

Running head: FRATERNIZATION POLICY

Fraternization Policy

SGM Harold Johnson

United States Army Sergeants Major Academy

Class #58

SGM David C. Taylor

3 January, 2008

Fraternization Policy

Our Ethics and moral values are what make us a strong organization, this is what we stand for. Ethics is defined as the study of the general nature of morals and the specific moral choices an individual makes in relating to others and the rules or standards of conduct governing the members of a profession. As leader we have a duty to mentor our subordinates to comply with the Army (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary 1985).

The rules or standards of conduct governing the members of a profession. They are the rules and regulations that govern our conduct as we go about our duties. Some, if not all are written down, while others are those inherent standards, the norms that we have had ingrained in our personalities and characters.

As Leaders, we have all faced this question of ethics at one time or another. We have observed soldiers experiencing situations where they must make these type decisions. Fraternalization is one that comes to my mind. The Army prohibits officers and enlisted personnel from conducting personal relationships. Prohibited relationships include:

- (1) Ongoing relationships between our officers and enlisted personnel. This exclusion does not apply to landlord/tenant relationships or a sale of an automobile or house, but does apply to borrowing or lending money, or any other type of ongoing financial or business relationship. In the case of Army service personnel, this prohibition does not apply to relationships that exist due to their civilian employment.
- (2) Dating, shared living accommodations other than those directed by operational requirements, and intimate or sexual relationships between officers and enlisted personnel. This prohibition does not apply to:
 - (a) Marriages that predate the effective date of this policy (March 1, 2000)

- (b) Situations in which a relationship that's complies with this policy would move into noncompliance due to a change in status of one of the members (for instance, a case where two enlisted members are married and one is subsequently commissioned or selected as a warrant officer).
- (c) Personal relationships outside of marriage between service members, when the relationship primarily exists due to civilian relations, unless the individuals are on active duty outside of annual training or full-time National Guard duty outside of annual training
- (d) Personal relationships between members of Army services not married to each other primarily exists due to civilian association and the Reserve service member is not on active duty outside of annual training or full-time National Guard duty outside annual training.
- (f) Soldiers and leaders share responsibility, however, for ensuring that these relationships do not interfere with good order and discipline. Commanders have the responsibility to ensure relationships between Soldiers of different ranks coming from their civilian careers will not influence training, readiness, or personnel actions (AR 600-20, 7 July 2006, 4–16, *page 26*).

Now that we have defined fraternization in accordance with the Army policy let us discuss officer and enlisted relationships, in particular, the marriage between an officer and enlisted Soldier. I professionally was exposed to a situation where two outstanding Soldiers of different ranks were face with an ethical dilemma to get married before the date of 01 March 2002 or not be together.

The Soldiers were in two different job fields and locations. They were two Soldiers that loved each other and the country that they served. They were now faced with rushing to get married or dissolve their relationship before the cutoff date or face with violating the Army Fraternization policy. They can marry but one of them would have to give up their career with the Army.

The Army allows a senior enlisted soldier marry a Soldier of lesser rank without one of the other giving up his or her career, but an officer and enlisted can't. I continue to ask myself what is the difference. My thought is that if it doesn't interfere with the good order and discipline of the Army than it should be okay to continue to serve without being faced with punishment under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) or force to get out of the Army. I say this because it is not clear what the difference between an officer and enlisted married before the cut-off date continuing to serve and officer and enlisted married after the date when it clearly don't interfere with the good order and discipline of the Army. It is still not clear why the rule stating that a officer can't have a person relationship with a n enlisted soldier. Instead we continue to lose good soldiers to a policy that is not clear and in my view not right.

There are many functional marriages between officers and enlisted in our Army that contributes to the fight. A senior enlisted Soldier can marry a junior enlisted Soldier if the marriage don't affect good order and discipline of the Army and continue to serve. Then question is still open why can't an officer and enlisted soldier get married and continue to serve. As I stated we as leaders have the responsibility to enforce the rules that governs the standards of conduct of our profession likewise we have the same obligation to take hard look at rules and regulation that may not make good sense. The Army policy allows homosexuals to enlist as long as they do not discuss their sexual orientation, but an officer and enlisted soldier can't marry and

serve just is not fair. I have had a personal experience where a soldier was confronted with a similar situation. It put a strain on the Soldier's performance and his outlook on the army. I found myself as a leader in a position where I could not give him good advice that supports the Army. We as leaders must continue to evaluate policies but in to affect that affect soldiers willing to serve our country that clearly don't affect our good order and discipline of our Army.

References

Army Command Policy AR 600-20. (07 July 2006) Washington, DC: Dept of the Army

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. (1985) Springfield, Massachusetts,