



# Army Values: “C-LDRSHIP” Confronting the Realities of Change

Command Sgt. Maj. Woody B. Carter, U.S. Army

*Command Sgt. Maj. Woody B. Carter is, serving as the Battalion Command Sgt. Maj. for the 52d Strategic Signal Battalion in Stuttgart, Germany. Carter holds an A.S. and B.S. from Excelsior College. His assignments include tours to Korea, Bosnia, Kosovo, and multiple combat deployments in Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom. Carter's previous deployment was in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, where he served as an Afghan National Army Advisor, where he promoted the importance of having values in the military.*

Trust is not possible without candor, and this involves, to a certain extent, self-policing and encouraging lower-ranking officers, and enlisted soldiers to speak truth to power (or up the chain of command).

—Profession of Arms Seminar, 2011<sup>1</sup>

Back when there were no “Army Values,” we had the Professional Army Ethics that were comprised of Loyalty, Duty, Selfless Service, and Integrity. These were the core values of the Army in the mid 1980’s. They all meant the same then as they do now. Along with the Professional Army Ethics, we also had individual values that were the four C’s: Commitment, Competence, Candor, and Courage. These hopefully sound somewhat familiar, because two C’s are part of today’s certifying criteria – Competence, Commitment, and Character. In 1986, then Chief of Staff of the Army, General John A. Wickham, Jr., declared the theme for the year as “Values.” He challenged all soldiers to “live our Army values and make our Army all it can be.” Also in 1986, DA Pam 600-68, “The Bedrock of Our Profession” White Paper 1986, was written. DA Pam 600-68 also stated, “We needed to develop and maintain strong individual and professional values because decisions frequently involve tough ethical choices.”<sup>2</sup> In 1994 FM 100-1, The Army, was published. It stated that the U.S. Army is a doctrine-based organization in a values-cen-

tered profession. As the Army’s cornerstone document, FM 100-1 defined the broad and enduring purposes for which the Army was established and the qualities, values, and traditions that guide the Army in protecting and serving the nation. It was in here the first Army ethos was identified simply in one word—Duty. Duty guided beliefs, standards, and ideals that characterized and motivated the Army.<sup>3</sup> Duty was defined as “behavior required by moral obligation, demanded by custom, or enjoined by feelings of rightness.”<sup>4</sup> Integrity and selfless service were embedded in duty. They gave it the moral foundation that the qualities of the ethos demanded from all soldiers from the rank of private to general officer. Also identified in FM 100-1 were the professional Soldier’s core qualities of commitment, competence, candor, compassion, and courage.<sup>5</sup> These core qualities were the facets of the soldier’s character that undergird the ethos.

In the 1990’s, the Army came out with the current seven Army Values we know today: Loyalty, Duty, Respect, Selfless Service, Honor, Integrity, and Personal Courage (LDRSHIP).

By now, I believe everyone knows them easily but living them, as retired Army Gen. Wickham challenged, is another thing. Back in the 80’s, integrity was the glue that held everything together. I believe integrity was greatly assisted by one of the “C’s” that is now no longer mentioned, which is candor. Candor was defined in FM 100-1 as “unreserved, honest or sincere expression; frankness; freedom from bias, prejudice, or malice.”<sup>6</sup> There were not very many “yes” men back then. If something was not right, they had the moral and personal courage to tell someone, rather it be a senior or peer. The Army Ethic, Public Trust, and the Profession of Arms article, written by Army Lt. Gen. Robert L. Caslen, Jr. with Army Capt. Nathan K. Finney, states that “candor is an important value that is not captured well enough in our current formulation of the Army Values and is important to this relationship.”<sup>7</sup> The two writers believe that enough evidence has surfaced in surveys and focus groups to consider the addition of an eighth Army value – candor. Candor applies inside and outside the Army, up and down the chain of command. If

candor had not been faded out, it is possible Gen. Petraeus would have been confronted by one or more of his subordinates to think twice about what he was doing, as stated by Sarah Chayes about General Petraeus and his book “All In.”<sup>8</sup> The Bedrock of Our Profession White Paper states, “If we cannot rely on each other to be honest and truthful in our dealings with one another, then we cannot get the job done. We must demand and expect honesty from all members who are in the Army or who work for the Army.”<sup>9</sup> In ADRP-1, the Army Profession, states, “...esprit de corps is reflected in an open command climate of candor, trust, and respect.”<sup>10</sup> Our seven Army Values are great and I believe many soldiers are living them, but possibly not as well as they could if they had the personal courage to be candid with their seniors, peers, and subordinates alike.

Col. Paul Paolozzi wrote an article for the Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College titled “Close the Candor Chasm: The Missing Element of Army Professionalism.” In it, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, 2008, has a quote “...if as an officer one does not tell

blunt truths or create an environment where candor is encouraged, then they have done themselves and the institute a disservice.” Col. Paolozzi writes that “candor is a critical mark of character in communication-providing strength, purpose, boldness, and validity.”<sup>11</sup> We, the Army, want to build “trust.” Trust between soldiers and their leaders, soldiers and their families, and trust between the Army and the American people. We cannot achieve this without effective communication between everyone. We all know that effective communication is the key to any relationship, personal or professional. Vice President Biden stated “Candor generates trust...trust is the basis on which real change – constructive change – is made.”<sup>12</sup> Retired Army Gen. Frederick Franks, wrote, “The Army Profession must reinforce the necessity for, tolerate, and indeed encourage mutual candor, even as it allows wide discretion in command.”<sup>13</sup> ADRP 6-22, Army Leadership,<sup>14</sup> talks about how leaders build trust. It says that “it is important for leaders to promote a culture and climate

of trust.” It goes on to discuss how to develop others, help them learn, assess their developmental needs, coach them, counsel them and mentor them. How can we do all that? Candor has eroded through the years because of neglect, chiefly in training, education, counseling, and evaluations, effectively limiting the manner in which trust is reinforced. Being candid is not easy, it does take personal courage to tell someone where they are weak or when something is wrong. It is not a free ticket to say “no that’s wrong.” We need to bring candor back to the forefront. Candor is only mentioned four times in all of ADRP 6-22, Army Leadership.

In my experience, over the past 24 years, I believed in asking the hard questions and telling it like it is. I have seen other soldiers, NCOs and officers who were candid with their peers, seniors, and subordinates; they were all respected for their honesty. I think we all know a couple of people who are not afraid to “tell someone off” or “put someone in their place.” That is what the Army needs

more of, but in a professional and tactful manner. I asked how do we coach, teach, and mentor and build a culture and climate of trust; the answer is – to be candid. We need to create an environment that allows change and leaders must be willing and accepting of candor and ready for change. Retired Army Gen. Peter Schoomaker once said; “Cultural changes begins with behavior and leaders who shape it.”<sup>15</sup> Do not be afraid to tell your soldiers where they are weak and how they need to improve. Do your due diligence in giving them open and honest feedback. Do not just say they are weak and not tell them how to improve. If it’s a senior, be professional and use tact. Most subordinates know what is really going on in the work area and have a good grasp on things. As seniors, we have to give them a chance in order to build real trust. So how do we get after this; to bring candor back to the forefront; we talk about it. When we hear or see that someone may be holding back, fearing what we might say, give them a chance and let them speak.

There is a duty and obligation to build the trust between our soldiers, leaders and the American people. Exercising candor is everyone’s responsibility. The Profession of Arms Seminar that was held in January 2011, had a panel that felt strongly about candor being an essential value, and part of the attributes, though never recommended candor as an addition; rather they felt that it was encompassed under trust, and that trust would not be possible without candor.” Trust is part of the five essential characteristics of the Army Profession and is the bedrock of our profession. However, like integrity held our original values, the Professional Army Ethics” together, so does candor. It would be real easy to add to our values; just put it first and it will say what we should all see: **C-LDRSHIP**.

To read more about why I believe candor is so important to our Army Values, our Profession and everything we do, please read Col. Paul Paolozzi’s article “Closing the Candor Chasm: The Missing Element of Army Professionalism.” ■

## Endnotes

1. Booz / Allen / Hamilton, UNIFIED QUEST 2011-The Army Future Study, “Profession of Arms Seminar; 11-13 January, Event Report;” p. 52.

2. Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1986, “The Bedrock of Our Profession” White Paper 1986, p. 3.

3. Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1994, “The Army” p. 5.

4. Ibid. p. 5-6.

5. Ibid. p. 7.

6. Ibid. p. 8.

7. Lt. Gen. Robert L. Caslen, Jr. with Capt. Nathan K. Finney, Military Review, “The Army Ethic, Public Trust, and the Profession of Arms article” p. 19.

8. Paula Broadwell with Vernon Loeb, 2012, Penguin Books, All In – The Education of General David Petraeus.

9. “The Bedrock of Our Profession” White Paper 1986, p. 3.

10. Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2013, ADRP-1, The Army Profession, p. 5-3.

11. Col Paul Paolozzi, 2013, Strategic Studies Institute, Closing the Candor Chasm: The Missing Element of Army Professionalism. <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1178>.

12. Army Times, Josh Lederman -The Associated Press, 2013, Biden: U.S.-China ties hinge on trust, good motives; <http://www.armytimes.com/article/20131204/NEWS08/312040004/Biden-U-S-China-ties-hinge-trust-good-motives>.

13. Gen. Frederick Franks, Military Review, The Pro-

fessionThe Profession of Arms, p. 32. [http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview\\_20110930PofA\\_art009.pdf](http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview_20110930PofA_art009.pdf).

14. Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012, Army Leadership; ADRP 6-22, p. 6-7. [http://armypubs.army.mil/doctrine/DR\\_pubs/dr\\_a/pdf/adrp6\\_22\\_new.pdf](http://armypubs.army.mil/doctrine/DR_pubs/dr_a/pdf/adrp6_22_new.pdf).

15. Fastabend and Simpson, “Adapt or Die,” The Imperative for a Culture of Innovation in the United States Army, p. 1.