The teaching of values and ethics in the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) through the Professional Military Education and Training (PMET) Program.

Author: James Cyril CURTAIN

Supervised research project submitted to the Melbourne College of Divinity for the MASTER OF MINISTRY degree

September 2008
CONTENTS

CONTENTS                                          ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS                                 vi

PREFACE                                          vii

ABBREVIATIONS                                   viii

INTRODUCTION                                    1

CHAPTER 1                                       7

RAAF VALUES AND COMPETENCIES – WHAT ETHICS ARE IMPLIED?

Introduction

The purpose of the Air Force

The aims of the Air Force

The expectations of the Air Force

The ethical theories behind the RAAF Values Statement

The ethical and ‘RAAF Values’ aspects of the PMET competencies

‘RAAF Values’ in the competencies

‘Character’ in the competencies

‘Military ethics’ in the competencies

Conclusion

CHAPTER 2                                       23

LIST OF AIR FORCE COMPETENCIES WITH VALUES & ETHICS IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

What are the competencies and how are they constructed and
how they relate to the Air Force training philosophy

General comments

Core

General comments

Corporal

General comments

Sergeant

General comments

Flight Sergeant

General comments

Warrant Officer

General comments

Junior officer

General comments

Squadron Leader

General comments

Wing Commander

General comments

CHAPTER 3
ETHICS, COMPETENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

Introduction

Recruit Course

Corporal (CPL) Course

Just war

Character Development
Sergeant (SGT) Course
  RAAF Values
  Just War
  Character Development

Flight Sergeant (FSGT) Course
  Character Development

Warrant Officer (WOFF) Course

Initial Officer (IOC) Course
  RAAF Values
  Just War
  Character Development

Squadron Leader (SQNLDR) Course
  RAAF Values
  Just War
  Character Development

Conclusion

CHAPTER 4 VALUES AND ETHICS FOR LEADERS – PREPARING SERGEANTS AND SQUADRON LEADERS

Sergeant Course
  RAAF Values
  Just War
  Character Development

Squadron Leader Course
  RAAF Values
  Just War
Character Development

Conclusion

SUMMARY

79

BIBLIOGRAPHY

82

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

THE RAAF VALUES STATEMENT

85

APPENDIX 2

SERGEANT COURSE – CASE STUDIES

86
FOR RAAF VALUES

APPENDIX 3

SERGEANT COURSE – INSTRUCTOR

89
GUIDE FOR LESSON ON MILITARY
ETHICS

APPENDIX 4

SERGEANT COURSE – DISCUSSION

91
GUIDE FOR DEBRIEFING
PARTICIPANTS
ON THE CHARACTER ISSUES IN
PRACTICAL LEADERSHIP EXERCISES

APPENDIX 5

SQUADRON LEADER COURSE –

92
RAAF VALUES RESOURCES

APPENDIX 6

SQUADRON LEADER COURSE –

95
JUST WAR DISCUSSION POINTS

APPENDIX 7

SQUADRON LEADER COURSE –

97
CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT AND
CONSCIENCE DISCUSSION GUIDE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has been completed as part of the Master of Ministry degree program of the Melbourne College of Divinity, which has been undertaken with sponsorship from the Department of Defence under the Civil Schooling scheme.

Many colleagues have assisted this project by their ideas, discussions and experience. I would particularly like to thank Wing Commander John Fisher, Chaplain – Group Captain Kevin Russell and Chaplain – Group Captain Murray Earl for their guidance.

My supervisor, Rev. Kevin McGovern, has been an invaluable guide, friend and confidante.

My wife Vicki, as always, gives me total support and love, and her philosophical training and teaching experience have been an essential resource for me.

This thesis submitted for assessment is the result of my own work, and no unacknowledged assistance has been received in its planning, drafting, execution or writing. All sources on which it is based have been acknowledged in writing, as has the supervision which I have received in the process of its preparation.

Name: ______________________ Signature: _____________________
Date: ________
PREFACE

The impetus for this project came from my experience as a new chaplain at the Officers Training School, Point Cook. I was required to teach classes in ethics to students on the Initial Officer Course, and discovered that the materials provided for teaching ranged from a potted, and partially inaccurate, history of ethical philosophy to an interesting, although simplistic, account of the ethical decision making process. Unfortunately none of the materials related to a proper syllabus, validated through the RAAF’s training system. On investigation I found out that ethics was seen as the individual Chaplain’s ‘baby’, to be taught as he saw fit. I put together materials that I was comfortable with, but these still lacked systemic validation, and were not part of a continuum that a member would be educated in as he or she progressed through their service career. As the RAAF became more operationally focused through the 1990’s, and the Air Force went to war in the Middle East in 2003, I felt more and more that the members of the Air Force needed a better ethical education to cope with the potential legal, psychological, emotional and spiritual effects of war. The project is an attempt to provide some resources for this ethical education, and to lay out some proposals for systemic training in ethics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RTU</td>
<td>No 1 Recruit Training Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Aircraftsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACW</td>
<td>Aircraftswoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Australian Defence Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADFA</td>
<td>Australian Defence Force Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLGOFF</td>
<td>Flying Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLTLT</td>
<td>Flight Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSGT</td>
<td>Flight Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Leading Aircraftsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACW</td>
<td>Leading Aircraftswoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTS</td>
<td>Officers Training School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMET</td>
<td>Professional Military Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAAF</td>
<td>Royal Australian Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQNLDR</td>
<td>Squadron Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGCDR</td>
<td>Wing Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOFF</td>
<td>Warrant Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The Royal Australian Air Force Mission ‘is to prepare for, conduct and sustain effective air operations to promote Australia’s security and interests.’ ¹ The nature of these operations includes at least the threat of force, and the weapons and ordnance under RAAF control are designed ‘to kill people and break things,’ ² or as an official document rather more elegantly phrases it, ‘The Australian Defence Force is the only Australian organisation that has the authority to employ lethal violence in defence of Australia.’ ³ As Australians we trust that our military will be fighting in just wars, but we must acknowledge that even a just war is horrible. There will always be collateral damage, and the innocent will suffer. Those who are sent to fight even the most just of wars are laid open to temptations to sins of hatred, anger, cruelty, greed, despair and lust. Indeed, St Augustine saw this as the major moral objection to war, not the fact that people suffer and die, since suffering and death are an inevitable part of the human condition:

What is evil in war? It is not the deaths of some who would soon die anyway. The desire for harming, the cruelty of avenging, an unruly and implacable animosity, the rage of rebellion, the lust of domination and the like – these are the things which are to be blamed in war.⁴

A society that accepts that there can be just wars, and is willing to send some of its citizens away to fight them, has a duty to prepare its warriors physically, intellectually, and morally. Physical and intellectual training is given a high priority in the RAAF. Technical and trade training for aircrew, technicians and support staff is of

---

² This rather blunt phrase is the informal and unofficial motto adopted by some members of the RAAF’s Air Combat Group.
a very high standard. General military skills and attitudes are well taught. Warriors in the RAAF are trained and equipped to win, and in a just war this is in itself highly moral. To resist the temptations mentioned above, however, moral training is needed, or warriors may well come back from conflict with a legacy of guilt, anger and resentment arising from moral and consequent psychological wounds: ⁵

Morally conscientious military personnel need to understand and frame their actions in moral terms so as to maintain moral integrity in the midst of actions and stress of combat. They do so in order to explain to themselves and others how the killing of human beings they do is distinguishable from the criminal act of murder.⁶

In addition to the pressures of war, military service puts its members in a strictly ordered hierarchy, where the authority of the workplace supervisor has the force of Australian law, and where the employer has the power not just to warn or dismiss an incompetent or unwilling worker, but also to administer punishments ranging from monetary fines to restriction of liberty, up to and including imprisonment. Additionally, the habit of obedience (rightly) inculcated by basic military training can be abused so that people will obey clearly immoral, even illegal, orders from superior officers. In this environment the right use of power is essential, and members at all levels need to be trained in the ethical exercise of authority. This is


⁵ ’Swank and Marchand's World War II study of US Army combatants on the beaches of Normandy found that after 60 days of continuous combat, 98% of the surviving soldiers had become psychiatric casualties. And the remaining 2% were identified as “aggressive psychopathic personalities.” Thus it is not too far from the mark to observe that there is something about continuous, inescapable combat which will drive 98% of all men insane, and the other 2% were crazy when they got there.’ This quote is from Lt. Col. Dave Grossman & Bruce K. Siddle Psychological Effects of Combat, quoted from the SynEARTH Archives dated 28 FEB05, accessed from http://futurepositive.synearth.net/2005/02/

the major area where military forces in democracies can come unstuck morally. The basic principle that it is illegal to follow an illegal order needs to be reinforced constantly, and supported by ethical training that gives members of all ranks an appreciation that some actions are just wrong, regardless of what higher authority (at whatever level) says. The Abu Ghraib scandal is the most spectacular recent example where orders were followed which should have been self-evidently immoral, and were definitely illegal. The fact that the abusers took photographs of their illegal and immoral acts indicates that at the very least they lacked a full appreciation of the enormity of their actions, and their evidence at their trials indicated a belief that their superiors were at least willing to turn a blind eye to abuse.

Although the RAAF has not had such a spectacular public issue with standards of behaviour and conduct, the issues of values and ethics were seen as a cultural issue in the 1990’s. A paper presented to the Chief of Air Force Advisory Committee (CAFAC – the committee consisting of the Chief of Air Force and those very senior officers who report directly to him) discussed the issue of values and attitudes at length. This paper quotes a number of instances where junior officers, senior non-commissioned officers and junior airmen/airwomen behaved inappropriately, or ignorantly of Service standards and conventions. These instances ranged from ‘aspects of etiquette, dress and basic social conventions’ to an increased number of ‘low level general harassment and discrimination complaints.’ The report then lists the then-

---

7 Within the Australian military we too have our scandals – well within recent memory training units such as the Australian Defence Force Academy and RAAF No 1 Recruit Training Unit, and operational units such as 3rd Battalion Royal Australian Regiment, have had well publicised problems with bullying and harassment.  
8 CAFAC Agendum 3/97 – Development and Maintenance of Values and Attitudes. HQTC 56/104/1/Air Pt4 (5) dated 24 April 1997. Quoted with the permission of the relevant staff officer.  
9 CAFAC Agendum 3/97 para 13  
10 CAFAC Agendum 3/97 para 18
current RAAF values: Espirit de Corps, professionalism, Flexibility, Dedication, Courage, Excellence, Ethical Conduct, pointing out:

…there is potential for **significant disparity** (my emphasis) between the culture implicit in these espoused values and the real organisational culture, visibility of which appears in those values, attitudes, norms, styles and cues daily being enacted throughout the organisation…"\(^{11}\)

The paper then goes on to point out that while the training system can give initial formation in values, these values must then be carried through to the operational workplace. The paper adds that there are perceived inconsistencies between training schools, and that in a number of workplaces there is ‘significant pressure to disregard previous high standards of behaviour set in the Training System.’\(^{12}\)

The nature of military service is such that the controlled and ethical use of power, authority and physical force are vital. If the principles officially espoused by the military hierarchy are not observed in the training system, or if they are then ignored in the operational workplace, then there is tremendous room for abuse. The CAFAC paper shows that these issues were seen as a major problem. The current PMET program was an initial attempt to deal with these problems and this paper argues that a specific focus on character development and ethical education in certain PMET courses would improve the ability of RAAF members to make ethical decisions, and to influence others to behave ethically.

So members of the RAAF have to deal with at least two areas of ethical conflict different from, and arguably more intense than, those common in Australian civilian life. First, how to exercise (or even directly support the exercise of) lethal

---

\(^{11}\) CAFAC Agendum 3/97 para 20
force while remaining morally and psychologically healthy and unbrutalised. Secondly, how to exercise authority over others and accept that authority over oneself in an ethical way. The Service acknowledges that these matters influence not just the moral and psychological health of individual members, but also the effectiveness of the RAAF as a whole. ‘The cohesion of an air force can be defined by the values it espouses. The Royal Australian Air Force has a clear and unequivocal set of values.’

Issues of character and its development, and questions about what is a just war and how is it fought are all relevant to this. These should be central issues in military training, and in this project I shall examine how the RAAF currently provides this training through its Professional Military Education and Training (PMET) system, and give suggestions for improvements. At present the RAAF gives its members guidance in these matters through its Values Statement (attached as Appendix 1). This statement lists what the Service is there for, and its duties to and expectations of its people. It forms an important part of the training system and is frequently referred to. Therefore I shall start the project by analysing the statement, looking at its philosophical underpinnings (the ‘metaetic’ implied) and then seeing how this is reflected in the Competencies which are the basis of the PMET system. I shall then list the competencies that have ethical implication, and give a brief explanation of how these competencies fit in with the training system. Then I shall look at the individual courses that form the PMET system and examine how ethical training is covered in those courses. Finally I shall give precise recommendation for two courses in the PMET system, the Sergeant course and the Squadron Leader course, as to how ethical training can be better accomplished.

12 CAFAC Agendum 3/97, para 16.
Fundamentals, 261.
CHAPTER ONE
RAAF VALUES AND COMPETENCIES—WHAT ETHICS ARE IMPLIED?

Introduction.

The Royal Australian Air Force Values Statement\(^{14}\) lists the RAAF’s purpose, its aims, and its expectations of its own people. In this chapter I shall first discuss the statement under these three headings, looking at the ethical implications and whether or not the contents of the statement are realistic. Then I shall discuss the ‘meta-ethic’ implied by the statement – the ethical theories which are behind the RAAF’s values. Finally I shall examine the way these values are reflected in the official competencies that are the basis for the RAAF’s Professional Military Education and Training (PMET) program.

The purpose of the Air Force.

The Royal Australian Air Force stands for:
- Delivery of effective, precision aerospace power;
- Defence of Australia’s people, security and interests;

These purposes both have the great virtue of being falsifiable. That is, if the RAAF does not deliver effective and precise aerospace power then Australia will be at risk of aerospace attack, ordnance will not fall on the correct targets, illegal or suspicious ships or aircraft will not be identified, and military or humanitarian cargo will not be transported. These are all outcomes that can be objectively measured. Similarly if Australia is not properly defended we shall know it by measures ranging from our influence in world forums to, at the extreme, defeat in

\(^{14}\) This statement can be found at http://www.defence.gov.au/raaf/corporate/value.htm as at 26 October 2007, and it is attached as Appendix 1. I quote the three parts of this statement at the beginning of the first three sections of this chapter.
The statements are therefore realistic because we know that what they entail can be measured.

There is no directly ethical content in this part of the statement. There are no words that describe how these purposes can be achieved in an ethical way, or any ethical account of why these are our purposes. However, ethical implications can be read into these purposes. ‘Effective, precision aerospace power’ echoes the just war requirements that wars be winnable (jus ad bellum), that damage caused be proportional to the outcome and that non-military targets be avoided (jus in bello).

‘Defence of Australia’s people, security and interests’ implies (at least for ‘people’ and ‘security’) that wars are fought in response to aggression, and that these wars are defensive in nature. The ethical use of force is therefore implied in the purpose of the Air Force, although no direct ethical judgements are made. ‘Defence of Australia’s people, security and interests’ is open to wide interpretation. In our system the elected Federal government decides what Australia’s interests are. In certain circumstances a Defence member may find that their personal interpretation of ‘Australia’s interests’ is so at odds with that of the government that it would offend their conscience to follow orders. The ethical question then is to balance the Defence member’s duty to obey legal orders with the ethical requirement to follow a well-formed conscience.

The aims of the Air Force

The Royal Australian Air Force aims to:
- Be a professional, highly motivated and dedicated team;
- Develop and support its people;
- Be a safe and equitable place to work.

These aims are about the responsibility the Air Force has towards its members, rather than about its responsibilities towards the people of Australia. It is also about
the responsibilities that the members of the Service have to each other. Implied here is that the Air Force is not just an organisation that controls or purchases the labour of individuals to provide certain services to its customers. The Air Force is a community of people who have responsibilities towards each other and to the organisation as well as to the larger community from which they are drawn, the people of Australia. This community has a very strong self-image – people are socialised into the community through intense training, and this socialisation is strengthened through communal experiences such as exercises and operational deployments, as well as military uniforms and rituals that have roots millenia old. A feature of the community is that it does not only include currently uniformed members – family members and veterans are all seen as belonging in one sense or another.

The aims can be summarised as ‘members of the Air Force have the right to an effective and just work environment’. This is both because this is right in itself, and also because such an Air Force is better able to meet the purposes listed above. ‘Rights’ language implies that there is some body that can be held accountable when those who have rights are denied them. In this case the accountable body is also that which has the rights, so that every member is responsible to every other member for ensuring that the aims are met. Obviously in a hierarchical organisation, the more senior the member, the greater the responsibility, but all members down to the most junior bear some of the burden. Although there is a massive difference in the status of the Governor-General, Minister of Defence and Chief of Air Force on the one hand, and a recruit on the other, they are all part of the Air Force community, with a responsibility to meet the aims of the Air Force in a way appropriate to their status.
The judgement of how well the Air Force achieves its aims has a large element of subjectivity. At any time I could find various people in the Air Force who either strongly agree or disagree that the Service is professional, highly motivated and dedicated, that members are normally developed and supported, and that where they work is safe and equitable. So is it the people of the Service who determine whether or not these aims are met? Or is it the leaders? Certainly the leaders have much of the responsibility for meeting these aims, and should have the resources and experience to determine whether or not the Air Force community is successful in meeting them. The ethical implications of these aims are directed at all levels of the Air Force. In an ideal world there could be a clear answer as to whether the Air Force was successful or not. However the reality is that the best that can be hoped for is that most members of the community trust that their comrades usually achieve these aims by working effectively and being worthy of trust. In the end we rely on the judgement of that philosophical abstraction, the reasonable person! In other words we must ask: Would a reasonable person conclude that the RAAF is professional, highly motivated and dedicated, that its members are developed and supported, and that they work in a safe and equitable place?

The expectations of the Air Force

The Royal Australian Air Force expects that its people will:
- Display honest commitment to the Royal Australian Air Force Values.
- Strive for excellence as both leaders and followers.
- Be fair to and respect the rights of others.
- Encourage diversity in all its forms.
- Balance work and personal commitments, including family and relationships, for themselves and those they work with.

15 The latest Defence Attitudes Survey (http://intranet.defence.gov.au/ciog/isd/535/14279_1.pdf as at 26 September 2005) shows that Air Force members have generally more positive attitudes to a number of Service issues than their Army and Navy counterparts. For example, 86.6% of Air Force members believe that their commanders/managers promote a safe working environment, 68.4% are satisfied with the military as a way of life, and 80.8% speak highly of the Service to their friends. These figures, of course, all imply a substantial number of people who are unsure or negative on these issues!
- Work together as a team.
- Communicate in an open and honest manner.
- Be capability focussed and operationally ready.¹⁶
- Be professional and innovative.
- Be recognised for their loyalty, integrity and determination.
- Serve with pride and dedication.¹⁷

If the aims of the Air Force could have been interpreted as the rights of its members, these expectations are actually the concomitant duties. As discussed above, the aims of the Air Force put responsibilities on all individual members as part of a community. These expectations put flesh on those responsibilities. There is an intimate relationship between the aims and expectations in that if every member of the Service met these expectations, then the aims listed above would be met. I summarised the aims as ‘members of the Air Force have the right to an effective and just work environment’. In as much as individual members of the community meet these expectations, so will the community provide an effective and just work environment. As with the aims, the community itself is the arbiter as to whether or not expectations are being met, and as stated above a large degree of mutual trust is needed.

The expectations themselves are an interesting mix of military, or possibly ‘work community’ virtues (pride, dedication, loyalty, teamwork, ‘capability focussed and operationally ready’); traditional virtues (integrity, determination, professionalism); and contemporary, even ‘politically correct’, virtues (work/life

¹⁶ These two terms have a ‘history’ within the RAAF. In the early 1990’s the RAAF had a strength of approximately 23,000 full-time uniformed members. Since then, the Service has reduced to around 13,000 full-time uniformed members, and yet maintained a higher level of operations, including continuous active service (i.e. war or war-like operations) since 1999. Through the various reform programs that brought this about ‘capability’ and ‘operational focus’ have been watchwords. By implication, they place a focus outside the organisation. The Service exists not to serve itself, but to be ready to successfully operate as required by the Australian people, as represented by their government.

¹⁷ The RAAF Values statement then ends with the general comment ‘The Royal Australian Air Force values its people.’
balance, diversity, innovation). The mix speaks to the Service’s responsibility to be responsive to the standards of the society from which it is drawn, which provides it with the resources to exist, and which it is required to defend. Traditionally, the military virtues are inculcated and/or encouraged through training, particularly through the traditional pressures of initial training – hard physical work, strict time limits, and total immersion in the military environment. The traditional virtues of integrity, determination and professionalism are hopefully modelled in family, school and society, as are the contemporary virtues.

Are these expectations realistic? Much here depends on the individual’s formation. The modelling of the virtues certainly varies from family to family, school to school, and the effectiveness of the military training system is also variable! What can be safely said is that if these expectations are to be met, these virtues required of individuals must be modelled and taught by the Service.

**The ethical theories behind the RAAF Values Statement.**

As we have seen, the statement presents the purposes, aims and expectations of the RAAF - that is why it exists (and what it owes to the Australian people), what it owes to its own members, and what it requires from its own members. It is interesting that the bulk of the statement is concerned with human relationships within the Service: a possible reason for this will be discussed below. As discussed above, it reflects a collection of traditional military qualities, as well as those valued by our society and common to Western liberal society. What ethical theories are behind it,
however? Does it consider the greatest good of the greatest number, or does it refer to a common religious code? Is it based on a vision of a fully flourishing human life, or does it refer to a universally valid moral principle by which all standards and actions can be judged? I believe that the ethical underpinning of the statement comes from virtue ethics, and deontological ethics, and that this is demonstrated if we look at the origins of the statement.

The need for the statement came from changes in the Australian Defence Organisation (ADO) in the 1990’s. Before this time, the Service tended to follow the traditional military way of operating, with all authority coming from the top down, and with a heavy reliance on set rules. As all parts of the ADO ‘downsized’ there was a realisation that this traditional military way of doing business would no longer work. Furthermore there was the shock coming from the report of the Board on Inquiry into F-111 fuel tank maintenance at RAAF Base Amberley (colloquially known as the ‘De-seal re-seal inquiry’). The central finding of the report was that the RAAF had placed ‘platforms before people,’ at considerable and at times tragic cost to the people.

This revealed a need to change the culture – since the traditional ‘can do’ culture of Air Force, when combined with the pressures of reorganisation and

---

18 Virtue ethics is an ethical theory that focuses not on teaching right actions but rather on developing good character. It holds that a person so formed can be trusted to identify and perform right actions. ‘The cardinal virtues have the task of making a person sufficiently rightly ordered to perform morally right actions.’ (James F Keenan, Proposing Cardinal Virtues, Theological Studies 56 (1995), 714).

19 Deontological ethics is an ethical theory that focuses not on character, but on right and wrong actions ‘…according to which certain acts must or must not be done…According to deontology certain acts are right or wrong in themselves.’ (T Honderich, ed. The Oxford Companion to Philosophy (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995) 187). The system is also known as Kantian ethics from its best known exponent, Immanuel Kant. Its fundamental principle is the categorical imperative, which can be summarised as ‘Any action should be universally morally valid for any person in the same situation.’

downsizing, could result in the abuse of people. The decision was made to move to a values-based organisation – that is, in the words of an unnamed member of the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) ‘people should do things because they’re the right thing to do, not because they have to do them.’ A process was put in place by which people, across rank levels, were asked to determine ‘the type of Air Force people wanted to work in, the kind they did work in and how to close the gap between the two.’ It was from this process that the values statement was derived. This process may explain why so much of the statement is relational, almost contractual in nature – or in other words, why there is an overwhelming concern about the relationships among individuals, and between individuals and the organisation.

The implication of this for ethics and ethics training is that Air Force wants its people to be the sort of people who can recognise the right thing to do (deontological ethics), and have the strength of character to do it (virtue ethics). I shall therefore now look at the competencies listed in the RAAF’s PMET program that have an ethical aspect, and consider how they reflect the RAAF Values Statement, and the ethical principles behind it.

---

21 In ethical terms, this way of doing things has echoes of consequentialism, that the moral worth of an action is judged by its consequences. The problem with consequentialism is that it can degenerate to ‘the means justifies the end’. In the case of ‘Re-seal de-seal’ the desired consequence was airworthy aircraft, but the unique human value of the people doing dangerous work to produce these airworthy aircraft was forgotten.

22 The SLT was one of the innovations of the time that has been preserved. All uniformed and public service officers of ‘star rank’ (that is Air Commodores and above and their civilian rank equivalents) working in the Air Force are gathered together on a regular basis for consultation.

23 For more on this see a paper by Prof Stephen Mugford & WGCDR Bob Rodgers (RAAF) “If you do what you’ve always done … ”: Leadership challenges in a downsizing RAAF” presented to the ‘Air Force Leadership: Beyond Command’ conference at RAF Hendon, July 2005.
The ethical and ‘RAAF Values’ aspects of the PMET competencies.

The Professional Military Education and Training (PMET) scheme competencies are the official Air Force description of the general military and workplace skills required of all Air Force members, regardless of work specialisation. They cover generic military skills that are required regardless of specialisation, and from them are derived training requirements. There are ‘Core’ competencies which apply to all members from Aircraftman/woman (the entry level rank) up, and then a series of rank specific competencies for all the ranks from Corporal to Wing Commander. In all, there are eight sets of competencies. A number of the competencies in every set are either directly ‘ethical’ in nature, or have ethical implications. There are three general areas that I wish to discuss. The first is the explicit place of the official ‘RAAF Values’ in the competencies. The second is the place of ‘character’ in the competencies (particularly issues of personal integrity, leadership and followership). The third will be those competencies which have a specifically ‘military ethics’ component (the classical definition of military ethics is that they cover issues of when it is right to go to war - *jus ad bellum*, of how wars may be fought justly - *jus in bello*, and in recent years the issues of how a war may be justly resolved – *jus post bellum, jus in pace, or jus ad pacem*, as well as general issues of war and peace).

---

24 The RAAF rank system applicable to the PMET scheme (in ascending order, with abbreviations and army equivalents) is Aircraftsman/woman (AC/W, Private), Corporal (CPL, Corporal), Sergeant (SGT, Sergeant), Flight Sergeant (FSGT, Warrant Officer 2\textsuperscript{nd} class), Warrant Officer (WOFF, Warrant Officer 1\textsuperscript{st} Class), Flying Officer (FLGOFF, Lieutenant), Flight Lieutenant (FLTLT, Captain), Squadron Leader (SQNLDR, Major), Wing Commander (WGCDR, Lieutenant Colonel). Note that FLGOFF and FLTLT are both subsumed under a common set of Junior Officer competencies.
‘RAAF Values’ in the competencies. In each set of competencies there are mentions of ‘values’, with the responsibility of the member towards those values varying with rank. All the competencies however include the values in the ‘Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes’ section which states ‘Positive attitude toward: Air Force and its values’ and then in the ‘Range of variables’ section which states ‘Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:…Ethical standards’. The values are therefore seen as pervasive, being required throughout all the competencies. Specifically, each set of competencies contains one\(^{25}\) that requires the member to ‘…(verb) the values and attitudes of the Air Force’. The verbs are ‘Assume’ (Core competencies), ‘Maintain’ (CPL), ‘Promote’ (SGT and Junior Officer), ‘Foster’ (FSGT and WOFF), ‘Engender’ (SQNLDR), and ‘Uphold’ (WGCDR). Under the competency is a ‘Descriptor’, which is the same for each of these ‘2A’ competencies, regardless of the intended rank:

This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes.

It is in the elements and performance criteria\(^{26}\) that we must therefore look for the differences between what is required of the various ranks implied by the different verbs. In general, the lower the rank, the greater is the concentration on individual performance. The higher the rank, the greater the emphasis on being a role model, and on taking responsibility for the overall culture of RAAF Values in the Service. For example, where the Core competencies talk about the need to ‘display’ RAAF Values,

\(^{25}\) The identifying code for this competency always finishes ‘2A’.

\(^{26}\) In accordance with the system set up by the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) each competency consists of a number of elements, that are further supported by a number of performance criteria.
the CPL competency uses the word ‘Model’, and the SGT competency says ‘Foster commitment by subordinates to the Air Force and its values’. Also, in the higher ranks the willingness to accept the responsibilities of the warrant, commission, or higher rank is specifically listed in the performance criteria of the ‘RAAF Values’ competency and element. In these higher ranks the individual’s personal commitment to and understanding of the Values is taken for granted! What is required is that the individual use the authority of rank to make the ‘RAAF Values’ the culture within which all those under his or her authority operate.  

‘Character’ in the competencies. The Core competencies have a strong concentration on the character of the individual member. Integrity, honesty and diligence are all included in the qualities to be displayed, and there is a strong sense of a need for personal responsibility. This is emphasised by the mention of qualities such as self-awareness, self-perspective, the identification of personal strengths and weaknesses, even the need for a sense of humour. Here there is an acknowledgement that personal responsibility can only be real if there is self-knowledge. Through the rank specific competencies it is assumed that the individual’s character has been formed by the Core competencies, as there is no mention of individual character qualities but of leadership related characteristics (with the exception of the Junior Officer: ‘ Standards of individual honesty and integrity are maintained.’). As well as

---

27 In the Core competencies, and the higher rank competencies of WOFF, Junior Officer, SQNLDR, WGCDR ‘the profession of arms’ is specifically mentioned, but whether one fights, provides leadership, or commands, varies by rank.
28 Although there is little indication in the competencies as to how these qualities of character and self-knowledge should be inculcated, anyone who has been through some form of basic military training will be wryly amused by DDRAC202A, performance criteria 2.3.3 ‘Candid feedback and criticism are accepted’.
29 Note that although Junior Officer training is often initial training, and so Core competencies would therefore be taught to those civilians who come directly in to officer rank, a number of members are commissioned from the ranks, and therefore should have already been trained in the Core competencies. Officer rank however is traditionally seen as a different kind of authority from that of
the individual characteristics of integrity, honest and self-awareness, the Core competencies also recognise the need for the member’s character to be socially adept. The ‘team’ aspect of military life is central, and so the competencies also talk about the need to ‘Establish effective interpersonal and workplace relationships.’ The criteria for this include such words and concepts as ‘sensitivity’, respect for the backgrounds of others, interest in other’s feelings, and ‘collaboration and cooperation’. Much of this comes under the heading of ‘followership’ – the ability to work effectively as part of a team, and give the leader responsible support and obedience.

In summary then, the basic character of the Air Force member, as required by the Core competencies, is one of traditional values such as integrity and honesty, as well as those social virtues needed to work effectively in a close-knit team. All of these virtues are predicated on the need to know oneself and others - to recognise personal strengths and weaknesses, to see where one is lacking required qualities, and to be able to make up deficiencies. The presence of these qualities is assumed regardless of rank.

In some higher rank competencies there is a strong emphasis on the need to ‘nurture’ (SGT) and ‘monitor’ (FSGT) the team qualities of subordinates. Generally, the higher the rank the stronger the emphasis on the role of moral teacher. WOFFs must ‘Supervise the development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in other ranks’, Junior officers must ‘Encourage…’ ditto, SQNLDRs ‘Facilitate…’. WGCDRs however are seen as more of a role model: ‘Personal drive and integrity are non-commissioned officers, so possibly a reaffirmation of individual standards is seen as necessary at this stage.
exemplified’. Overall there is a requirement for the member with rank to be one who can assess the character of subordinates, exemplify the required character, and know how to develop character in others. However, although it is present in the competencies, this ‘moral guidance’ aspect of leadership training is, I believe, neglected in the Air Force training system.\textsuperscript{31}

\textbf{‘Military ethics’ in the competencies.} Military ethics is normally understood as the ethics of war – when (or if) war is morally justified, and how may wars be morally fought. The usual technical terms for these issues are \textit{jus ad bellum} and \textit{jus in bello} respectively. This classical division of the ethics of war (also known as ‘Just War theory’) into \textit{jus ad bellum} (which could be translated as ‘The law on going to war’) and \textit{jus in bello} (which could be translated as ‘The law on how to fight a war’) has been recently amended by some scholars by the addition of the concept of \textit{jus post bellum} also called \textit{jus ad pacem} or \textit{jus in pace} (which could be translated as ‘The law on how war is to be concluded with peace and justice’). This new concept looks specifically at the result of the war as an essential factor in judging its overall morality.\textsuperscript{32} Under international law, both \textit{jus ad bellum} and \textit{jus post bellum} are not matters that a military force under civilian political control are responsible for, or at least not members of those ranks included in the PMET program. I would argue however that in all modern wars, governments have recognised the need to convince their military of the moral rightness of their cause. This is the case even in

\textsuperscript{30} DDRAC202A 2.4 – the points that follow are derived from the related performance criteria.
\textsuperscript{31} The reason for this is a matter of speculation, but I believe that in part it derives from a post-modern or liberal reluctance to be seen to be imposing morality on others, and a belief that there is no such thing as an absolute right or wrong. ‘Today…We are much more nervous talking about our good: it seems moralistic, or undemocratic, or elitist. Similarly, we are nervous talking about duty.’(S. Blackburn, \textit{Being Good – a short introduction to ethics} ( Oxford, OUP, 2001), 4)
dictatorships, and in a modern democracy like Australia it is even more so. Therefore *jus ad bellum* and *jus post bellum* have a place in the moral training of the military.\(^{33}\) *Jus in bello* issues of course are a clear and personal responsibility for all members of a military force at war, as even an unjust war can be fought in a just way, or a just war in an unjust way. The moral responsibility of those directly using the weapons is not affected by whether or not the initial (political) decision to go to war was moral or not. This individual responsibility is recognised by the international treaty commitment that all members of the Air Force are required to be trained to an appropriate level in the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC), the codification of *jus in bello* into international law.

Within the Core competencies the only reference to military ethics is in the ‘Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes’ sections to the first two competencies, where ‘Morality of Air Force employment’ and ‘Morality associated with serving within the Profession of Arms’ are listed. The higher rank competencies become more specific as to military ethics issues, until from the WOFF competencies onwards there are numerous references to aerospace doctrine, operational management, the ‘Art and science of warfare’ and higher strategy, getting more advanced as the rank level rises. Although there is no specific mention of military ethics anywhere that I could find, the ethical implications of statements such as ‘Operational plans associated with national and international military assistance are developed’\(^{34}\) or ‘A military solution in war? - Force as means to a political end state’\(^{35}\) are obvious.

---

\(^{33}\) *The Price of Peace* 217-273  
\(^{21}\) WGCDR competency DDDRWC601A 1.3.3  
\(^{22}\) Junior Officer competency DDDRFL401A, list of underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes.
In terms of training, specific military ethics instruction can probably be subsumed under the mandatory LOAC instruction in the lower rank levels. As rank rises however the need to have a more sophisticated knowledge of aerospace/airpower doctrine, the theory of warfare, and their political implications requires a more sophisticated appreciation of *jus ad bellum*, *jus in bello* and *jus post bellum* principles.

**Conclusion**

A number of the PMET competencies have clear ethical implications, which need to be covered by the training system. These do not just include the specific teaching of RAAF Values, or of traditional military ethics, but also include character development of oneself and others (as appropriate to rank). The Air Force cannot assume that those entering the Service have a properly formed character, or that they will automatically put on RAAF Values with the uniform. The metaethical background to the RAAF Values, and indeed to the development of character in the military and to traditional military ethics, is that of deontological ethics and virtue ethics. As I stated above, the Air Force wants its people to be the sort of people who can recognise the right thing to do (deontological ethics), and have the strength of character to do it (virtue ethics). Training is needed to ensure that this happens. However the way to provide training in these matters needs to be carefully considered. Do we rely on a (hopefully) healthy military culture within Air Force to form people in the morally desired way? Do we deliberately structure practical training in such a way that moral lessons are taught? Do we provide classroom lessons and discussions on moral issues (ranging from RAAF Values to character
development and military ethics) as part of the PMET courses? My answer to each of these questions would be ‘Yes, as appropriate’. In the remainder of my project I shall provide some ideas and resources for this training.
CHAPTER TWO
AIR FORCE COMPETENCIES IN THE PMET SYSTEM WITH VALUES & ETHICS IMPLICATIONS

INTRODUCTION.

What are the competencies and how are they constructed, and how they relate to the Air Force training philosophy.

These Air Force competencies are taken from the list of generic military competencies required of Air Force members. They are the official Air Force description of the general military and workplace skills required of all Air Force members, regardless of work specialisation. Whether the Air Force member is a pilot, clerk, technician, doctor or firefighter he or she is expected to have the generic skills applicable to rank.

These competencies were identified through a process of competency analysis, which may also be referred to as occupational or job analysis. This process required the collection of data from a number of sources, including data gathered on individual Air Force musterings and specialisations during the 1990’s, interviews with Subject Matter Experts (SME’s) of different ranks from across the Air Force’s functional groups, and input from training units and other key stakeholders. The first stage of the process produced a framework that would fit competencies within the following ‘domains’:

a. Operations,
b. Values and Attitudes,
c. Military Leadership,

36 Most of the information about the competency process and training philosophy in this and the following paragraphs was gained from a paper produced by the PMET Review Team in 2000 – ‘RAAF Professional Military Education and Training (PMET) Review Report – Enhancing Capability through People’, File Ref DPOL 57/2/9/Air Pt3 (6) dated 2 October 2000, hitherto to be referred to as the ‘PMET Review’. Formal permission to use this paper for my project has been received from the relevant staff officer, Wing Commander John Fisher.
d. Organisational Structures,

e. Personal Performance, and


Draft competency standards were then circulated around the Air Force, a sample derived from all rank levels and employment groups being asked identical questions to determine whether the generic competencies were valid. The philosophy at work through the process was that the formal competencies should accurately reflect the working experience of the whole gamut of Air Force ranks and employment specialisations. The competencies by themselves however do not mandate the style of training or assessment required. As the PMET Review states,

‘Competency can be attained through a number of pathways. For example, education, training, personal development and experience all contribute to the achievement and maintenance of competency.’37

The Introduction and Chapter 1 discussed the various cultural issues that stimulated the discussion as to RAAF Values and the RAAF Values Statement – a perception that the old, hierarchical way of doing business was no longer effective, and that values had to be taught and caught from the lowest rank level up. In this context the PMET Review was a ‘straw in the wind’ in that it explicitly moved away from a rigid division between commissioned and non-commissioned officer training by its statement,

There is a continuum within the Military leadership domain (command, leadership and management) where the function is performed at all ranks (my emphasis), but with progressively increasing levels of degree and emphasis.38

37 PMET Review para 18.
38 PMET Review para 17.
Similarly the PMET Review moves away from a purely military context and culture by its use of the Karpin Report\textsuperscript{39} identification of the skills needed by ‘the emerging front line manager, namely: coaching, mentoring, facilitating, training and team leadership.’\textsuperscript{40} These skills can all be identified in the various competencies required, particularly once any form of leadership is mentioned. This move away from a purely military context is also seen in the civilian derivation of the structure of the competency units, as is discussed below.

The competency units (preceded by a DDRAC reference) focus on performance in the workplace, in accordance with the usual format of industry competencies following the guidelines of the National Training Framework of the Australian National Training Authority. Each competency has a number of elements which ‘state the activities, actions and tasks undertaken within the work role’, and then performance criteria for each element, which state the outcomes of the activities and actions. For example, the first competency listed is DDRAC201A

**Participate in aerospace activities.** This is a core competency, which is expected of all trained Service members of the RAAF. One of the elements listed therefore is ‘1.4 Perform workplace activities in a integrated workforce environment’, and one of the performance criteria for this element is ‘1.4.4 The rights, obligations and responsibilities of Service personnel are respected.’ Following the elements and performance criteria, a number of general notes are listed for the competency under the following headings:

1. Critical aspects of evidence to be considered.
2. Interdependent assessment of units.
3. Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes.


\textsuperscript{40} PMET Review para 17.
6. Context of assessment, and
7. Range of variables.

Overall then, each competency contains a full guide to the trainer as to what is needed in training courses. This is further refined in the Training Specification.

**General comments.**

This list contains all those aspects of the Air Force PMET competencies that have ethical implications. These range from individual and team behaviour through to issues of military ethics as commonly understood such as targeting, and other *jus in bello* issues. Particularly in the ‘Core’ competencies – that is those that are considered as required by all members and which therefore need to be covered in initial training courses, I have included ‘character’ based competencies such as

**Display self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation.** The character training of junior members has strong ethical implications – What sort of person are we trying to form and what values we teach them are ethical issues and cannot be considered without an ethical base. With this exception, however, I have only included competencies that seem to have a direct ethical orientation. All the competencies, however, include ethical statements in the ‘Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes’ section - *Positive attitude toward: Air Force and its values* and then in the ‘Range of variables’ section the statement *Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s: Ethical standards*’ is universal. After each set of competencies, I have made some general comments about the ethics and training issues that they raise, but more detailed discussion of this will be saved for Chapter 3.
CORE

**DDDRA201A Participate in aerospace operations**

1.4 Perform workplace activities in an integrated workforce environment
1.4.4 The rights, obligations and responsibilities of Service personnel are acknowledged

**3. Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes**

**Morality of Air Force employment**

Individual’s rights, obligations and responsibilities

Positive attitude toward:

Air Force and its values
Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

**Ethical standards**

---

**DDDRA202A Assume the values and attitudes of the Air Force**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes.

2.2 Display a commitment to the Air Force and its values
2.2.1 The importance of Air Force values and ethos is appreciated
2.2.2 Commitment to serve within the profession of arms is displayed

2.3 Display self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation
2.3.1 Individual strengths and weaknesses are identified
2.3.2 Experiences are used to develop self
2.3.3 Candid feedback and criticism are accepted
2.3.4 Self-motivation, self-perspective and a sense of humour are displayed
2.3.5 A strong sense of one’s self-worth and capabilities is recognised
2.3.6 Self-control is maintained
2.3.7 Honesty, integrity, care and diligence are displayed
2.3.8 Responsibility is taken for personal performance
2.3.9 Initiative and flexibility are displayed
2.3.10 Persistence in the pursuit of individual goals is displayed

2.4 Establish effective interpersonal and workplace relationships
2.4.1 Sensitivity and understanding of other’s perspectives are displayed
2.4.2 Interest in other’s concerns, needs and feelings is shown
2.4.3 Backgrounds of others are respected
2.4.4 Collaboration and cooperation when working with others is demonstrated

**Evidence guide:**

1. **Critical aspects of evidence to be considered**
For this unit of competency, the individual must provide evidence of consistent achievement of specified workplace outcomes, by showing that they:

- Appreciate the individual’s role in the achievement of the Air Force mission
- Understand and influence RAAF culture
- Have a positive attitude toward the Air Force and its values

2. **Interdependent assessment of units**
   This unit may be assessed in conjunction with other units that form part of a job function.

3. **Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes**
   Knowledge of:
   - The Profession of Arms
   - Morality associated with serving within the Profession of Arms
   - The individual’s role in the achievement of the Air Force mission
   - Air Force mission and vision
   - The importance of Air Force values and ethos
   - Personal relationships
   - Self awareness

   Positive attitude toward:
   - Air Force and its values
   - Commitment to fight within the Profession of Arms

   Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

   Ethical standards

**DDDRAC206A Comply with national imperatives**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to appreciate the relationship between internal Air Force policies and practices and the external social and political framework of legislation, standards, practices and protocols.

6.1 Comply with national legislation, social standards, practices and protocols
   6.1.1 Sources of information and assistance related to Equity and Diversity policies and practices are accessed
   6.1.2 Acted in accordance with Equity and Diversity policies and practices

6.2 Adhere to government policy
   6.2.2 Behaviours and practices prescribed in government legislation are embraced.

3. **Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes**
Knowledge of:
- Equity and diversity requirements – ADF Junior ranks
- Fraud and Ethics

Core Competencies – General Comments.

There is a strong emphasis on being the sort of person who works well as part of a military team. The Air Force member is expected to know, accept and demonstrate Air Force values, which are mentioned in a number of different areas, often as part of ‘Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes’. Overall there is a greater emphasis on the individual willingly and knowledgably fitting in with the system.

CORPORAL

**DDDRCP301A Participate in aerospace operations**
Skills to:
- Understand and influence RAAF culture

Positive attitude toward:
Air Force and its values

Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
- Ethical standards

**DDDRCP302A Maintain the values and attitudes of the Air Force**
**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes.

2.2 Model a commitment to the Air Force and its values
2.2.1 The Air Force mission is reinforced
2.2.2 Air Force values and ethos are modelled through behaviour
2.2.3 The role of a non-commissioned officer in the Air Force is accepted
2.2.4 Commitment to fight within the profession of arms is supported

Knowledge of:
The importance of Air Force values and ethos
Positive attitude toward:
• Air Force and its values
Commitment to fight within the profession of arms
Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace
environments in which they use the organisation’s:
Ethical standards

**DDDRCP403A Support the principles of military leadership**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers command, leadership and management as practiced within the military environment. Within their work teams/groups all personnel have a prominent part to play in the manner in which they conduct themselves as leader and/or follower.

Positive attitude toward:
Air Force and its values
Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s
Ethical standards

**DDDRCP304A Support organisational structures**

4.2 Support the application of law in the Defence environment
4.2.4 The provisions of the Laws of Armed Conflict (LOAC) are applied.

Knowledge of:
Laws of Armed Conflict (LOAC) - Principles and practices
Positive attitude toward:
Air Force and its values
Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
Ethical standards

**DDDRCP206A Support the achievement of national imperatives**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to appreciate the relationship between internal Air Force policies and practices and the external social and political framework of legislation, standards, practices and protocols.

6.1 Support measures to accord with national legislation, social standards, practices and protocols
6.1.1 Respect for individuals is demonstrated

Note that there is no specifically ‘ethical’ performance criteria listed under this competency, but much is implied.

Knowledge of:
Fraud and Ethics
Positive attitude toward:
• Air Force and its values

**Range of variables:**
Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

- Ethical standards

**Corporal Competencies – General Comments**

Like the Core competencies, these have a strong emphasis on team work.

These competencies however reflect the granting of authority to Corporals in areas such as **DDDRCP304A** 4.2 ‘Support the application of law in the Defence environment.’ The issue of power and authority can also be seen in **DDDRCP304A** 6.11 ‘Respect for individuals is demonstrated.’ As noted, there is an implied ethical content to this – how is authority exercised in such a way as to show respect for subordinates?

**SERGEANT**

**DDDRLG301A Promote aerospace operations**

1.1 Promote the application of aerospace power in the defence of Australia
1.1.1 Aerospace power and its role in national defence is advocated

Positive attitude toward:
- Air Force and its values

Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s

**Ethical standards**

**DDDRLG402A Promote the values and attitudes of the Air Force**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes

2.2 Foster commitment by subordinates to the Air Force and its values
2.2.1 Team focus on the Air Force mission is supported
2.2.2 Commitment to the Air Force vision, values and ethos is nurtured
2.3 Monitor development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in subordinates
2.3.4 Trust is built through demonstrated reliability and authenticity

Knowledge of:

- The importance of Air Force values and ethos
Positive attitude toward:
Air Force and its values

Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s
• Ethical standards

**DDDRSG306A Implement measures to support national imperatives**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to appreciate the relationship between internal Air Force policies and practices and the external social and political framework of legislation, standards, practices and protocols.

*Note that there is no specifically ‘ethical’ performance criteria listed under this competency, but much is implied.*

Knowledge of:
• Fraud and Ethics

Positive attitude toward:
Air Force and its values

**Range of variables:**
 Fraud and Ethics IAW Miscellaneous Departmental Publication - Fraud Awareness and Resource Management
Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
• Ethical standards

**Sergeant Competencies – General Comments**

There is a focus on the Sergeant as exemplar of, and educator in, the values of the Air Force. As with the Corporal competencies, ethical issues are implied in some areas (e.g. **DDDRSG306A**) without being made explicit. The mentions of ‘Fraud and Ethics’ relate specifically to financial issues. At this rank it is possible that the member may well be given financial delegations for the use of public money. With these delegations of course comes temptation, and the need for the strength of character and ethics to resist that temptation.

**FLIGHT SERGEANT**

**DDDRFS301A Contribute to aerospace operations**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the knowledge and skills associated with the application of the Air Force doctrine and structures to plan and conduct successful aerospace operations. An individual may be
required to perform in support of operations, perform in direct support of operations or directly participate in operations.

1.1 Promote the application of aerospace assets for the defence of Australia
1.1.1 Air Force aerospace power is promoted
Positive attitude toward:
Air Force and its values
Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
• Ethical standards

**DDDRFS502A Foster the values and attitudes of the Air Force**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes.

2.2 Foster a commitment by other ranks to the Air Force and its values 2.2.1 Team focus on the Air Force mission is monitored

1. **Critical aspects of evidence to be considered**
For this unit of competency, the individual must provide evidence of consistent achievement of specified workplace outcomes, by showing that they:

• Appreciate human factors
• Have a positive attitude toward the Air Force and its values

Knowledge of:
• The importance of Air Force values and ethos

Positive attitude toward:

• Air Force and its values
Personnel will normally operate in filed and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s
• Ethical standards

**DDDRFS406A Support national imperatives**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to appreciate the relationship between internal Air Force policies and practices and the external social and political framework of legislation, standards, practices and protocols.

Note that there is no specifically ‘ethical’ performance criteria listed under this competency, but much is implied.

Knowledge of:
• Fraud and Ethics
Positive attitude toward:
Air Force and its values
**Range of variables:**
Fraud and Ethics IAW Miscellaneous Departmental Publication - Fraud Awareness and Resource Management

Personnel will normally operate in a filed and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
Ethical standards

**Flight Sergeant Competencies – General Comments**

These competencies are a development on those for Sergeant, covering the same areas. There is an implied difference by the use of the word ‘Foster’ rather than ‘Promote’ in the competency that talks of the values and attitudes of the Air Force. This may reflect the Flight Sergeant’s higher rank and his/her responsibility to lead leaders – particularly in aircraft maintenance units a Flight Sergeant would frequently have over twelve Sergeants and Corporals in their particular sub-unit.

**WARRANT OFFICER**

**DDDRWO401A Contribute to aerospace operations**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the knowledge and skills associated with the application of the Air Force doctrine and structures to plan and conduct successful aerospace operations. An individual may be required to perform in support of operations, perform in direct support of operations or directly participate in operations.

1.1 Support the operational capabilities of aerospace assets applied to the defence of Australia
   1.1.1 Air Force aerospace power is applied
   1.1.2 Air Force aerospace power doctrine in relation to Australia’s defence requirements is explained
   1.1.3 The application of Air Force aerospace assets is explained
1.2 Implement operational tools for the conduct of national defence and security operations
   1.2.1 Theories of operations are explained
   1.2.2 Advised on the interpretation of mission objectives with respect to situation
   1.2.3 Plans are implemented in accordance with military mission objectives
   1.2.4 Achievement of mission objectives are reported
1.3 Contribute to activities which support Australia’s national and international interests
1.3.1 Adherence to protocols and policies when dealing with the civilian community is encouraged

1. Critical aspects of evidence to be considered

For this unit of competency, the individual must provide evidence of consistent achievement of specified workplace outcomes, by showing that they:

- Apply aerospace power doctrine

Knowledge of:

- Application aerospace power
- The capability of Air Force aerospace assets
- The employment of ADF air weapons in accordance with operational objectives
- Types of aerospace operations that fall inside LOAC
- Types of aerospace operations that fall outside LOAC
- Information operations
- Definition of war
- A military solution in war
- Force is means to a political end state
- Influence of doctrine on military operations
- Relationship between the effective conduct of aerospace operations and the application of sound doctrine
- Effectives of various weapons
- Weapons in offensive air operations are matched to target specifications
- Influence of tactical doctrine on military operations
- Relationship between the effective conduct of aerospace operations during an engagement and the application of sound tactical doctrine

Positive attitude toward:

- Application of aerospace power
- Air Force and its values
- Use of military power and assets to support Australian interests

Personnel will normally operate in a filed and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

- Ethical standards

**DDDRWO602A Foster the values and attitudes of the Air Force**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes.
2.2 Engender commitment by other ranks to the Air Force and its values
2.2.2 Commitment to the Air Force vision, values and ethos is cultivated
2.2.4 Commitment to fight within the profession of arms is promoted
2.2.5 Junior officers are mentored to enhance their values and attitudes with the Air Force
2.3 Supervise the development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in other ranks
2.3.2 Disparity of individual values and goals are reconciled
2.3.3 Unethical actions are confronted

1. Critical aspects of evidence to be considered

For this unit of competency, the individual must provide evidence of consistent achievement of specified workplace outcomes, by showing that they:

- Appreciate the importance of Air Force values and ethos
- Appreciate the principles and standards associated with holding a warrant

Knowledge of:
- Air Force mission and vision an
- The importance of Air Force values and ethos

Positive attitude toward:
- Air Force and its values

Principles and standards associated with holding a warrant

Personnel will normally operate in filed and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
- Ethical standards

DDDRWO406A Coordinate the implementation of national imperatives

Descriptor: This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to appreciate the relationship between internal Air Force policies and practices and the external social and political framework of legislation, standards, practices and protocols.

Note that there is no specifically ‘ethical’ performance criteria listed under this competency, but much is implied.

Knowledge of:
- Fraud and Ethics

Positive attitude toward:

Air Force and its values
Range of variables:
Fraud and Ethics IAW Miscellaneous Departmental Publication - Fraud Awareness and Resource Management
Personnel will normally operate in a fielded and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s Ethical standards

Warrant Officer Competencies – General Comments.

These competencies introduce the discussion aerospace operations, including the theory of air power and LOAC aspects which have a clear relationship to military ethics, or ‘just war’ theory. This recognises the status of the Warrant Officer as a mentor for other Service members. That is, one who is expected to understand and support the activities of the Service and guide other members to accomplish the Service mission. The description of competency DDRWO602A ‘Foster the values and attitudes of the Air Force’ reinforces this, as there is a strong emphasis on the Warrant Officers influence on other members at all rank levels.

JUNIOR OFFICER

DDDRFL401A Contribute to aerospace operations
Descriptor: This competency covers the knowledge and skills associated with the application of the Air Force doctrine and structures to plan and conduct successful aerospace operations. An individual may be required to perform in support of operations, perform in direct support of operations or directly participate in operations.

1.1 Exploit the operational capabilities of aerospace assets applied to the defence of Australia
1.1.1 Aerospace power is applied to the defence needs of Australia
1.1.2 Air Force aerospace power doctrine and the application of aerospace assets are discussed
1.1.3 The nature and evolution of war are discussed
1.2 Apply operational tools in the planning and conduct of national defence and security operations

1.2.1 Theories of operations are applied
1.2.2 Defensive, offensive and contingency plans are actioned
1.2.3 Mission objectives and end-states are interpreted with respect to situation
1.2.6 Participated in the planning of a modern air operation

1. Critical aspects of evidence to be considered
For this unit of competency, the individual must provide evidence of consistent achievement of specified workplace outcomes, by showing that they appreciate the:

- Role of the Air Force officer corps
- Application of aerospace power

3. Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes
Knowledge of:

- Definition of war
- A military solution in war?
- Force is means to a political end state
- The application of national and military power
- Political and military history

Application of aerospace power
Relationship between the effective conduct of aerospace operations and the application of sound doctrine
The employment of ADF air weapons in accordance with operational objectives
- Weapons in offensive air operations are matched to target specifications
- Effectiveness of various weapons
- Types of aerospace operations that fall inside LOAC
- Types of aerospace operations that fall outside LOAC
- Influence of tactical doctrine on military operations
- Relationship between the effective conduct of aerospace operations during an engagement and the application of sound tactical doctrine
- Matching of tactical level weapons are matched to target specifications

Nature of civil-military relations in Australia

Positive attitude toward:

- Application of aerospace power
- Air Force and its values
- Use of military power and assets to support Australian interests

Personnel will normally operate in a field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

Ethical standards
**DDDRFL502A Promote the values and attitudes of the Air Force**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes.

- **2.2** Promote commitment to the Air Force, its vision and its values
- **2.2.2** Commitment to the Air Force vision, values and ethos is promoted
- **2.2.4** Commitment to the principles and standards associated with holding a commission are accepted
- **2.2.5** A commitment to lead and fight within the profession of arms is displayed

**2.3** Encourage the development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in self and subordinates

- **2.3.5** Sound decisions despite uncertainties and pressures are made
- **2.3.7** Standards of individual honesty and integrity are maintained

Positive attitude toward:

Air Force and its values

- The principles and standards associated with holding a commission

Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

- Ethical standards

**DDDRFL506A Support national imperatives**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to appreciate the relationship between internal Air Force policies and practices and the external social and political framework of legislation, standards, practices and protocols.

Note that there is no specifically ‘ethical’ performance criteria listed under this competency, but much is implied.

Knowledge of:

- Fraud and Ethics

Positive attitude toward:

Air Force and its values

**Range of variables:**

Fraud and Ethics IAW Miscellaneous Departmental Publication - Fraud Awareness and Resource Management

Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

- Ethical standards

**Junior Officer Competencies – General Comments**
Many members joining as junior officers will have had no previous Air Force training, and therefore will be trained on these competencies at the same time as being trained on the Core competencies. Therefore these competencies should be read in conjunction with the Core competencies. The specific ‘officer’ issues raised include some character development (of self) and education (of others) aspects within DDDRFL502A ‘Promote the values and attitudes of the Air Force’. Also there is an emphasis on the introduction of strategic issues within DDDRFL401A ‘Contribute to aerospace operations’ that reflects the junior officer’s status as one required to consider strategic matters, and being at least introduced to issues of high command.

**SQUADRON LEADER**

**DDDRL501A Plan and conduct aerospace operations**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the knowledge and skills associated with the application of the Air Force doctrine and structures to plan and conduct successful aerospace operations. An individual may be required to perform in support of operations, perform in direct support of operations or directly participate in operations.

1.1 Analyse the application of aerospace power doctrine in the defence of Australia
   1.1.1 Air Force aerospace power doctrine is analysed
   1.1.2 The nature and evolution of war are analysed
   1.1.3 The historical context of contemporary and future aerospace power issues are examined
   1.1.4 The influence of technology on military aerospace power is assessed
   1.1.5 The capability of Air Force aerospace assets are analysed

1.2 Implement operational plans in the conduct of national defence and security operations
   1.2.1 The principles of conflict theory are applied to operations
   1.2.2 Operational planning tools are used
   1.2.3 Contributed to the preparation of defensive, offensive and contingency plans
   1.2.4 Contributed to the conduct of operations
   1.2.5 Prepared operational plans are analysed
   1.2.6 Participated in the planning of an air component of a joint or coalition
operation involving a combination of air roles and capabilities
1.2.7 Logistics and personnel operational requirements are assessed
1.2.8 Combat power assets are prepared in accordance with readiness objectives
1.2.9 Command and control arrangements to support ADF operations are assessed
1.2.10 The employment of ADF air weapons are implemented to meet operational objectives

1.3 Support Australian national and international interests
1.3.1 Contributed to the employment of Australian assets in the support of national interests and objectives in operational and non-operational situations
1.3.2 The execution of operational plans associated with national and international military assistance are supported
1.3.3 Australian and Defence organisation interests are represented within national and international forums

Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes

Knowledge of:

• Nature and evolution of war
• Levels of war
• Conflict theory
• Application of aerospace power doctrine
• Technology and military aerospace power
• LOAC and military aerospace power
• Australian laws that restrict aerospace operations
• Global and regional interests
• National security policy
• Information operations
• Relationship between government and ADF activities
• Australian warfighting concepts
• Operations and operational doctrine
• Operational procedures
• Influence of operational doctrine on military operations
• Relationship between the effective conduct of aerospace operations during an engagement and the application of sound operational doctrine

Positive attitude toward:

• Maintenance and development of aerospace doctrine
• Air Force and its values

Note the following:
Personnel will normally be engaged in a workplace context in which they:
• Have substantial depth of knowledge in some areas and a range of skills for work, tasks, roles and functions
Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

- Ethical standards

**DDDRSL602A Engender the values and attitudes of the Air Force**

*Descriptor:* This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes.

2.2 Engender commitment to the Air Force, its vision and values
2.2.2 Commitment to the Air Force vision, values and ethos is cultivated
2.2.4 The role of the squadron leader in the Air Force is accepted
2.2.5 Leadership within the profession of arms is developed

2.3 Facilitate the development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in the Air Force
2.3.1 Disparity of individuals’ values and goals are resolved
2.3.4 Unethical actions are confronted

1. Critical aspects of evidence to be considered

For this unit of competency, the individual must provide evidence of consistent achievement of specified workplace outcomes, by showing that they appreciate the importance of Air Force values and ethos. Positive attitude toward:

- Air Force and its values
- The principles and standards associated with holding a commission

Personnel will normally be engaged in a workplace context in which they:

- Have substantial depth of knowledge in some areas and a range of skills for work, tasks, roles and functions
- Personnel will normally operate in filed and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

**DDDRSL606A Facilitate the application of national imperatives**

*Descriptor:* This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to appreciate the relationship between internal Air Force policies and practices and the external social and political framework of legislation, standards, practices and protocols.

Note that there is no specifically ‘ethical’ performance criteria listed under this competency, but much is implied.

Knowledge of:
- Fraud and Ethics
Positive attitude toward:

Air Force and its values

**Range of variables:**
Fraud and Ethics IAW Miscellaneous Departmental Publication - Fraud Awareness and Resource Management

Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
Ethical standards

**Squadron Leader Competencies – General Comments**

These competencies continue the themes laid out in the Junior Officer competencies. There is however an even greater emphasis on strategic issues, which reflects the placement of Squadron Leaders in headquarters positions; and on the Squadron Leader’s responsibility as a leader and exemplar which, I believe, has implications for character education.

**WING COMMANDER**

**DDDRWC601A Plan and conduct aerospace operations**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the knowledge and skills associated with the application of the Air Force doctrine and structures to plan and conduct successful aerospace operations. An individual may be required to perform in support of operations, perform in direct support of operations or directly participate in operations.

1.1 Evaluate the application of aerospace power doctrine in the defence of Australia
   1.1.1 The theoretical and conceptual basis of contemporary aerospace power doctrine is evaluated
   1.1.2 ADF aerospace capability, the influence of operating environments, and the employment of Air Force combat power are evaluated
   1.1.3 The art and science of warfare is applied to the military workplace

1.2 Plan and conduct national defence and security operations
   1.2.1 Operational capabilities are exploited
   1.2.2 Civilian and military intelligence are evaluated for air operations
1.2.3 The employment of ADF air weapons are planned to meet operational objectives
1.2.4 Defensive, offensive and contingency plans are developed
1.2.5 Operations are conducted
1.2.6 Prepared operational plans are evaluated
1.2.7 Command and control arrangements are established to support ADF operations
1.2.8 Mission objectives are derived from higher command directions
1.2.9 The intent of superior authorities is interpreted

1.3 Support Australian national and international interests
1.3.1 The theory of national interest is applied to the military workplace
1.3.2 Military assets are applied to support Australian national interests
1.3.3 Operational plans associated with national and international military assistance are developed
1.3.6 Development of international cooperation on security is supported
1.3.7 Development of Defence policy on international relations is supported
1.3.8 The implementation of Australian policies on international representation and engagement are supported

1. Critical aspects of evidence to be considered
For this unit of competency, the individual must provide evidence of consistent achievement of specified workplace outcomes, by showing that they:
• Correctly interpret their superior’s intent
• Analyse critical facts and assumptions

3. Underpinning knowledge, skills and attitudes
Knowledge of:
• Aerospace power doctrine
• Aerospace power theoretical and conceptual basis
• Technology on the development aerospace power
• Art and science of warfare
• Employment of Air Force combat power
• Operational plans and superior authority intent
• Command directions and mission objectives
• Definition of the term strategic doctrine
• Influence of strategic doctrine on military operations
• Relationship between the effective conduct of aerospace operations during an engagement and the application of sound strategic doctrine
• The external and internal influences affecting Australia’s defence and security policies
• The theory of national interest and national or Defence organisation protocols and policies
• Australian strategic plans
- Australian strategic alliances
- Coalition operations
- Government processes and structures
- Relationship between government, ADF and national/international organisations

Positive attitude toward:

- The unique capabilities of aerospace power
- Air Force and its values
- Representing the Air Force and Australia’s interests

Personnel will normally be engaged in a workplace context in which they:

- Are autonomous, working under limited guidance in line with a broad plan, budget or strategy
- May lead teams
- May have responsibility and defined accountability for the management and output of the work of others
- May have responsibility and defined accountability for a defined function or functions
- Have substantial breadth of knowledge across a number of areas of skills for work, tasks, roles and functions

Personnel will normally operate in field and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

Ethical standards

**DDDRWC602A Uphold the values and attitudes of the Air Force**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to assume, support and promote the Air Force mission, vision and values. The individual must also possess the ability to manage themselves as well as handling relationships within their team/workgroup to ensure the achievement of planned outcomes.

2.2 Uphold commitment to the Air Force, its vision and values
2.2.2 Commitment to the Air Force vision, values and ethos is engendered
2.2.3 The role of the wing commander in the Air Force is accepted
2.2.4 Command within the profession of arms is practiced
2.2.2 Commitment to the Air Force vision, values and ethos is engendered
2.2.3 The role of the wing commander in the Air Force is accepted
2.2.3 Command within the profession of arms is practiced

Knowledge of:

- The role of military history in the evolution of operational doctrine
- Air Force mission and vision
- The importance of Air Force values and ethos

Positive attitude toward:
• Air Force and its values
• The principles and standards associated with holding a commission
Personnel will normally be engaged in a workplace context in which they:
• Are autonomous, working under limited guidance in line with a broad plan, budget or strategy
Have substantial breadth of knowledge across a number of areas of skills for work, tasks, roles and functions
Personnel will normally operate in filed and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
• Ethical standards

**DDDRWC703A Exercise military leadership**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers command, leadership and management as practiced within the military environment. Within their work teams/groups all personnel have a prominent part to play in the manner in which they conduct themselves as leader and/or follower.

3.2 Lead a military unit to satisfy strategic initiatives and management plans
3.2.5 Personal drive and integrity are exemplified

Positive attitude toward:
• Air Force and its values
• Leading in the military

Personnel will normally be engaged in a workplace context in which they:
• May have responsibility and broad ranging accountability for the structure, management and output of the work of others
• Have a systematic and coherent body of knowledge and a broad range of skills for work, tasks, roles and functions
Personnel will normally operate in filed and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:

**DDDRWC606A Apply national imperatives**

**Descriptor:** This competency covers the requirement for all personnel to appreciate the relationship between internal Air Force policies and practices and the external social and political framework of legislation, standards, practices and protocols.

Note that there is no specifically ‘ethical’ performance criteria listed under this competency, but much is implied.

Knowledge of:
• Fraud and Ethics

Positive attitude toward:
Air Force and its values

**Range of variables:**
Fraud and Ethics IAW Miscellaneous Departmental Publication - Fraud Awareness and Resource Management

Personnel will normally operate in filed and/or base workplace environments in which they use the organisation’s:
Ethical standards

**Wing Commander Competencies – General Comments**

As the professional military training for potential Wing Commanders is not done through the Professional Military Education and Training system, but through the Command and staff Course, I am not going to give a detailed analysis of these competencies or the associated training in Chapter 3. It should be noted however that these competencies continue the trajectory seen though the rank system in that a greater degree of strategic knowledge and education is implied. It is interesting however that there is less emphasis on the place of character development and education.
CHAPTER THREE

ETHICS, COMPETENCIES, AND LEARNING OUTCOMES.

Introduction.

As discussed above, ethical training in the RAAF attempts to cover three areas; the RAAF Values Statement, character development, and military ethics (centering on just war theory). These areas are covered in a number of the competencies, which are reflected in Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria. In this chapter I shall go through each of the major PMET courses (Recruit, Corporal, Sergeant, Flight Sergeant, Warrant Officer, Initial Officer, and Squadron Leader), listing the ethics-related Learning Outcomes (LOs) and associated Assessment Criteria (ACs). I shall then discuss for each course how effectively these cover the required competencies. Before discussing these courses however it needs to be pointed out that the consigning of ethical training to the PMET exclusively is in itself controversial. The CAFAC paper quoted in the Introduction points out that:

‘The arbitrary consigning of values and attitudinal development to the OETS and the AETS (Officer education and Training System and Airmen Education and Training System - the predecessors of the PMET – JCC) has allowed a separation of responsibilities for attitudinal development whereby specialisation, trade and field training programs can ignore this focus in training.’\footnote{CAFAC Agendum 3/97, para 29.}

This state of affairs has not changed with the coming of the PMET. The effect of this is that ethical training is seen as unrelated to the daily workplace – either in peace or war. Although I would argue that the PMET system should be the prime means of ethical education, I acknowledge the argument that other systems could also be used. These include the addition of attitudinal development to technical and trade training
courses, workplace consolidation programs that follow on from PMET training, and the appointment of senior airmen/airwomen with specific responsibility for the maintenance of ethical military attitudes. The latter two options have in fact been partially adopted. For example, the Initial Officer Course is followed by the Junior Officer Consolidation Program (JOCP), a workbook which includes attitudinal/ethical objectives; and the new ‘Executive Warrant Officer’ positions within a number of major Air Force elements have a responsibility for the maintenance and development of correct military attitudes and ethics. I argue however that although these are good things, without high quality ethical training in initial courses (Recruit and IOC), reinforced by development in the other PMET courses, the habit of thinking (and acting) ethically could be divorced from the other military habits (e.g. obedience to lawful authority, basic combat skills) inculcated through the PMET system.

**Recruit Course**

The Recruit Course is a nine-week course which is required to give students the Core Competencies needed by any member of the RAAF. All members entering the full-time RAAF as airmen or airwomen (that is, NOT as officers or officer cadets) undergo Recruit Course within a few days of being sworn in to the Service at Recruiting Centres. The student body on any individual Recruit Course normally

---

42 The scheme’s Statement of Principles, accessed at http://defweb.cbr.defence.gov.au/airforcepeoplecentral/banner.asp on 6 AUG 08 states ‘Executive Warrant Officers also have a responsibility for enhancing the alignment of the airman/woman force with the: … ‘Air Force Values, …’

43 Men or women entering the RAAF Reserve without previous full-time RAAF training are required to gain the same core competencies, but normally do so through a combination of training weekends and camps provided by the Reserve Training Wing. However, the same LOs must be met.
has wildly varying backgrounds. It may include 17-year-old teenagers who have only completed Year 10 at school and who wish to train as cooks, 20-year-old ex-university students who wish to train as aircraft systems technicians, 45-year-old Conservatorium graduates who have decided to join one of the RAAF Bands, or almost any other type of job seeker. Students come from as wide a variety of domestic circumstances and cultural and religious backgrounds as Australian society can provide, and normally have already formed their ethical beliefs, even if they haven’t consciously realised them. Ethical training therefore needs to aim at the basics. Within the Recruit Course Module Three on ‘Air Force Culture’ and Module Nine on ‘Character Development’, there are a number of ethics-related LOs that cover the three areas of the Values Statement, character development and military ethics. Module Five on ‘Ground Defence Training’ also requires the application of the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC), which is based on military ethics.

Within the ‘Air Force Culture’ module there are four relevant LOs. Air Force Culture Learning Outcome 3 (AFC3) is ‘Adopt the philosophy of the RAAF Values Statement.’ The AC for this are that the statement is outlined (and the three divisions of what the Service stands for, what it owes to and expects from its members are specified), and that the philosophy is adopted. These criteria are to be assessed by observation, oral questioning and written examinations. Within the same module ethical issues should also be introduced in subjects such as ‘Outline the Application of Aerospace Power’ (AFC5) where Just War issues should be raised; and ‘Comply with the ADF Policy on Equity and Diversity’ (AFC7) and ‘Outline the Rights, Obligations and Responsibilities of ADF personnel (AFC8), where both character development and RAAF Values issues should be introduced.
Within the ‘Character Development’ module there are two relevant LOs, Character Development LO 2 (CD2) is ‘Deal with Others in the RAAF Work Environment’ and CD3 is ‘Apply Ethical Conduct in the RAAF Work Environment’. The AC for CD2 require the recruit to identify personality types and cope with personality conflict. The method of assessment is to be by instructor observation and oral questioning. The AC for CD3 start by requiring that ‘ethics, morals and values’ be defined, and then go on to examine issues such as personal values and the process of ethical decision-making before requiring that the student apply ethics in everyday life and in the work environment. Again, assessment is by instructor observation and oral questioning.

The LOs listed above certainly cover all the ethically-related competencies. Bearing in mind that Recruit Course, by its nature, has a student body with extremely varied levels of education, age, personal maturity and experience it is probably reasonable that most of the assessment is by oral questioning and observation. What this tends to mean in the training area is that the classes are taught by a mixture of lecture, group exercise and discussion, and that students will be assessed according to the experience of the instructor. In these circumstances students tend to self-censor any personal beliefs that may conflict with the official (i.e. the instructor’s) views, and instructors are normally reluctant to fail students on their beliefs or opinions expressed in the class. Students are presented with the Service’s minimum requirements in the three ethical areas, and are given a basis for further reflection and learning. However unethical actions may well be cause for disciplinary penalties or
even removal from training, which would result in either retraining or discharge from the Service.

**Corporal (CPL) Course**

The Corporal Course is of two weeks’ duration. It builds on the Recruit Course and the students’ Service experience to give them the additional Competencies required of a Corporal. The students should either hold the rank of Leading Aircraftsman/woman (LAC/LACW) and have been identified for promotion, or be newly promoted Corporals (CPLs). The students would normally have been in the Service for at least four years, with at least three years having been spent in the active workforce, out of the training system. Therefore, although the range of difference referred to above in the discussion of the student body for Recruit Course would still be present, training and socialisation would have led to a more homogeneous student body, and hopefully the average maturity level would be higher. Within the course, only one of the three ethical areas is specifically covered, that of Air Force Values. Whether the other two areas (character development and military ethics) are covered by implication will be discussed.

LO2 within the ‘Values and Attitudes’ module of the course is ‘Model RAAF Values and ethos’. The AC include stating, listing and defining RAAF Values, which is basically revision on Recruit Course material, although hopefully the students would have a more mature knowledge of the Values in practice. This would be tested by AC 2.4 to 2.6, which require that the values be related to workplace practice, and the RAAF Mission, and modelled within a Service environment. These are to be assessed by performance, knowledge and attitude – the Learning Outcome specifying
that there is to be a student presentation on the topic of the relationship of RAAF Values to the achievement of the RAAF Mission, and that the ‘workplace’ where the Values are applied is to include social areas such as the Mess and the Airmen’s Club. The greater experience and maturity levels of the students should enable realistic and useful discussion to take place.

LO2 within the ‘Rights and Responsibilities’ module of the course also has implications for character development. The LO includes issues of authority, law, and the maintenance of personal standards. Course members are expected to both maintain the required levels of observance in these areas, and enforce those levels on their subordinates.

**Just War.** This theory is not explicitly mentioned in the CPL course, and there is little explicit LOAC training in the Airpower related sections of the course. The statutory responsibilities to ensure all Service members are current in LOAC are normally covered outside the PMET system, and where members of this rank are deployed to any area of actual or potential conflict special LOAC presentations are given. At this rank, level further training in Just War theory is redundant.

**Character Development.** This is not specifically covered in the CPL course, although the use of the word ‘Model’ in LO2 of the ‘Values’ module carries with it implications of character-training and raises questions such as ‘Whom do we model to?’; ‘Why are we modelling these Values?’ and ‘How well have we practised these values?’. Similar questions arise in the ‘Rights and Responsibilities’ module when the enforcement of standards on subordinates is required. Within the teaching of the
course, issues of character would arise that would have clear ethical implications, including questions of right and wrong and such as ‘What sort of person do I want to be?’ The instructors for the course need to be aware of these issues so they can be integrated into their lessons.

**Sergeant Course**

The Sergeant’s course includes LOs covering ‘Conflict Resolution’, ‘Leadership’, and ‘Air Power’ that all have explicit references to values and ethics issues. RAAF Values are stated twice in the Air Power LO, which also includes syllabus objectives that imply a background in Just War theory, for example the ten principles of war\(^{44}\) and the linking of RAAF Values to air power doctrine. Aspects of character development are covered in the ‘Leadership’ module where, incidentally, ‘ethics’ makes an explicit appearance in the context of fraud. Also the ‘Conflict Resolution’ LOs cover aspects of personal character development and the ability to train the character of others.

**RAAF Values.** LO6.1 in the Air Power section requires that the student be able to list the RAAF Values. However, the syllabus, unlike that for the CPL course, does not require any student presentations, and as less than a period is allocated this is likely to be a fairly superficial run through of the Values, more a reminder than introducing new material. By this stage of a member’s career, the expectation would be that the Values have been well and truly assimilated, and that they are reflected in a total approach to Service life. In this course, the Values are obviously seen as being

\(^{44}\) These are ten principles accepted by the Australian Defence Force. They can be found in official publications including AAP1000 *Fundamentals of Australian Aerospace Power*, Fairbairn, ACT, August 2002, p105-110.
linked to air power, so the aspect of the Values that covers the reasons for the
RAAF’s existence and the member’s duty to the Service would be foremost, and the
duty of the Service to its members would need to be considered inasmuch as the
Sergeants now represent the Service to their subordinates.

**Just War.** There is no explicit mention of Just War theory in the syllabus
although, as stated above, there are Just War issues that could be raised when it comes
to describing the link between the RAAF’s mission, its values, and Air Power
doctrine. Although members of this seniority should have received the usual LOAC
training, with the Just War implication of that law being explained, I believe that by
this stage there should be some suitable teaching on the basics. At the very least, the
distinction between *jus ad bellum, jus in bello* and *just post bellum* should be
explained in a non-technical way, so that members are aware as to what is their
responsibility, and what is the responsibility of their (our) political masters.

**Character Development.** There is no LO that specifically refers either to the
development of the character of the (student) Sergeant, or the Sergeant’s skills at
developing the characters of putative subordinates. The distinction between
submissive, assertive and aggressive communication made at LO4, with ‘assertive’
communication as the preferred option, has clear implications for character. If an
instructor was willing and able, this could be developed. At this stage, however, there
is no explicit teaching of character in the course. I believe that the prestige of Sergeant
rank to young junior members is such that this is a definite lack. The Sergeant is
likely to be the highest rank with which an Aircraftsman/woman or Leading
Aircraftsman/woman would be in regular contact, and will probably have the greatest
day-to-day influence on the most impressionable members of the Air Force. I would
strongly recommend that some basic training in ethics and ethical formation be given
at this point of a member’s career.

Flight Sergeant (FSGT) Course

This course has a heavy concentration on leadership, and as such it has much
material related to character development. Air power, military ethics and RAAF
Values are not specifically listed in the syllabus, so the expectation is that these have
been covered to the level appropriate to a FSGT in previous courses in the PMET
system, and/or have been inculcated through the member’s experience of Service life.
Members on this course would usually be in their 30s or 40s, and have had at least 12
years of Service experience. The expectation would be that they were personally
mature, and appropriate role models for younger members.

Character Development. Words such as ‘personal competence’, ‘human
interactions’, ‘social skills’, ‘social management’, and ‘social competence’ are present
in the syllabus. All of them beg ethical questions, particularly as they are not directly
defined in the syllabus. For example, different people could define a ‘personally
competent’ human being in very different and even highly subjective ways. Within a
Service context, it certainly includes professional competence: there would be an
expectation that members of FSGT rank would be masters of their individual trade or
specialisation, and would be able to train and mentor junior members in those specific
skills. This would be non-controversial, but other possible aspects of personal
competence could be more difficult to reach agreement on. For example, if a member
has a string of short-term relationships in their history, most of which have ended in a
mutually bruising way, would that reflect on ‘personal competence’? Or if a member was known to be in financial difficulties, or there was a history of harassment allegations? Similar questions could be asked about social competence, social management and social skills. In these cases there is a need to identify what sort of character is desired/required.

One clue to a possible path here could be the ‘Leadership’ LO 1.2: ‘Define the following aspects of personal competence: 1.2.1 Self-awareness. 1.2.2 Self-management’. Self-awareness in particular implies a level of maturity and integration, and is certainly a quality that requires reflection, and even education, rather than training as usually understood. The LO requires that the student be able to ‘Examine methods for the development of personal competence.’ (1.5) and ‘Relate the elements of personal competence to effective military leadership.’ (1.6). At this stage some sort of psychological inventory such as the Strength Deployment Inventory (SDI)\(^\text{45}\) or the well-known Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) could be used. At this rank, members are moving out of the realm of day-to-day supervision of trade work, and into the area of management - the allocation of resources and the prioritisation of work according to a bigger picture than they have hitherto had to be concerned about. Any psychological inventory programme, therefore, would need to give the member tools to recognise strengths and weaknesses and methods of self-development. However, this would not just be a matter of the need to ‘know thyself’ (and therefore have at least some insight as to how their own character could most effectively lead others), but also to give tools to the prospective FSGT so that s/he could develop the characters of subordinates.

**Warrant Officer (WOFF) Course**

\(^{45}\) Porter, Elias H., Ph.D ‘Strength Deployment Inventory’ Sandy Bay TAS Personal Strengths Publishing (Australia), 1996.
The rank of Warrant Officer (WOFF) is very prestigious in the RAAF, and indeed throughout the Australian and other British Commonwealth military forces.\textsuperscript{46} It is the highest non-commissioned rank. As the name signifies, its origin was in a ‘Warrant’ from the Crown, rather than a promotion from the Service. Its holders are (or should be) held in high respect by all other members, regardless of rank, and they are addressed as ‘Sir’ or ‘Ma’am’ by junior members. Indicative of this respect is the fact that the Service includes in their role the mentoring of junior officers, who are in the rank structure their superiors.\textsuperscript{47} Members promoted to this rank have normally been in the Service for at least 15 years, and most of them have more than 20 years’ service.

Considering this, I believe the course is deficient in its treatment of ethical issues. The Leadership LOs do include a number of character-based outcomes, such as the developing of self-knowledge and interpersonal relationships in the workplace, and ‘Fraud and ethics’ is also mentioned in a ‘shopping list’ of the responsibilities of a WOFF ‘as required by law’. However there is no specific mention of RAAF Values save the usual proviso throughout that all training will be conducted in accordance with them, and even the ‘Values and Attitudes’ section of the course talks only of military etiquette and drill and ceremonial. Similarly although there is a section on operations that covers airpower issues there is no attempt to even look at military ethics (Just War) issues. As the course specification states:

\begin{quote}
The purpose of this module is to provide the Warrant Officers with the knowledge, skills and attitude required to discuss and promote aerospace power; and to represent the Defence organisation within the civilian community.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{46} Note that within the military forces of the United States of America the rank has a very different history, and is normally held by specialists who are seen as slightly outside the usual rank structure.
\textsuperscript{47} See WOFF Course Leadership Learning Outcome LE 2.6.3.
\textsuperscript{48} Warrant Officer Course, Section 4, Module 3.
I believe it is a serious lack that Just War issues are not covered. Within the civilian community issues of both *jus ad bellum*, *jus in bello* and *jus post bellum* could be controversial. The history of airpower includes many instances that are now seen as, at best, morally ambiguous such as the bombing campaigns of World War II and Vietnam, and of course the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan in 1945. Someone expected to represent Defence within Australian society should at least be able to explain basic concepts of the Just War theory such as collateral damage, relate the use of ‘smart’ weapons to Just War principles, and have a basic concept of ‘Why we’re fighting’ more advanced than ‘I’m just following orders.’ Although members of this rank will have experienced numerous LOAC briefs, it is quite likely that they will have had no real training in the theoretical background to the law, and it is this background that would enable them to answer the questions of subordinates, properly support the decisions of higher authority and explain those decisions to the civilian community.

It is also a serious lack that there is no mandated discussion of RAAF Values at this stage of the member’s career. As stated above, WOFFs are expected to be mentors for junior officers, and the respect in which they should be held by all ranks is such that they should embody the Values. I believe at their seniority and experience level the course should include at least one guided discussion on the RAAF Values Statement, its history, its underlying principles, and its application in daily Service life and work. Because of their experience and general level of maturity, such a discussion should avoid the dangers of unreality and superficiality which would be present with younger members.
Initial Officer Course (IOC).

As the rank of Warrant Officer has a particular mystique, so does the holding of a commission. Legally, the commissioned officer holds rank from the Sovereign or the Sovereign’s representative, and is responsible for leadership and command in training and active service. In recognition of that responsibility, the commissioned officer is accorded certain privileges of authority and pay. The Initial Officer Course (IOC) therefore is not just another training course, but is seen as a rite of passage that marks entry into a particular caste, that of the military officer. That having been said, within the contemporary RAAF the IOC has a widely varied student body. The range includes 18-year-old Officer Cadets (OFFCDT) who are going on to pilot or other specialist training; graduates in their 20s, 30s or 40s going into positions that range from logistics to medical; and serving members who have taken a commission after some years of service. The course is structured so that prior (RAAF) learning can be recognised. Depending on the student’s previous Service experience they can be given credit for anything from four to 14 weeks of the 17-week course. The aim however is that all required competencies are met by every student before they can graduate from the course.

The full course therefore has a double function. As well as providing officer training (that is training in military, leadership and management skills appropriate to people expected to take charge of subordinates immediately on graduation), it must also provide military induction and indoctrination to civilians ‘off the street’. All three areas of ethical training – RAAF Values, military ethics and character development are therefore dealt with during the course, and shall be separately examined.
**RAAF Values.** Course Learning Outcome 6 (part of the ‘Qualities’ area of the syllabus) is that students be able to ‘Apply the principles and standards associated with holding a commission.’ The RAAF Values are a central part of the assessment criteria that follow. Students are to ‘Outline the components’ of the Values, which are described as ‘What the Air Force stands for/ What the Air Force aim is/ What the Air Force expects of its personnel’. This reflects the division of the statement into purposes, aims and expectations, and discussed in Chapter 1. This is the only one of the syllabuses where the Values statement is subdivided like this, and the implication is that this is the course where the most time is given to exploring the statement. This exploration and teaching of the Values is explicitly linked with the holding of a commission. The language used in the LO reinforces that the student is not just expected to ‘know’ the Values – that is to be able to repeat, expound or explain them, but also is required to ‘display’ them in personal behaviour. When the conditions and methods of assessment are prescribed, they include both ‘knowledge’ and ‘performance’. The student is expected to outline (‘knowledge’) the Air Force Vision and the components of the Air Force Values Statement, but the verbs used when the components of the Values Statement are laid out are rather more ‘performance’ based – for example, ‘strive’, ‘encourage’, ‘work’, and ‘demonstrate’.

Students are assessed as to their compliance with the Values by observation of their behaviour while on course – particularly on the field exercises that are there to assess both leadership and followership. Teamwork, accepting responsibility and even work/life balance are all present in the LO and are all matters for assessment in the
field exercises. These exercises include some with a concentration on team building, others on military skills, and others that concentrate on leadership. In all the exercises RAAF Values are part of the assessment, and although specific assessment criteria, particularly in the Leadership exercises, are not restricted to the RAAF Values, a student is not assessed as ‘Competent’ if they do not comply with the Values.

**Just War.** This is taught through various Military Law LOs as related to the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC). Military Law LO2 requires that the student outline the meaning of ‘military necessity’, ‘proportionality’, unnecessary suffering’, and ‘distinction’. These are all aspects of *Jus in bello*, and as such are issues with which a junior officer should be conversant. Their knowledge of these is not to be simply theoretical, as the syllabus makes it clear that the students’ compliance with LOAC is to be assessed on Exercise Labuan, one of the military skills exercises discussed above. These concepts are reinforced in further LOs which require an examination of who is and is not a lawful combatant, and what is a legitimate target under LOAC. *Jus ad bellum* issues are only touched on lightly, when an LO requires ‘Crimes against peace’ to be defined. Otherwise, the syllabus seems to accept the common ruling that, except at the highest levels, military members obeying the orders of their

---

49 These are normally near the beginning of the course, and may include team building exercises such as rock climbing or abseiling, and ‘trust’ exercises that are familiar forms of adventure training.

50 These exercises concentrate on those military skills that are, in the RAAF, normally referred to as ‘ground defence’. That is, the skills needed to defend an airfield against attack by ground forces. They therefore include such mundane activities as digging weapon pits, setting up controlled access points through the use of physical barriers such as barbed wire, standing guard, and maintaining communications with the rest of the group; as well as defending against ‘enemy’ attacks. The physical effort and boredom inseparable from this work provides a good setting to determine a student’s compliance with many of the RAAF Values.

51 Leadership is assessed in the field at the end of the course. The method used is to form the students into teams, each student taking a turn in leading the team in the performance of a task which is normally structured around a scenario such as the rescue of an aircraft pilot or crew downed due to accident or enemy action.
government are not to be held responsible for breaches of the *Jus ad bellum*. There are, however, LOs which require that Australia’s security and strategic interests be discussed, and some discussion as to in what circumstances Australia is justified in going to war would seem to be a valuable (if not even necessary) part of such teaching. At the moment, such discussion is not specifically mandated by the syllabus.

**Character Development.** Although the teaching of RAAF Values discussed above could well develop aspects of the individual student’s character (particularly in those who had little or no military and/or leadership experience), there is no specific teaching in the syllabus that would help the student to develop the character of others, especially the airmen and airwomen who will soon be under their command. Neither is there any training in the theory of ethics so that the student can put RAAF Values, Just War theory and leadership training in a theoretical context. Values, LOAC and leadership are taught in terms of ‘This is right because it’s the policy’, rather than in terms of a coherent philosophy. As stated in Chapter One, I believe that the RAAF Values, and indeed most military ethics, are derived from Virtue ethics, supported by a fundamentally deontological perspective. At IOC level, these concepts should be introduced, so that the students are shown that they are part of an honourable tradition of military might virtuously applied in the service of justice.

On graduation from the IOC, many of the students will be placed in positions of leadership. The leadership role of a junior officer is taught in largely functional terms such as management, command and leadership. Certainly, the style of leadership taught and assessed on the IOC is structured around the leadership of a

---

32 The “enemy” attacks referred to at footnote 8 above are structured so as to raise * jus in bello* issues
small group in the performance of a specific practical task. Vision and team-building are quite rightly seen as important components of leadership for the student officer, and students are warned against becoming so ‘task-focussed’ that they lose sight of a bigger picture. However, students on this course are given little training in developing others. This is another theoretical weakness in ethical training on the IOC.

**Squadron Leader Course**

This course is designed to prepare senior Flight Lieutenants and junior Squadron Leaders for the responsibilities of senior officer rank. The course description states that:

The course introduces officers to issues concerning Australia’s strategic outlook and posture, aerospace power theory and doctrine and joint and single service doctrinal development. The topics of command, leadership, management, personnel and military law issues pertinent to the rank of Squadron Leader are examined in detail.

At two weeks the course is comparatively short. It is mostly classroom instruction and discussion based course. The students would all have had considerable military and air force experience.

---

53 The classic example of this in the IOC is the student who, having been given a strict time constraint for the performance of one section of an overall task, insists on finishing that section even when ‘overtime’, to the overall detriment of the task.

54 The least experienced officers to do the course would be professionals such as doctors, dentists, lawyers or chaplains who are normally appointed straight to the rank of Flight Lieutenant or its equivalent. In their case it is possible that they would do the SQNLDR Course after as little as three years full-time Air Force service. Most officers on the course however would have at the very least eight years service.
**RAAF Values.** In this course, RAAF values are discussed in the context of RAAF culture and the broader Australian culture. This occurs as part of LO3 ‘Discuss the expectations, roles and responsibilities of a senior RAAF officer holding squadron leader rank.’, which is a ‘Values and Attitudes’ LO. The expectation here is that the student officers have sufficient Service experience and general education to be able to relate RAAF Values to their work environments. (By this stage of their careers most officers would have experienced a number of different jobs, including operational, training and staff positions.) The only specific mention of RAAF Values in the syllabus is at LO3.4 ‘Discuss RAAF values and culture, including their origins and implications.’ All the students on this course should have had sufficient experience to enable them to join meaningfully in such a discussion. Further, there are papers available that would be a good resource.\(^{55}\)

**Just War.** Although the ‘Operations’ area of study includes LOs that look at the principles of aerospace doctrine (LO1), these principles do not cover Just War teaching, but instead concentrate on operational and tactical issues.\(^{56}\) However, LO11 looks at the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC), and specifically requires that students ‘Discuss the fundamental concepts of LOAC including undue suffering, proportionality, and military necessity’ and that they be able to state the sources of LOAC (LOs 11.1 and 11.2). This certainly gives an ‘in’ for the discussion of Just War issues, although there would probably be a tendency to restrict them largely to *Jus in bello* matters because of the time constraint. I believe that at this level *Jus ad bellum*

---

\(^{55}\) The paper by Prof Stephen Mugford & WGCDR Bob Rodgers (RAAF) “If you do what you’ve always done …”: Leadership challenges in a downsizing RAAF’ presented to the ‘Air Force Leadership: Beyond Command’ conference at RAF Hendon, July, 2005, would be an excellent resource, jogging memories as to what caused the creation of the Values statement.

\(^{56}\) That is, they look at how aerospace assets can be used to achieve tactical or operational ends.
and *Jus ad pacem* principles need to be introduced and discussed. Officers at SQNLDR rank would be expected by their troops to be able to ‘contextualise’ any conflict they were involved in. Troops in a modern military conflict where their lives are being placed at risk as a result of government policy have the perfect right to ask their superiors ‘Why are we here?’ and get a reasoned answer which applies classic Just War principles in clear language. In a deployed, operational environment, it is probable that a SQNLDR will be the most senior officer most troops will be in regular contact with, and therefore the one of whom these sorts of questions are most likely to be asked. As combatants are only legally liable under LOAC for *in bello* breaches, previous Just War training has concentrated on these issues and, because of a need to prepare members for the reality of war fighting, there has been little attention paid to *ad bellum* principles. This may have been good enough for junior members, but at SQNLDR rank members should be able to explain the morality of ‘why we fight’, and not just ‘how we fight’.

**Character Development.** There is little explicit teaching of character development techniques or issues in this course. Values and Attitudes LO4 requires that students be able to ‘Facilitate the development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in the Air Force.’ and that in so doing they have applied a personal assessment technique. This would seem to require students to be able to assess themselves, and be at least familiar with some technique such as the MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) or the SDI (Strength Deployment Inventory). There is no explicit requirement, however, that they be able to apply lessons learned from these techniques to their subordinates, or indeed develop or educate their subordinates. I
regard this as a major failing in the course, as at SQNLDR rank officers have a vital leadership role which should include character issues.

Conclusion.

The teaching of the three areas of values and ethics (RAAF Values, Just War theory, Character Development) in the PMET system is patchy. Although the Recruit Course LOs cover the three areas required to a satisfactory level for new members, the other courses all have areas of need. Although RAAF Values are adequately covered in most of the courses, they are not mentioned at all in the WOFF course – a rank at which the member is expected to be a model airman/woman. Just War theory is usually taught through the prism of the Law of Armed Conflict. This is done adequately at Recruit, CPL and FSGT level – either through the specific Recruit course or through refresher LOAC training. The higher ranks, however, need a stronger presentation of the moral theories behind LOAC – Just War theory - particularly in terms of the Jus ad bellum issues that a member may be required to understand as a representative of the Service in the public arena, or to justify a particular conflict to junior members. Character Development is only covered adequately in the Recruit Course and the IOC. In all the other courses, the responsibility of a member holding rank in the military to be a moral exemplar and teacher to subordinates is largely ignored.
CHAPTER FOUR
VALUES AND ETHICS FOR LEADERS – PREPARING SERGEANTS AND SQUADRON LEADERS

Sergeants and Squadron Leaders hold influential ranks within the RAAF. A SGT is the line supervisor for junior troops, the mediator of command decisions and often the initial source of personal and pastoral advice for the adolescents and young adults found in the junior ranks. The SQNLDR sometimes holds command, particularly in the field, and must enforce official policy with conviction. Members at both ranks would normally have at least ten years Service experience, and often considerably more life experience than their juniors. Therefore SGTs and SQNLDR will often be seen by their subordinates as mentors in both Service and personal matters. As discussed in Chapter Three above, the teaching of values and ethics to members at or aspiring to these ranks needs to bear in mind their status as mentors, and equip them accordingly. The proposed changes that follow are designed to give members at these ranks the knowledge and skills to mentor their subordinates in the RAAF Values, in ‘Just War’ theory, and in general character development as a part of leadership.

Sergeant Course.

RAAF Values. As discussed in Chapter One, the RAAF Values statement has three broad divisions: the purpose, aims and expectations of the Air Force. ‘Aims’ actually reflects what the Air Force, as an institution, owes its members, and ‘expectations’ reflects what the members owe to each other and the institution. At present the SGTs course only spends one period on the Values, requiring that
members be able to list them, and this seems to reflect an assumption that the Values have been internalised. This is taught as part of the Air Power section of the syllabus, which would mean that any discussion of the Values would be centred around their first section, the purpose of the Air Force, as this is relevant to the application of Air Power in the defence of Australia and its interests. ‘Aims’ and ‘expectation’, reflecting on the relationship of the institution and its members, would be better dealt with as part of the Leadership package.

At present the learning Outcome for Leadership (LE1), the SNCO’s role in leadership, is assessed through Assessment Criteria 13. The sub-sections of this criteria include ‘fraud’ and ‘ethics’ – which in this context are financial in nature - but have no mention of the RAAF Values. After criterion 13.8, which talks about team maintenance, a new 13.9 should be inserted, with the present criteria 13.9-13.19 being adjusted accordingly. This new 13.9 would read as follows: ‘13.9.1 Discuss the SGT’s role in ensuring that the ‘aims’ of the Air Force are met in respect of the SGT’s subordinates. 13.9.2 Discuss the SGT’s role in assisting subordinates to meet the ‘expectations’ of the Air Force.’ There would be a note in the syllabus explicitly relating these ‘aims’ and ‘expectations’ back to the RAAF Values Statement.

The verb in the new criterion is ‘Discuss’, but resources would need to be provided so that the discussion was based on the lived reality of the students and on real situations. I have attached a number of Case Studies at Appendix 2 that I believe would be an appropriate resource to focus discussion.

**Just War.** At present the SGT course does not teach military ethics or Just War theory. Although the students would have received training in the Law of Armed
Conflict (LOAC) in their Recruit Course, and this would have been reinforced during compulsory yearly refresher training, they have been given little of the theory behind the law. As SGTs will often be the first people that junior members go to for information in the field, they need to have some awareness of the theory behind the law. This could be given as part of the Air Power LO – ‘Advocate Air Power’ – as military ethics is an essential part of the application of any military force such as air power. Presently Assessment Criterion 6.8 reads:

Describe the link between RAAF:
6.8.1 Mission,
6.8.2 Values, and
6.8.3 Air Power doctrine.

This could be amended thus:

Describe the link between RAAF:
6.8.1 Mission,
6.8.2 Values,
6.8.3 military ethics, and
6.8.3 Air Power doctrine.

In teaching military ethics at this level the basic difference between *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* would be introduced, and the importance of this difference in terms of the responsibilities and liabilities of the RAAF member under LOAC would be considered. Furthermore, *jus in bello* issues such as proportionality and discrimination would need to be introduced, and related to the RAAF Mission and Values, particularly where the Values include concepts such as professionalism,

---

57 All members are required to attend yearly training in a variety of matters ranging from first aid and small arms training through to equity provisions and occupational health and safety policy. LOAC is normally included in this training. It should be noted that the training normally takes the form of mass briefs (that is lectures to large groups), and there is little opportunity for discussion or reinforcement of the material taught.

58 Proportionality in this context means the use of sufficient, but not excessive, force to achieve a valid military objective with as little collateral damage as possible. Discrimination refers to the care needed to ensure that, as far as reasonably possible, only valid military objectives are targeted.
integrity, and the ‘Delivery of effective, precision aerospace power’. Appendix 3 outlines a sample Instructor Guide with teaching points.

**Character Development.** There is no teaching of Character Development in this course. This is notwithstanding the fact that the purpose of the Leadership module includes: ‘to undertake the personal and professional development of its individual members.’ ‘Personal’ development certainly includes character development, and yet there is no explicit training in how to do this. Whether one calls it ‘Personal’ or character development those qualities normally listed under the heading of ‘emotional intelligence’ - knowing one’s emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognising emotions in others, and handling relationships\(^{59}\) - are an essential part of leadership. Although the students may be at various stages of personal maturity a certain minimum standard of moral maturity,\(^{60}\) as well as emotional intelligence, is essential if they are to be effective as SGTs.

At present, the Leadership Learning Outcome includes the following sections:

1.8 State qualities of followership.
1.9 Describe the relationship between leadership and followership.

The relationship between ‘leadership’ and ‘followership’ has implications of character development – if ‘Leadership’ is about more than just management it must include concepts such as inspiration and formation which should mean that the character of the followers is developed! However, to ensure that the proto-SGTs are made aware

\(^{59}\) This list is taken from D. Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence – Why it can matter more than IQ* (Bloomsbury: London. 1996), 43. Goleman acknowledges this as being taken from the work of Yale psychologist Peter Salovey which in its turn is based on that of Howard Gardner of Harvard.

\(^{60}\) On Kohlberg’s six stages of moral development the student at this level should at least at the 4th stage, that of following the rules because they are rules, and be moving towards the 5th stage, that of
of this, and that they are given some explicit guidance in how to develop the characters of their putative subordinates, a new Outcome could be added which would require the teaching of Character Development:

1.10 Describe the means by which the qualities of followership can be encouraged. This LO follows on naturally from the previous two, quoted above, but emphasises the SGT educative, developmental role. It would enable discussion of character development to be included in the course. This could be done through the practical leadership exercises which are already included in the course. These exercises already include an implicit testing of character. Many of them create stressful conditions, and aim to put people under pressure to determine how they will react. The students’ skills in areas such as Anger management and aspects of Emotional Intelligence such as self-awareness and empathy can be developed through these exercises and the subsequent debriefing and discussion.\(^6\) Emotional Intelligence in particular encompasses essential qualities for leaders who wish to develop followers who will work well in a team. These followers need to see appropriately assertive behaviour modelled, and then encouraged. They need to be able to answer questions such as – ‘How do I talk to the boss so that I keep my job? my self-respect? How do I work effectively in the team?’ As suggested above, to meet the requirements of the new LO, LE 1.10, the debriefings after the exercises could include group discussions. As part of this, character-based questions can be asked – ‘How did the choices made by the participants reflect their characters?’ ‘How can you (as leaders) reinforce behaviour that shows good character?’ ‘How do you (as potential leaders) deal with

\(^{61}\) Goleman also includes the following abilities in Emotional Intelligence: ‘abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulses and delay gratification; to

bad behaviour in a just and educative way?’ - are just three. At Appendix 4 there is a
discussion guide, including these and other questions, that can be used when
debriefing participants in practical leadership exercises to encourage discussion on
character development and related issues.

Squadron Leader Course

**RAAF Values.** As stated above, the SQNLDR course includes a RAAF Values
related LO in the Values (VA) section:

3.4 ‘Discuss RAAF values and culture, including their origins and implications.’

There are papers and other resources that can be used to stimulate a good discussion,
and these are listed at Appendix 5. A teaching strategy that I would recommend is that
the Values statements or similar documents put out by other Defence Forces should
be examined and compared.\(^{62}\) Many of these are simply a list of qualities expressed
by a single word or pithy phrase. A useful discussion could be structured around the
question: ‘Why did the RAAF decide to use the structure that it did, with implied
aims, rights and responsibilities expressed as sentences?’ \(^{63}\) This would require the
students to reflect on the structure of the RAAF Values statement, noting that it
includes both individual rights and responsibilities. Few defence force value
statements talk about the rights of the individual soldier, sailor or airman in the way

---

\(^{62}\) For example, the United States Air Force has: Integrity First, Service Before Self, Excellence in All
We Do; the Australian Army lists courage, initiative and teamwork as core values, and has lately put
out the ‘I’m an Australian Soldier’ poster listing nine aspirational behaviours. These and others are
listed among the resources at Appendix 5.

\(^{63}\) The balance of rights and responsibilities could be discussed in an ethical setting. Taylor’s ‘ethics
of authenticity’ could be the basis for a discussion on the balance between the two – service to others
being an essential part of genuine self-fulfillment. Cfr Charles Taylor, *The Ethics of Authenticity*
that the RAAF statement does. Does this make the RAAF’s statement a better or worse document? Is it more selfish than the others, or more realistic? The students on this course will have had considerable Service and life experience, and hopefully will have the intelligence to reflect on that experience. In that context, a class discussion acknowledges their experience and gives them a chance to apply it to the RAAF Values Statement in a way that respects their status as leaders.

**Just War.** As discussed in Chapter 3 above, the course already treats *jus in bello* issues as part of the LOAC training (the OPS11 Course Learning Objective), but *jus ad bellum* issues are untouched. They could however be introduced as part of the OPS7 Course Learning objective, which is headed ‘Discuss strategic level command and strategic planning in the ADF.’ The new LO in this section could be:

7.5 ‘Discuss the concept of ‘just cause’ for war.’

Students would need to be reminded of the basic *jus ad bellum* concepts of ‘defence against aggression’, ‘competent authority’ and ‘right intention’, and the circumstances in which pre-emptive attacks are considered moral would need to be discussed.64 As well as these *jus ad bellum* concepts the idea of *jus post bellum* (also known as *jus ad pacem* or *jus in pace*) should be introduced. Officers at SQNLDR rank and higher need to be aware of what may be called the strategic aspect of just war thinking – a particular war may be entered into for just reason, and even fought justly, but can it be seen as contributing overall to the peace and prosperity of humanity?65 A vigorous

---

64 A good explanation and history of the *jus ad bellum* concepts is in Johnson, *Morality and Contemporary Warfare* Chap. 2 pp 41-70. A complementary discussion can be found in Walzer *Just and Unjust Wars* Part 2 pp 51-124. Walzer’s discussion on pre-emptive attacks (pp80-85) is particularly stimulating.

65 This issue was first raised above at Chapter 1, footnote 19. *Jus post bellum* considerations have always been a part of just war thinking through the *jus ad bellum* factors of ‘right intention’ and ‘proportionality of ends’, and a strong utilitarian argument for *jus in bello* has also been that ‘right fighting’ makes a just peace easier to achieve, and leaves far less bitterness behind it – such bitterness being a frequent cause of future wars. However, scholars of recent years have paid much more
discussion could be structured around recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, and peacekeeping/peacemaking tasks in East Timor and Darfur (Sudan). Discussion points and questions are listed at Appendix 6.

**Character Development.** The Values and Attitudes (VA) area of the syllabus contains character-related material, but does not require training in Character Development. For example, LO VA4 states ‘Facilitate the development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in the Air Force.’, and although in its sub-sections it includes personal awareness techniques and ‘self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation’, it is not clear whether this is purely in regard to ‘self’ (that is the individual SQNLDR course student) or whether it is expected the student will be trained in developing these qualities in others. As a further example, LO VA5 states ‘Promote effective interpersonal and workplace relationships’, but no hint is given that this should include character development within the workplace. Similarly, the LOs for Military Leadership (ML) do not mention anything about character development of subordinates, consisting of either theoretical talk about the difference between leadership and management, or explanations of bureaucratic structures within the Service and the Defence organization.66

Character development is a skill which can be taught, and which officers of SQNLDR rank should have some familiarity with. To introduce it to the syllabus could be done simply by amending the current LO VA4.2 from ‘Facilitate the development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in the Air Force.’ to

consideration to ‘just peace’ as a retrospective justification for war. Reed & Ryall (eds) *The Price of Peace* Part 4, pp217-273 gives a good discussion of the issues..

66 For example, ML LO1.1 is ‘Define and contrast the terms: leadership, management and command.’, where ML LO2 is ‘Discuss workforce planning issues.’, and LO4 is ‘Outline the Defence appropriation and financial management system.’
‘Facilitate the development of self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation in subordinates.’ This removes the ambiguity noted above, and requires the student to think about the characters of his/her subordinates and what can be done to develop them. The three qualities listed are all included under the rubric of ‘Emotional Intelligence’, and as such may well have been introduced in previous PMET courses. The SQNLDR course is a short two week course, almost entirely classroom based, and there is no opportunity as it is currently structured for extensive field exercises that would give the students the opportunity to practice character development techniques on peers or putative subordinates. With these constraints, a short lesson and discussion is the most that would be able to be allocated to this important area. I recommend that this lesson be given over to a discussion on building conscience in others. Conscience requires ‘self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation’ as listed in the LO, and is the quality which is required if good character is to be manifested. The importance of conscience in the development of character, identity and healthy self-esteem is well expressed in this quote from Patrick Glynn.

I merely had come to see honour and conscience as a psychological necessity, as the sine qua non of a stable identity. If you did not adhere to your conscience, if there was nothing that in some way absolutely limited your conduct in life, then who were you, I asked myself? What were you?

Discussion points and materials for a lesson on the development of conscience are attached at Appendix 7.

Conclusion

67 cfr Goleman p.43.
68 As above, I have already recommended this be used as a framework for discussion in the SGT course.
The ideas outlined in this chapter, and the materials included in the Appendices, are simply one set of resources designed to get RAAF members thinking in terms of their ethical responsibilities as members of a defence force legally allowed to use violence when authorised by the government, and empowered to give commands to subordinates that carry the force of Australian law. Because they hold these powers RAAF members have responsibilities to each other, the Australian community, Australia’s national allies and enemies, and the international community. However all members of the RAAF also have a responsibility to themselves. Each of us has a responsibility to ensure that, as far as it is within our power, we are not brutalised by our service – that we do not turn into bullies, thugs or criminals – and that as far as possible we do not suffer serious long-term psychological damage. The RAAF Values Statement gives a realistic and practical picture of how we can fulfil all our responsibilities. Appropriate training in the Statement and its implications, and in Just War theory and the development of character, is one means by which we can meet these important responsibilities.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this Supervised Research Project was to discuss the teaching of values and ethics in the RAAF’s PMET program, and to provide some resources to improve this teaching. The perceived need for this came from my own experience as a chaplain in the RAAF, trying to give instruction in ethics to officer trainees, and from the belief of the leaders of the Service on the mid-1990’s that there was a problem with the behaviour of some members of the RAAF that seemed to derive from a lack of basic ethical education. This problem was discussed in the CAFAC Agendum paper quoted in the Introduction, and one of the outcomes of that paper was a decision to emphasise values and character in training. In my belief the need for this training has been reinforced since the late 90’s by the marked increase in operational tempo, which also has an effect on the need for RAAF members to be aware of ‘just war’ issues. Now members of the RAAF are involved in active service, peacemaking, peace keeping and humanitarian relief operations on a regular basis, and are more likely to be confronted with ethical problems as a result of this.

My analysis of the RAAF Values statement and other ethical issues in Chapter One showed the base from which this problem was tackled – a decision to define values in terms of what individuals owed to the organization and vice versa, and what the purpose of the organization was. This was in marked contrast to the values statements common to other armed forces, which tended to be a list of ‘hurrah’ words and phrases (e.g. ‘courage’, ‘integrity above all’), which placed all responsibility on the individual. The other aspects of ethics educations that were discussed – military ethics (‘just war’ issues) and character development were also looked at through the
prism of the Values Statement. In Chapter Two I analyzed the competencies required at rank levels from AC to WGCDR, looking at the ethical issues required at each rank level. In Chapter Three I then examined the ethical training provided in the PMET courses applicable to the ranks from AC to SQNLDR. My finding is that although the RAAF Values were adequately covered in most courses there needed to be more attention given to the other areas of ethical teaching. Just War theory is adequately taught to ranks up to Recruit, CPL and FSGT courses through the teaching of the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC). The SGT course contains no Just War material, and I believe this is a serious lack. Even more serious however is the lack of Just War teaching to warrant and commissioned officers. As they may well hold a representational position for the Service in regard to the broader Australian community they need a knowledge of the theoretical background to LOAC which would be provided by a teaching of Just War theory. Finally my analysis showed that the teaching of Character Development was lacking in many of the PMET courses. It is adequately covered in the two courses where trainees are initiated into the military – Recruit course and the IOC. However in the other courses where leadership responsibilities are present there is no substantial effort to train leaders in developing the characters of their subordinates.

The scope of this project was such that I only gave in detail prescriptions for two courses – those for prospective SGTs and SQNLDs. I have recommended amendments to the official syllabus, particularly the Learning Outcomes in areas relevant to RAAF Values, Just War theory and Character Development for these two courses. These changes would have to be accepted by the official RAAF training authorities. If that should happen, relevant teaching strategies and materials would
have to be developed at individual training schools. I have made some suggestions for these strategies in Chapter Four, and also developed some basic teaching materials which are attached at Appendices Two to Seven.

The benefit of these changes would, I believe, only properly be seen over a number of years. That benefit would be seen positively in an increased ethical awareness among the members of the RAAF. This is a good thing in itself, and would result in a lower possibility of LOAC breaches and a greater degree of psychological health and resilience due to improved character training. This can only aid the RAAF’s mission ‘to promote Australia’s security and interests’ and we hope as Australians that our ‘interests’ will always be in the peace and security of the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Official Department of Defence documents


Other printed resources


Porter, Elias H *Strength Deployment Inventory* Sandy Bay TAS Australia: Personal Strengths Publishing.


Web-based resource

Resources on the ethics of war, peace and terrorism, from San Diego University, http://ethics.sandiego.edu/Applied/Military/index.asp
APPENDIX 1 – RAAF VALUES STATEMENT

The Royal Australian Air Force stands for:
- Delivery of effective, precision aerospace power;
- Defence of Australia’s people, security and interests;

The Royal Australian Air Force aims to:
- Be a professional, highly motivated and dedicated team;
- Develop and support its people;
- Be a safe and equitable place to work.

The Royal Australian Air Force expects that its people will:
- Display honest commitment to the Royal Australian Air Force Values.
- Strive for excellence as both leaders and followers.
- Be fair to and respect the rights of others.
- Encourage diversity in all its forms.
- Balance work and personal commitments, including family and relationships, for themselves and those they work with.
- Work together as a team.
- Communicate in an open and honest manner.
- Be capability focussed and operationally ready.
- Be professional and innovative.
- Be recognised for their loyalty, integrity and determination.
- Serve with pride and dedication.

The Royal Australian Air Force values its people.

APPENDIX 2 – SERGEANT COURSE - CASE STUDIES FOR RAAF VALUES

Situation 1.

AC Johnson graduated from trade training eight months ago. Since his arrival at your section his work has been careless, and he has barely started his trade workbook. Although at first he seemed to fit in with the rest of the troops, you have noticed that he is becoming isolated at social events. You have spoken to him informally about his work performance and the need to complete his workbook, but now you have decided to formally counsel him, and raise a Record of Conversation.

Values issues for discussion.
When discussing this situation, you will need to be careful that the group does not simply see it as a personnel management issue. Many in the group should be aware of the administrative system, and know the process that works through informal counselling through Records of Conversation, Formal Warnings and Adverse Reports. The focus in discussion needs to be on the RAAF Values – what is it about this situation which may be contrary to RAAF Values and who is responsible for the maintenance of the Values. The questions that could be asked include ‘What are AC Johnson’s responsibilities to the Service?’, ‘What does the Service owe to AC Johnson?’, and ‘Who is in the ‘Service’ that AC Johnson is relating to?’.  

**Situation 2**

Due to the sudden operational deployment of another squadron, your squadron is to be sent at short notice on an exercise to RAAF Sherger. The operationally deployed squadron is receiving good allowances, lots of publicity, and will get the medals and the welcome home parades. Your squadron gets to go to Sherger (during the wet season).

**Values issues for discussion**

The RAAF Values Statement begins by looking at the purpose of the Air Force. How does this situation figure in that purpose? What is the place of training exercises in maintaining capability? How can we deal with injustice, perceived and/or real, from the Service? There may well be course members who have operationally deployed, who should be encouraged to relate relevant personal experiences that have a ‘RAAF Values’ implication.

---

RAAF Sherger is a ‘bare base’ – that is, an airfield with operationally essential buildings such as a headquarters, maintenance buildings and basic accommodation. Bare bases are normally used for exercises and operational deployments as required, but there are less than six full-time personnel at any
**Situation 3**

Two LACs in your section have been sharing a house for over a year. There has been gossip and jokes in the section that they are gay, and some of the jokes have had a real ‘edge’ to them. They come to you in private and tell you that they would like to apply for recognition as being in an interdependent relationship, but are worried that they will be the subject of harassment and ‘humour’.

**Values issues for discussion**

This situation may affect some course members personally. Depending on your experience of the group, you may need to remind them that what may be ‘humour’ to one person may be seen as an insult to another. The discussion could be structured around questions such as ‘How do we balance our private moral beliefs with the RAAF Values requirement of tolerance?’, and ‘What does an RAAF team need to agree on to be effective?’. The discussion could be developed to include the relationship between the RAAF and the society that it serves. How different are we in the RAAF from Australian society?

**Situation 4**

While you are deployed on active service, one of your troops tells you he saw an officer in an ‘out of bounds’ area of the local town, drinking alcohol and mixing with prostitutes. Both these activities are a serious breach of local orders, you have been briefed that there are serious security dangers in the ‘out of bounds’ areas, and that the local prostitutes are controlled by gangs with links to enemy governments.

**Values issues for discussion**

such base. They are located in isolated areas in Australia’s north and west – Sherger is on the west
Discuss the various ways in which the officer’s behaviour breaches RAAF Values, including its effect on the Air Force to properly fulfil its mission, the officer’s lack of integrity, and the breakdown in trust engendered by someone holding authority behaving in this way. Then discuss the issue of reporting the officer’s behaviour to higher authority – do you have a responsibility to do this? What are the potential dangers of reporting? What are the potential dangers of not reporting? In this situation, how do RAAF Values relate to your unit’s ability to complete its mission?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.8.3</th>
<th>Outline the basics of the Just War Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss the question of force – Why is it ethical to ‘kill people and destroy their stuff’ in a war when it would be a crime in peace? How does this relate to the RAAF Values Statement? Discuss the concepts of professionalism, integrity and ‘Delivery of effective, precision aerospace power’ as they relate to warfare. Outline the origin of Just War theory in Christian thought. At first most Christians felt ‘Thou shall not kill’ was an absolute commandment that forbade fighting in war. As Christianity became more common in the Roman Empire, Christians wondered how they could defend their neighbours, their own lives and their country/Empire without fighting Christian thinkers (Augustine, Aquinas) worked out a number of principles for moral fighting, which are commonly known as the ‘Just War Theory’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Many standard reference books describe the classic Just War theory. James Turner Johnson | Discuss the difference between *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*:  
*Jus ad bellum*: When is there a right to fight?  
*Jus in bello*: How do you fight justly?  
Point out that although a country may be justified in going to war, they may still fight the war in a cruel, unfair or unjust way.  
**Define and discuss the following criteria of *jus ad bellum***:  
*Just Cause*: Defence of the innocent against aggression, restoring something wrongly taken;, punishment of evil.  
*Right Authority*: Only a sovereign government with no political superior can authorise a just war. |

---

72 In the RAAF training system, the purpose of an Instructor Guide is to give the (hopefully, qualified) instructor and outline of the material to be taught in the lesson, with appropriate references and some ideas as to presentation. It is the instructor’s responsibility to construct a lesson plan from the Instructor Guide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morality and Contemporary Warfare. Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 199 pages 28-29 is one good reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right Intention:</strong> The intention must be in accordance with the just cause, and not include territorial gain, ethnic cleansing or vengeance. <strong>Proportionality of Ends:</strong> The overall good achieved must be greater than the harm (inevitably) wrought by war. The level and means of using force must be proportional to the just ends sought. <strong>Last Resort:</strong> There must be no reasonable chance of peaceful means achieving the just result sought. <strong>Reasonable Hope of Success:</strong> Prudent calculation should confirm that the means used to fight the war will achieve the just result sought. <strong>The Aim of Peace:</strong> The war should tend in the long term to the establishment of international stability, security and peaceful interaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Define and discuss the following criteria of jus in bello:**

- **Proportionality of Means:*** Forbids ways of fighting which cause harm greater than that needed to achieve the military result needed.
- **Noncombatant Protection/Immunity:** Direct, intentional harming of noncombatants (i.e., civilians, medical staff, chaplains) is to be avoided, and efforts are to be made to protect them from the effects of war, as far as reasonably possible.

**Teaching Strategies:** The DS may use a straight lecture based around the above points, or may choose to give students examples of wars in history to determine how they match up to the criteria, or use a hypothetical role play. The Reference gives a number of good historical examples.
APPENDIX 4 - SERGEANT COURSE – DISCUSSION GUIDE FOR DEBRIEFING PARTICIPANTS ON THE CHARACTER ISSUES IN PRACTICAL LEADERSHIP EXERCISES

During the exercises the participants will be assessed on their leadership abilities, and debriefed accordingly. The instructor may wish to lead a separate discussion on character issues after all the practical leadership exercises have been completed, or may wish to integrate this discussion into individual debriefs. The following questions are given as a guide that should stimulate discussion.

• How did the choices made by the participants reflect their characters?
• Where were there any choices that clearly showed good character?
• How do you differentiate between a wrong or unwise decision, and one that shows bad character?
• What actual or potential choices could have shown bad character?
• How do you recognise good or bad character?
• How can you (as leaders) reinforce behaviour that shows good character?
• How do you (as leaders) deal with bad behaviour in a just and educative way?
The following essays and papers are a useful background resource for discussion on the RAAF Values Statement (at Appendix 1):

**OBSERVATIONS OF QQSR INVOLVEMENT IN THE AIR FORCE CULTURAL JOURNEY 1999-2004.** This paper is available through the QQSR website http://www.qqsr.com.au/about.htm.

**“If you do what you’ve always done … “: Leadership challenges in a downsizing RAAF** Prof Stephen Mugford and WGCDDR Bob Rodgers, Conference paper presented to *Air Force Leadership:Beyond Command* RAF Hendon July, 2005. This paper is available from (now) GPCAPT Rodgers.

The following statements from Australian, United States, British and Israeli sources indicate differing approaches to military Values. Comparing them with the RAAF Values statement at Appendix 1 should provide a useful stimulus to discussion.

**VALUES STATEMENTS OF VARIOUS ARMED FORCES**

**Australian Army** - The following statement were sourced from speeches and documents at the Australian Army intranet site http://intranet.defence.gov.au/armyweb/

The Army’s Ethos and Values

The ethos of the Army is that of the soldier serving the nation: empathetic and discriminatory, mentally and physically tough, and with an unrelenting courage to win. We fight as part of a team, and are inspired by the ANZAC tradition of fairness and loyalty to our mates. We are respected for our professionalism, integrity, esprit de corps and initiative.

The Army’s core values are:

*Courage Initiative Teamwork*

- Every soldier is an expert in close combat
• Every soldier is a leader
• Every soldier is physically tough.
• Every soldier is mentally prepared.
• Every soldier is committed to continuous learning and self-development.
• Every soldier is courageous.
• Every soldier takes the initiative.
• Every soldier works for the team.
• Every soldier demonstrates compassion.

**RAN Values** – This statement was sourced from the Royal Australian Navy intranet site,

**Honour**: Honour is the fundamental value on which the Navy's and each person's reputation depends. To demonstrate honour demands honesty, courage, integrity and loyalty and to consistently behave in a way that is becoming and worthwhile.

**Honesty**: Honesty is always being truthful, knowing and doing what is right for the Navy and ourselves.

**Courage**: Courage is the strength of character to do what is right in the face of personal adversity, danger or threat.

**Integrity**: Integrity is the display of truth, honesty and fairness that gains respect and trust from others.

**Loyalty**: Loyalty is being committed to each other and to our duty of service to Australia.

**U.S. Army** – This statement was sourced from the United States Army internet site –
http://www.army.mil/111asg/values.html

The Seven Army Values (U.S.)

**Loyalty**: Bear true faith and allegiance to the U.S. constitution, the Army, and other soldiers. Be loyal to the nation and its heritage.

**Duty**: Fulfill your obligations. Accept responsibility for your own actions and those entrusted to your care. Find opportunities to improve oneself for the good of the group.

**Respect**: Rely upon the golden rule. How we consider others reflects upon each of us, both personally and as a professional organization.
**Selfless Service:** Put the welfare of the nation, the Army, and your subordinates before your own. Selfless service leads to organizational teamwork and encompasses discipline, self-control and faith in the system.

**Honor:** Live up to all the Army values

**Integrity:** Do what is right, legally and morally. Be willing to do what is right even when no one is looking. It is our "moral compass" an inner voice.

**Personal Courage:** Our ability to face fear, danger, or adversity, both physical and moral courage.

**U.S. Navy** – This statement was sourced from the United States Navy Internet site, http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/traditions/html/corvalu.html

**Honor:** I am accountable for my professional and personal behaviour. I will be mindful of the privilege I have to serve my fellow Americans.

**Courage:** courage is the value that gives me the moral and mental strength to do what is right, with confidence and resolution, even in the face of temptation and adversity.

**Commitment:** The day-to-day duty of every man and woman in the Department of the Nave is to join together as a team to improve the quality of our work, our people and ourselves.

**Royal Air Force** – These values are found in official RAF document that can be accessed through http://www.raf.mod.uk/purpose/ethosvaluesstandards.cfm

**Respect:** Mutual and Self Respect

**Integrity:** Integrity Always

**Service:** Service Before Self

**Excellence:** Striving for Excellence
APPENDIX 6 – SQUADRON LEADER COURSE – JUST WAR DISCUSSION POINTS

The aim of the discussions at this level is to examine strategic and political considerations, as well as legal and tactical ones. Students should be encouraged to refer to personal experiences and reading.

**Timor.** The Australian intervention in East Timor in 1999 was strongly supported by the Australian people, and was regarded at that time as a triumph. Does the need for a second intervention in 2006 obviate that ‘triumph”? Should we have declined to intervene in 1999 on the grounds that the resulting (independent) government may have been less stable than that of the Indonesian authorities?

**Iraq.** The Iraq War of 2003 was fought because the then Iraqi government was alleged to possess (or be close to developing) Weapons of Mass Destruction that posed an unacceptable risk to the security of the world community. After the war, it was found that these weapons did not exist. A secondary reason for the war was the overthrow of a bloodthirsty dictator, Saddam Hussein. This was accomplished, but some would argue that the country is less stable and secure now than it was under Saddam’s rule. Was the war justified? If not, should we have realised that at the time? If Iraq becomes a peaceful, stable democracy does that (retrospectively) justify the war?

**Darfur.** The Darfur region of Sudan has been a humanitarian disaster area for some years. There is strong evidence that the local people of the region, who are mostly Christian and animist African tribal people, are being systematically enslaved, raped
and killed by criminal gangs with covert support from the Sudanese government.

Under what circumstances is the world community justified in intervening in Darfur?

Does it matter whether or not the Sudanese government agrees to such an intervention? What possible consequences of intervention need to be taken into account?
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APPENDIX 7 SQUADRON LEADER COURSE – CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT AND CONSCIENCE DISCUSSION GUIDE

The lesson should commence with a discussion of what the class understands by the word conscience, and how they believe their consciences were formed. They should be encouraged to talk about the place of law, community standards and religious faith in forming conscience, and about the relationship between law and ethics. The question ‘What, if anything, could be morally wrong, but legally right?’ should be put to the class as a discussion starter, with cases drawn from sexual, social and financial behaviour.

When discussing how to help others (particularly subordinates) make conscience decision, the following principles can be introduced: 73

- Remember, every person has a conscience. We can’t make someone else’s decision for them.
- Take the time to listen to what the person has to say. Don’t rush them into a decision.
- Appeal to the ‘good’ the person desires. Help them to discover what the ‘good thin’ is they are actually trying to achieve.
- Encourage a future perspective. Help the person to judge what their real long-term wants and needs are.
- Try to provide compassionate care and supportive challenge. This person may be in a very difficult situation – they need to know they will be supported to follow their conscience.

73 These principles are derived from Charles M. Shelton Achieving Moral Health – An Exercise Plan for your Conscience (New York: Crossroad,2000), 214-224
• Keep your boundaries. It’s their decision, not yours; their consequences, not yours.

• If guilt is appropriate and the person feels guilty, acknowledge the truth and appropriateness of that guilt.

• Be willing to say that something is wrong. If the person suggests some course of action which you believe to be morally wrong, be willing to say so in a way that is respectful of them.

• Try to find an aspect of the situation which is hopeful, and for which the person can feel gratitude.