



(AP Photo by Anja Niedringhaus)

A U.S. soldier arrives at the site where a suicide car bomber attacked a NATO convoy 16 May 2013 in Kabul, Afghanistan. Hizb-e-Islami, a Muslim militant group, claimed responsibility for the early morning attack that killed many in the explosion and wounded several others.

Ethics, Combat, and a Soldier's Decision to Kill

Chaplain (Maj.) Sean Wead, U.S. Army

On a lonely forward operating base in Iraq, an 18-year-old private, who five months before worried only about whom he might take to the prom, listens carefully to his commanding officer as if his life depends on it. It does. The soldier's mission

is to deliver critical supplies to units spread across his region. The commander orders him not to stop on the road for anything—even for children blocking the road. The enemy uses them to obstruct the road, hoping soldiers' moral sense will cause them to stop their vehicles,



(Photo by Sgt. Matthew Moeller, 5th Mobile Public Affairs Detachment)

A soldier with 1st Battalion, 32nd Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, fires his M4 rifle during a gun battle with insurgent forces 12 July 2009 in Barge Matal during Operation Mountain Fire. The tiny mountain village in Afghanistan's eastern Nuristan Province was overwhelmed by enemy forces until combined elements of the Afghan National Security Forces and International Security Assistance Forces forced the enemy to flee.

which leaves convoys open for attack. If he should meet any children on the road, the soldier is ordered to run them down if they refuse to get out of the way.¹

Four Navy SEALs (members of a sea-air-land team) drop into an isolated village in Afghanistan to identify the location of a Taliban commander. Their operation is exposed when they are discovered by a young shepherd boy and his companions. The SEALs agonize over whether they should kill the shepherds and continue the mission or let them go. By freeing them, the SEALs undoubtedly will alert others to their presence, bringing probable death and mission failure.²

Four insurgents kneel blindfolded before the squad of soldiers who captured them. These same insurgents were captured and handed over to the Iraqi government twice before. Each time they were released to fight again. The previous night, these same insurgents had injured U.S. soldiers with a command-detonated improvised explosive device—the wounded were members of the same squad as those now holding the insurgents at gunpoint. After conferring with the battalion commander, the platoon sergeant—having sworn to protect the lives of his men—moves deliberately to

a position behind the kneeling insurgents. He takes out his M9 Beretta pistol and fires a bullet through the head of each prisoner.³

These types of morally complex quandaries of war could be considered part of what is commonly called the fog of war. This idea, attributed to famed strategist Carl von Clausewitz, refers to the uncertainty and ambiguity that surround military operations.⁴ Former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara explains: “What the fog of war means is—war is so complex it’s beyond the ability of the human mind to comprehend all the variables. Our judgment, our understanding, are not adequate. And we kill people unnecessarily.”⁵

A Complex Moral Decision

In war, soldiers make judgments of life and death. The magnitude of such absolute decisions is nearly beyond comprehension. No remediation can change the outcome of killing, justifiable or not. When faced with killing someone, soldiers often try to synthesize moral and legal values with their mission, their safety, and the safety of fellow soldiers. They may struggle with the decision to kill, and eventually

they may struggle with the memory of killing for many years afterward.

When soldiers make decisions about killing, they make moral choices. When soldiers have time to consider a moral problem and make a decision, their thought process usually integrates an ethical foundation of personal concepts of virtue that influence intent, rules that guide actions, and the consequences likely to follow the decision. Even if all these things are understood theoretically, applying these moral concepts is not a habit in the average soldier. Therefore, when a decision must be made and action taken in the moment, the conscience is morally disengaged. The enormity of the decision is only considered in the aftermath.

In the dense fog of war, soldiers need more than these sometimes-competing frameworks ranked by the dominant value and only contemplated when given the opportunity after the fact. Soldiers need a way to understand and apply moral guidance and internalize moral standards as second nature to all their actions. This essay proposes that the principles of *just war theory* can help soldiers develop a clear moral vision when they have to measure out whether to kill.

Ideally, soldiers take life in the belief they will make the world a better place—or at least prevent it from getting worse. They believe their actions in war, while unpleasant, are necessary. They feel morally responsible for protecting and defending others from malicious attack and unlawful assault. Of course, this is an idealized understanding of a soldier's duty, which is intrinsically tied to trust and faith in the government of the United States.

The Nation's decisions must be perceived as just and implemented to protect the American people or its allies rather than for selfish gain. This means that to maintain faith in the government, soldiers must believe that the war they fight is just. The standard for determining if war is just is known as just war theory, or justified war.⁶

Just war theory consists of criteria addressing justice in going to war (*jus ad bellum*), justice in waging war (*jus in bello*), and justice after the war (*jus post bellum*). The theory comprises a systematic application of moral reasoning for the decision to undertake armed conflict against another state. It includes conduct during war and after its completion. Just war theory claims

that sometimes war may be justified and preferable to an immoral peace.⁷ But if war is to occur, it must be guided by morality, and the most evil aspects of warfare must be muted, limited, or eliminated.

Both *jus ad bellum* and *jus post bellum* are of great importance when a nation's leaders are considering war. Their implications are strategic because they apply to the state giving guidelines for actions during and after war. Moreover, the strategic implications of decisions made by political and senior military officials have immediate tactical and operational effects on the military forces that prosecute the war.

Soldiers asked to give their lives or to take lives in defense of their country deserve a well-reasoned justification for their sacrifice and labor. To tell soldiers only that they will do their duty in unquestioning obedience is an abuse in a professional military. Soldiers will bear the aftereffects of such actions for a lifetime. They deserve to understand the meaning and purpose of their actions so they can manage and give order to the consequences.

In the same way, civilians in a democracy demand justification to provide both blood and treasure to any such endeavor. Sun Tzu, in the oldest known manuscript on war, postulates in his "First Constant" that before going to war, a state should consider "The Moral Law, which causes the people to be in complete accord with their ruler so that they will follow him regardless of their lives, undismayed by any danger."⁸ This means that to maintain a fighting force willing to give their lives for a national goal, both the soldiers and the civilian population must believe their cause is right. Just war principles, when considered, can provide the moral high ground.

Just war principles provide moral, psychological, practical, and strategic reasons for conducting warfare, juxtaposed with enemies' motives and actions that would lead to unacceptable devastation if not stopped by violent means. To help forces handle the moral dilemmas they stumble into in the fog of war, the military equips its personnel with principles of *jus in bello*—justice in waging war. Most military personnel know the applied form as the rules of engagement or the law of armed conflict. This is the codification of just war by treaty and international commitments as they apply to different situations and battlefields.

Soldiers need to understand the principles of jus in bello because they can help clarify moral reasoning. Jus in bello dominates other paradigms of moral justification for actions in war. When understood and applied, it dissipates much of the fog of war by guiding when the taking of life is appropriate and when it is not. The rest of this discussion focuses on applying jus in bello at the tactical level.

Jus in Bello

Jus in bello, in its simplest form, can be broken down into two concepts: distinction and proportionality. Distinction concerns distinguishing between non-combatants (friendly and soldiers and civilians who are not actively involved in combat, so they are posing no threat) and combatants (all who are involved actively in combat). Civilians not participating in combat are, morally, immune from attack, although some could be injured or killed unintentionally in what is termed “collateral damage.” Prisoners are not combatants and should be safeguarded from attack. Proportionality concerns soldiers using only the amount of force necessary to meet the task, but no more. Both of these concepts are designed to limit the destruction of warfare.

While these concepts seem simple and straightforward, their application can be far more complicated. What really constitutes a combatant? Sometimes this is easily determined by the uniforms combatants wear. Yet, in irregular warfare, clear identification of an enemy may sometimes only be made when that enemy is firing a weapon. Furthermore, how can a person’s participation in warfare be ascertained? If civilians are manufacturing arms and equipment for the enemy, do they become lawful targets? These types of difficult questions illustrate the fog of war.

Soldiers struggle internally with a number of competing values in the fog of war, weighing the expediency of mission objectives and the cost of victory against actions they believe to be morally right. Overpowering emotions such as anger, grief, and revenge complicate their decision making. Moral codes of the profession of arms, the law of war, and the rules of engagement, although helpful, often are inadequate in the chaotic situations of war. Factoring in the relatively young average age of a soldier in combat and the limited time available for making a decision, the difficulty of moral decisions in war becomes evident.

At least jus in bello, through the concepts of distinction and proportionality, provides a baseline for determining the actions that would be moral. For example, it is clear that a civilian—even a citizen of an enemy state—who is not an immediate participant in combat, is an unlawful target. Similarly, it is clear that destroying an entire town to kill a few enemy combatants is morally wrong. There is a baseline, a point of reference from which to decide.

The U.S. Army as an institution is not blind to the difficulty of these situations, and it does not want command authority preempted by legalities. Army Doctrine Reference Publication (ADRP) 6-22, *Army Leadership*, tasks commanders, officers, and other leaders to apply ethical reasoning to different situations using character traits and beliefs developed in the individual when the rules of engagement and law of armed conflict prove insufficient.⁹ Therefore, there is a place for value judgments. The Army puts its full faith in the moral judgment of its leaders on the battlefield.¹⁰ However, to understand moral decisions in combat, one must also understand the community of the warrior.

The Warrior Society and Moral Leadership

Personal survival on the battlefield is a group effort. Individual ethics and adherence to principles of jus in bello are played out within the context of the group, within a society of warriors. A soldier belongs to concentric circles of groups, from team, squad, platoon, and company, to battalion, brigade, division, and even higher. The group dynamic is paramount to survival, and soldiers fight in the smallest of these warrior society groups.

Not all are equal within the group; some hold status because of rank, technical skill, or strong personality. Nevertheless, the fear of losing one’s reputation in these groups because of moral lapses, lack of courage, or ineptitude during the fight can be a stronger motivator than avoiding losing one’s life.¹¹ These thoughts are echoed by Albert Bandura in his social cognitive theory, where he states,

People do not operate as autonomous moral agents impervious to the social realities in which they are immersed. Moral agency is socially situated and exercised in particularized ways depending on the life conditions under which people transact their affairs.¹²

Unfortunately, a group's norms can lead to individuals conducting extreme violations of ethical standards derived from *jus in bello*. The group and the leaders can also emphasize immoral behavior that leads to disengagement of a soldier's moral sense.¹³

If the leadership of a unit begins to fail in addressing even minor infractions of discipline, especially those related to human dignity, soldiers can easily lose their core moral beliefs. The type of conduct that should proceed from moral beliefs can become lost as well. This process can quickly change the moral atmosphere of even the best units, making them susceptible to moral disengagement and the war crimes that follow.

Justin Watt, who served in the Black Hearts platoon, Company B, 1st Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, describes how his leaders, after nine months in one of the most hostile areas of Iraq, stopped caring about discipline in regard to the little things:

They stopped correcting soldiers when they used terms like "rag head" in reference to the Iraqis. It was in their attitude. They just did not care anymore. It sent an immediate signal to the soldiers that certain attitudes and even actions were now permissible. It all started from there and quickly got worse.¹⁴

Some members of Watt's platoon would go on to commit one of the worst atrocities of the Iraq War, involving rape and murder. Similarly, a soldier who participated in the infamous massacre of My Lai during the Vietnam War describes his actions after his leadership abandoned all moral guidance:

You didn't have to look for people to kill, they were just there. I cut their throats, cut off their hands, cut out their tongues, and scalped them. I did it. A lot of people were doing it, and I just followed. I just lost all sense of direction.¹⁵

Base and cruel natures hidden in the depths of the human soul can surface during the stress of combat, surprising those who believe such natures do not exist in themselves. Some acts of cruelty proceed naturally from character flaws, while others are a side effect of the state's mechanized brutality that is intrinsic to war. Without an outside authority reemphasizing and holding to standards, even those

who enter combat with a sense of moral principles can lose their way.

Leaders, officially sanctioned or chosen by consensus of the group, are key to the moral conduct of a unit. Moral leadership of those in command, exemplified by virtue and strengthened by the moral principles established in *jus in bello*, can steady those around them assaulted by the horrors of war.

However, that does not mean that soldiers hold special immunity to perpetrating atrocity in units with virtuous leadership. Even with the support of moral codes and good leadership, soldiers must confront the dissonance within them and master it. At times, some choose to value priorities such as victory or survival over convictions about what is right. Others simply fail their own sense of honor when confronted by the extremes of combat and when overcome by strong emotion. These soldiers disengage their moral belief system in favor of other priorities they value more highly in the moment.

Victory Over Honor

Practical concerns for victory drive some soldiers to put their consciences and rules of war aside. In offensive maneuvers, the speed and superiority of firepower can mean the difference between victory and defeat, and the management of prisoners can hinder a unit's effectiveness. Sending soldiers to secure prisoners' transfers to the rear leaves combat units weaker and more vulnerable to counterattack. Diverting vital offensive personnel to secure prisoners who had killed or maimed members of the unit moments before is a risk that some are unwilling to take. After all, if defeated, they could never be sure their own lives would be spared by the enemy to which they surrendered.¹⁶

Sometimes the calculus of victory wins out over honor or other concerns, even the condition of the soul. If soldiers believe their only choice is victory or death, then for some nothing is sacred or off-limits to achieve victory. The motive becomes completely utilitarian, where victory can supersede all wrongs. The laws of war, along with the values of a nation or a religious faith, are set aside for victory. Such a vision is morally repugnant to adherents of Christian religions, as illustrated in the Gospel of Matthew: "What good will it be for someone to gain the whole world, yet forfeit their soul?"¹⁷ A more worldly view, however, holds victory in



(Photo courtesy of U.S. Army)

Pfc. Jeremy Morlock poses with his weapon while sitting next to Staff Sgt. David Bram. Morlock pleaded guilty to three counts of premeditated murder following the killing of three Afghan civilians between January and May 2010 in Maiwand District, Kandahar Province, Afghanistan. Bram was found guilty of seven crimes, including solicitation to commit murder, for his actions related to those murders.

much higher esteem, as we can see from the history of Henry V of England.

Henry's actions at the battle of Agincourt, 1415, illustrate a case of choosing victory over honor. Beset by a superior force of French knights on French soil, Henry V broke with the medieval chivalric code to secure victory. After surviving two waves of French attackers, Henry expected a third assault that would break his defenses. Fearing an uprising from the multitude of prisoners he had captured during the first two waves, he ordered his knights to kill the prisoners.

After the noble knights refused, Henry turned to his archers, who stood outside the chivalric system. More than 200 of his archers began killing the prisoners. Once the French attack did not materialize, the king rescinded his directive.

Morality was set aside for the practical goal of victory. Henry, nominally a Christian king, knew such actions were considered murder, but his actions were calculated to win the day. His victory was glorified and romanticized by Shakespeare, and Henry's

moral lapse faded from memory.¹⁸ No doubt Henry's actions steeled French resistance to English claims, which prolonged one of the longest wars in world history, the Hundred Years War.

For the U.S. Army, to be victorious outside its own ethic and moral identity would be equal to being defeated from within.¹⁹ The Army's approach to victory is based on the expected morality of its soldiers, who represent the American people. If the pursuit of victory in war can motivate some to set aside moral trappings, personal survival can be even more powerful. The basic human instinct for survival is universal.

Survival Over Honor

Combat is a physically and emotionally turbulent environment where emotional extremes climb and fall unexpectedly. The reality of death and violence drives the human condition to its limits. In this atmosphere, physical survival can dominate, driving all other concerns to a secondary position. Notions of victory, honor, or obedience to law recede while base kill-or-be-killed instincts emerge.

One study shows that most people favor self-interest over principled reasoning.²⁰ This supports Abraham Maslow's famous psychological theory of a hierarchy of needs, whereby a deficiency in physical safety turns the need to survive into the prime impulse.²¹ Some soldiers will do whatever is necessary to survive, even if it means violating their conscience. Moreover, human beings may feel that as long as they are alive, they can seek forgiveness. When a person dies, all is finished. Biblical scripture conveys the idea that where there is life, there is hope: "Even a live dog is better off than a dead lion."²² Basic instincts of survival and victory are material expressions of human existence. Their vision tends to be limited to the here and now, and it precludes a transcendental existence after death. These drives, however, can be overridden by powerful emotions appealing to an even more primal response.

Revenge Over Honor

Emotions such as revenge can trigger an overpowering rage in combatants who see life violently ripped away in front of their eyes. Morality and concepts of rules in war slip to the back of the mind—disengaged—and become reluctant witnesses to atrocity. Once the passion of vengeance dissipates, the conscience will fight its way back and begin a separate battle for peace within the individual. Often, dominating vengeful emotions focus on the enemy, but in later psychoses, they may push an individual to attack innocents.

In his book *Achilles in Vietnam*, Jonathan Shay postulates that revenge in war is often linked to the deep psychological and cultural need to resurrect fallen comrades. Shay quotes a veteran who recalls revenge killings: "Every [expletive] one that died, I say, '_____, here's one for you, baby. I'll take this mother[expletive] out and I'm going to cut his [expletive] heart out for you.'"²³ The soldier was talking to his comrade as if he were alive and present. This illustrates that not only are the dead brought back to life through this sacrificial act of bloodletting but also feelings of helplessness and fear are banished. Keeping faith with friends' ghosts who haunt the battlefield in the survivor's mind affirms a sense of justice in the insanity of war, even if it is vengeance.

Americans should not fall into the delusion that their soldiers have any special immunity from the moral stressors and temptations of war. Like anyone,

soldiers may suffer from lapses in character when tested by the extremes of combat. Even soldiers from the so-called "Greatest Generation" committed war crimes. During the liberation of St. Lo in France, after the horrors of fighting in the hedgerows, U.S. forces fanned out in bands of soldiers, gathering up surrendering German troops, summarily shooting them as they were taken into custody. Several chaplains witnessed these brutal actions and were appalled. One of the American soldiers went through the pockets of his German victim and found a picture of the soldier's wife and baby. Out of guilt, he sought the chaplain and tried to justify his action by reasoning that "it was either him or me." The chaplain angrily pointed out that this was hardly the case since the German bore no weapons and had his hands up in surrender when the soldier murdered him.²⁴

Many soldiers die spiritually in combat because they feel forced to betray what they believe to be right. They are haunted for the rest of their lives. One only needs to look through the ranks of American veterans to find high suicide rates.²⁵ Moreover, drug abuse is higher among veterans than the rest of the population.²⁶ In addition, homelessness and alcoholism are rampant among combat veterans.²⁷ The soul can die before the body; it only takes longer for physical collapse. Such soldiers become like the living dead, the joy of life vanishing on the day of battle. They return home as shadows of their former selves, casualties of conscience. Therefore, to avoid this tragedy, it is imperative that each commander form an ethical command climate, as described in ADRP 6-22.²⁸ This climate must be built on the foundation of *jus in bello*, as described in Field Manual (FM) 27-10, *The Law of Land Warfare*.²⁹

Human Desecration and Moral Injury

War, by its nature, causes innocents to suffer and die. Nations at war make mistakes, and the cost is paid in lives. At times, the orders established to protect the whole bring about the unintended deaths of civilians, a circumstance euphemistically referred to as collateral damage. However, these deaths may be excused by the law of armed conflict as a case of double effect, meaning that the deaths as a measured risk were not intentional nor an instrument of gain in the conflict.



(Photo by Spc. Ryan Hallock, 28th Public Affairs Detachment)

A soldier identified as Staff Sgt. Robert Bales appeared in this photo and in an article in *High Desert Warrior*, a military website, in 2011. Bales was sentenced to life in prison without parole 23 August 2013 after pleading guilty of killing 16 Afghan villagers on 11 March 2012.

Yet, killing of any kind still causes anguish in the human heart. The weight of this anguish crushes the human and unhinges the psyche. In fact, according to Roy L. Swank and Walter E. Marchand, an average human being can survive only 60 days of unrelenting sustained combat before he or she breaks down mentally.³⁰ Witnessing or perpetrating unjust killing is a particularly traumatic experience.

In a 2008 article, Pvt. 1st Class Earl Coffey describes an anguish-causing desecration from the Iraq War to correspondent Billy Cox.³¹ In the 2003 incident, a civilian vehicle had failed to stop, and this was interpreted as a threat:

I saw an Abrams [tank] fire a super sabot round right through a pickup truck, and the woman who got out begged us to kill her while she watched her husband and her children burn to death ... In perfect English, she's saying, "Why? Why are you doing this? We're Christians!"³²

According to Shay, the ruin of the soul caused by the unraveling of moral character in the face of continued combat and traumatic experiences is termed moral injury, and it is associated with acute stress

disorder, or post-traumatic stress disorder.³³ During the American Civil War, it was called "soldier's heart." In World War I, it was called "shell shock." In World War II, it was termed "combat fatigue." In Vietnam, it would be called "combat stress reaction."

Stress disorder focuses on the trauma of an event while moral injury focuses on grief, regret, betrayal, shame, and other spiritual aspects of combat. Combat operational stress affects all soldiers who participate in war, and most symptoms subside over time. However, prolonged combat—or particularly traumatic experiences—can leave soldiers affected for life.

A study by the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies reports that the majority of troops back from Iraq and Afghanistan have had few problems readjusting. The study finds that 44 percent report some difficulties, which may include depression and alcohol use. Of this group, another 3 to 20 percent will be affected with what is now termed "stress illness."³⁴

According to post-traumatic stress disorder expert Dr. Bridget Cantrell, soldiers without moral grounding appear to have a tougher time resisting post-traumatic stress disorder. Cantrell and Chuck Dean describe how one soldier who fought in Central

America and Grenada, after killing a number of people, lost much of his ability to cope when he came to the conclusion that his actions had betrayed his Christian upbringing, which had taught him to respect life.³⁵ His moral disengagement and later realization of a loss of moral identity may have been prevented if combat training and command had emphasized the principles of *jus in bello*.

There would have been a doctrine to reinforce his beliefs and help him come to a moral conclusion on what he believed about his role and his actions as a soldier. Albert Bandura defined this process from a sociological framework, where individuals adopt standards of conduct that provide deterrents to bad behavior through self-respect and self-demands of ethical conduct.³⁶

Soldiers should not contemplate their role and its implications only after an event. If leaders can help soldiers think about their values in advance, the shock of combat will be somewhat inoculated against many of these unforeseen stressors because soldiers will have a greater sense of their moral self.

Collapse of Character and Insanity

Shay describes one type of acute reaction to combat stress as the “berserker state.”³⁷ According to Shay, the word comes from the ancient Norse warriors who fought in mad, uncontrolled states during combat. The berserker feels both beneath humanity as an animal and above it as a God.³⁸

Shay relates how one soldier from Vietnam could not remember a single person he served with in two years of a berserker state. When this condition advances to an all-consuming force, soldiers are known to have killed friend and foe alike.³⁹

According to his lawyer, Staff Sgt. Robert Bales, convicted of killing 16 Afghan civilians in Kandahar Province in March 2012, claims a similar disconnect from reality. He retains almost no memory of the atrocity. Bales claims symptoms consistent with post-traumatic stress disorder before committing the atrocities.⁴⁰ Bales was on his fourth deployment and had been taking Valium, steroids, and alcohol before the incident.⁴¹

It is safe to assume that relatively few people commit atrocities in war, considering how many have served in militaries across the world. It may

also be assumed that even fewer experience such a horrific disconnect from reality that they fall into insanity. However, no one who has seen war is unaffected.

In considering what is valued above honor and the effects discussed, only one course of action is prudent for a soldier to follow. That course of action is an idealistic approach that values what is believed to be right or good over self-interested urgencies that, ironically, lead to a loss of identity. This is the iconic prototype of virtue depicted in movies as the hero. It is the ideal that our society favors. Therefore, how does the military equip soldiers for moral survival in the dim fog of war? How does the military make them heroes? The answer is foundational to that same profession—it is found in *jus in bello*.⁴²

Survivability Through Honor

For the individual, the long-standing idea that a strong ethical framework is an asset in combat remains true. *Jus in bello* is, and always has been, a buttress to the moral foundation that most soldiers bring with them into the military. A morally formed and disciplined soldier is an imperative to an effective fighting force. These attributes are described collectively as character and are espoused in Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) 6-22, *Army Leadership*.⁴³

In World War I, considered by many to be the first modern war, the soldier and his morality were weighed as one component of endurance in battle. The key to survival for the British soldier in the trenches was believed to be a morality born out of Christian belief, which was and is the state religion of the United Kingdom. At the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, students and faculty were obliged to subscribe to the Church of England’s Articles of Religion.⁴⁴ The products of these institutions became the officer corps of the British forces. These officers instilled virtues such as temperance, loyalty, and candor in their soldiers. Most British officers believed this model of Christian virtues to be resilient in the stress of combat, providing a better chance of survival.⁴⁵ Again, it was the society of the group that emphasized a moral code of conduct. Similar examples appear throughout history. A strong ethical framework guided individual soldiers in World War II as well.

During the invasion of Normandy, German and American soldiers sometimes found themselves being

treated side-by-side for wounds by opposing forces at battlefield aid stations across the area of operations. Donald Crosby describes how an American chaplain, Francis Sampson, witnessed a badly wounded German soldier crawl to a wounded American who had slipped off his litter onto the hard ground.⁴⁶ The German soldier, in obvious pain, gently repositioned the critically wounded American into a more comfortable position. This would be the German soldier's last act of kindness. He died later that night.⁴⁷

Elsewhere on the battlefield, two paratroopers and medics, Pvt. Robert E. Wright and Pvt. Kenneth J. Moore, of 2nd Battalion, 501st Parachute Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division, set up an aid station in the small church in the village of Angoville au Plain in Normandy, France. It was D-Day, 6 June 1944.⁴⁸

Their orders were to treat U.S. soldiers only. They were not to take German prisoners alive for the first 48 hours. Because of their Christian faith, they ignored this order. Control of the ground of their aid station changed hands numerous times as the fighting around them dragged on. They became overwhelmed with more than 80 German and American wounded soldiers bleeding in pews and even on the altar of the small stone church.

This aid station was defended only by a Red Cross flag when the wooden door of the church burst open. A German officer stood primed with machine gun tightly gripped at the ready, rage in his eyes. When he saw that German soldiers were being treated by the medics, the officer's countenance quickly became serene as his rage drained away; he tearfully thanked the American medics for their care of his soldiers and promised to send a surgeon to assist with the wounded.⁴⁹

These examples show how soldiers even in the turmoil of combat can stay centered on their morality and spiritual belief, strengthened by the principles of *jus in bello*. While war may take lives and destroy the structures of civilization, it need not destroy a soldier's identity as expressed in care for other human beings and adherence to sacred beliefs. Even the taking of life can be done with sober intent in relation to the enormity of the action. *Jus in bello* guides the soldier to recognize the humanity of the enemy, thus preventing dehumanization that can lead to atrocity and even genocide.

Victory Through Honor

In combat, the saying "death before dishonor" expresses virtue at all costs. However, such a sacrifice is not always required. Indeed, more times than not, honor and other virtues may assist in victory. There are times when moral behavior and adherence to *jus in bello* can support triumph not just for the individual but also for the force. Moral action not only is the right thing to do but also it is the most effective thing to do.

According to Dave Grossman, during World War I, U.S. soldiers had such a reputation of humane conduct that in World War II, many Germans advised their young relatives entering into service, "Be brave, join the infantry, and surrender to the first American you see."⁵⁰

The American reputation for good treatment had survived from one generation to the next.⁵¹ Once Germany neared defeat in World War II, units fighting the Soviet Army would move out of the sector in order to surrender to American troops. Needless bloodshed was averted because they expected, and typically were given, good treatment.

According to Andrew Roberts, attitudes were far different on the Russo-German front.⁵² Both sides were swept into cycles of atrocity against soldiers and civilians. By the end of the war, German and Soviet soldiers were fighting each other to the last man, seldom taking prisoners. Soviet soldiers were told they were not accountable for civil crimes committed on German soil and that property and women were theirs by right and were the spoils of war. More than two million German women and girls were raped.⁵³ This vengeful policy was a reaction to Nazi atrocities committed in the Soviet Union during invasion and occupation by German troops.⁵⁴

Good moral conduct and a reputation of fair play have beneficial results on the traditional battlefield, but also they have beneficial results in counterinsurgency. For example, morality played a strategic role in the guerrilla warfare of Vietnam, as it did in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

While insurgents often use terrorist tactics, counterinsurgency forces are limited in their actions. In his classic *Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice*, David Galula explains that insurgents are judged by promises, but counterinsurgents are judged by their actions, and they are tied to their responsibility as well as to what they have done.⁵⁵ If they lie or cheat, their short-term gains



(Photo by Capt. Arnaldo Zelayacastro, 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team PAO)

Chaplain Mike Swartz, 1st Battalion, 503rd Parachute Infantry Regiment, 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, performs a communion service 20 February 2010 at an outpost overlooking the Tangi Valley in Afghanistan. Soldiers in remote outposts would miss the opportunity to worship without the field services that chaplains provide.

will be overturned, and they will be discredited forever. The prize in this sort of warfare is the hearts and minds of the people. It is the center of gravity of battle.

In Iraq, according to retired Iraqi Maj. Gen. Najim Abed Al-Jabouri, much of U.S. operational success was a by-product of al-Qaida's brutality against the Iraqi people.⁵⁶ Al-Qaida in Iraq and other insurgent groups used kidnapping, murder, and intimidation to gain support. This approach had the opposite effect, turning civilians against them and their cause.⁵⁷

In contrast, and for the most part, U.S. soldiers proved themselves partners with the Iraqi people. Local politicians, some who had been insurgents, became allies. This meant extending trust, which in war can lead to becoming exposed to an enemy. In turn, many Iraqis met coalition troops halfway. The beginning of this turnaround was known as the "Anbar Awakening." It extended into a program spanning the entire country. Former Iraqi insurgents changed sides to work for Iraq and maintained checkpoints that provided security against foreign fighters.

Nevertheless, such a stance is tenuous. If undone, the military could have quickly lost those gains. Soldiers and other supporting agencies must adhere to *jus in bello* and act with discipline and moral restraint, or they will risk extending a war indefinitely.

Conclusion

The effects of ethical decisions made in combat are far-reaching and echo in consequences later in life; they may become the most significant force in a soldier's life and in the lives of others on the battlefield. Ethical decisions can cause a war within the spirit of the warrior even as battle rages around him or her. Strong emotions batter the warrior, combining with extreme stress and unspeakable desecrations, to push soldiers to their spiritual and psychological limits. It is imperative that the Army prepare soldiers for making difficult moral decisions during combat. One way to equip them is through study of the application of *jus in bello*, which is worked out in the law of land warfare.

In addition, a solid faith, moral grounding, and a developed character seem to anchor an individual to peace of mind and spirit despite the turbulence of the battlefield.⁵⁸ *Jus in bello* can be a vital tool in synthesizing these characteristics and reminding soldiers of their moral selves. Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory refers to a similar process, in which individuals adopt standards of ethical conduct that deter immoral behavior.⁵⁹

Unfortunately, soldiers usually understand the rules but they sometimes do not adhere to them.



(Photo by Sgt. Terysa King, U.S. Army Africa PAO)

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Jason Duckworth, director of clinical supervision of the Family Life Chaplain Training Center at Fort Hood, Texas, works through a practical exercise 4 March 2014 with a Malawi Defense Force chaplain assistant.

Many times, they prefer victory or their own survival, or they are overcome by emotions such as revenge or grief. Something in their mind turns off their conscience. Bandura describes disengagement of the moral self-regulatory system as a psychological maneuver designed to circumvent the conscience. According to Bandura, when the conscience is working properly, people engage their personal standards by using self-sanctions, self-reflection, and proactive measures.⁶⁰ These measures can prevent some of the catastrophic behavior described in this essay.⁶¹ Valuing one's own

life, success, or anything else over one's beliefs of what is right disengages the conscience.

Soldiers need to engage in ethical thought well before they face ethical dilemmas in the fog of war. *Jus in bello* provides the subject matter and discussion parameters. If the Army can get soldiers to think about and understand the concepts of just war—especially justice in waging war—it can make the mind fit for battle. With the mind prepared, body and soul will follow. Soldiers will be able to resist the devastation war can impose on themselves and on others. ■

Chaplain (Maj.) Sean Wead, U.S. Army, is an assistant professor of ethics at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. He holds master's degrees in divinity and theology and a doctorate in ministry with an emphasis in ethics from Virginia Theological Seminary. Wead is a former infantry soldier and metropolitan police officer, with combat deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Notes

1. Retired 1st Sgt. Alan Vivyan (57th Transportation Company, 548th Corps Support Battalion, U.S. Army), in discussion with the author, October 2006, Fort Drum, NY.

2. Marcus Luttrell and Patrick Robinson, *Lone Survivor: The Eyewitness Account of Operation Redwing and the Lost Heroes of SEAL Team 10* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2007).

3. Name withheld by mutual agreement (U.S. Army soldier) in discussion with author, December 2007, Forward Operating Base Warrior, Kirkuk, Iraq.

4. Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War*, Anatole Rapoport ed., J.J. Graham trans. (Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books, 1968), 140.

5. Robert S. McNamara, quoted from Robert S. McNamara

- et al., *The Fog of War: Eleven Lessons from the Life of Robert S. McNamara*, documentary film directed by Errol Morris, Sony Pictures Classics, 2003.
6. John Howard Yoder, *When War is Unjust* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2001), 15.
 7. Michael Walzer, *Arguing About War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 10-11.
 8. Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, trans. Samuel B. Griffith (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1963), 63.
 9. ADRP 6-22, *Army Leadership* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office [GPO], August 2012), 3-38.
 10. Martin L. Cook, *The Moral Warrior* (Albany, NY: New York Press, 2004), 32.
 11. John Keegan, *The Face of Battle* (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 72.
 12. Albert Bandura, "Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities," *Personality and Social Psychology Review, Special Issue on Evil and Violence* 3 (1999): 208.
 13. Irving Lester Janis, *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascoes* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972).
 14. Justin Watt, "The Heart of Black Hearts: A Whistle Blower's Story," lecture at the Fort Leavenworth Ethics Symposium, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 4 December 2012.
 15. David L. Anderson, *Facing My Lai, Moving Beyond the Massacre* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1998).
 16. Keegan, 196.
 17. Matt 16:26 (New International Version).
 18. Keegan, 108-112.
 19. ADRP 1, *The Army Profession* (Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, June 2013), 4-1.
 20. William E. Sobesky, "The Effects of Situational Factors on Moral Judgment," *Child Development*, 54, (1983): 575-584.
 21. A.H. Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation," *Psychological Review* (1943): 50, 370-376, <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Maslow/motivation.htm> (accessed 15 December 2014).
 22. Eccles 9:4.
 23. Jonathan Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character* (New York: Scribner, 1997), 90.
 24. Donald Crosby, *Battlefield Chaplains* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas 1994), 135.
 25. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Mental Health Services Suicide Prevention Program, *Suicide Data Report*, 2012, by Janet Kemp and Robert Bossarte, a report of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Washington, DC, 2013, 15-16, <http://www.va.gov/opa/docs/suicide-data-report-2012-final.pdf> (accessed 15 December 2014).
 26. Elizabeth Oliva et al, "Trends in Opioid Agonist Therapy in the Veterans Health Administration: Is Supply Keeping Up with Demand?" *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Use*, 39 (2013): 103-107.
 27. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs website, Homeless Veteran Treatment Programs, <http://www.nynj.va.gov/homeless.asp> (accessed 15 December 2014)
 28. ADRP 6-22.
 29. FM 27-10, *The Law of Land Warfare* (Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, July 1956).
 30. Roy L. Swank and Walter E. Marchand. "Combat Neuroses," *American Journal of Sociology* (1946): 51, 465-478.
 31. Billy Cox, "The Spoils of Iraq War: How a Sarasota Soldier Got Rich and Lost it All," *Sarasota Herald-Tribune* (18 May 2008).
 32. Ibid., 15.
 33. Shay, 31-32.
 34. Committee on the Initial Assessment of Readjustment Needs of Military Personnel, Veterans, and their Families; Board on the Health of Selected Populations; and Institute of Medicine, *Returning Home from Iraq and Afghanistan: Assessment of Readjustment Needs of Veterans, Service Members, and Their Families* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, March 2013).
 35. Bridget Cantrell and Chuck Dean, *Down Range to Iraq and Back* (Seattle: Word Smith Publishing, 2005), 65-66.
 36. Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986) 491.
 37. Shay, 87.
 38. Ibid., 88.
 39. Ibid., 88.
 40. Carol D. Leonnig, "Staff Sgt. Robert Bales Describes PTSD [Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder]-Like Symptoms, Lawyer Says," *Washington Post*, 28 March 2012, <http://www.washingtonpost.com> (accessed 18 December 2014).
 41. Gene Johnson, "Staff Sgt. Bales Defers Plea in Afghan Massacre," *USA Today Online*, 17 January 2013, <http://www.usa-today.com/story/news/nation/2013/01/17/afghanistan-army-rob-ert-bales-sanity/1841995/> (accessed 15 December 2014).
 42. Anthony Hartle, *Moral Issues in Military Decision Making* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas: 2004), 9.
 43. ADP 6-22, *Army Leadership* (Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, August 2012), 6.
 44. Gerald Parsons, James Moore, and John Wolffe, *Religion in Victoria Britain* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1988), 223-224.
 45. Keegan, 279-281.
 46. Crosby, 133.
 47. Ibid.
 48. Paul Woodage, *Angels of Mercy: Two Screaming Eagle Medics in Angoville-au-Plain on D-Day* (Bayeux, France: Battle Bus Sarl, 2013), 77-78.
 49. Ibid., 84-89.
 50. Dave Grossman, *On Killing* (New York: Back Bay Books 1995), 205.
 51. Ibid., 205.
 52. Andrew Roberts, "Stalin's Army of Rapists: The Brutal War Crimes that Russia and Germany Tried to Ignore," Mail Online News, 24 Oct 2008, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1080493/Stalins-army-rapists-The-brutal-war-crime-Russia-Germany-tried-ignore.html#ixzz2RVZ7MH8o> (accessed 15 December 2014).
 53. Ibid.
 54. Grossman, 211.
 55. David Galula, *Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice* (London, UK: Frederick A. Praeger, 1964), 9.
 56. Najim Abed Al-Jabouri and Sterling Jensen, "The Iraqi and AQI [Al-Qaeda in Iraq] Roles in the Sunni Awakening," *Prism* 2, no. 1 (January 2010): 3-4.
 57. Ibid.
 58. Cantrell and Dean, 65-66.
 59. Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*, 491.
 60. Bandura, "Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities," 205.
 61. Ibid.