

348 Finney and Mayfield

Voiceover: This program is sponsored by The United States Naval Institute, GPD Charitable Trust and John DeBlasio.

(Theme music)

Voiceover: The following is a production of the Pritzker Military Museum and Library. Bringing citizens and citizen soldiers together through the exploration of military history, topics, and current affairs, this is *Pritzker Military Presents*.

(Applause)

Williams: Welcome to *Pritzker Military Presents* with authors Nathan Finney and Tyrell Mayfield discussing their book *Redefining the Modern Military*. I'm your host Jay Williams, and this program is coming to you from the Pritzker Military Museum and Library in downtown Chicago. It's sponsored by the United States Naval Institute, The GPD Charitable Trust and John DeBlasio. This program and hundreds more are available on demand at PritzkerMilitary.org. What does it mean to be a professional leader in the military? What does that profession value? What ethical issues are most relevant in considering the future of the military? In this new collection of essays, editors and US Army officers Nathan Finney and Tyrell Mayfield seek to answer such questions by reflecting on the role of ethics and the profession in the military of the 21st century. They consider what role training and continuing education play in defining the new military professional, and if there is a universal code of ethics that ought to be adopted by the military as a profession in the context of our changing world. *Redefining the modern military* is unique in how it treats the subject of ethics in the military profession. It brings together a wide variety of writers coming from academia, the law, and the officer corps to address this important and timely topic. The volume puts a significant emphasis on individual agency for military professionalism rather than broad organizational or cultural change. The authors suggest that conversations about these challenging and complex topics are necessary because serious intellectual self-reflection is a requirement for any military professional, especially considering that each individual choice can affect the life and death of people and nations. Nathan K. Finney is a major in the US Army with a focus on strategy and planning. He is the creator and cofounder of the Strategy Bridge, the founder and first managing director of military fellowships at the Project on International Peace and Security, and is a founding member of the Military Writers Guild. A term member at the Council on Foreign Relations and a nonresident fellow at the Modern War Institute at West Point, he is also a visiting fellow at the Australian Strategic Policy Institute. He has published in a number of print publications, peer reviewed journals, and online forums. Tyrell O. Mayfield is a Lieutenant Colonel in the US Air Force with a focus on expeditionary security operations and advising foreign partners. He is also a cofounder of the Strategy Bridge. A founding member of the military writers guild, he has published photography and written work in a number of print publications, peer reviewed journals, and online forums. Please join me in welcoming Nathan Finney and Tyrell Mayfield to the Pritzker Military Museum and Library.

(Applause)

Mayfield: Thank you all for joining us. This evening we'd like to talk to you a little bit about our new book *Redefining the Modern Military* by Naval Institute Press, and we'd like to walk you through the book, why we think it's important now, kind of how the book came to be, and then where we see the book being utilized in the future and its place in literature and its place in the modern profession. But first I'd like to talk to you a little bit about how the book came to be, right, and why we think that it's important now.

Professionals perform services for their clients. In the case of the military the clients in the United States is actually the US Constitution, which is a manifestation of the citizens

of the United States. In other western militaries the client is the citizenry of that state. Professionals perform a unique service for their client, one that society cannot perform itself. Historical professions include clergy, law, medicine, and more recently in the 20th century, military professionalism. Military professionals and professions in general are self-policing. They develop and maintain expert knowledge, they perform a service for society which it cannot perform itself, and they execute this expert knowledge with autonomy, right, and this entire relationship with the client is built on trust, a trust that is shared between the client and the professional, and one that is essential to the professional's ability to perform their duties specific with autonomy. And that's something you'll find carries throughout the book is the individual agency and autonomy not just of the profession but of the individual professional within the military. So now that you understand a little bit about the profession and its relationship with its client, it's important also that we understand why this is an important topic to discuss now. And history shows us time and again that periods of conflict are followed by periods of introspection and reflection by professional militaries about their role in society, about their role in times of conflict, and how they train, organize, and prepare for those conflicts. And this is a periodic reflection that happens, generally speaking, at the end of a major conflict. So the First World War provides a good example of how the US Army itself went through a period of reflection and reorganization, and I'll let Nate speak a little bit to that point.

Finney: Absolutely. So, following WWI, as usually termed the inter-warriors, coming out of that war there was a lot of assessment of the key drivers of that conflict and how that affected the military in the way the military performed in WWI. Much discussion usually relates to that interwar period in coming out of WWI involves the warfare itself, so how the warfare evolved over time and how professionals had to adapt and overcome those changes, things like the increase of the use of field artillery, trench warfare, the use of armor, the use of airpower being the most discussed aspects of the inter-warriors. But additionally coming out of the war General Pershing was charged with--and one of his subordinates Fox Conner did an assessment of the US Army and its organization, specifically the division size. Were the size and the use of the units in the US Army appropriate to what happened in the past in WWI and looking into the future to any future conflicts? And then of course there was an assessment across government about the mobilization and lessons learned coming out of the mobilization of almost four million men and women put into uniform in support of that war, about two million that were sent over into France. So both the military aspects of that mobilization but also the industrial aspects. So how did we gear up industry, how did we gear up society, and how did we gear up the military for that conflict? All those lessons that were learned for the army, for the war department, and for government as a whole then led to WWII, so the mobilization, the application of power for WWII, the use of what type of warfare we endured and went through for WWII was an application of that self reflection that the military took following WWI.

Mayfield: Then coming out of WWII we see works like by S.L.A. Marshall, *The Soldier's Load and the Mobility of a Nation*, we see *Men Against Fire*, and this is again military professionals reflecting on their performance and having pen conversations about how they can become more efficient and effective, and this is a tension which is present constantly in the military, this balance between efficiency and effectiveness, and military professionals are ultimately concerned with effectiveness, and efficiency is a secondary consideration but one which goes back to that relationship and trust with our citizens and our government leaders. So coming out of the Second World War we see these works, this period of reflection, we have the birth of a new branch of service, the United States Air Force, which comes into being, which again marks the division of professional

responsibilities, the development of new technology, and the requirement for a new corps of officers and professionals to manage that piece, that military-specific capability which comes out of the Second World War. This walks us right into the path of Korea, where again we go to war with a corps of army professional officers and air force professional officers, but we backed them with services filled with conscripts again. And so this is the model, which the US military had been working on and improving over time. World War I and II set the groundwork for the rapid mobilization and expansion of the services, and the United States felt this was the appropriate model and the appropriate model for us to carry on with our conflicts. Korea showed some of the challenges associated with that and in the end becomes a near disaster, results in a stalemate and an armistice or a ceasefire as it were. Coming out of Korea we have the works of the Samuel Huntington, Janowitz, and Abbott eventually several decades later. But Huntington in particular uses the model of Korea and looks back and sees an opportunity for the professionalization of the entire service, not just the officer corps but also the enlisted personnel and the NCO corps and sees a role for an all-volunteer force. He's forecasting this, reflecting on the near-disaster of Korea, kind of envisioning a new pathway and a new way forward to develop and fuel the military in a western society, one that's founded on democratic values and individual freedoms, supported by an all-volunteer force. This is 1957 when Huntington is writing, and if we put this in perspective with the time, 1957 is the year that the Russians launch Sputnik into space. So Huntington is writing and thinking about the military at a time when it's dealing largely in organic or natural domains: you have air, land, and sea. He's not envisioning, nor should he be critiqued for not envisioning or considering the ideas of cyberspace or space operations. These are more technical aspects of military development and military professionalism that would come into being in the years that followed. But this gives us an idea that this seminal text, one that we still teach from and instruct military professionals on today, is bounded by time and the knowledge that was available when it was written. So we carry this model into Vietnam, again where we have an army or department of defense which is built around a corps of volunteers who are largely officers, a corps of professional officers backed by both volunteers and conscripts again. And the Vietnam war teaches us many of the same lesson we learned in Korea but in new ways that really begin to encroach on and erode that trust between the civilians and the military, and it's this trust that's the foundation of the profession and allows the autonomy from military professionals to operate. So coming out of Vietnam, General Westmoreland directs the military to do this significant period of reflection and introspection, and that gives us several lessons going forward.

Finney: Absolutely, and that study that Westmoreland chartered was really focused on the officer corps in the army and how they had performed, particularly ethically, in the Vietnam War. But the outflow of those lessons learned from that study set the stage for the military at large, not just the army, to assess itself coming out of Vietnam, to assess its leadership, to assess the importance of civil military ties both between those in uniform and government leaders at the head of the Department of Defense and the White House, as well as the signal ties between those in uniform and the civilian populace as well. And as I'm sure all of you know coming out of Vietnam we get the all-volunteer force. So that break from that model of a small corps of professional leadership that then grows based on conscription, we now have an all-volunteer force that is highly professionalized. It's built around bringing people and training them for years before they're employed in any kind of manner for the nation. It also sets the foundation for everything that comes forward, so you have an all-volunteer force, you have a new doctrine that ties services together, so air-land battle where the army and the air force work very closely to figure out how new technologies are employed on the

modern battlefield, as well as a revamping of education, everything from officer education down to a professional education for noncommissioned officers as well. And that foundation based on the study and the work that all the services did coming out of Vietnam set the stage for the Gulf War, Iraq and Afghanistan following.

Mayfield: So coming into the Gulf War, we have the all-volunteer force. And again following that conflict we had this period of reflection and introspection. And this is the time in which Dr. Don Snider of the Army War College, a retired colonel of the Vietnam Era, himself begins to lead the army's next round of introspection and reflection. And this manifests itself in a book entitled *The Future of the Army Profession*, which Dr. Don Snider edited. And he put this together--it comes out in the early 2000s. He leads a reflective look at the previous decades in an attempt to set the tone and a foundation for the army as a professional institution and organization. There are several documents which come out of this which drive the army ethic, the army values, and helps the army itself kind of refocus and centralize its ideas about professionalism and how it intends on instructing and teaching those. But we have this intervening event that happens right as Dr. Don Snider's book is coming out, and those are the events of September 11, 2001. And this drives the United States Military into a period of prolonged conflict, which now has entered its seventeenth year. It's not over, and this sets the stage in a new way for us. It's not episodic; it is now enduring. So there's not a clear end to the conflict as it was in Korea or even in Vietnam or the World Wars where the military itself can come back to the States, come back to the continental base and have this period of reflection and introspection and reorganization. Instead the current military is forced to reorganize itself in mid-battle. It's forced to balance these challenges between personnel and modernization and operational readiness, all during a period of conflict. And these are things which are unique to this specific period of time. So absent this periodic pause between conflicts that traditionally we have had, Nate and I feel like this is the time in which this conversation should be had. There's not a clear end in sight to the current conflicts, and we don't feel like it can wait another five years or ten years or twenty years or whatever that period of time is until the military gets this pause, if it ever comes, and that's something that we have to begin to consider in our own minds is that the pause may not come. This may be an entirely new era, if you will, of conflict. And so this process of professionalization, of building and developing and honing expert knowledge, of self-policing, of maintaining this relationship with our clients, which is the United States Constitution in our instance, manifested by the population of the United States, is something that must be engendered and must be cared for, and it must be worked on constantly. It's a relationship in the end, and one built on trust. So we feel like this is the time for a new generation of officers, of academics, of noncommissioned officers and professionals across the Department of Defense, and those organizations and institutions which support it to begin this new reflection, to begin to think about what it means to be a professional in the modern era, and to carry this conversation forward, because being a professional is not something that is just bestowed upon you and that you can just put in your pocket and carry with you. It is something that requires constant maintenance and constant work and development.

Finney: And this book, this project that we put together really, I think, demonstrates the current profession, the military profession in the 21st century. So the way the book started actually started with a tweet from a military ethicist, Dr. Pauline Shanks Kaurin who writes the opening chapter to our book. And she was essentially crowdsourcing trying to get some perspectives in preparation for going into class with a bunch of undergraduates. And as a part of that tweet and that crowdsourcing she had a conversation with people she'd never even met which includes Ty. And I think at the end I jumped in as well. And the robustness of that conversation online with people who had

never met each other, may not ever meet each other, but were interested in the topic enough to have a robust discussion got to me, got to Ty, and we had a conversation about expanding that from just kind of one-off quick conversations through 140 characters at the time into something a little more in-depth. Ty and I started an organization called the Strategy Bridge, which is focused on trying to get people to write about the profession. We believe that writing for the profession and having that conversation in written form is critical to the profession and the growth of the profession and professionals within it and so we decided to come up with a series of articles, about 1,500 words each. And we reached out to a lot of the folks who had been a part of that conversation on Twitter and to other academics and professionals we knew who were interested in the profession and ethics, military ethics in particular. And we invited them to submit an article and ended up doing a series based around the profession and ethics, where we ended up getting seventeen, nineteen articles from varied perspectives. The conversation that was had because of that series, the response articles we got, let us know that there was more that we could go into than 1,500 words each. We decided maybe it was time to something more in-depth, let some of these really good arguments that were made in about 1,500 words and let them dive down into it a little bit more. And that's where we came up with the idea for this edited volume.

Mayfield: So I think that it's important to consider kind of the genesis and the evolution of these online platforms as they relate to the profession today, right. So you have historical ones. Small Wars Journal. It's been around for a very long time. Strategy Bridge. War on the Rocks is a more recent iteration of that. And there are other whole series of other online blogs and journal forums, which have been really instrumental in the development on a new corps and a new cadre, a new generation of company grade, field grade officers. And so that's really how the Strategy Bridge came about. It came about as a group of officers and professionals who are in the defense community, so Nate Finney, myself, Mikhail Grinberg, Rich Ganske, Eric Murphy, and we all came together 'cause we saw we were working in the same space. We were all writing independently and individually, and we realized that the sum of our work would better serve the conversation than working independently. So you see this actually in this micro-incident, this microenvironment, where professionals are working on their own to hone and develop expert knowledge, this period of peer development of each other and of subordinates as well. So these platforms then become important to the development of professionals, and they're replacing things within our community that we've lost over time. So the demise of the officer club is something that comes up often in this conversation, where military installations no longer have officer clubs and NCO clubs. If they have a club at all it's a joint club. So these individual spaces where soldiers or officers can come together in a non-attribution environment and have a conversation that works on this concept of mentorship and works on these relationships between officers and their subordinates or sergeants and their soldiers, and allows them a forum to pass on information and knowledge and establish the norms and values of their own organizations. These are missing in many ways in our own institutions now. But I think that what is evolving in their place are these online forums. And they range everywhere from small individually-operated blogs all the way to more international journal format organizations like the Strategy Bridge. And I think they provide a really important space, and that's evidenced by the series that led to this book. So as Nate said we started with around fifteen or seventeen articles. We honed that down to about twelve, and we went back out to a number of folks just to fill in a few gaps, because as Nate said this is a multidisciplinary book, so we have professors, we have people who are working in PME, represented both by the Naval War College and the Marine Corps War College at this point in time. We have international professors, so having an instructor in the UK and a

professor from Sweden as well. And the book also reflects the coalition effort as well, the new coalition focus in modern warfare. So we have military officers from the United States and Australia. And then backing this core group of officers and academics are lawyers, which is kind of the other important piece to this. And so we have lawyers both from the US and from Australia that write chapters and provide important insights into how the profession balances ethical obligations and legal obligations. So over the course of writing this book, it comes full circle, right, so it starts with a conversation on a social media platform, which then evolves into an online journal series, which continues the conversation. These 1,500-word articles are then taken to chapter length, and then Nate and I, we talked with the other members of the editorial board of the Strategy Bridge, we carved out the time necessary to work on these, and built them out to chapter-length pieces and ultimately put this together. It took just a little over three years--be four years in January--that we began this project, and it's been a fascinating road to walk. I think it's also really important to put in context of the profession and to see this book and the effort that went into it as a manifestation of professionals who are interested in creating new knowledge, who are interested in building expert knowledge and maintaining it and then sharing that conversation with their subordinates and with their peer groups as well. Finney: So as Ty mentioned, the book is multidisciplinary, it's multinational, kicks off with the person who rightfully should kick it off. She started the whole conversation on Twitter, Dr. Pauline Shanks Kaurin, whose opening chapter really sets the foundation of what is ethics and where does that fit with the profession and what are the ethical foundations as a military professional. And then as she goes through her argument, she actually--what's great about this book I think is really all the themes are woven together and each chapter kind of hands the baton off to the next person. So as Pauline wraps up her conversation about the ethical foundations of the profession Jo Brick, who is a lawyer in uniform for the Australian Air Force, the Royal Australian Air Force, she takes on that idea and tries to compare the military profession to the legal profession and how the fiduciary risk seen in law is similar to the fiduciary risk of American society taking on that risk by providing their trust in military professionals to be able to action their will with lethal force or the threat of it.

Mayfield: So I think another thing that Dr. Shanks Kaurin really touches on is the aspirational notion of the profession, right, and so this is another thing which is very interesting in the book is that there are disagreements from chapter to chapter on whether or not the military is actually a profession and to what extent that might be true. And Dr. Shanks Kaurin will argue, and I think she does it quite well, that this notion of professionalism in the military is truly aspirational. And it's one that is not achieved, and it's one that requires constant pursuit. And so she points that out as hopeful and as optimistic, because long as the concept of professionalism is aspirational, then there are those who are striving to achieve it, and this is that sense of constant work in development, which I think is central to the idea of building a professional force. Jo Brick does talk about this fiduciary responsibility, which between client and professional is important to understand. And that is that--and this goes back to the autonomy of the professional and the ability to apply this expert knowledge with autonomy and discretion, which Dr. Snider would talk to you about, right, and that is every act is one of discretion, one which the professional makes a decision not in isolation but necessarily without consulting the client on every decision that is made. So Rebecca Johnson, Dr. Johnson from the Marine Corps War College, she takes this idea and this relationship between the profession and its client, and she kind of builds it out to talk about the ethical requirements in kind of a triad, the ethical requirements of the client who's responsible for providing resources and funding and ultimately civilian guidance to the military. She also talks about the ethical requirements of the profession as a whole, and then she

actually steps back and talks about the ethical requirements of the individual professional. And this is really one of the first hints in the book at the importance of individual agency, of the individual professional as a single point in this system. And that is something that I think is really important and is more of a focus in this book than it has been in previous pieces of work, and that is about the importance of autonomy and the discretion of the individual professional and not necessarily the caste of the profession itself at large. Mike Denny's chapter I think is the next one that kind of fits that segue, right, and talks a little bit more about individual agency.

Finney: Right, so discretionary application. Mike Denny's chapter is probably one of the most provocative chapters in the book. Title is "Professionals Know when to Break the Rules," and it's really this discussing that he has with the judgment that is required by a professional. They have to have the expert knowledge to be able to ply their trade, but sometimes ethically there is that discretion that sometimes you are being given an order or you've been given a mission and been told how to accomplish that mission, and either ethically or based on your own professional judgment you believe that you need to bend that, you need to even break that in order to achieve the mission or in order to have a more ethical outcome. And so that discretionary application is tied to that idea of autonomy, the idea of expert knowledge and of the professional having enough of that expert knowledge to make a judgment call to be able to do what is right, even if it's against maybe regulation rules or even orders.

Mayfield: So Mike Denny's chapter picks up and reinforces this idea of individual autonomy, individual discretion, and individual professional. In Casey Landru's chapter walks us through that point, right, he gives us kind of the literary review of Huntington, of Janowitz, of Abbott later on, and then kind of ends us with Don Snider. And I think Don Snider's work in the future of the army profession, in the development of the army ethic and the army values, really sets you up to see Mike Denny in action both in his chapter and in that environment from which he is writing. We talked a little bit about how not all of the contributors agree, and I think Tony Ingesson's chapter is another one. He takes a little bit different position than Dr. Shanks Kaurin does, where she says there is not a profession per se, but in an abstract and an aspirational concept. And Tony Ingesson will tell you that the profession doesn't exist and that it's also not necessarily helpful to have that conversation. And that it is in some ways a distraction for the military, that we should focus more on our technical capabilities and our uniqueness in that it's not a step back from the military to acknowledge it as non-professional but it's actually okay for the military to be something other than professional. And that concept of profession, of a profession and of individual professionals changes over time. And I think Tony Ingesson's argument is that it's okay for the Department of Defense, for western militaries, to step back, to step away from that idea of a profession and focus on what it is that's unique that makes military service different than other professions and that makes that a unique vocation, and I think that's what Tony Ingesson would argue is probably the better path forward, the better point of conversation.

Finney: And coming out of Tony's chapter makes me think of Holly Hughson's chapter. She was an aid worker in Iraq and Afghanistan. And coming off of Tony's argument that it's a distraction to focus on the military officer as a profession or there being one military profession, that really applies to Holly's chapter which is focused on, military uniform folks aren't the only professionals on the battlefield. Aid workers, nongovernmental organization workers, those who are there to support the war effort, support the people on the ground, and support humanitarian law at large are also professionals that see a lot of the same things, encounter a lot of the same ethical challenges that we need to consider not just those in uniform carrying guns on the battlefield, but all of the professionals on the battlefield and what they bring to the fight.

Mayfield: So Holly's argument about a new profession on the battlefield is interesting, and it's also worth noting that it segues nicely with William Beasley's chapter on the history of the navy profession, right, and how the navy has struggled over time with the pendulum swing between professionalism and technicism. And the argument is that as the navy transitioned from sail to steam, this focus on the technical aspects of mastering this new technology de-professionalized the navy. And then there's a core group of officers across the 20s and 30s tried to refocus the navy on its professionalism and moving away from just being technical masters of this new technology. This is a really unique time in naval history, and this corps of officers known as the Young Turks. Their relationship with the public, with citizens, and with publication actually is what help transformed the navy and give rise to the Naval War College. And so in some ways it's almost reflective perhaps of this period of time that we're in now, where new technologies, be that assisted intelligence or artificial intelligence, unmanned aerial vehicles, unmanned sea vehicles--these new technologies are driving us towards a technical focus within the military. But there is a new generation of officers who are trying to again broaden the aperture, look beyond the specific technology and what it means to be a military professional and how that might translate into future service.

Finney: And that technicism actually flows very well into Brian Laslie's chapter, which is the last chapter for our book. And in that chapter Brian Laslie, who is a command historian at NORTHCOM NORAD in Colorado Springs, really looks at the air force, the newest service, the service that is built on technicism and technology for the most part. And he takes case studies and looks at the missileers, he looks at unmanned aerial vehicle pilots and looks at how that technicism, that focus on the technology, affects the culture of the service, and then ties it back to the importance of the culture and its impact on the profession and how the air force, it can be argued, has grown out of insubordination as Brian says in his chapter. Focused on those like Billy Mitchell who really kind of bucked the army, when they were still part of the army, and really made the argument for the air force as a separate service and how that confluence of insubordination and maverick-ism with the technicism of the technology really affected the culture of the air force and how that affects the profession as a whole.

Mayfield: Much of the 20th century from military, professional military education is focused on this bit of the education, educational system. Simon Anglim talks about this in his chapters, and he maps the arc of professional military educational beginning with the Germans and the French and how those lessons and the influence of the First and Second World War, and then the early lessons of the Americans as well with West Point and its development of officers. And if you look at these professional military educational platforms, they all begin as technical. They're all focused on artillery and engineering, right, and these are the hard sciences of the military profession at the time. And then over time they become more focused on the humanities. There's more of a focus on leadership, of organizational psychology, of how to lead and influence people. There's more influence on logistics of getting to the battle and then sustaining the fight, and these are representative of the changing character of the conflict, which the United States and other western militaries faced both in Europe and abroad with Korea and Vietnam. But I think that as we come out of that period, I think that modern militaries have not perfected professional military education, but they have developed it to a point where it's time to be looking at other things. And this is where two of our last chapters by Ray Kimball and Steve Foster come into play, when they talk about the importance of mentoring, right, and the importance of individual agency. So Ray Kimball's chapter very clearly focuses on mentoring and that those relationships between mentor and mentee or mentor and protégé are very important, and it's something that the military has struggled with both in the army and the air force and the other services as well about

how to define these relationships, about how to build them out, can they be manufactured. Is it better to match faces in a mentoring relationship, or is it better create spaces for that mentoring to happen? Right, and so that's part of this conversation earlier where we talked about the establishment or the disestablishment of officer and NCO clubs and then the rise of these online forums, and I think that what Ray argues effectively is that it's much more important to create the spaces for the mentoring to happen than it is to try and match the faces to those mentoring relationships. And then Steve Foster's chapter really drives home for us the importance of individual agency in this and that it's not okay as a professional to wait for the profession to develop you, that you have a personal responsibility to cultivate your own expert knowledge, to seek out those relationships, be they mentoring ones or developmental ones, and really drive them with your own intent and your own direction, understanding the culture and the values and the ethics of your institution and operating within those parameters. And so I think that that's a good segue actually looking at the individual agency and its role in modern militaries and modern professionals to talk a little bit about where we see the book being used. And now that we've talked about why this book and how it came to be, I think it's important that we discuss even briefly where we see it in the future.

Finney: Absolutely. So, this book was written by professionals, by academics, really to be used by professionals and academics. Primarily in the professional military education everything from the captain's career course, the company commander course, all the way up to the war colleges. We think it would be a good primer to be able to start to talk about the profession and the ethics. Instead of maybe picking up a larger book, more academic book like Huntington or Janowitz or even Don Snider's tome. It would be good to wrestle with those key concepts both from an academic perspective as well as a practitioner perspective, which is what we've done in this book.

Mayfield: And so I think Nate touches on an important point, and that is generally we come to this conversation about professionalism late in our careers, kind of at that ten-year mark when we're going to our senior NCO academies, when we're going to our command and staff colleges, or even later when we're attending war college. And if you come to the conversation about professionalism at that point in your career, you're probably late to the game; you're late to the conversation. So what we wanted to do is provide a tool for what Don Snider would tell you are the stewards of the profession, these senior leaders who have moved up from being a member of the profession to a practitioner within the profession to a full-fledged member of the profession, and that responsibility of stewardship to pull others up along with you. And so what we wanted to do was provide a tool for stewards, and I think that's what we've done here. And this book has a place in civilian ethics courses that discuss civil military relationships. I think it has a place in commissioning programs, be that officer training school or officer candidate school or even our service academies. Certainly at the company grade officer level, those career courses, but then definitely as a prelude to that command and staff college or that senior NCO academy where you're having bigger conversations. If the first thing you try and read is Janowitz or Don Snider's book, it can be a bit overwhelming. And so what we've wanted to do here is create a stepping-stone and entry point to the conversation and something that's useful for stewards of the profession to facilitate that conversation through mentorship relationships, right, and involve and build on that sense of individual agency and the importance of individual self development.

Finney: And really, this is just a small contribution to that conversation. Really looking at and trying to assess what the profession and what ethics mean for military professionals in the 21st century. You read this book, you're gonna learn a lot. You will not get an answer as to exactly what is required to be a professional in the military in the 21st

century. What you will get is a foundation for the conversation that folks like Ty and I hopefully will continue to have and will continue to mentor our subordinates into the profession and what it might mean for the future.

Mayfield: So I think in closing what's important to remember is that there are a lot of voices in this book, and that's one of the strengths of it. It has a multidisciplinary approach. It provides you a series of conversations that you can move through rather quickly, that you can have conversations with subordinates, with your peers, with your superiors even about what it means to be a professional, those questions that you have, and to begin to get others thinking and hopefully writing about the profession and its role with modern militaries and the societies that they serve.

Finney: Thanks for coming.

Mayfield: Yeah.

(Applause)

1: Gentlemen, are you concerned that this book will be bought by military people from Russia, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, North Korea?

Mayfield: That's an interesting question, one I had not considered.

Finney: I hope they do. This book is all about being a professional and the ethical use of power, and I sure would like to see a little bit more of that from those countries.

Mayfield: I think--that's my initial response as well. I hadn't thought about that, but I don't think there's any danger in that, actually. The concept of this book, of professionalism really drive home this responsibility and this necessity of trust between the military and the societies they serve, and I think in many of those countries that you mentioned, that trust is not present in the way it is in the United States, and I think that if other countries and militaries or citizens of other countries read that, that they would reflect then on Dr. Shanks Kaurin's chapter that military professionalism is something that's aspirational, and they would look around their own service and not see that present in the way that they would like it to be. So, yeah, that's a good question. Interesting.

2: You've written something rather unique, and you've indicated the forums or the venues in which you'd like to see it used as a tool. How do you go about getting it used in that way? Does marketing as a concept exist in your profession, and can--how do you get it so it's on the reading list at a war college or a basic training or wherever it's appropriate?

Finney: I think marketing--you may be participating in marketing right now. But to your point about how do we get into the institutions, we do that through platforms, through journals like the Strategy Bridge, right, which has been very successful at influencing professional military education specifically on the officer side of the house. A number of those journal articles are written, they are widely circulated in peer networks, they turn up on the reading lists, the daily read books of general officers, of professional organizations within the military, you know. And eventually they make their way to the war colleges; they make their way to the command and staff colleges. They are either cited and referenced in papers that students write, 'cause that's something that students have read and have access to. And that's how you influence those, and that's how you get present. I just attended the Army War College last year, and it was--I was surprised to see articles from the Strategy Bridge come across my desk in our own reading assignments. Same thing for War on the Rocks, same thing for Small Wars Journal. And to see something that you have edited get assigned you for reading in professional military education is interesting, right, and that's how you get in the conversation. I think the only thing better would be to see something you've written come across your desk as an assignment.

Finney: It's an interesting dynamic when you have your own work that your name's on get cited in any professional military education, 'cause the military being the military, all

the other students look at you like, "Thanks, man. Really appreciate you making me read this thing." I appreciate your very much inside-baseball question. I'm gonna see if I can answer without giving away any trade secrets. But there certainly is, I wouldn't call it marketing or branding as much as leveraging the networks that you build. So one thing the military is very good about, if you pick up on it, is teaching us how to create networks and develop relationships. Everything that we do every day involves other people that we either have to tell them to do something or, in my job as essentially a professional staff officer, you have to convince them that it's the right thing to do. And so developing those relationships through having an online journal, through helping other people produce for the profession, supporting other people's work that are similar to this, all help with that. The Strategy Bridge has been on the reading list for the UK's chief of general staff, the chief of staff of the air force here in the United States. Other reading lists, other reading books as Ty had mentioned. So when this book came out we knew that as the case, and we reached out to those people and said, "We appreciate all that you've done for us before. We have a book coming out. We'd be interested in really your feedback. Not so much the branding or marketing, but the feedback." And that led to such things as General Martin Dempsey writing the forward for this book. He's been a great mentor for me from afar. He was the man who started, really started the conversation on the army as a profession back when he was our training and doctrine commander then chief of staff of the army then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He really pushed hard on this as the military profession conversation. So being able to reach out to him through our networks allowed us to have a good conversation with him on the profession and led to a really great forward from him. I'm certain that will help with marketing and branding, having him on the forward, having him on the front of the book. But really what it comes down to is less the branding and more the leveraging of those networks that you have helped and that have helped you along in their career.

Mayfield: And we took this to Don Snider as well, right, as he is the most contemporary work on the army profession. And while it may be dated, early 2000s, it's still the preeminent work. It's still the thing that people go to now. So part of this process is you go to the last guy or gal who wrote the last book, and you present your work to them, and you ask for their feedback on it. And Don Snider provided feedback on this book, let me--and it's better for it, right. But that's what you do. And then you go back to him, and he reads it again, and he doesn't tell you you did a great job, but he tells you that it's better, and that's what you're looking for, right. And that's mentoring right there, and that's development of professional knowledge. And so we appreciate that, but it's a really interesting question.

3: I've heard a number of emphasis on ethical education among the officers, but I would like to advocate that the same kind of—well, similar level of attention be given to administer as well? I'm not advocating that we introduce a categorical comparative to that, enlisted basic program, but something similar appropriate to their level of age ought to be considered, after all, it's the enlisted man more so than the officers who actually make contact with enemy and enemies.

Mayfield: You're right, so the last two decades have brought home this idea of the strategic corporal, right. Of a junior enlisted person who's responsible for initiating action independently in that range, so it this gets to that point of autonomy. And I think your point about ethics and ethical deployment of our enlisted corps is really important. It's really a natural segue to this conversation. And it's one that Dr. Shanks Kaurin is actually working on, on developing a curriculum to help the ethical education of the enlisted corps, specifically to the navy, but I think it's something that will carry over. So you raise a valid question or a point. I think it's one that were' going to agree with, that it needs to be developed. That's one thing that I learned in writing this, or editing this book, and in

writing the introduction and conclusion and the summary to the online series as well, is that my own ethical development was lacking. When I balanced that with the amount of time I read reading history or strategy or studying logistics or learning the tactics of small units, my own ethical education was lacking. And so I think that your observation that we focus on developing the ethical and moral foundation for our enlisted personnel is absolutely essential to the conversation going forward.

Finney: I think our enlisted education mirrors the officer education when it comes to the teaching of ethics. From my understanding--I haven't been through enlisted education, but from my understanding from the soldiers I served with, it really doesn't happen until late in the career, right. So a master sergeant, a sergeant major, really the sergeant majors academy, at least in the army when they teach in depth the same type of courses that are taught at our staff colleges and above. And what we really need is that to be earlier. I have no doubt the training and education in action that our NCOs and officers are giving to our enlisted is instilling some sort of ethics in them, but there's no real robust discussion of ethics. One thing that Dr. Johnson mentioned in her chapter is that ethics as taught and as instilled in soldiers and other military members is really a way of taking preventative measure. Right, it's a way of providing that basis of knowledge to prevent anything bad from happening in the future. And I think the more that we do that at lower levels, the better. I think it's lower in the officer corps than it is in the enlisted, and we probably do need to push it down some more. That's a great point.

4: Did the stewards emphasize mentoring those who have made the most attempts at personal agency in the field of ethics to choose the mentor?

Mayfield: So I think who stewards of the profession choose to spend their time with in the profession is an interesting question, and I think it varies across the spectrum from officer to officer. I don't think--as the previous question kind of highlighted, I don't think there is necessarily a core group of officers or personnel in the military who focus on ethics as their own personal development. And so I think that this is one point, which I wish it played a bigger part in this book. If I had it to do over again I would ask that more chapters emphasize this role of the ethical development of subordinates.

Finney: Thank you very much.

Mayfield: Thank you.

(Applause)

Williams: Thank you to Nathan Finney and Tyrell Mayfield for an outstanding discussion and to the United States Naval Institute, the GPD Charitable Trust and John DeBlasio. The book is *Redefining the Modern Military*, published by the Naval Institute Press. To learn more about the Pritzker Military Museum and Library, visit us in person or online at PritzkerMilitary.org. Thank you, and please join us next time on *Pritzker Military Presents*.

Voiceover: Visit the Pritzker Military Museum and Library in downtown Chicago. Explore original exhibits on military history or be a part of a live studio audience. Watch other episodes of *Pritzker Military Presents*. Find out What's On at PritzkerMilitary.org.

(Theme music)

Voiceover: *Pritzker Military Presents* is made possible by members of the Pritzker Military Museum and Library and its sponsors. The views and opinions expressed in this program are not necessarily those of the Museum and Library.

(Theme music)

Voiceover: The preceding program was produced by the Pritzker Military Museum and Library.