethical dilemmas, will create autonomous streams of consciousness that instinctively place primacy on the moral dimension of decision making.

Leading the opposing school of thought that adhering to battlefield ethics will result in hamstrung military tactics, Kaplan favours the *realpolitik* view of a Hobbesian world, loaded with unchangeable offensive, cruel and ruthless tendencies.¹⁵² This win at all costs mentality has a potent antecedent lineage to the Homeric age whereby compassion and ethical warfare played second-fiddle to a narrative that prioritised ends over means. Shakespeare's articulation of Hector's fatally unsuccessful pleading with Achilles for mercy neatly encapsulates this world view that might is right: "I am unarm'd; forgoe [sic] this vantage, Greek".¹⁵³ Similarly, Bourke contends that soldiers have insufficient emotional dividend to reinvest during a three block war scenario: "you can't stimulate and let loose the animal in man and then expect to be able to cage it up again at a moment's notice".¹⁵⁴ Common humanity, practicality and a clear conscience would all serve as an appropriate foil to this opposing view, and these traits can all be trained-in.

151. Challans, *Awakening Warrior: Revolution in the Ethics of Warfare*, 157.

152. Robert Kaplan, *Warrior Politics: Why Leadership Demands a Pagan Ethos* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), 102.

153. William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida* ed. Sam Johnson and Geo Steevens (London: D Deans, 1811), 135.

154. Joanna Bourke, *An Intimate History of Killing: Face-to-Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare*, (London: Granta, 2000), 187.

Providing an alternative perspective, it is instructive to consider the concept of supererogation to assess the dangers associated with soldiers applying moral heroism to go recklessly beyond the call of duty in pursuit of a moral good.¹⁵⁵ Whilst joining the Army and accepting the tenet of unlimited liability is a supererogatory act, it is important to note that unlimited moral heroism may have negative consequences. Soldiers must be trained that can may not always mean ought to. This applies on operations when the use of lethal force may be legal but morally unjustifiable. Equally, a conviction to apply minimum moral expectations to a given situation must be balanced against the cultural norms that govern the unique environment of each ethical dilemma. Asserting that “most people believe they are just, virtuous and moral”,¹⁵⁶ Tappin and McKay caution against an illusionary sense of moral superiority that can result in an irrational appetite to impose familiar behaviour. Covering the extremes of excessive morality, moral deficiency and moral superiority, a deeper understanding of moral reason will sufficiently lift consciousness to change the ethical narrative and consequently reduce moral error.¹⁵⁷

The intricacies of the contemporary operating environment place a sizeable individual moral demand on officers and soldiers. “It is assumed that individual responsibility is a term which speaks for itself. In reality, this is no insignificant assumption”.¹⁵⁸ Crossey’s remarks on the fallibility of individual responsibility provides a link to the following chapter that aims to unpack the utility of the term moral compass within a military framework. Individual responsibility sits at the heart of the quest for moral autonomy. The next chapter will explore how the responsibility for setting a bearing on a moral compass can be shared between the individual, the organisation and society.

155. David Heyd, *Supererogation: Its Status in Ethical Theory* (Cambridge: University Press, 1982), 1-12.

156. Ben Tappin and Ryan McKay, “The Illusion of Moral Superiority,” *Social Psychological and Personality Science* (2016): 1.

157. Challans, *Awakening Warrior: Revolution in the Ethics of Warfare*, 173.

158. Crossey, “To what extent is the modern operational soldier responsible for his moral decisions?,” 19.

Chapter 6 - The Moral Compass

A lack of responsibility allows most young children to live in a state of moral innocence and self-righteousness. Eventually, maturity, clarity and increased accountability will develop a moral awareness of right and wrong. However, this inevitable migration from moral innocence to morality is not the final destination. Through education, experience and wisdom, an authentic morality can be achieved.¹⁵⁹ It is commonly suggested that a moral compass is the best tool to help plot a safe and navigable route through complex ethical dilemmas. When serving as the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, General Krukak's 1996 definition of character informs that the notion of a moral compass is not a new phenomenon: "character can be described as a moral compass within one's self that helps us make right decisions even in the midst of the shifting winds of adversity".¹⁶⁰ Indeed, the following extract, taken from a media interview given by the then Chief of the General Staff, General Sir Richard Dannatt, in 2006, demonstrates that the British Army has been wrestling with a moral compass metaphor for over a decade:

"What I would hate is for the Army to be maintaining a set of values that were not reflected in our society at large. I think it is important as an Army entrusted with using lethal force that we do maintain high values and that there is a moral dimension to that and a spiritual dimension.

There is an element of the moral compass spinning. I am responsible for the Army, to make sure its moral compass is well aligned and that we live by what we believe in".¹⁶¹

Within a military construct, is the phrase 'rely on your moral compass' merely an overstated shibboleth?

159. Craig Nakken, *Finding Your Moral Compass: Transformative Principles to Guide you in Recovery and Life* (Minnesota: Hazelden, 2011): 223-225.

160. All Marines Message: Integrity. "Character." Accessed 19 April, 2017. <https://studylib.net/doc/11072415/ethics-for-the-marine-lieutenant-stockdale-center-for-eth>

161. The Daily Mail Online. "A Very Honest General." Accessed 10 March, 2017. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-410175/Sir-Richard-Dannatt--A-honest-General.html>

There is an obvious dichotomy between the precise navigational aide of a compass and the imprecise and artistic nature of ethics. Seemingly, expecting ethical precision or a degree of ethical exactness is a fool's errand. Ethics is a practical exercise, not a laboratory science, and caution should be applied to a perception that there is always a simple right answer awaiting once you have marched on a moral bearing to reach a destination.¹⁶² Given the large number of possible variables within a moral dilemma, there is danger associated with a desire to achieve ethical exactness. Indeed, Aristotle cautioned against anaspiration to apply metrics to ethical assumptions, noting that perception, induction, culture and habituation all compete to deny ethics a universally accepted position.¹⁶³ However, the navigational tone embedded within Aristotle's summation of the journey and search for an ethical arche¹⁶⁴ provides a useful jumping-off point to determine how useful a moral compass analogy is in the pursuit and maintenance of authentic and autonomous morality.

Three functional considerations are required prior to using a compass for reliable navigation: (1) Individual Compass Error; (2) Magnetic Deviance; (3) Magnetic Declination. Examining each in turn. Every compass has a specific variation, an individual compass error, whereby the north pointer is not exactly signalling magnetic north. Before using a compass it is necessary to determine the scale of this manufacturing divergence through a process of calibration so that future bearings can be adjusted to cater for the variance. Second, the sensitivity of a compass needle allows certain environmental factors, through a process of local magnetic attraction, to deviate the true compass bearing. Third, the difference between magnetic north and true north on a horizontal axis represents a magnetic declination angle that will vary depending on geographical location and this declination changes over time.¹⁶⁵

162. Grosch, Interview.

163. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, 17.

164. Beginning or starting point.

165. Ordnance Survey. "Using a Compass." Accessed 12 December, 2016. <https://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/getoutside/guides/beginners-guide-to-using-a-compass/>

Overlaying a moral compass analogy onto these variable tolerances is informative. There is an implicit navigational metaphor within an Aristotelian virtue that designs a narrow path signalling the dangers of deficiency on one side and excess on the other. Indeed, the similarities between the Greek word for human excellence or moral virtue, arete, and the noun for a steep sided mountain ridge, arête, deepen the metaphor.¹⁶⁶ Knowing the individual error of your internal moral compass will reduce the likelihood of wandering off into the vices that line the path and help maintain equidistance from the flanking immoderations. Moreover, the environmental and geographical nature of magnetic deviance and declination chime with the external pressures on a moral compass. Wilful blindness, peer pressure, cultural differences, bias, anxiety, psychological safety and fatigue all have an antagonistic relationship with ethical variance. Lastly, a combination of experience and wisdom can counter the impact of ethical declination. Whilst an exact ethical bearing is a misnomer, limiting the moral error, deviation and declination is advantageous to prevent slipping into the vices that line the virtuous path.

On balance, there is organisational merit for the British Army to use the term moral compass, but this must be packaged within a complementary ethical training design that places primacy on ethical theory and ethics based leadership. It is a truism that a small error in bearing will result in a significant deviation from the intended target destination. Indeed, the further away the destination, the greater the error. Consequently, having established some utility in the moral compass phraseology, it is necessary to establish who is responsible for setting and then checking the bearing on a moral compass. Using a buddy-buddy system, the British Army engrains the notion of a two-man check when conducting military manoeuvres. Prior to a patrol, the route card is checked. During the patrol, regular map-checks are conducted and a dedicated check-bearing is nominated. Following the patrol, an honesty trace is submitted to the higher formation headquarters to compare the planned and actual routes to help build an intelligence picture. To enable a moral compass to operate coherently, it is necessary to mirror the indoctrinated layers of scrutiny in the physical component of fighting power within the moral component. To deepen this analysis, this paper will examine the roles and responsibilities of the individual, the organisation and society in setting and checking a moral bearing.

166. Malik, *The Quest for a Moral Compass: A Global History of Ethics*, 36-37.

Gosling uses a 3 x Cs model to contend that a combination of Character, Company and Context play a central role in shaping individual decision making whereby morality is about choosing and then accepting the outcomes of those decisions.¹⁶⁷ To that end, the art of ethical judgement is not discerning what is right and wrong along a binary choice but rather the art of sufficiently understanding the cauldron of risk, values and duty that surround an ethical dilemma. This pursuit of psychological ethical safety within the 3 x Cs model, demands recognition of the complementary role and responsibility placed on the individual, the organisation and society in setting the most appropriate bearing on a moral compass. Using examples from the private and the public sector, this paper will seek to illustrate the moral dangers associated with an over-reliance on one actor to determine the bearing of a moral compass.

“Dubbed the biggest rogue trader in British history, Kweku Adoboli was convicted in 2012 for losing \$2.3 Bn of the Swiss bank UBS’s money”.¹⁶⁸ As a result of his immoral actions, more than 500 jobs were lost, UBS profit margins were slashed, the fragile reputation of the financial sector was further damaged, and, charged with fraud and false accounting, Adoboli was sentenced to seven years imprisonment. Held up by UBS as a “rotten apple in an otherwise clean industry”¹⁶⁹ the organisational hierarchy denied any corporate responsibility for his actions. Contrastingly, Adoboli maintains that his sole motivation was to enhance UBS profit, insisting that the senior leadership “actively encouraged his behaviour for more than two years when it was profitable”.¹⁷⁰

167. Gosling, Interview.

168. The Financial Times Online. “Kweku Adoboli.” Accessed 23 March, 2017. <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/b0350eac-3307-11e2-aa83-00144feabdco.html>

169. Kweku Adoboli Podcast. “Crime and Punishment.” Accessed 23 March, 2017. <http://podcast.ft.com/2015/10/22/the-crime-and-punishment-of-kweku-adoboli/>

170. Ibid.

Acting in a grey area trying to balance the profit demands of senior management within the complicated rules of fiscal compliance, Adoboli believed that his moral bearing was being subconsciously set by an organisational culture that prioritised profit over justice. This context allowed an individual to disregard personal morals in a misguided effort to follow a perceived organisational moral bearing, regardless of consequence. The result of this modern-day cautionary tale of cultural matching created a context that had negative connotations for both the individual and the organisation, thus proving that trust and loyalty can be a double-edged sword. From an opposing view, the opportunities and risks associated with allowing individuals to set the bearing on their own moral compass must be examined.

Created in 2006, Buurtzorg is a strictly non-hierarchical networked nursing organisation in the Netherlands where leaderless teams ensure that humanity stays above democracy to achieve optimal workforce autonomy. “Nine thousand nurses all work in small teams of ten to twelve nurses, without a leader in the team and with no manager above them”.¹⁷¹ From a position of implicit trust, innovatively using social media blogs to progress policy and utilising external mentors to help achieve resource arbitration when necessary, Buurtzorg is reinventing management principles. Within this context, responsible for the problem and the solution, the individual workers must each individually set the bearing on their moral compasses.

Whilst lacking formal leadership is not the same as lacking formal values, there is inherent risk associated with unconditionally delegating morality to the individual level within a complex medical environment rich in potential ethical dilemmas. “The mind is its own place, and in itself can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven”.¹⁷² This extract from Milton reminds us that whilst ultimate transparency and trust are bedfellows of a solid foundation from which to engender firm morals, a lack of hierarchy removes the opportunity for an organisation to provide accountability to the decision making process. In essence,

171. Buurtzorg Website. “General Information – About Us.” Accessed 18 April, 2017. <http://www.buurtzorgusa.org/about-us/>

172. John Milton, “Paradise Lost,” in John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose, ed. Merritt Hughes (New York: Odyssey Press, 1957), 254.

there is no formal structure to review the bearing on the moral compass and purposefully act to change the bearing if required. Having examined the role of the individual and the organisation in maintaining an ethical golden thread, this paper will now briefly unpack the role of society in relation to a moral compass. “Heroism often requires social support”.¹⁷³ The psychological transformation that occurred during Zimbardo’s famed Stanford Prison experiment was compelling and shocking. In less than a week, the guards had become aggressive, bullish and violent whilst the prisoners had become symbiotically anxious, depressed and hopeless. Prior disbelief had become desensitised. Zimbardo had proven that “bad systems, create bad situations, create bad apples, and create bad behaviours, even in good people”.¹⁷⁴ Whilst Zimbardo’s experiment examines the psychological effects of perceived authority and the immersive power of the situation and context, there is a subtext that points towards the important societal nature of the company we keep to prevent succumbing to the worst elements of an environment.

Rousseau overlays a notion of increased societal moral rot onto a growing appetite and dependency for individuals to have their self-esteem massaged by society.¹⁷⁵ This combination is inflamed by the connected and permissive nature of social media. The net result is a recipe for individuals to act in a manner that prioritises societal approval over motive, duty and consequence. Cognisant of a perceived ethical degeneration of society, there is an inherent danger in allowing society to monopolise the moral bearing of the military without organisational influence.¹⁷⁶ Zimbardo identifies “ambient anonymity as a precursor to violations of the social contract”.¹⁷⁷ The fiduciary relationship the British Army holds with society places an expectation on the Army to understand societal norms and thus design a recruitment and training engine that ensures a soft landing for recruits. Subsequently, the team centric nature of military life ensures that the British Army is well placed to replace ambient anonymity with team cohesion.

173. Philip Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect: How Good People Turn Evil* (London: Rider, 2009), 164.

174. *Ibid*, 445.

175. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile: Or, On Education* (New York: Basic Books, 1979), 5-22.

176. Interview with Jeremy Clare on 10 February, 2017.

177. Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect: How Good People Turn Evil*, 25.

The Adoboli, Buurtzorg and Stanford Prison examples demonstrate the need for a complementary middle ground whereby the intertwined ethical relationship between the individual, the organisation and society are mutually supporting. Bridging the Clausewitzian remarkable trinity of violence, chance and reason, this interoperable dynamic is particularly important within the British Army.¹⁷⁸ As a bottom-fed, tribal, triangular organisation holding a fiduciary relationship with the society it seeks to serve, individual soldiers perform extraordinary acts, often in the shadow of unlimited liability, to fulfil a team-orientated task. Against this backdrop, the moral compass is reciprocally shaped by internal and external stimuli within a cauldron of individual interests, organisational values and societal expectations. Crossey contends that “responsibility can be a relatively fluid term, dependant on its social context and therefore essentially relational in nature”.¹⁷⁹ Seemingly, without clear lines of moral responsibility, a process of ethical fading can allow individuals to “transform morally wrong behaviour into socially acceptable conduct by dimming the glare and guilt of the ethical spotlight”.¹⁸⁰ This systemic vested interest, spanning individual, organisational and societal responsibility to ensure the morality of a fighting force, demands a review of the Army’s approach to educating ethics.

178. Edward Villacres and Christopher Bassford, “Reclaiming the Clausewitzian Trinity,” *Parameters* (Autumn 1995): 10

179. Crossey, “To what extent is the modern operational soldier responsible for his moral decisions?,” 2.

180. Leonard Wong and Stephen Gerras, *Lying to Ourselves: Dishonesty in the Military Profession* (US Army War

Conclusion

This research paper seeks to land two key recommendations. First, cognisant of the current Chief of the General Staff's (CGS) main effort of leadership,¹⁸¹ the British Army should introduce an ethics based leadership model to complement the extant approach to training and educating leaders at every rank. This will serve to make an explicit and concrete link between leadership and ethics, deepening the altruistic nature of military service. Additionally, embracing the direction of travel within the private and public sector, switching leadership focus away from traditional transformational models and more towards ethical and authentic leadership models provides a bridge between the British Army and society.¹⁸² This bridge can be subsequently exploited for awareness, engagement, attraction and recruitment. Second, in addition to a leadership solution, the British Army should deepen its education of ethical theory, rich in philosophy, to overlay an explicitly ethical approach to decision making. This would provide the conceptual tools for soldiers and officers to confidently conduct ethical triangulation when facing an ethical dilemma.

Against a changing societal backdrop and the evolving character of the contemporary operating environment, this paper contends that moral advantage, gained through an enhanced aptitude in dealing with ethical dilemmas, conveys a strategic advantage. This is best achieved through the realisation of moral autonomy, delivered by an expanded ethics educational pathway that teaches philosophical theory and ethical triangulation. Underpinning the values and standards of the British Army with an explicit ethical foundation will serve as a catalyst to accelerate the realisation of moral autonomy, noting that moral autonomy can create moral armour. Robinson, Lee and Carrick decree that "ethics training should not be a substitute for moral leadership".¹⁸³ This paper

181. College: Strategic Studies Institute and United States Army War College Press, 2015), 17. Army Command Plan 2016/2017, MOD, 26 May 2016, 4-4.

182. Copeland, "The Emerging Significance of Values Based Leadership," 123-124.

183. Paul Robinson, Nigel de Lee and Don Carrick, *Education in the Military* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), 199.

acknowledges that sentiment but also recognises the mutually supporting nature of training and educating both ethics based leadership and ethical theory to strengthen the moral component of fighting power. Developing an intellectual and philosophical understanding of the competing dynamics within ethics theory will help to build clarity and confidence around ethical responsibility and thus align character development with ethics education. These pedagogical enhancements are overdue.

This Defence Research Paper began with a simple question: who really sets the bearing on my moral compass? The subsequent journey through ethics based leadership, ethical theory, values, educating ethics and the contemporary operating environment, demonstrates that questions can be more powerful than answers. Cognisant that there are few absolute answers in the study of ethics this paper concludes that the bearing on a moral compass is governed by the interplay of individual values, organisational culture and societal norms.¹⁸⁴ Challans asserts that “the military has navigated poorly through the moral jungle – it has lost its ability to use its moral compass”.¹⁸⁵ This paper has demonstrated that the provision of a more prominent platform for military ethics to permeate both leadership and values will enable the British Army, as amoral agent, to trust the bearing on its moral compass. Explicitly linking ethical leadership and ethical theory will improve the British Army’s ability to navigate through ethical dilemmas. Recognising the centrality of ethics is the first step in a process that seeks to build momentum behind a conversation that leads to action.

184. Mileham, “Teaching Military Ethics in the British Armed Forces,” 55.

185. Challans, *Awakening Warrior: Revolution in the Ethics of Warfare*, 175.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by J Thomson. London: Penguin, 2004.
- Baker, Deane-Peter. *Key Concepts in Military Ethics*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2015.
- Bandura, Albert. *Social Learning Theory*. London: Pearson, 1976.
- Beebe, Shannon and Mary Kaldor. *The Ultimate Weapon is No Weapon*. New York: Public Affairs, 2010.
- Bourke, Joanna. *An Intimate History of Killing: Face-to-Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare*. London: Granta, 2000.
- Brevert, Tony. *Immortal Words*. London: Quercus, 2009.
- Challans, Timothy. *Awakening Warrior: Revolution in the Ethics of Warfare*. New York: University Press, 2007.
- Coker, Christopher. *War in an age of Risk*. Cambridge: Polity, 2009.
- Coleman, Stephen, "Ethical Dilemmas and Tests of Integrity," in *Key Concepts in Military Ethics*. Edited by Deane-Peter Baker. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2015.
- Coleman, Stephen. *Military Ethics: An Introduction with Case Studies*. Oxford: University Press, 2013.
- Connelley, Carroll and Paulo Tripodi. *Aspects of Leadership: Ethics, Law and Spirituality*. Virginia: Marine Corps University Press, 2012.
- Cornish, Paul. *Strategy in Austerity: the Security and Defence of the United Kingdom*. London: Chatham House, 2010.
- Crawford, Neta. *Accountability for Killing*. Oxford: University Press, 2013.
- Deakin, Stephen, "Education in an Ethos at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst," in *Ethics Education in the Military*. Edited by Paul Robinson, Nigel de Lee and Don Carrick. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008.
- Finsler, Torin. *In Search of Ethical Leadership: If not now, when? USA*: Steiner Books, 2003.

- Fisher, David. *Morality and War: Can War be Just in the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford: University Press, 2011.
- Gentile, Mary. *Giving Voices to Values*. Yale: University Press, 2010.
- Greenleaf, Robert. *Servant Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Grossman, Dave. *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. New York: Back Bay Books, 2009.
- Guthrie, Charles and Michael Quinlan. *Just War. The Just War Tradition: Ethics in Modern Warfare*. London: Bloomsbury, 2007.
- Guyer, Paul. *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*. Cambridge: University Press, 1993.
- Hadot, Pierre. *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
- Harding, Carol. *Moral Dilemmas and Ethical Reasoning*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2010.
- Hawley, Alan, "People not Personnel: The Human Dimension of Fighting Power," in *The British Army, Manpower and Society into the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Hew Strachan. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000.
- Heffernan, Margaret. *Wilful Blindness*. London: Simon & Schuster, 2012.
- Held, Virginia. *Rights and Goods: Justifying Social Action*. Chicago: University Press, 1989.
- Heyd, David. *Supererogation: Its Status in Ethical Theory*. Cambridge: University Press, 1982.
- Hoban, Jack. *The Ethical Warrior. Values, Morals and Ethics for Life, Work and Service*. New Jersey: RGI Media and Publications, 2012.
- Johnson, James. *Ethics and the Use of Force*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2011.
- Jones, Dawna. *The Leadership Challenges of VUCA: Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity*. London: Insight to Action, 2011.
- Kahneman, David. *Thinking Fast and Slow*. London: Penguin, 2012.
- Kant, Immanuel, "Towards Perpetual Peace," in *Practical Philosophy*. Translated by Mary Gregor. Cambridge: University Press, 2011.
- Kaplan, Robert. *Warrior Politics: Why Leadership Demands a Pagan Ethos*. New York: Vintage Books, 2003.

- Karpinski, Janis, "Ethical behaviour and ethical challenges in the complex security environment," in *Ethical Decision Making in the New Security Environment*. Edited by Emily Spence and Daniel Lagace-Roy. Winnipeg: Canadian Defence Academy, 2008.
- Keating, Paula, "Deontological Ethics," in. *Key Concepts in Military Ethics*. Edited by Deane-Peter Baker. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2015.
- Kidder, Rushworth. *Moral Courage*. New York: Harper Collins, 2006.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence, "Resolving Moral Conflicts within the Just Community," in *Moral Dilemmas and Ethical Reasoning*. Edited by Carol Harding. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2010.
- Lang, Anthony, Cian O'Driscoll and John Williams. *Just War: Authority, Tradition and Practice*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2013.
- Lee, Steven. *Ethics and War: An Introduction*. Cambridge: University Press, 2012.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue*. London: Duckworth, 2006.
- Malik, Kenan. *The Quest for a Moral Compass: A Global History of Ethics*. London: Atlantic Books, 2014.
- Mendonca, Manuel and Rabindra Kanungo. *Ethical Leadership*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2007.
- Mileham, Patrick, "Teaching Military Ethics in the British Armed Forces." In *Ethics Education in the Military*. Edited by Paul Robinson, Nigel de Lee and Don Carrick. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008.
- Mileham, Patrick and Lee Willett. *Military Ethics for the Expeditionary Era*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2001.
- Miller, William. *The Mystery of Courage*. Cambridge: University Press, 2000.
- Milton, John, "Paradise Lost." In *John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Edited by Merritt Hughes. New York: Odyssey Press, 1957.
- Moran, Lord. *The Anatomy of Courage*. London: Constable, 1945.
- Mothershead, John. *Ethics: Modern Conceptions of the Principles of Right*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955.
- Nakken, Craig. *Finding Your Moral Compass: Transformative Principles to Guide you in Recovery and Life*. Minnesota: Hazelden, 2011.

- Nash, Christopher. *The Unravelling of the Postmodern Mind*. Edinburgh: University Press, 2001.
- Norman, Richard. *Ethics, Killing and War*. Cambridge: University Press, 1995.
- Olsthoorn, Peter. *Military Ethics and Virtues: An interdisciplinary approach for the 21st Century*. Oxon: Routledge, 2011.
- O’Neil, Onora. *Constructions of Reason: Explorations of Kant’s Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge: University Press, 1989.
- Peters, Ralph. *Fighting for the Future: Will America Triumph?* Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 2001.
- Plato. “The Apology.” In *The Last Days of Socrates*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick and Harold Tarrant. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.
- Reichert, Richard. *Boxing the Moral Compass*. Great Britain: Amazon: 2016.
- Robinson, Paul, “Introduction: Ethics Education in the Military,” in *Ethics Education in the Military*. Edited by Paul Robinson, Nigel de Lee and Don Carrick. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile: Or, On Education*. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- Scheewind, Jerome. *The Invention of Autonomy*. Cambridge: University Press, 1998.
- Schweitzer, Richard. *The Cross and the Trenches*. Westport: Praeger, 2003.
- Shakespeare, William. *Troilus and Cressida*. Edited by Sam Johnson and Geo Steevens. London: D Deans, 1811.
- Shepherd, Alan. *Sandhurst*. London: Hamlyn, 1980.
- Singer, Peter. *Practical Ethics*. Cambridge: University Press, 1993.
- Sison, Alejo Jose. *Handbook of Virtue Ethics in Business and Management: Volume 1*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2017.
- Smith, Rupert. *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*. London: Penguin, 2005.
- Sorensen, Roy. *Thought Experiments*. Oxford: University Press, 1992.
- Spence, Emily and Daniel Lagace-Roy. *Ethical Decision Making in the New Security*

Environment. Winnipeg: Canadian Defence Academy, 2008.

The Holy Bible, King James Version.

Toner, James. *Morals Under the Gun: The Cardinal Virtues, Military Ethics and American Society*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000.

Tzu, Sun. *The Art of War*. Translated by Lionel Giles. Pax Librorum Publishing House, 2009.

Vardy, Peter and Paul Grosch. *The Puzzle of Ethics*. London: Fount Paperbacks, 1999.

Von Clausewitz, Carl. *On War*. Translated by M Howard and P Paret. Princeton: University Press, 1989.

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Whetham, David. *Ethics, Law and Military Operations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Williams, Andrew. *A Very British Killing: The Death of Baha Mousa*. London: Vintage, 2013.

Wolf, Michael and Jeremy Randel. *The Normative and The Natural*. Washington: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Wong, Leonard and Stephen Gerras, *Lying to Ourselves: Dishonesty in the Military Profession*. US Army War College: Strategic Studies Institute and United States Army War College Press, 2015.

Zimbardo, Philip. *The Lucifer Effect: How Good People Turn Evil*. London: Rider, 2009.

Publications

Avolio, Bruce and William Gardner, "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership," *The Leadership Quarterly* 16, No 3 (2005): 315-338.

Brown, Michael and Linda Trevino, "Ethical Leadership: A review of future directions," *Leadership Quarterly* 17 No 3 (2006): 595-616.

Coleman, Stephen, "The Problems of Duty and Loyalty," *Journal of Military Ethics* 8 No 2 (2009): 105-115.

- Cook, Martin and Henrik Syse, "What Should We Mean by Military Ethics," *Journal of Military Ethics* 9 No 2 (2010): 119-122.
- Copeland, Mary, "The Emerging Significance of Values Based Leadership," *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 8, No 2 (2014): 105-135.
- Crossey, Nigel, "To what extent is the modern operational soldier responsible for his moral decisions?," Farmington Institute. Harris Manchester College: Oxford University Press (2006): 1-60.
- Deakin, Stephen, "Ethics and the British Army's Values and Standards," *The British Army Review* No 140 (2006):39-46.
- Den Hartog, Deanne, Robert House, Paul Hanges and Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla, "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: are attributes of charismatic transformational leadership universally endorsed?," *The Leadership Quarterly* 10 No 2 (1999):219-256.
- Fernandez, Jorge and Robert Hogan, "Values Based Leadership," *The Journal for Quality and Participation* 25 No 4 (2002): 25-26.
- Grosch, Paul, "Against the Utilitarian Grain: Alternative Approaches to Health Care Ethics," *The Proceedings of the 21st World Congress of Philosophy – Volume 1 – Ethics* Ankara, Philosophical Society of Turkey (2007): 167-174.
- Immel, August, "The Need for an Ethical Fitness Assessment in the US Armed Forces," *Journal of Military Ethics* 15 No 1 (2016):3-17.
- Irwin, General Sir Alistair, "The Ethics of Counter-Insurgency," *British Army Review* 166 (Spring 2016): 123-131.
- Kalshoven, Karianne, Deanne Den Hartog and Annebel de Hoogh, "Ethical Leadership at Work (ELW) Questionnaire: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure," *The Leadership Quarterly* 22 No 1 (2011): 51-69.
- Kanungo, Rabindra, "Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders," *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 18 No 4 (2001): 257-265.
- Krulak, Charles, "The Strategic Corporal: Leadership in the Three Block War – Operation Absolute Agility," *Marines Magazine* (January 1999): 1-7.
- LaPorte, Todd and Paula Consolini, "Working in practice but not in theory: Theoretical Challenges of High-Reliability Organizations," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* (1991): 19-47.

Bashall, General James, “Grounding British Army Values upon an Ethical Good – Covering Note”, Executive Committee of the Army Board (March 2015), 1-4.

DCDC, Joint Concept Note 2/12: Future Land Operating Concept, London, Ministry of Defence, 2012.

Future Character of Conflict (FCOC), Strategic Trends Programme, DCDC, February 2010.

Global Strategic Trends – Out to 2045, Strategic Trends Programme: 5th Edition, Ministry of Defence, April 2014.

Kirke, Charles, “The Understanding by Regular Junior Personnel of the Values and Standards of the British Army – Final Study Report,” Cranfield University (2005).

McCormack, Phillip, “Grounding British Army Values upon an Ethical Good”, Executive Committee of the Army Board (March 2015), 1-40.

Military Annual Training Test 6, Ministry of Defence, April 2008.

National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015, Ministry of Defence, November 2015.

Queen’s Regulations 1971, London, HMSO, J1427.

The Aitken Report, Army Headquarters, HQ Adjutant General Design Studio, DS13076, January 2008.

The Discipline and Standards Paper. The Military Ethos - The Maintenance of Standards, Ministry of Defence, Army, 1993.

Values and Standards of the British Army, Ministry of Defence, AC63813, 2008.

Values and Standards, Ministry of Defence, The Stationary Office, 2000.

Websites

All Marines Message: Integrity. “Character.” Accessed 19 April, 2017.<https://studylib.net/doc/11072415/ethics-for-the-marine-lieutenant-stockdale-center-for-eth>

BBC News. “London Attack.” Accessed 19 April, 2017.<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-39377966>

Buurtzorg Website. “General Information – About Us.” Accessed 18 April, 2017. <http://www.buurtzorgusa.org/about-us/>

London Police Challenge Forum – Post Event Information Pack, Police Code of Ethics V0.2, December 2016.

Lord, Robert, Roseanne Foti and Christy De Vader, “A Test of Leadership Categorisation Theory: Internal Structure, Information Processing and Leadership Perceptions,” *Organisational Behaviour and High Performance* 34 (1984): 343-378.

McCartney, Helen, “Hero, Villain? The Public Image of the British Soldier and its Implications for Defence Policy,” *Defence and Security Analysis* 27 No 1 (2011): 43-54.

McClelland, David and David Burnham, “Power is the Great Motivator,” *Harvard Business Review* (January-February 1995): 126-139.

Schulzke, Marcus, “Ethically Insoluble Dilemmas in War,” *Journal of Military Ethics* 12 No 2 (2013): 95-110.

Syse, Henrik and Martin Cook, “Editor’s Introduction. How Do We Do Military Ethics,” *Journal of Military Ethics* 13 No 4 (December 2014): 301.

Tappin, Ben and Ryan McKay, “The Illusion of Moral Superiority,” *Social Psychological and Personality Science* (2016): 1-9.

Trevino, Linda, Laura Hartman and Michael Brown, “Moral Person and Moral Manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership?,” *California Management Review* 42 (2000): 128-142.

Villacres, Edward and Christopher Bassford, “Reclaiming the Clausewitzian Trinity,” *Parameters* (Autumn 1995): 9-19.

Wortel, Eva and Jolanda Bosch, “Strengthening Moral Competence: A Train The Trainer Course on Military Ethics,” *Journal of Military Ethics* 10 No 1 (2011): 17-35.

Doctrine / Military References

Army Command Plan 2016/2017, Ministry of Defence, 26 May 2016.

Army Doctrine Publication Operations, Land Warfare Development Centre, AC71940, March 2017.

Army Leadership Doctrine, Edition 1, Ministry of Defence, September 2016.

Army Leadership Code: An Introductory Guide. First Edition, Director Leadership, AC72021, 2015.

CBS News. "Obama: US underestimated rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria." Accessed 21 March, 2017. <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/obama-u-s-underestimated-rise-of-isis-in-iraq-and-syria/>

Kweku Adoboli Podcast. "Crime and Punishment." Accessed 23 March, 2017 <http://podcast.ft.com/2015/10/22/the-crime-and-punishment-of-kweku-adoboli/>

Ordnance Survey. "Using a Compass." Accessed 12 December, 2016. <https://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/getoutside/guides/beginners-guide-to-using-a-compass/>

Strategic Studies Institute. "Character Development of US Army Officers." Accessed 15 February, 2017. www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a589452.pdf

The Daily Mail Online. "A Very Honest General." Accessed 10 March, 2017. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-410175/Sir-Richard-Dannatt--A-honest-General.html>

The Financial Times Online. "Kweku Adoboli." Accessed 23 March, 2017. <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/b0350eac-3307-11e2-aa83-00144feabdco.html>

The Spectator. "The Truth about Islamic State." Accessed 21 March, 2017. <https://www.spectator.co.uk/2016/01/the-truth-about-islamic-state-its-in-crisis/>

The Telegraph Online. "London Terror Attack." Accessed 18 April, 2017. <https://www.google.co.uk/amp/www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/03/23/two-former-war-veterans-first-scene-used-combat-first-aid-try/amp/>

Research Interviews

Clare, Jeremy. Farmington Institute Fellow – Oxford University. Interviewed on 10 February, 2017.

Gosling, Jonathan. Emeritus Professor of Leadership Studies. Exeter University. Interviewed on 23 March, 2017.

Grosch, Paul. Former Head of Theology and Philosophy. University of St Mark and St John. Interviewed on 7 March, 2017.

Against a changing societal backdrop and the evolving character of the contemporary operating environment, this paper contends that moral advantage, gained through an enhanced aptitude in dealing with ethical dilemmas, conveys a strategic advantage. This is best achieved through the realisation of moral autonomy, delivered by an expanded ethics educational pathway that teaches philosophical theory and ethical triangulation. Underpinning the values and standards of the British Army with an explicit ethical foundation will serve as a catalyst to accelerate the realisation of moral autonomy, noting that moral autonomy can create moral armour. Ethics matter. Moral character matters. Provoked by the absence of a specified ethics based leadership framework for the British Army, this paper will run hard at that gap.

This thesis has been awarded the second prize of the year 2018 in EuroISME's annual contest for the best student's thesis. EuroIMSE will annually publish the winning theses in two or more languages. For information about the contest, please visit www.euroisme.eu

