Hot Topics

CURRENT ISSUES FOR ARMY LEADERS • FALL 1999

Inside:

FROM THE CHIEF OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
MG John G. Meyer Jr. 2

GOOD ORDER AND DISCIPLINE
Mr. Patrick T. Henry 3

ARMY FRATERNIZATION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION 5

HISTORY OF ARMY FRATERNIZATION POLICY 15

Fraternization

Love, Money and More...

MESSAGE FROM THE

Chief of Public Affairs

Your feedback about the first issue of *Hot Topics* has been truly gratifying and shows that the publication is reaching our intended audience, Army leaders and trainers. As we hoped, *Hot Topics* is stimulating lively discussions and is helping to clarify the intent of new or controversial Army policies and regulations. We appreciate all of you who took the time to let us know by e-mail that you received *Hot Topics* and found the publication helpful.

In this issue, we focus on another sensitive topic, the new Army fraternization policy. Training about the new policy was mandatory by Oct. 1, 1999. Our goal is to help commanders get the word out. Please keep sending us your feedback so that we can continue to serve the needs of our Army.

MG John G. Meyer Jr.
Chief of Public Affairs

Hot Topics

Hot Topics — Current Issues for Army Leaders is a U.S. Army newsletter produced by the Office of the Chief of Public Affairs. Its purpose is to guide and inform Army leaders and trainers in discussing current or controversial topics. A contract printer distributes the newsletter as an insert to **Soldiers** magazine. *Hot Topics* is in the public domain and may be reproduced locally without obtaining further permission. Your comments and feedback are welcome. Write to: Hot Topics, c/o SOLDIERS, 9325 Gunston Rd., Ste. S-108, Fort Belvoir, VA, 22060-5581. Telephone us at (703)806-4486; FAX us at (703) 806-4566 (DSN-656). Send e-mail to: soldiers@belvoir.army.mil. You can obtain *Hot Topics* on the internet at **www.army.mil** (click on Public Affairs and scroll down to "Related Sites" — *Hot Topics*).

Secretary of the Army
Hon. Louis Caldera

Army Chief of Staff
Gen Eric K. Shinseki

Chief of Public Affairs
MG John G. Meyer Jr.

Chief, Information Strategy Division
William R. Drobnick

Writer and Producer
Janice E. Meer

Creative Production
U.S. Army Visual Information Center
Layout: Larry Parlier
Photos: Scott Davis, USAVIC;
Ronald Rooney, Visual Information Training Support Division, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland;
Soldiers Magazine

Special Thanks to
SSG Elena Elliott & SSG William Elliott, Army Field Band
Chuck Phelps, Denny Moog, Joan Lease

MESSAGE FROM THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS

Maintaining Good Order and Discipline

The new Army policy on relationships between soldiers of different rank became effective Mar. 2, 1999. The changes reflect the need for the military services of the United States to have standard policies because of the increasingly joint character of modern military missions. The Army changed its policy because it was the right thing to do for our soldiers, especially junior officers and enlisted. These soldiers deserve a very clear set of guidelines about which interpersonal relationships are acceptable and which are not acceptable. Our soldiers deserve the protection of policies that are consistent across the services.

We have and will continue to prohibit unprofessional relationships that compromise the chain of command; cause partiality or unfairness, whether real or perceived; involve the improper use of rank for personal gain; exploit or coerce fellow soldiers; create an adverse impact on discipline, authority, morale, or mission accomplishment.

The new policy makes clear that certain types of previously acceptable personal relationships between officer and enlisted are now prohibited.

"We need to do the right thing for our soldiers and ensure that everyone knows what personel relationships are prohibited and which ones are appropriate."

The Army has always emphasized the importance of sound professional interpersonal relationships to the success of Army missions. The nature and structure of our Army requires and demands that officers and enlisted work together in teams and units under trying circumstances. Unit cohesion is essential to build the confidence and trust necessary for units to fight and win on the battlefield. Professional leadership and common sense will make these new policies work for the good of the Army.

We all need to understand and comply with this new policy. We need to do the right thing for our soldiers and ensure that everyone knows what personal relationships are prohibited and which ones are appropriate. If we follow the policy, then our Army's cohesion and teamwork will be strengthened by solid, professional interpersonal relationships.

Mr. Patrick T. Henry
Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs

In the following interview, Mr. Patrick T. Henry answered our questions about the new fraternization policy.

QUESTION BY HOT TOPICS (HT): Mr. Henry, your office has oversight of the Army's new fraternization policy. Can you tell us about the origins of the new policy?

MR. HENRY: We had an unacceptable clash of policies. Unlike the policies of the other services, the Army fraternization policy did not prohibit officers from dating and having intimate relationships with enlisted personnel. An Army officer could date an Air Force or Navy enlisted person, and it was okay for the officer but not for the enlisted person. Because of the increasingly joint character of modern military missions, Secretary [of Defense William] Cohen gave guidance for all of the services to make their policies more consistent.

HT: Were there any other reasons for changing the policy, in addition to the fact that the Army is operating in an increasingly joint environment?

MR. HENRY: Yes, definitely. In my view this was the right thing to do for a number of reasons. For one thing, the Army is moving toward more of a community environment. Our officers and enlisted soldiers are increasingly in daily working relationships with members of the other services and civilians. That alone was enough reason to revisit our policy. Equally important in my view is that within our Army community, we no longer have officer clubs, senior NCO clubs, NCO clubs and enlisted clubs. We are putting officers and enlisted folks together more frequently than we used to do. It is important to the leadership that the junior enlisted soldiers and our junior officers have a line that marks off what is acceptable conduct and what is not acceptable conduct.

HT: What is the significance of the date Mar. 1, 2000?

MR. HENRY: By Mar. 1, 2000, all personal relationships between officers and enlisted personnel that violate the new policy must be resolved. Officers and enlisted persons in personal relationships must either break up or get married. Officers and enlisted persons in prohibited business relationships must end those business relationships.

HT: It looks like officer/enlisted couples who are dating have some tough choices to make before Mar. 1, 2000. Why did you decide on a one-year implementation period?

MR HENRY: We took a very hard look at how long to provide for an implementation period, and we settled on a year from the effective date of the policy. In my view it was a fairness issue. We knew we were asking people to make life-changing decisions. If you were in a romantic relationship when this policy went into effect, Mar. 2, 1999, we've provided a year for you to bring the relationship in line with the policy — either get married or end the relationship. Officers and enlisted also have a year to end business relationships that violate the policy. Those are really the two important choices. The third alternative — just to continue the relationship outside of the regulation — is unacceptable and violates the policy. We've provided a year for people to resolve their relationships because we thought it was reasonable and fair.

HT: What would you say to those who say, "the new policy will create new problems the Army didn't have before under the old policy?"

MR. HENRY: I would strongly disagree. The new policy continues to emphasize all of the important features of the previous policy but now

(Continued on page 14)

FRATERNIZATION

AR 600-20

Relationships between Military Members of Different Rank

COL John S. Westwood and Chaplain (COL) Herman Keizer Jr. discuss implementation of the Army's new fraternization policy.

COL John S. Westwood
DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTORATE
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL

Chaplain (COL) Herman Keizer Jr.
MILITARY ASSISTANT TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS

QUESTION BY HOT TOPICS (HT): COL Westwood, your organization has the responsibility to implement the new policy on fraternization. What do you tell those who say, "We didn't have a problem with our fraternization policy. Why is the Army trying to fix something that wasn't broken?"

COLONEL JOHN WESTWOOD: While it's true that our system has been working well for years, the Army doesn't live in isolation today. More and more, we're in a joint environment. We need to respect the idea that service policies need to be consistent, so that it's fair, so that ALL services are singing off the same page. So we need to buck up, salute, and understand that the revised Army policy is better for all of the services because we're bringing them all together more and more. We know the new policy will be inconvenient for some people in the short run and that some people will have serious personal choices to make between now and Mar. 1, 2000.

WHAT'S NEW UNDER THE REVISED POLICY

CERTAIN TYPES OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED SOLDIERS ARE PROHIBITED.

- **No dating.**
- **No shared living accommodations.**
- **No intimate or sexual relationships.**

The term "officer" includes both commissioned and warrant officers.

EXCEPTIONS TO ARMY POLICY ON PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

- **Marriages existing before Mar. 2, 1999.**
- **Marriages entered into from Mar. 2, 1999, to Mar. 1, 2000.**
- **Marriages that violate the new policy only because of the promotion or change in status of one military member.**

HT: Chaplain Keizer, you were involved in developing the Army's previous policy on fraternization, which dates back to the early 1980s. How do the old and new policies differ?

CHAPLAIN KEIZER: In the past, the Army's policy was designed to judge the results of a relationship. We didn't judge it formally on the basis of rank or position. And I think that we've preserved that concept in the new policy. We continue to stress that commanders have to subjectively use good common sense about the results of any relationship on the individuals in that relationship and on the organization that he or she commands. But now we've prohibited personal relationships between officers and enlisted personnel outright to align the Army with the other services.

"By Mar. 1, 2000, all personal and business relationships in violation of the revised policy must be resolved."

HT: Colonel Westwood, what is the response so far from the field? Have there been a lot of questions and problems?

COL WESTWOOD: I've talked to quite a few people overseas and in the U.S. So far, we've had some minor grumbling but virtually no questions about the prohibitions against officer/enlisted personal relationships. To tell you the truth, this surprises me. I thought a lot of people would be upset. But we truly haven't heard this yet. Most of the questions we're getting are about officers and enlisted socializing in the community or churches or athletics. We're also getting some questions about the technicalities of defining what constitutes a business relationship and some comments about the policy in regard to the Army's reserve components.

HT: What are you hearing about the fraternization policy with respect to the reserve component?

COL WESTWOOD: Some people are writing to us to say, 'Why isn't the fraternization policy the same for the active duty Army, the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard if we're trying to make one Army?" In the case of fraternization, the rules can't be the same for both. They just can't. This is particularly true when we're talking about business relationships. We have lots of situations where an officer and enlisted person in the reserve component work together in the same business in civilian life. We've tried to offer general guidelines in our policy, and we've given commanders the latitude they need to make common sense decisions.

HT: How are you getting the word out on the new policy?

COL WESTWOOD: Mandatory training was required to be completed by Oct. 1, 1999. We put the message out Armywide effective Mar. 2, 1999, and we've put our training package on the Internet and on the web **[www.odcsper.army.mil].**

HT: Why do you think there are so few inquiries about the policy on officer and enlisted dating so far?

COL WESTWOOD: As I said earlier, that really surprised me. Actually, I'm beginning to think there may not be that much dating going on between officers and enlisted soldiers. When you look at the total force, I think we're talking about a very small percentage. We do have quite a few married couples that are enlisted and officer, but in the total picture, it's still a small percentage.

HT: Chaplain Keizer, how would you counsel young leaders about the new policy?

CHAP KEIZER: If I were a young commander, I would sit down with my troops and say,

EXCEPTIONS FOR ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND U.S. ARMY RESERVE

- **Relationships with a member of the ARNG/USAR due to civilian association while off duty are not prohibited.**
- **Personal relationships that exist due to civilian acquaintanceship are not prohibited.**
- **These exceptions do not apply to reserve components serving full time.**

ALSO PROHIBITED UNDER THE REVISED POLICY

- Any relationship between permanent-party personnel and IET trainees not required by the training mission.
- Any relationship between permanent-party personnel assigned to or attached to U.S. Army Recruiting Command and potential prospects, applicants, members of the delayed-entry program and delayed-training program not required by the recruiting mission.

GAMBLING BETWEEN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IS PROHIBITED. THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONS.

"Okay, here's what's new: officers and enlisted can't date each other anymore or be in business together. And here are the things that are basically the same — the things we've already been doing in this unit to make it a good organization. We don't want preferential treatment; we don't want people abusing the authority of their rank; we don't want perceptions of partiality. I want us to continue to function in a professional way in this organization." Then, I would go through some case studies like the one's we've provided in our draft pamphlet and would encourage group discussion.
[NOTE: A pamphlet with case studies is available at www.odcsper.army.mil]

"By Oct. 1, 1999, training was mandatory for everyone in the service — active duty, Army Reserve and Army National Guard."

HT: Colonel Westwood, what should a leader do if an officer and an enlisted person suddenly turn up married after Mar. 1, 2000?

COL WESTWOOD: If an officer and an enlisted soldier suddenly turn up married after Mar. 1, 2000, the commander has an obligation to look into it, to talk to the parties involved, and to make a decision on what to do based on what is warranted, appropriate and fair. We didn't write this policy to get people in trouble. We wrote it to build a more cohesive Army. Along the way, commanders are going to have to fix some problems, but fix them in a fair way. If we have soldiers who violate any policy, including this one, commanders have a wide range of responses to the policy violations — counseling, education, administrative action, non-judicial punishment, all the way up to court-martial. Clearly, the policy does not cover every situation specifically. That's why we have leaders. They are leaders because they're expected to make sound decisions on a case by case basis. There is only one thing a commander should not do and that's to do nothing.

HT: Should commanders treat dating in violation of the policy differently from a marriage that occurs after Mar. 1, 2000, between an officer and an enlisted soldier?

COL WESTWOOD: We don't want a police force out there. We really don't. The new policy on fraternization is about good order and discipline; it's about doing the right thing for our Army at this time in history. In the case of dating, cohabitation, and intimate or sexual relations between officers and enlisted, commanders must take action when people willfully violate the policy. If a married couple flaunted their dating relationship publicly before their marriage, and everyone in the organization knew about it, I would say that is definitely detrimental to good order and discipline. In cases where the officer and enlisted person quietly turn up married, the commander has to use good judgment in responding and utilize the range of options available, as with any other policy violations. In all cases, we expect our leaders to make common sense decisions in enforcing the policy.

HT: Chaplain Keizer, how would you advise commanders to handle marriages that occur between officers and enlisted soldiers after Mar. 1, 2000?

CHAP. KEIZER: The new policy is not against marriages between officers and enlisted personnel. In some cases, we've made provisions and clarified things. For example, we've said that if two enlisted people are married, and one of them has a change in status, for example, goes to OCS and gets a commission, that relationship is OK. But there's

WHO'S AFFECTED?

The new policy applies to:

- Relationships between Army personnel (active or reserve component soldiers).
- Relationships between Army personnel and personnel of the other military services.

WHO'S ACCOUNTABLE?

- In any relationship, the senior person (by rank) is generally in the best position to terminate or limit the relationship.
- However, all service members may be held accountable for relationships that violate the policy.

BY MAR. 1, 2000

ALL PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN VIOLATION OF THE REVISED POLICY MUST BE RESOLVED.

OPTIONS:

- **Get married by Mar. 1, 2000.**
- **End the relationship by Mar. 1, 2000.**

no way the policy can address all specific cases and issues that come up in regard to marriages between officers and enlisted personnel.

"Right now, nobody is supposed to start any new personal relationships between officers and enlisted."

HT: Colonel Westwood, do officers and enlisted soldiers who participate together in community groups, neighborhood activities, PTA groups, scout troops, church groups, athletic teams, and other similar group and social activities have to stop their associations under the new policy?

COL WESTWOOD: We did not write this policy to stop those types of activities. That was never our intent. Associations between officers and enlisted personnel that occur in the context of community organizations, religious activities, athletic teams and events, unit-based social functions, or family gatherings are not prohibited.

HT: How about community clubs and all-rank clubs, which are increasingly prevalent today, where officers and enlisted often socialize in civilian clothes?

COL WESTWOOD: There is nothing in the new policy that should change the way soldiers have socialized at clubs in the past, with the exception that officers cannot date enlisted soldiers now. I'd tell soldiers that of course you can sit down together in a group while socializing at clubs. But when you are in a group at the club in civilian clothes, and you meet someone there you're attracted to, don't wait until you've left the club in a pair or as a couple to find out that your newly budding relationship violates the policy that officers can't date enlisted soldiers. Get that issue of who is an officer and who is enlisted out front from the beginning, when you first catch each other's eye. Then abide by the policy that officers and enlisted soldiers can't date each other anymore. And don't do it. It's that simple.

HT: Colonel Westwood, would you say that the period between now and Mar. 1, 2000, is critical for getting the word out?

COL WESTWOOD: Absolutely. When we sent out the message on the new fraternization policy last March, we also sent out a very good training package, with slides. We mandated that by Oct. 1, 1999, the training had to be put out to everyone in the service — active duty, Reserve and National Guard. So even if units didn't get the word by Oct. 1, 1999, leaders still have several months to get the word out and to do the training. We have a draft of a pamphlet included in the training package. It includes a whole range of scenarios to help leaders help their soldiers understand and apply the new policy.

HT: Chaplain Keizer, if soldiers are having problems resolving their relationships, where can they get help?

CHAP.. KEIZER: If soldiers have problems they can't solve themselves, they need to be steered to the right place to get some help. They can talk it over with their leaders. They can get help from the chaplain, the EEO counselor and Family Advocacy groups. There are many resources for soldiers out there.

HT: Colonel Westwood, what is the most important thing commanders should be doing between now and Mar. 1, 2000?

COL WESTWOOD: The answer is "awareness, awareness, awareness." If I am a commander, I have an obligation to insure that every person in

WHAT HAS NOT CHANGED

The Army continues to prohibit all relationships that —

- **Compromise the chain of command.**
- **Cause partiality or unfairness.**
- **Involve the improper use of rank for personal gain.**
- **Are exploitative or coercive in nature.**
- **Create an adverse impact on discipline, authority, morale or mission accomplishment.**

Relationships that present the appearance of violating any of these standards may also be prohibited.

NOT PROHIBITED

SOCIAL, UNIT AND FAMILY RELATIONS

- **Associations between officers and enlisted personnel that occur in the context of community organizations, religious activities, athletic teams and events, unit-based social functions or family functions are not prohibited.**

my command is aware of the policy, understands it, and knows why the Army is doing this. It's not to be mean or unfair; it's not to start a class-based system. We're trying to come in line with the Department of Defense and the other services so that we're on one team, so that we live by the same rules. If I were a commander, I'd make up posters and put them in the hallways, the bathrooms, the orderly rooms, and places like that telling soldiers that by Mar. 1, 2000, they need to either end an officer/enlisted dating relationship or get married. The alternative, continuing the relationship past Mar. 1, 2000, without marriage, is not an option.

HT: Do you think soldiers need to be told about the new policy more than one time?

COL WESTWOOD: I don't think that commanders can afford to talk about the new policy only one time. I think commanders, sergeants major and first sergeants now need to go into high gear about this policy, when it's getting down to the wire. They need to be saying over and over, in formations, at least once or twice a month, "Remember, the Army has a new policy. It goes into effect Mar. 1, 2000. Don't start any new officer/enlisted relationships now that violate the policy."

"We want commanders to emphasize the spirit of the law when enforcing the new policy."

HT: Does that mean that officers and enlisted soldiers cannot date each other during the implementation period?

COL WESTWOOD: Right now nobody is supposed to start any new relationships between officers and enlisted. This is the period when you need to be ending that relationship or making plans to get married before Mar. 1, 2000.

HT: Chaplain Keizer, do you have anything else you'd like to say?

CHAP. KEIZER: Yes, I want to emphasize that we want to continue to build units that have good morale, good cohesion, and good esprit. There is no intent in the policy to change those kinds of things. We want to continue to build an Army that has that kind of esprit. We also want to encourage mentoring. We want our leaders to continue to mentor their soldiers.

"We wrote this policy not to get people in trouble, but to make a more cohesive Army."

HT: COL Westwood, is there anything else you'd like to say?

COL WESTWOOD: We wrote the policy the way we did, not to get people in trouble, but to make a more cohesive Army. Sometimes a commander might have to use a hammer, but that's not the intent. Our intent is to make this new policy on fraternization as painless as possible. Leaders need to inform their people, give them a good understanding of the rules and help them abide by the rules because they think it's the right thing to do. The intent of the policy is to have good morale for the total armed forces and good order and discipline for the entire armed forces. That's what this policy is about. And we're going to do that. Along the way, we'll have to fix some problems, but we'll fix them in a fair way. But I can't say it enough. We want commanders to emphasize the spirit of the law when enforcing the new policy. The "eaches" should come from the heart.

HOW TO GET FRATERNIZATION TRAINING PACKAGE ON THE INTERNET

www.odcsper.army.mil

Click on links shown:

- **DRAFT DA PAMPHLET 600-35 (includes Case Studies)**
- **TRAINING SLIDES: "Revision of Army Policy on Unprofessional Relationships and Fraternization."**

(continued from page 4, Patrick T. Henry Interview)

looks at both the rank structure of the relationship and at the effects of the relationship. The new policy is causing our leaders to revisit the issue of fraternization and to reemphasize the standards of good order and discipline that have always been part of our Army. There are relationships that do not violate the policy because of rank, but that do violate the policy because they are detrimental to good order and discipline. For example, if a colonel and a major are dating, or if an NCO and a specialist are dating, that is not in itself prohibited. But if these relationships create disruption in the command, create an unhealthy environment, create appearances of favoritism or using one's grade to get advancement, then yes, those relationships do violate the policy.

HT: Mr. Henry, do you have anything else you'd like to say?

MR. HENRY: We need to be getting the word out now, over and over. If we wait until we have problems, it's too late. We're not in the business of trying to set our soldiers up to catch them or put them in compromising situations. It's our obligation to provide soldiers the opportunity to learn, understand, and apply the policy and adapt their lives to it. We need to do the right thing for our soldiers and to ensure that everyone knows which personal relationships are prohibited and which ones are inappropriate. If we help soldiers follow the policy, then our Army's cohesion and teamwork will be strengthened by solid, professional relationships

REFERENCES

AR 600-20
Permanent Change Message
ALARACT R020804Z Mar 99
Uniform Code of Military Justice

AR 600-20

Fraternization training materials are located on the internet at www.odcsper.army.mil

- **DRAFT DA PAMPHLET 600-35 (includes case studies)**
- **TRAINING SLIDES: "Revision of Army Policy On Unprofessional Relationships And Fraternization."**

Chaplain (MAJ) B. Duncan Baugh
Command Policy Officer
Leadership Division
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
e-mail: baughbd@hqda.army.mil
Telephone: (703) 697-6864

FRATERNIZATION POLICY HISTORY

Historically, there have always been rules that governed the relationships between officers and enlisted soldiers. In the early part of our history, those relationships were structured to reinforce the idea of an elite officers corps.

That elitist idea had completely broken down by World War II, when there was a democratization within the officer corps. That's when the Uniformed Code of Military Justice identified fraternization as an illegal act for the first time.

The policy statements we're talking about today are not the same as that law. Policy statements are broader than the law. By the late 1970s and early 1980s, we had become an all-volunteer Army.

The Women's Army Corps had been dissolved, and women were being put into the force in a very different way.

At that time, the Army developed a new policy on fraternization to make sure that relationships stayed appropriate between members of different rank, and that the policy was gender neutral, that it applied to all soldiers equally.

The intent was that the power implicit in a hierarchical relationship could not be abused and that our soldiers would not be exploited.

— Chaplain (COL) Herman Keizer Jr.

BOTTOM LINE FOR LEADERS — USE COMMON SENSE IN ENFORCEMENT!

AR 600-20

Business Relationships

BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL ARE PROHIBITED.

EXCEPTIONS:

- Landlord/tenant relationships.
- One time transactions (such as sale of a house or automobile).

EXCEPTIONS FOR ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND U.S. ARMY RESERVE ONLY:

- Business relationships which exist due to civilian occupation or employment.

EXISTING BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL ARE EXEMPT UNTIL MAR. 1, 2000.

OUR ARMY'S GOAL HAS NOT CHANGED:
A COMBAT READY FORCE.

OUR ARMY'S STANDARDS HAVE NOT CHANGED:
RELATIONSHIPS THAT HARM UNIT COHESION ARE UNACCEPTABLE.

PUBLISHED BY THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS • U.S. ARMY