



commander. How did General MacArthur conjure such an image under extreme duress? What contributed to his ability to evoke lessons from a battle nearly 200 years previous and display the courage to persist against seemingly impossible conditions?

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), General Martin Dempsey, published a white paper in April of 2002 that describes the criticality of leadership to military operations and mission command.<sup>3</sup> GEN Dempsey illustrates in detail his vision for how he expects leaders in the joint force to operate in the future security environment. Yet, an inspection of Joint Publication 1-02, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, shows no definition for leadership.<sup>4</sup> The definitions of several other terms include the words “leader” or “leadership,” but the publication contains no definition for “leader” or “leadership.” One can conclude from this omission that the publication’s authors did not find value in defining one of the most important aspects of the military. In the absence of a joint definition, each of the services created its own definitions for leader and leadership, none of which resemble that of another service.<sup>5</sup> The absence of a joint leadership model forces each service to develop its own leadership traits, values, and competencies. The joint staff will provide a baseline for the service leadership models by articulating a common model of leadership through joint doctrine.

### **Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Guidance on Leader Development**

Given the lack of current joint leadership doctrine one must look elsewhere to find available guidance on the subject. In order to understand the military’s model for leader development, one must first understand the CJCS vision for the joint force and the current guidance for how to develop joint leaders. Published in 2009, the *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations 3.0* (CCJO) describes how CJCS Admiral Mike Mullen envisions the joint force operating between the years 2016 and 2028.<sup>6</sup> The CCJO purposefully avoids specific guidance on processes. Instead, this document establishes what the Joint Chiefs of Staff expect the joint force to be and do, based on current strategic conditions, with an emphasis on unified action across the services and other elements of national power.<sup>7</sup> In its discussion of Common Operating Precepts, the CCJO discusses the importance of developing innovative and adaptive leaders at all levels who can provide the joint force an enduring advantage over its adversaries.<sup>8</sup>

The military requires quality leaders to achieve the CJCS-envisioned force. The *CJCS Vision for Joint Officer Development* (JOD) supports the CCJO concept by articulating how the CJCS envisions the development of the “joint” leader.<sup>9</sup> The JOD guidance states that the CJCS values service culture and that “joint officers are built upon Service officers.”<sup>10</sup> The JOD states that the joint force values the diverse quality that emerges when leaders from all of the services come together to solve joint problems, creating a tapestry effect at the joint level, rather than a melting pot. The CJCS does not want officers and leaders who are “born” joint; rather leaders should bring the service-honed skills with them to the joint force. Instead, the JOD states that officers at the grade of O-6 are “fully qualified and inherently joint” and at the focal point of development—the point at which the officers’ service and joint paths of development converge.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the current guidance allows each service to develop leaders as it sees fit, up to this focal point. In doing so, the guidance encourages the services to use four pillars of leader development: Joint Individual Training (JIT), Joint Professional Military Education (JPME), Joint Experience, and Self Development.<sup>12</sup> A joint leader, therefore, combines the service-specific traits he or she learns through education and experience with unique attributes that experience on joint staffs and education in JPME present.

The JOD defines joint leader competencies as the “collective body of leader competencies (i.e., uniquely joint, + common + Service) inculcated in the officer corps through career-long development” that will combine to create the “fully qualified and inherently joint colonel or captain.”<sup>13</sup>

The JOD describes the collective body of leader competencies to achieve this inherent jointness as the combination of three elements: uniquely joint competencies, competencies common to all of the services, and service competencies.<sup>14</sup> In order to define the standards for the uniquely joint competencies, the CJCS provides guidance for JPME through a document called the Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP). This directive guides the learning areas that the faculties at each of the Service-Senior Level Colleges instruct at the focal point of joint qualification. Learning Area 6—Joint Operational Leadership—includes leadership of a joint, interagency, intergovernmental, or multinational task force, critical thinking and decision-making, and the ethical dimension of operational leadership.<sup>15</sup> In accordance with the JOD design, the Naval War College presents the first opportunity for leaders to receive formal education regarding joint matters.

### **Role of Joint Doctrine**

How each service translates the CCJO and JOD into action varies widely. Neither of these documents is a doctrinal publication, so each service may decide for itself how to achieve the CJCS’ objectives. In each case, the unique culture of each service determines whether the service outlines its leadership model in service doctrine or through other means. The base document for all joint doctrine, Joint Publication 1, *Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States*, states that joint doctrinal publications are authoritative and provide the basis on which the services will develop service doctrine.<sup>16</sup> In other words, joint doctrine, while purposefully non-specific, is more directive in nature and intends to foster the development of supporting service doctrine. Further, the CCJO establishes that joint doctrine should reflect the way we operate amidst an ever-changing environment. It implies that joint doctrine should also constantly evolve, in order to adapt to a changing environment, and the ever-evolving manner in which we operate as a joint force. The document makes several references to filling gaps in doctrine to ensure the joint force can execute across the full spectrum of operations to meet the needs of future challenges.<sup>17</sup> “It is incumbent on the capability development process to ensure [the men and women of the joint force] are provided with the doctrine, training, education, and materiel they need to fulfill their mission successfully.”<sup>18</sup>

### **Existing Service Leadership Doctrine**

Despite intentions to the contrary, service leadership doctrine is not consistent across the services. The CJCS relies on each service to define its leadership traits, competencies, ethos, and values on its own, within the parameters of his guidance and vision. Accordingly, each service goes about this process differently and with a wide variety of results. The Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps have each published service doctrine on leadership—the scope and definitions within each publication differ, however. The Navy codifies leadership in its Navy Leadership Competency Model (NLCM) through the Center for Personal and Professional Development (CPPD).<sup>19</sup> The Navy traditionally relies on on-the-job training to provide the experience necessary for leaders to develop. Each service has varied perspectives on leadership attributes, traits, qualities and competencies. The Army and Air Force discuss leadership levels, although each calls them something different. Every service agrees that leadership is constant, regardless of position, level of organization, or service. Marine Corps doctrine focuses on the traditions and uniqueness of the Marine Corps and what it

means to be a Marine. Seemingly small unit-focused, MCWP 6-11, *Leading Marines*, emphasizes the importance and the responsibility of leadership.<sup>20</sup> Grounded in tradition and history, the Marine Corps leadership doctrine describes leading by example, generic concepts of warfighting, the Marine individual fighting spirit, and the will to win. The Army produced both a field manual and a regulation to define implementing instructions for the field manual. Army Regulation (AR) 600-100 defines key leadership terms and assigns responsibilities for management of leadership policy.<sup>21</sup> The Air Force defines its leadership model through Air Force Doctrine Document 1-1, which contains its version of the warrior ethos; an extensive list of leadership attributes and sub-attributes; and its service core competencies.<sup>22</sup> Figures 1 through 4 below encapsulate the disparity in terms, definitions, and framework for the service leadership doctrine. Notably, each service articulates its values differently, defines “leader” differently or not at all, and portray its leader attributes in different terms.

<b>U.S. Army Leadership</b>			
<b>Definition:</b> Leadership is influencing people by providing purpose, motivation, and direction while operating to accomplish the mission and improve the organization. <sup>23</sup>			
<b>Core Values<sup>24</sup></b>	<b>Leader Attributes<sup>25</sup></b>	<b>Core Leader Competencies<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Leadership Levels<sup>27</sup></b>
<b>Loyalty</b>  <b>Duty</b>  <b>Respect</b>  <b>Selfless service</b>  <b>Honor</b>  <b>Integrity</b>  <b>Personal courage</b>	<b>A leader of character</b>  - Army values  - Empathy  - Warrior ethos  <b>A leader with presence</b>  - Military bearing  - Physically fit  - Composed / confident  - Resilient  <b>A leader with intellectual capacity</b>  - Mental agility  - Sound judgment  - Innovation  - Interpersonal tact	<b>Leads</b>  - Leads others  - Extends influence beyond the chain of command  - Leads by example  - Communicates  <b>Develops</b>  - Creates a positive environment  - Prepares self  - Develops others  <b>Achieves</b>  - Gets results	<b>Direct</b>  <b>Operational</b>  <b>Strategic</b>

	- Domain knowledge		
--	--------------------	--	--

Figure 1: U.S. Army Leadership Terms and Definitions

<b>U.S. Marine Corps Leadership</b>				
<b>Definition:</b> None				
<b>Core Values<sup>28</sup></b>	<b>Leadership Traits and Principles<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Leader Competencies</b>	<b>Leader Qualities<sup>30</sup></b>	<b>Leadership Levels</b>
<b>Honor</b>  <b>Courage</b>  <b>Commitment</b>	<b>Justice</b>  <b>Judgment</b>  <b>Dependability</b>  <b>Initiative</b>  <b>Decisiveness</b>  <b>Tact</b>  <b>Integrity</b>  <b>Enthusiasm</b>  <b>Bearing</b>  <b>Unselfishness</b>  <b>Courage</b>  <b>Knowledge</b>  <b>Loyalty</b>  <b>Endurance</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Inspiration</b>  <b>Technical proficiency</b>  <b>Moral responsibility</b>	<b>None</b>

Figure 2: U.S. Marine Corps Leadership Terms and Definitions

<b>U.S. Navy Leadership<sup>31</sup></b>			
<b>Definition: None</b>			
<b>Core Values</b>	<b>Leader Attributes</b>	<b>Core Leader Competencies</b>	<b>Leadership Levels</b>
<b>Honor</b> <b>Courage</b> <b>Commitment</b>	<b>Accomplishing Mission</b> - Responsibility, Accountability, and Authority - Decisiveness / Risk Management - Continuous Improvement - Problem Solving - Technical Credibility  <b>Leading People</b> - Developing People - Team Building - Combat / Crisis Leadership - Conflict Management - Leveraging Diversity - Professionalism  <b>Leading Change</b> - Creativity & Innovation - Vision - Strategic Thinking - External Awareness - Flexibility	<b>None</b>	<b>None</b>

Figure 3: U.S. Navy Leadership Terms and Definitions

<b>U.S. Air Force Leadership</b>			
<b>Definition:</b> Leadership is the art and science of influencing and directing people to accomplish the assigned mission <sup>32</sup>			
<b>Core Values<sup>33</sup></b>	<b>Components<sup>34</sup></b>	<b>Leader Competencies<sup>35</sup></b>	<b>Levels<sup>36</sup></b>
<p><b>Integrity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Courage</li> <li>- Honesty</li> <li>- Responsibility</li> <li>- Accountability</li> <li>- Justice</li> <li>- Openness</li> <li>- Self-respect</li> <li>- Humility</li> <li>- Honor</li> </ul> <p><b>Service before self</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Duty</li> <li>- Respect for others</li> <li>- Self-discipline</li> <li>- Self-control</li> <li>- Appropriate actions or desires</li> <li>- Tolerance</li> <li>- Loyalty</li> </ul> <p><b>Excellence in All We Do</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Personal excellence</li> <li>- Organizational excellence</li> <li>- Resource excellence</li> <li>- Operational excellence</li> </ul>	<p><b>Core Values</b></p> <p><b>Competencies</b></p> <p><b>Actions</b></p>	<p><b>Personal Leadership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exercising Sound Judgment</li> <li>- Adapting</li> <li>- Inspiring Trust</li> <li>- Leading Courageously</li> <li>- Demonstrating Tenacity</li> <li>- Leading by Example</li> <li>- Assessing Self</li> </ul> <p><b>Leading People/Teams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inspiring, Empowering and Exercising Authority</li> <li>- Influencing &amp; Negotiating</li> <li>- Attracting, Developing &amp; Retaining Talent</li> <li>- Fostering Effective Communication</li> <li>- Fostering Teamwork &amp; Collaboration</li> <li>- Mentoring / Coaching / Counseling</li> <li>- Building Relationships</li> </ul> <p><b>Leading the Institution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shaping Strategy</li> <li>- Translating Strategy</li> <li>- Thinking/Working Across Boundaries</li> <li>- Applying Resource Stewardship</li> <li>- Driving Execution</li> <li>- Commanding</li> <li>- Creating and Demonstrating Vision</li> <li>- Driving Transformation</li> <li>- Driving Continuous Improvement</li> <li>- Integrating Systems</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strategic</b></p> <p><b>Operational</b></p> <p><b>Tactical</b></p>

Figure 4: U.S. Air Force Leadership Terms and Definitions

Such a variance in terminology and philosophy makes integration of the services, already a complicated endeavor, more challenging. More importantly, the wide range of approaches fails to take advantage of the collective experience and intellect of the services.

### **Why Leadership is so Important**

Leadership affects all factors and functions of military operations, both positively and negatively. Renowned military theorist Carl von Clausewitz maintained that leaders influence the always-important moral factor of war and guide a military force through the fog and friction of combat. Clausewitz emphasizes this point when he wrote that “The moral forces are amongst the most important subjects in war. They are the spirits which permeate the whole element of war, and which fasten themselves soonest and with the greatest affinity to the will which puts in motion and guides the whole mass of powers, unite with it as it were in one stream, because it is a moral force itself.”<sup>37</sup> Leadership affects the morale of a force, unit cohesion, effective execution of operations at all levels, command and control and myriad other areas. Leadership affects everything in military operations. However, leadership’s unquantifiable nature prevents many from understanding its importance or dedicating enough institutional energy to develop it. It is the unquantifiable nature that makes developing it that much more important. Military theorist Milan Vego discusses the effects of leadership and the value of the human element extensively in his writings. Vego states that much of a military’s capability comes from intangible factors like leadership. Those elements of leadership such as cohesion, doctrine, morale, and discipline cannot be quantified but are critical to an armed force.<sup>38</sup> Leadership, accordingly, should be the most important aspect of our doctrine, education, and training. So much depends on quality leadership that its development requires the full commitment of the joint force.

The current joint model for leader development, as outlined above in the JOD, provides a suitable baseline under which the services can develop its own doctrine, education, and training. However, there are gaps in the guidance that result in the varied service doctrine and interpretations of what defines outstanding leadership. The success of the JOD model relies upon the integrity of the “collective body of leader competencies” that include the uniquely joint, common, and service-specific competencies. However, the model only works if services implement the common competencies. The investigation into each service’s leadership development models shows that the *common* competencies are not exactly common. Acknowledging and encouraging the unique cultures of each service should continue—to include maintaining service-specific core leader competencies. Services, however, should differentiate between leadership and competencies. The service culture prism should not distract the military from articulating what quality leadership should embody. The military should strive to establish a model for what defines good leadership and the traits and attributes it values in its leaders. “Values and attributes are the same for all leaders, regardless of position, although refined through experience and assumption of positions of greater responsibility.”<sup>39</sup> This same metric must also apply between the services.

The military will increase the effectiveness of the joint force by increasing interoperability and jointness when it establishes a joint model for leadership. Today the U.S. military operates more frequently as a joint force than ever before, just as the CCJO describes. In 2000, CJCS General Henry Shelton predicted the requirement for increased jointness in *Joint Vision 2020*. This document articulated the direction the joint force should maintain in order to meet the nation’s defense needs in the year 2020. It confirmed that, in most cases, the military will require a joint force to meet the needs of the future security environment.<sup>40</sup> The joint nature of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan validated this view and brought members of the services together at earlier points in their careers

than the JOD model envisions. The CCJO validates this notion in its discussion of joint synergy and how synergy must be achieved at lower echelons and in lower increments. “Joint integration that was once achieved at the component level or slightly below will be achieved routinely in the future at drastically lower echelons -- even down to the small-unit level.”<sup>41</sup> The colonel/captain-level focal point applies less because of this increased service interaction, a dynamic that will not disappear soon. Creating a shared understanding of leadership attributes and values across the joint force will strengthen these relationships and make the force more effective. According to Dr. Vego, this interaction creates a multiplicative effect. He believes that the “combat power of a force in a campaign or major operation depends not only on combined arms tactics, but also on the degree of multiservice cooperation, or jointness.”<sup>42</sup> Current joint doctrine agrees with Dr. Vego:

Service skills form the very core of US military capability. Joint warfare relies upon service traditions, cohesion, and expertise. When combined with the ability to integrate these qualities into joint operations with partner military services and other defense, logistical, and intelligence agencies, they become a formidable and capable force. Successful joint operations are made possible by the capabilities developed and embodied in each Service. With a mutual understanding and respect of other partner services capabilities and the ability to be interoperable and effectively integrate operations to accomplish an overall campaign and/or US Government objective(s), the Armed Forces of the United States continue to build on the tradition of joint victory in war that began with the Revolutionary War.<sup>43</sup>

Similarly, the shared experience of each service would broaden and enhance the effectiveness of the joint force as a whole.

In his white paper, *Mission Command*, GEN Dempsey articulates his vision for adaptable leaders at all levels of command and echoes the sentiment that the force operates jointly at lower levels than ever before. Because the nation’s current enemies operate more decentralized, he argues that the American military also needs to operate in a more decentralized manner. To do so, he argues, “drives the need to create jointness deeper and sooner in the force.”<sup>44</sup> The amount of uncertainty and complexity in the future security environment require joint forces to operate together to bring all available elements of joint power to bear. GEN Dempsey complements this idea of jointness with the sentiment that jointness at lower levels require leaders to have greater mental agility and decision-making ability at all echelons, given the speed at which action must be taken.<sup>45</sup> GEN Dempsey’s vision for more agile joint leaders at lower levels proves that a re-evaluation of the JOD focal point must occur and supports the notion of a doctrinal model for leadership.

### **Why It Needs to be Doctrine**

Doctrine serves as the medium through which the services collect and share ideas and the joint force promulgates past lessons and forecasts future joint challenges. Doctrine serves as the most effective means to express a unified leadership model that will subsequently shape service leadership doctrine and help to formulate leader education throughout the military. All services do not share the same appreciation for doctrine, but the use of doctrine (or failure to use doctrine) to circulate wisdom has proven its worth. In his book, *Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam: Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife*, John Nagl states plainly that “an army codifies its institutional memory in doctrine.”<sup>46</sup> Nagl’s examination of the British Army’s counterinsurgency experience in Malaya, as opposed to that of the U.S. Army in Vietnam, showcases the value in capturing and sharing knowledge and understanding. The British Army, which previously eschewed

the use of formal doctrine, emphasized the capture and distribution of effective procedures to great effect in Malaya. “Doctrine is a critical element of the factor of military force,” says Dr. Vego. “Without soundly written and skillfully applied doctrine campaigns and major operations are likely to fail.”<sup>47</sup> A joint publication, therefore, would provide the most effective mechanism to develop, refine, and propagate a common leadership model.

### **Why now?**

The Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has expressed its vision for how leaders should grow from an individual, service-oriented leader to a “skilled joint warfighter” through the publication of the CCJO and the JOD. Why, then, should the joint staff commit the time and resources to produce another publication strictly to outline joint guidance for leadership? The ever-changing nature of the security environment requires doctrine to adapt quickly. Because the military operates as a joint force (and will continue to do so), the services must prepare its leaders to operate with one another effectively. Jointness and interoperability are more important than ever, which necessitates doctrine to develop leaders that can operate within a joint environment earlier in their careers. Doctrine, as opposed to guiding documents, requires service consensus, which will result in a publication that takes the best of all the service leadership models to form the baseline model. Further, the joint qualification triad of joint competencies, service competencies, and competencies common to all the services requires development. Definitions for what comprises the competencies common to all the services do not exist. A doctrinal publication will remove disparities from the joint qualification framework and will reduce the disparities between the service leadership models.

### **Isn't Experience is Enough?**

Despite the divergence of leadership models between them, the services do share some common threads in the respective approaches to leadership. For example, each model discusses the value of experience. Naturally, any worthwhile leader development model maintains experience as a key component. Some might take the view, then, that experience, combined with service doctrine and education, sufficiently hones leaders capable of distinguished service. No current military leader benefitted from a joint publication on leadership, so what value could one bring now? That viewpoint certainly has merit. That perspective, however, fails to incorporate centuries of leadership study and evolution. The complex environment referenced in the CCJO is reason enough to collaborate and refine what it means to be a military leader in the twenty-first century. In his book, *Leadership: The Warrior's Art*, noted author Christopher Kolenda grapples the argument between leader education and experience, arguing that both are invaluable and inseparable. “The education of a leader must move beyond personal experience and draw on the boundless experience and insights of others.”<sup>48</sup> Kolenda cites the wisdom of Otto von Bismarck, who said that “fools learn from experience. I prefer to learn from the experience of others.” Had General MacArthur not studied the experience of General Wolfe in Quebec, Inchon may never have happened. Harnessing the shared experience of all of the services in joint doctrine will provide universal benefits.

### **Doesn't The Guidance Already Exist?**

Guidance from current and former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff already exists in the form of the JOD and CCJO, so one could argue the merits of expending the institutional energy required to publish another joint publication. These directives, while valuable, fail to achieve certain objectives. A publication would seek, vet, and integrate input from each of the services and combine

the most appropriate portions of the service leadership doctrine. This process would not only result in the most comprehensive, applicable, and useful leadership doctrine possible, it would also provide the baseline from which each of the services could derive its own doctrine. A joint publication can serve as the common core for all service doctrine by providing a consensus leadership model with which each service can complement its service competencies. As discussed, the joint development model does not articulate the values common to all services—a joint leadership publication would do that.

## **Conclusions / Recommendations**

A joint leadership doctrinal publication will establish common traits and values to streamline the training, education, and development of military leaders at all levels. Each service should maintain its unique culture. A common understanding of leadership will provide a foundation to base that culture. For example, the technologically-focused cultures of the Navy and Air Force should complement universal leadership traits such as moral character and intellect. Selfless service should thrive at all levels of the military, regardless of service. Integrity can, and should, exist on the ground, in the air, and on the sea. Each service should maintain its respective core capabilities and culture even as the joint force outlines shared values and leadership attributes. In order to help protect the service culture and core competencies that the joint force values, the joint publication should refrain from establishing a joint ethos, descriptive competencies, or joint creeds. Instead, the joint document should restrict its content to establishing definitions for leadership, models for leadership at each level of war, and describe fundamental values and attributes common to all leaders. Members of the armed services of the United States deserve the effort it will take to codify what the nation expects of leaders at all levels, and for leaders of all services to embody that leadership model. The foundation exists, despite the varied service cultures and leader traits and values, to establish a model military leader.

The Army's Field Manual 6-22, *Army Leadership: Competent, Confident, and Agile*, provides an effective base upon which to build the joint publication. This recommendation does not imply that FM 6-22 provides everything that the joint version should include. *Army Leadership* provides, however, the most comprehensive and organized of the current models. This manual is thorough in its examination of leadership theory, its applicability across multiple levels of conflict, and provides ample historical examples of great leadership to complement each of its tenants and traits. On the foundation of FM 6-22, the most valuable aspects of doctrine and leadership models from each of the services could be integrated.

Figure 5 below provides recommendations on what a joint leadership model should include. One should note that this model does not include competencies, the determination of which should remain with the services. The leader attributes combines the most clearly articulated and appropriate aspects of each of the service models. This conglomeration includes elements of the Army, Air Force, and Marine leadership publications, as well as components of the Navy Leadership Competency Model. Figure 5 lists the Army's core values, but committing to a list of core values in doctrine could prove problematic. The traditional, cultural, and potentially emotional relationship that each service has with its core values model might prevent consensus in this area. A joint leadership model must include a discussion of the importance of values and character, even if the publication does not include a specific list of values. A joint leadership model should also clarify levels of leadership to match the levels of war. *Leadership and Force Development*, the Air Force's service leadership manual, maintains the tactical, operational, strategic levels of leadership to match the levels of war, which makes the most sense.

<b>Recommended Joint Force Leadership Model</b>			
<b>Definition:</b> Leadership is influencing people by providing purpose, motivation, and direction while operating to accomplish the mission and improve the organization			
<b>Core Values</b>	<b>Leader Attributes</b>	<b>Core Leader Competencies</b>	<b>Leadership Levels</b>
<b>Loyalty</b> <b>Duty</b> <b>Respect</b> <b>Selfless service</b> <b>Honor</b> <b>Integrity</b> <b>Personal courage</b>	<b>Character</b> - Humanity - Values - Selflessness  <b>Courage</b> - Moral - Physical  <b>Presence</b> - Military bearing - Physical Endurance - Composed / confident - Inspires  <b>Intellect</b> - Educated - Mentally agile - Sound judgment - Innovative - Decisive  <b>Communicate</b>  <b>Positive Influence</b> - Builds a team / maintains relationships - Develops others - Treats others with dignity and respect  <b>Gets Results</b> - Wins on the battlefield - Achieves	<b>Service-specific</b>	<b>Tactical</b>  <b>Operational</b>  <b>Strategic</b>

Figure 5: Recommended Baseline for Joint Leadership Publication

In addition to combining components of each service model to develop joint leadership attributes, the joint publication should reflect the historical examples that the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps each use to represent its attributes. Ample examples of each attribute exist. Also, *Leading Marines* reflects the warfighting character of the Marine Corps and uses a tone that would prove valuable to a joint publication. The joint leadership model should help to instill a warfighting spirit into leaders from all of the services, the way *Leading Marines* does. Joint leadership doctrine should also capture and perpetuate the traditional and cultural view of the Navy about the importance of experience. Experience provides a key component to leader development and the value the Navy places in experience should be shared. As noted, experience that complements study and education provides a veritable foundation for a leader of any service to develop.

The study of military leadership dates back as far as war itself. The variance in ideas associated with what makes a great military leader resembles the evolution of warfare over that same time. Similarly, the technical skills and competencies required to lead within the different services also vary widely. However, the US military should define the core set of leadership attributes that it desires in its joint leaders. The reasons for doing so exist now more than ever. The importance of developing leaders increases as the environment becomes more decentralized and the decision cycle shortens. The current environment also requires military leaders to integrate with leaders from other services more frequently, with the expectation that the force experiences no loss in interoperability or effectiveness. The force has a responsibility to provide a foundation on which leaders at all levels and from all services can operate and succeed. The joint force should continue to value and nurture the distinct culture and capabilities that each service provides, but it should do so under the umbrella of joint leadership attributes. The US military enjoys a distinguished history of great leaders from every service that exists because of its refusal to settle for the success of today. Instead, it sought to determine how to achieve greater capability tomorrow. Providing a model to which all leaders should aspire will enable leaders from every service to collectively contribute to a more effective force.

---

<sup>1</sup> David Halberstam. *The Coldest Winter: America and the Koran War* (New York: Hyperion, 2007), 299.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 298-9.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Mission Command*. U.S. Government White Paper. (Washington DC: Department of Defense, 3 April 2012), 3.

<sup>4</sup> U. S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*. Joint Publication (JP) 1-02. (Washington, DC: CJCS, 8 November 2010 amended through 15 February 2012).

<sup>5</sup> The available service leadership doctrine (FM 6-22, AFDD 1-1 and MCWP 6-11) each contain different definitions for “leader” and “leadership.”

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations, Version 3.0*. (Washington, DC: CJCS, 15 January 2009), iii.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Vision for Joint Officer Development*. (Washington, DC: CJCS, November 2005), 3.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., 3.
- <sup>14</sup> CJCS, *JOD*, 4.
- <sup>15</sup> U.S. Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP)*. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Instruction 1800.01D, Change 1. (Washington, DC: 15 December 2011), E-D-3.
- <sup>16</sup> U. S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.. *Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States*. Joint Publication 1. (Washington, DC: CJCS, 7 May 2007 incorporating change 1 March 20, 2009), i.
- <sup>17</sup> CJCS, *CCJO*, iv.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., 37.
- <sup>19</sup> United States Navy. Center for Personal and Professional Development web site, “Navy Leadership Competency Model,” accessed 5 May 2012, <https://www.netc.navy.mil/centers/cppd/News.aspx?ID=0>.
- <sup>20</sup> United States Marine Corps. *Leading Marines*. Marine Corps Warfighting Publication (MCWP) 6-11. (Washington, DC: Headquarters, United States Marine Corps. 27 November 2002), Introduction.
- <sup>21</sup> United States Army. *Army Leadership*. Army Regulation (AR) 600–100. (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 8 March 2007), 1.
- <sup>22</sup> United States Air Force. *Leadership and Force Development*. Air Force Doctrine Document 1-1. (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Air Force, 18 February 2006).
- <sup>23</sup> Army, *Army Leadership*, A-1.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid., 4-2.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid., A-1.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid., A-1.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid., 3-6.
- <sup>28</sup> Marine Corps, *Leading Marines*, 4.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid., 105.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid., 93.
- <sup>31</sup> All information in the table taken from the CPDD web site, *NLCM*.
- <sup>32</sup> Air Force, *Leadership*, 1.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid., 4.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid., 3.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., 8.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid., 16.
- <sup>37</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), book 3, chapter 1, p. 62.
- <sup>38</sup> Vego, Milan. *Joint Operational Warfare: Theory and Practice* (Newport, RI: Naval War College, reprint 2009), VII-15.
- <sup>39</sup> United States Army. *Army Leadership: Competent, Confident, and Agile*. Field Manual (FM) 6-22. (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, October 2006), 1-1.
- <sup>40</sup> U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Joint Vision 2020: America’s Military—Preparing for Tomorrow*. (Washington, DC: CJCS, June 2000), 12.
- <sup>41</sup> CJCS, *CCJO*, 25.
- <sup>42</sup> Vego, *Joint Warfare*, III-44.
- <sup>43</sup> CJCS, *Doctrine*, ii.
- <sup>44</sup> CJCS, *Mission Command*, 3.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid., 4.
- <sup>46</sup> Nagl, *Soup*, 7.

---

<sup>47</sup> Vego, *Joint Warfare*, III-45

<sup>48</sup> Kolenda, Christopher D., Barry R. McCaffrey, and Walter F. Ulmer. *Leadership: The Warrior's Art*. (Carlisle, PA: Army War College Foundation Press, 2001), xvi.