

5-2020

Combating Sexual Misconduct and Abuse of Authority in the United States Army: Same Long Fight

Wesley Martin

United States Army Military Police (Retired), signalcop@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/dignity>



Part of the [Law Enforcement and Corrections Commons](#), [Military, War, and Peace Commons](#), [Other Law Commons](#), [Rule of Law Commons](#), [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martin, Wesley (2020) "Combating Sexual Misconduct and Abuse of Authority in the United States Army: Same Long Fight," *Dignity: A Journal on Sexual Exploitation and Violence*: Vol. 5: Iss. 1, Article 1.

DOI: 10.23860/dignity.2020.05.01.01

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/dignity/vol5/iss1/1> <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/dignity/vol5/iss1/1>

This Frontline Report is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dignity: A Journal on Sexual Exploitation and Violence by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

Combating Sexual Misconduct and Abuse of Authority in the United States Army: Same Long Fight

Abstract

Before my combat deployments into Iraq, I, Colonel Wes Martin, had successfully fought another war. As a military police officer, I spent many years fighting against sexual misconduct, abuse of authority, and cover-ups within the senior officer and sergeant ranks in the United States Army. During this fight I faced continual criticism from my senior officers who claimed I was discrediting the Army by exposing the corrupt and immoral behavior of senior officers and sergeants.

During the early days of standing up to the corruption, when I had the rank of Major, I received retaliatory evaluations and was forced to temporarily leave active duty. After successfully appealing and having the retaliatory evaluations removed from my records, I was determined no one should suffer the consequences of doing the harder right over the easier wrong. Teaming with military icon Colonel (Retired) David Hackworth and other officers determined to create a just system, I played a pivotal role in forcing reforms throughout the Army. While helping other victims of sexual harassment and abuse of authority I wrote three articles that found their way throughout the Army.

During this same period, I progressed through four successful commands. In each of those commands I aggressively enforced his standards of "mutual respect" and "trust." In formations and training I warned all subordinates of the consequences of involvement in sexual harassment, abuse of authority, and racism. Even though I firmly drew the line when assuming each of my commands, there was always at least one subordinate in each who crossed the line thinking he was immune from being held accountable. The result was an immediate end to the transgressions and all dedicated soldiers realizing they had a champion to protect them from abuse.

The Army did change for the better and also commenced holding senior officers and sergeants accountable for their actions. Unfortunately, the continuing deployments into combat has had a negative effect on Army leadership. A lot of outstanding junior officers and sergeants left the ranks to build family-oriented lives and civilian careers. Their departures have created vacancies and promotion opportunities for substandard performers. This has in turn resulted in a resurgence of misbehavior. The fortunate part is top Army leadership is no longer blatantly covering the corruption.

Keywords

United States Army, sexual misconduct, abuse of authority, sexual harassment, military police, heroes, leadership

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgement must start with the bravery of each person subjected to sexual harassment and abuse of authority who takes a stand against the perpetrator(s). These warriors for justice prove themselves to be the heroes and not defeated victims in their own lives. Their fights are twofold. The first is against their tormentor(s) and the second against a system in which people in authority are not always prone to do the harder right over the easier wrong. Acknowledgement is also warranted to Major General Robert Shadley who could have tried to cover-up the sexual misconduct when it was discovered in his command at

Aberdeen. Instead, being a professional leader dedicated to the principles of duty, honor, and country he immediately opened up an investigation and brought in the Army's Criminal Investigation Command. Special acknowledgement is rendered to my mentor and best friend Colonel David Hackworth. Having in 1971 blown the whistle on the failing Vietnam strategy, Hackworth suffered the consequences of his convictions. Hackworth stayed the fight as did Colonel John Pitchford. Without their involvement, the Army's top sergeant and the Army's Deputy Inspector General would never have been court-martialed. There were other heroes not mentioned in this document, but the number of all soldiers combined who aggressively fought for justice in the late 1990s only add up to a small fraction within a single percentage point. Yet their uncoordinated and simultaneous efforts came together at the right time to force reform within a broken system. The success they achieved should not be lost. As stated at the beginning of this report, "Warriors despise having to pay for the same real estate twice."

COMBATING SEXUAL MISCONDUCT AND ABUSE OF AUTHORITY IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY: SAME LONG FIGHT

Wesley Martin

Colonel (Retired) United States Army Military Police

ABSTRACT

Before my combat deployments into Iraq, I, Colonel Wes Martin, had successfully fought another war. As a military police officer, I spent many years fighting against sexual misconduct, abuse of authority, and cover-ups within the senior officer and sergeant ranks in the United States Army. During this fight I faced continual criticism from my senior officers who claimed I was discrediting the Army by exposing the corrupt and immoral behavior of senior officers and sergeants.

During the early days of standing up to the corruption, when I had the rank of Major, I received retaliatory evaluations and was forced to temporarily leave active duty. After successfully appealing and having the retaliatory evaluations removed from my records, I was determined no one should suffer the consequences of doing the harder right over the easier wrong. Teaming with military icon Colonel (Retired) David Hackworth and other officers determined to create a just system, I played a pivotal role in forcing reforms throughout the Army. While helping other victims of sexual harassment and abuse of authority I wrote three articles that found their way throughout the Army.

During this same period, I progressed through four successful commands. In each of those commands I aggressively enforced his standards of “mutual respect” and “trust.” In formations and training I warned all subordinates of the consequences of involvement in sexual harassment, abuse of authority, and racism. Even though I firmly drew the line when assuming each of my commands, there was always at least one subordinate in each who crossed the line thinking he was immune from being held accountable. The result was an immediate end to the transgressions and all dedicated soldiers realizing they had a champion to protect them from abuse.

The Army did change for the better and also commenced holding senior officers and sergeants accountable for their actions. Unfortunately, the continuing deployments into combat has had a negative effect on Army leadership. A lot of outstanding junior officers and sergeants left the ranks to build family-oriented lives and civilian careers. Their departures have created vacancies and promotion opportunities for substandard performers. This has in turn resulted in a resurgence of misbehavior. The fortunate part is top Army leadership is no longer blatantly covering the corruption.

KEYWORDS

United States, Army, sexual misconduct, officers, sexual harassment, abuse of authority, cover-up

IN THE EARLY 1990s, I, United States Army Major Wesley Martin, found myself in a broken environment where sexual misconduct and abuse of authority was an accepted and self-sustaining way of life. For having protected subordinates from a corrupt environment, I was drawn into a fight that exposed the seriousness and depth of an Army-wide problem. The efforts of my allies and I resulted in reforms that ranged from temporary to potentially permanent. Now retired from active duty, I am witnessing the repeat of a disturbing history. The following is my account of combating sexual misconduct and abuse of authority among high-ranking officers in the Army.

I retired from active duty in 2010. During my rise from private to colonel I accumulated over 10 years of command time, including two battalions, one group, and one base. My combat tours include serving as the senior Antiterrorism/Force Protection Officer for all coalition forces in Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom 1 and 2, as senior coalition forces liaison officer with the United Nations, as Senior Operations Officer for Task Force 134 (Detention Operations), and as Commander of Forward Operating Base Ashraf (working with the Iranian Mujahedin). During my three Pentagon tours of duty I served as Force Protection Assessment Team Chief, Army Operations Center Crisis Action Team Chief, and Department of Army Information Operations Chief. I completed my military service as the U.S. Forces Korea (USFK) Information Operations Chief.

As the Senior Antiterrorism Officer in Iraq, my “boots on the ground” and “always operate inside the enemy’s decision-making cycle” style of leadership resulted in his blocking Al Qaeda from killing the moderate Shia Grand Ayatollah Sistani and blowing up the Baghdad doctors’ convention. I also prevented the theft of over 1000 Cobalt 60 radioactive sources and an attack on the Baghdad trade fair. As the USFK Information Operations Chief, I developed the Computer Network Operations oversight program that became the template for all U.S. Department of Defense major commands. I am also a retired Member of Technical Staff at Department of Energy’s Sandia National Laboratories. While at Sandia I came through the ranks as a member of the Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) force, Protective Force Lieutenant, Operations Security Program Manager, and served as Operations Chief of the Laboratory’s Security Force. In my current work of addressing Middle-East and military issues I have appeared on numerous American, Canadian, and European national news programs and have articles published in numerous printed media venues throughout the United States.

Recent Surge of Cases of Sexual Misconduct

Warriors despise having to pay for the same real estate twice. Yet, that is exactly what is happening as proven by the recent surge of investigations and subsequent demotions of senior officers in the United States Army.

The growing list already includes Major General Joseph Harrington for flirting with the wife of an enlisted soldier (Brook, 2018); Major General Wayne Grigsby for an inappropriate relationship with a captain on his staff (Myers, 2017; Witlock, 2017), Major General David Haight for his swinging lifestyle (Brook, 2016;

“General demoted after affair,” 2016), and Brigadier General Jeffrey Sinclair for a three-year affair with a subordinate (Zoroya, 2014).

Then we have Lieutenant General Ron Lewis, a top aide to the Secretary of Defense, using a government credit card at strip clubs (Tan, 2017), while Brigadier General Bryan Roberts was busted after getting into a physical altercation at a social event with his mistress from an external affair (“Misconduct by armed forces’ generals,” 2017). These last two examples would be comical if not so pathetic.

The aforementioned are only the general grade officers who have been exposed and held accountable for misconduct. It would be foolish to believe they are the only ones who have broken the trust expected of their positions. We have not seen the last of the scandals. There are more waiting to be exposed, and those exposed will always be a small fraction of what is happening inside a broken system.

The only good news in these situations is that once-unwritten doctrine of cover-up, specifically misbehavior of senior officers and senior enlisted, did not prevail. Twenty-five years ago, vicious cover-ups of corrupt behavior were the standard, usually conducted at the expense of the victims and those who fought for the moral right.

While serving on the front line against sexual harassment and abuse of authority in the 1990’s, in my role as a military police officer I took an aggressive stand against peers and seniors who used their positions for personal gain and pleasure. Rather than accepting the “rank has its privileges” or R.H.I.P. philosophy, my belief was “with rank comes responsibilities and expectations.” One of these expectations is that loyalty between seniors and subordinates goes both ways.

Into the Line of Fire

What started as a local fight eventually had an impact on the entire Army. In September of 1990 I returned to active duty as an activated Army Reserve officer. The assignment was as a major and the deputy commander of a Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) detachment of a northeastern university. Unfortunately, it turned out to be a very dysfunctional operation with a toxic commander.

I came into this position with over a decade of active component time behind me. Previous assignments included reconnaissance duty inside the Korean DMZ, Military Police Officer in the Berlin Brigade, security inspector for Field Command Defense Nuclear Agency (FCDNA), and then 30 months of command time. From my enlisted and commissioned service, having worked closely with all four branches of the U.S. military and numerous foreign militaries, the words duty, honor, and country had developed a very special meaning to me. At this ROTC detachment, I was working with people to whom those words meant nothing.

Cadet Command’s False Claim of “Leadership and Excellence”

At the time I was assigned to Cadet Command it had no business containing the words “Leadership and Excellence” on its insignia. Typically, in the 1990s, the heads of U.S. Army Cadet Command’s ROTC detachments were lieutenant colonels the Army had determined to be substandard performers. Being offered the means to retire from undistinguished careers, they were sent to these detachments for their twilight tours with the expectation to achieve the four “gets”: get transition education; get a permanent home; get a civilian job; and get out. In terms a

hardened combat warrior would appreciate, “Cadet Command was serving as the Army’s septic system.”

Previous assignments in the U.S. Army had exposed me to military ethics at its highest and lowest points. Following a high-profile assignment as a member of Inspections Directorate, Field Command Department of Defense Nuclear Agency, I transferred into a command that had torn itself apart by blatant and overwhelming sexual misconduct and abuse of authority on the part of senior officers and sergeants. Even as a captain I was subsequently able to change that environment by accepting command of the headquarters company which oversaw daily administrative responsibility of the command, including the senior officers assigned to it. This was a combination of developing and enforcing policies that included sexual harassment and fraternization. Unfortunately, those successes provided me the illusion that pointed in the right direction, even the behavior of senior officers could be moderated. There was no moderating the despicable behavior of the lieutenant colonel who been trusted to command this isolated ROTC detachment.

This individual was by far the most unprofessional officer I have ever witnessed, including Iraqi officers. He severely lacked every professional character trait expected of a leader. Never-ending lying, continuous temper tantrums, and frequent throwing of objects at subordinates were part of his typical behavior. As the deputy commander, I spent a lot of time protecting everyone from him as well as protecting him from everyone else, including himself. The adage “no good deed goes unpunished” was very much a reality.

To deal with this lieutenant colonel the command’s secretary, Vivian Reithmiller, once noted I needed a degree in abnormal psychology. One day, two hours after pounding his own head into a door frame, this lieutenant colonel was prancing down the corridor singing “Zippidy Do Dah.” The only relief we got from his childish behavior was when he was developing yet another conniving scheme. One of the most blatant, of which he was finally successful even after I warned the finance officer what was really happening, this lieutenant colonel was able to have the Army pay for his civilian conducted elective surgery fertility operation by claiming it was a cancer preventing procedure.

Another of his never-ending antics involved severely upgrading the interview results of a very attractive female high school senior applying for a full Army college scholarship. That female was no more impressive than a young male who came in the same day but was rated significantly lower. As Vivian had attended both interviews I asked her what happened. Vivian replied that although the young man had a better interview, the young woman won the day because the lieutenant colonel was blatantly infatuated.

There is a good reason the Army periodically conducts Reduction in Force (RIF) purges. Unfortunately, for 20 years this had not happened and a lot of problem individuals slid through the system and into senior positions. During the President Reagan and Bush years, the military was expanded and unless someone had been convicted of a serious crime the likelihood of an officer being promoted to at least lieutenant colonel was very much assured.

This lieutenant colonel was not the only resident issue. The next-most serious problem was an activated National Guard major who was making a sport of having as many sexual relationships as possible, including with cadets. Not to be outdone was a captain who was blatantly having an affair with two cadets at the same time.

This captain made sure everyone knew that he graduated from West Point, but despite his best efforts was not able to hide the fact it took him five years to come out at the bottom of his class – the goat.

The colonels and generals assigned over these problem officers were just as substandard; however, it took the Army longer to realize it. When the light finally dawned, they too were sent to Cadet Command. The colonel assigned to serve as brigade commander had tried to commit suicide twice when he was a major because of his inability to handle stress. One attempt followed his being verbally reprimanded by his battalion commander for the unit's dysfunctional vehicle maintenance program.

The brigadier general had been returned from Germany, removed from his position as Deputy 1st Armored Division Commander. Already on marriage number three, his continual indiscretions in the local German village resulted in his being moved stateside before the command deployed for Desert Storm. Neither the weak colonel nor problematic general were held properly accountable, including in their evaluation reports. Both were allowed to continue contributing to a growing problem throughout the Army.

That was the command climate in which I found myself having to protect staff and cadets from abuse and exploitation. Some of the females accepted the exploitation in exchange for preferential treatment, to which other members of the staff, cadets, parents of the cadets, and university administrators were not blind. Yet nothing was done, especially by the colonel and general who wished to protect their careers by denying such serious problems existed on their watch.

For having stood up against the sexual misconduct, the abuse of authority, and the countless other violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice in this command environment, I might as well come to work every day with a target on my chest. I was a threat to their incompetent and corrupt way of life. Unlike the motion picture "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" (1939, Columbia Studios) the bad element does not suddenly roll over and admit their shortfalls. They will come after their threat with every means possible, including using the very system they are abusing against the whistleblower. For me retaliation was a continual saga.

Repositioning for the Continuing Fight

Knowing I was not going to see justice while assigned to this detachment, in September of 1992 I returned to my civilian job and simultaneously accepted a position as commander of the Headquarters Detachment, 469th Quartermaster Group, U.S. Army Reserve. I vowed that I would do everything possible to ensure no one else would have to endure what I did for protecting subordinates from abuse and standing up for the truth. In this effort, I was putting a military application to the statement New York City Police Officer Frank Serpico gave before the Knapp Commission in 1971: "We must create an environment where the dishonest officer fears the honest one, not the other way around."

My first order of personal business, concurrent with my Army command and civilian job responsibilities, was to clean up my records from the retaliatory reports submitted by these self-protecting ROTC seniors. On January 1, 1994 I submitted the evaluation report to the Appeal's Branch of the Army Personnel Command. Eighty pages of witness statements within this 200-page evaluation appeal were critical to my vindication. On October 31, 1994 the notification of the evaluation's

revocation was published. Even before receiving the document by mail, I knew the results. A member of the Appeal's Office had already telephoned me with appreciation for having stood the fight against corruption and extending his respect for the outstanding document submitted to clean up my records.

In the next order of business, I started reaching out to senior Army leaders to expose the seriousness of problems within the Army and get them involved in correcting the problem they owned. One of the first people contacted was Inspector General of the Army, Lieutenant General Ronald Griffiths. He was no solution; never even acknowledged my official requests for involvement. Congressional inquiries always resulted in responses stating more time was needed to investigate. A friend of mine who had worked in the Congressional Liaison Office told me that this is a standard stalling tactic. As my friend predicted, I never received any replies or follow-up action.

I then locked in on one person making a difference – retired Colonel David Hackworth, or “Hack.” From his days in Korea and Vietnam, “Hack” had earned over a hundred awards, to include 10 silver stars and eight purple hearts. Because he spoke out about the failed strategy of the then ongoing war in Vietnam, Hack was vilified by Army leadership.

Warriors do not go down easily, and Hack was a total warrior. After forced retirement from the Army, Hack wrote the best seller “About Face” (Hackworth & Sherman, 1990). By the time Desert Storm occurred, Hack was an ace military reporter and military icon. Seeing Hack's articles and television interviews addressing problems inside the Army ranks, I realized we were both saying the same things about a broken system. The difference was Hack was being heard. I reached out to Hack and provided him documentation of what I had endured and how I had been unsuccessfully attempting to fix a broken system.

Just as in years earlier when he had been mentored by the Army's top historian, Brigadier General Sam (S.L.A.) Marshall, I became Hack's protégé. By having already read many of Marshall's books (1947) and articles I had been greatly influenced by his style.

Now I was studying Hack's methodology as he was developing thoughts into published products. Hack liked to build his argument and test its ability to stand before he wrote.

The results of many discussions between Hackworth and I could be seen in his articles. This was not a one-way street. Those discussions also surfaced in my writings, including a progressive trilogy consisting of “In Search of Accountability” (1998), “Plan On Blowing A Whistle, Here's What You Have To Look Forward To” (1997) and “Don't Give Up the Ship” (1998). Following Sam's legacy, I also continued to document the lessons of history. However, it was Hack's legacy of fighting corruption and abuse of authority that dominated my focus.

Hack was also in contact with then-Army Chief of Staff General Dennis Reimer. When Reimer was a young lieutenant, he had been in the same battalion as then-Major Hackworth. The two got along very well and remained friends through the years. Hack provided Reimer my documentation concerning Cadet Command and recommended the Chief have someone meet with me to discuss the seriousness of the Army's abuse of authority problem. Like Army Inspector General Griffith, Reimer did nothing. Had either of them tried to reach out and fix the problems, I

likely would not have been involved in exposing serious problems that soon landed in each of their offices.

CHALLENGING A BROKEN SYSTEM

In this section, I discuss the details that forced the entire United States Army to admit the existence of serious problems and the need to develop reforms. I was a Lieutenant Colonel throughout this campaign and it was no secret that senior commanders disapproved of my involvement in the fight for justice and integrity over the concept of “rank has its privileges.”

During May, 1996, the depth of abuse of authority and sexual misconduct problems started coming to a head from what should have been a most unlikely source. Basic training drill sergeants are expected to be role-models. At Aberdeen Army Base the revelation was starting to unfold that drill sergeants were making a sport out of how many attractive female recruits they could entice into sexual relationships.

To the credit of the Aberdeen situation, once Major General (MG) Robert Shadley learned of the problem within his command, he took all the right actions (“Judicial Proceedings Panel Remarks from Major General Robert D. Shadley,” 2015). MG Shadley immediately engaged the Army Criminal Investigation Command, set up telephone hotlines, took proper action to protect victims, and removed the threat of retaliation from all soldiers who came forward. If every general in the Army possessed MG Shadley’s ethics and determination to get involved when a problem was exposed, there never would have been the Army-wide meltdown that was about to occur. Unfortunately, MG Shadley’s commitment to properly fulfill his responsibilities did not generate the same response up the chain of command. A great warrior was out front, without proper support from his seniors. MG Shadley later documented the entire situation in his book titled, *The GAME, Unraveling a Military Sex Scandal* (2013). This book should be required reading for all officers and sergeants.

With people now coming forward throughout the Army, it was soon learned the problems of abuse of authority and sexual misconduct were widespread. Even General Reimer started using the term “cancers” when describing the people creating the problems. I had been using that term for years, to include in documents Hackworth provided to Reimer. It is not important whether or not Reimer had picked up this term from my documents or selected this word on his own; the bottom line is that was the term he used to accurately describe the people who were creating the problems. From his office, Reimer was stating the right things, but he failed to wade into the battle. Reimer was no Omar Bradley, the World War II “Soldiers General” who led from the front in Europe and later served as Army Chief of Staff.

Establishment of Secretary of Army’s Special Task Force

To address the problems now being exposed, in the autumn of 1996 Secretary of the Army Togo West established a special task force to examine the depth of the problem and to recommend solutions. Ironically, Sergeant Major of the Army Gene McKinney, the Army’s and Reimer’s top sergeant, was assigned to this task force as spokesman for the enlisted soldiers. Women soon came forward stating McKinney had sexually harassed them (Gross, 1998). The first to come forward was Sergeant Major Brenda Hoster, McKinney’s former Chief of Public Relations

(Graham, 1997). From personal experience, I knew what Brenda was about to endure. Sending her an appreciation letter, which included Hack's message to General Reimer concerning my fight, I offered Brenda support. She accepted.

Meanwhile, inside the Pentagon a well-placed general officer was passing on to Hackworth critical information about McKinney's demeaning strategy concerning Brenda Hoster. The strategy was meant to be used on an unsuspecting Hoster and knock her off balance at the Article 32 hearing. The judge possibly would have tossed the information out, but the negative effect on Hoster would have been achieved. The Article 32 hearing, which best translates in civilian terms to a grand jury, was not intended to recommend a court-martial. Hack provided the information to me, with instructions to pass it on to Brenda.

Armed with the information I had provided, Hoster had an outstanding interview with Forrest Sawyer on "Nightline" (Sawyer, 1997, July 29). Next morning her interview on "Good Morning America" (Chung, 1998) was equally superlative. These interviews resulted in an immediate one-day suspension of the Article 32 hearing. The following day the hearing re-commenced and the final recommendation was to proceed with a court-martial for Sergeant Major of the Army McKinney.

Throughout the entire process, I stayed in contact with Brenda, provided moral support, wrote articles on her behalf, and presented her with a Revolutionary War "Don't Tread on Me" flag. Brenda was in fact serving point on a revolution, one against sexual harassment being an accepted and protected way of life in the Army. Unfortunately, the first battle of most revolutions results in defeat and this fight was to be no exception.

To McKinney's credit, he had hired the very skilled military defense attorney Charles Gittins. A former Marine Corps lieutenant colonel and legal officer, U.S. Navy Academy graduate Gittins knew more about military law than any of the other attorneys ever to be involved in this case, to seemingly include the judge.

For five weeks the trial progressed, or regressed, depending on one's viewpoint. A telling sign of what was going on behind the scenes came with one juror wanting to be discharged from responsibilities because of the stress. The verdict was read on March 13, 1998: McKinney was found guilty of obstructing justice and cleared of 18 other charges ("McKinney sentencing phase under way," March, 1998). The presiding military judge then took it upon himself to call the accusers to the stand and reprimand them. Usually it is the role of the defense attorney to degrade the victims and produce doubt of credibility to the jury, which was achieved. This time the judge also wanted to get his personal attacks in. The culture of protecting seniors was very much in play.

The verdict was read on a Friday, the day I had arrived in Dallas for an Army Reserve conference. I already had a Sunday morning breakfast scheduled with retired Army Colonel John Pitchford, who lived in the greater Dallas area. John was a friend of Hack's, a fellow survivor of exposing corruption in the Army, and someone who had read my article "Plan on Blowing a Whistle" (1997) in Hackworth's *Defending America* weekly e-mail posting. Over breakfast, I vented hard to John about the McKinney verdict. After breakfast, I went back to the conference. John went home and wrote an article about the Army's breakdown of accountability and discipline, which was immediately published in *USA Today* (1998). John was then contacted by Donnamarie Carpino. A whole new fight against a corrupt system was on.

Exposing Corruption in General Officer Ranks

Donnamarie Carpino has been married to a colonel serving in Turkey under the command of Major General David Hale. To Carpino, Hale had claimed to have evidence that her husband was having an affair. Hale informed Carpino that if she would become his mistress, her husband would be protected. Carpino later learned her husband never had an affair. Unfortunately, her affair with Hale resulted in a Carpino's marriage ending up in divorce. Meanwhile, Hale went on to become Deputy Inspector General of the Army.

Once this incident was brought to the attention of the Army's Criminal Investigation Command (CID) a thorough inquiry commenced. However, this effort was cut short by Army Chief of Staff General Reimer who, against regulations, had allowed Hale to retire while being a subject of an investigation.

Days after our breakfast meeting, Pitchford called me and asked the name of Hoster's attorney. He explained that he was now helping Carpino. I told him the attorney was Susan Barnes of Denver and assured John she was one of the very best lawyers to be found. Carpino had been using the same Charles Gittins who was McKinney's attorney.

My original intent was to support Pitchford's effort of exposing Major General David Hale's antics and lack of accountability. Hackworth instructed me to pull back, explaining Hale possessed derogatory information about Hack's main source inside the Pentagon. If it came out I was involved in going after Hale, that would lead right back to Hack, and access to his source would be jeopardized. Assuring me Pitchford would get the job done without my involvement, Hack stated, "Pitch has the grip of a bulldog; once he locks on he does not let go. He will take Hale." Agreeing that we had lots of other fights ahead of us, I accepted Hack's instructions.

With Pitchford on the attack against Hale and the subsequent cover-up, the Army was forced to call Hale back onto active duty and the investigation into his behavior recommenced. Twice, the Army assigned general officer friends of Hale to head the investigative process. Pitchford started probes on both generals. The result was the first general unexpectedly retired within days of Pitchford initiating the probe. The case was then assigned to the second. Almost immediately Pitchford alerted the world to ethical and conflict of interest problems concerning this general.

Army leadership then assigned Lieutenant General George Crocker, a dedicated general officer who can be best characterized as "Mister Clean" to preside over the case against Hale. The result was Hale being court-martialed, convicted, and reduced one rank (Whitlock, 2017). With the Hale conviction, Army leadership was no longer able to deny and cover-up the existence of serious problems.

Fight on the Broader Front

Meanwhile, as John Pitchford was pushing forward with the Hale situation, through Hackworth's 27,000 recipients e-mail newsletter, I released the article "In Search of Accountability" on March 28, 1998. The article laid the blame for its ongoing scandals right in the lap of senior Army leadership. Reimer, one of Hack's 27,000 newsletter recipients, immediately contacted Hack and inquired as to the nature of my hostility. When Hack brought this to my attention, I responded that

Reimer should have listened to me the first time around when he was provided the appeal packet that exposed massive corruption within Cadet Command.

As a result of the Aberdeen, McKinney, and Hale situations, throughout the U.S. Army, soldiers with complaints were coming forward to report sexual misconduct and abuse of authority on the part of their seniors. Years later someone who was working with Reimer at the time informed me that every day the general came to work a scandal was waiting to be addressed. We were not letting up on the pressure. As mentioned, we previously had tried to work with the Army command structure and were ignored. Inspector General of the Army Lieutenant General Griffiths failed to get involved. Congressional inquiries were blown off. Now we were using the media and having an impact.

For a year Hack and I kept the media pressure on the U.S. Army. When allied bombing of Yugoslavia commenced on March 24, 1999 a unity of effort was necessary. Our intent was to pick up the fight when hostilities were over. Meanwhile, the Army took advantage of the reprieve to introduce corrective actions. Two programs, "Consideration of Others" and "Army Values," were developed. All soldiers were required to participate in the training. Soldiers were also issued and required to have on their possession at all times cards that explained the Army Values of loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage.

While the introduction of "Consideration of Others" and "Army Values" was nice and a step in the right direction, there was nothing in either program that was not already covered in the application of basic leadership principles. In short, the Army went through corrective action training because of a broken command structure that went all the way from private to the Army Chief of Staff.

Disapproval of Senior Officers and Military Community

Meanwhile, my actions for justice and accountability were noticed in a very negative way. Seniors in my chain of command and members of military-affiliated organizations of which I was a member informed me I was "bringing discredit to the Army." Their feeling was that I should have been helping the Army mitigate the bad publicity, not exposing problems. In short, their opinion was I should have been supporting Army seniors, not their accusers.

This attitude validated the seriousness of a broken system. My stand was that the people conducting sexual harassment and abuse of authority were the ones discrediting the system, not the people who stood against corruption. Furthermore, I have never figured out why we should expect subordinates to risk their lives in a field of fire if their seniors will not fight for their well-being. Loyalty works both ways. The West Point prayer calls for "the harder right over the easier wrong." Fighting for justice and integrity in a broken system is about as right as it gets.

Verbally stating displeasure was as far as my chain of command dared to take themselves. There were three reasons further retaliation did not occur. The first was they knew I was right and they had no desire to get themselves into an Army-wide fight. The second was fear of Hackworth and fulfilling Japanese Admiral Yamamoto's December 7, 1941 expressed concern for "waking the sleeping giant and leave him with a terrible resolve." The third reason was the continuing success of units I was being called in to command. By the time I retired, I had accumulated 123 months of command time, to include combat. Of my six commands, only one did not involve my going in to clean up a dysfunctional operation.

MAKING AN IMPACT

While fighting against corruption throughout the entire United States Army, I was also standing firm against sexual misconduct and abuse of authority in my own commands. In this section, I examine the concepts of professional leadership and how I used it to protect the victims of abuse while holding the perpetrators accountable. I also was able to personally witness the positive impact of the long-term fight for accountability, and that finally the Army's top leadership came to share his views.

Dedication to justice was not just a fight I was involved in directed at the senior level. It was at the forefront in every one of my units. Hackworth told me the only lives you can be guaranteed to affect positively on a continual and permanent basis are those of the people assigned to your commands. Other efforts are random shots.

During the 1995 to 2002-time frame, while progressively commanding two battalions and one group, I developed a list of "kill zones." All subordinates were advised by me that entering into any of them would result in my direct engagement. The term "kill zones" was used to ensure no doubt existed regarding my seriousness in enforcing them. The irony of publicly announcing my "kill zones" was that I was doing it while the Clinton Administration was trying to move the United States military to a kinder, gentler force composed of people in touch with their emotions.

When coming into all my leadership positions since the mid-90s, upfront I always announced those zones before my troops. I also assured them during these briefings that someone in attendance would be offended and feel threatened by my comments, specifically the culprits of the standards I was enforcing. In 2003, I even had an Inspector General complaint filed against me because the term "kill zones" was intimidating. It was, but not to the dedicated soldiers living up to "Army Values." The Inspector General's determination was in my favor with the acknowledgement his life would be easier if more commanders would take such an aggressive stand.

The six forbidden zones were: racism; sexual misconduct; alcohol on duty/illegal drugs anytime; loss of a firearm; blatant safety violation which could result in loss of life or limb; and use authority for personal interest or pleasure. All soldiers were advised up front that victims would be placed on the sideline and the fight would be between the perpetrator(s) and myself. In all my commands, the goal was to build an environment based upon mutual respect and trust. It was made clear I would take undermining of that goal as a personal matter. Everyone heard the warning, and dedicated soldiers appreciated the message.

Using the "Be, Know, Do" concept, subordinates were further informed if they tried to do the right thing, but it went wrong because of lack of knowledge, or the "Do" just did not turn out right, despite the best of intentions, we could deal with it. However, if the problem resulted from problematic inner character of the person, the "Be" element of that triad, then they would be held accountable

Accountability Enforced

There was usually one senior person in each command who did not take the warning seriously. The most blatant was in the first battalion I commanded from September 1996 to January 2000. This command, the 95th Division Signal

Battalion, was headquartered in Albuquerque, New Mexico, with subordinate operations stretching to Louisiana, Iowa, Nebraska, and all states between. My number two sergeant proved himself to be a racist, alcoholic, and a sexual predator. From his peers and previous superiors, I found out he had been doing these antics for two decades. When I asked the previous seniors why they did nothing about it, the response was always the same: "I did not personally see it." That is no excuse.

Unless the perpetrator is totally stupid, or the command environment allows it, wrongful antics are not going to be carried out in front of seniors. When problems are reported to seniors, they are then the owners of the problem. Avoiding confrontations, while providing problem individuals glowing performance evaluations, is not a solution. As for this senior sergeant, he did not survive me. He left the Army with one less rank, and his blazing close-out performance evaluation forever documenting his antics.

As a result of this sergeant finally being held accountable and removed from the ranks, the morale of the command skyrocketed, especially among the minorities and females. However, one sad long-term reality was exposed in the process: only white male sergeants came forward to provide statements as I proceeded against this individual. The reason was that the minorities had filed reports in the past. The only thing these previous complaints had accomplished was to bring wrath down on the people who told the truth. The minorities thought history was only going to repeat itself, at their expenses.

Continuing the Fight

Assignment of my second battalion command came quickly. As Deputy Commander of the 647th Area Support Group (Army Reserve), in June of 2000 I was called into the commander's office. Colonel Mark Widmer's message was pretty basic. "I have an additional duty for you. Go take command of the 372nd and do something with that officer corps." The lieutenant colonel battalion commander being relieved had taken the troops to the desert for eight days, but he and his three senior officers left the field and went back to their homes for the middle four days, while still on the Army payroll.

In my taking command of this battalion, with Hackworth in attendance, the command environment was so bad the previous commander had been told not to show up for the ceremony. I received the colors from the captain who had stayed with the troops in the field. My first order of business was to remove the lounge environment from my newly inherited battalion commander's office. My second order of business was to forbid future officer meetings at Hooter's Restaurants and strip bars.

One day, while working in my office, Chief Warrant Officer Jim Terrazas of a subordinate unit walked into my office and stated, "We have to talk!" Jim, an outstanding soldier I had known for years, told me about an incident that happened prior to my arrival. While on two weeks annual training, a senior sergeant had manipulated a young female soldier into driving him to a lakeside. While both were outside the vehicle looking at this "scenic location" the sergeant came up behind the soldier, put his arms around her and commenced kissing her neck. The soldier pushed the sergeant away and both returned to camp. When confronted, the sergeant admitted to the captain what he had done. The captain's only action was to respond, "I wish you had not done that." Now, a year later, the captain had submitted a promotion packet on the sergeant.

I immediately interviewed the soldier, with Chief Terrazas and Lieutenant (and registered nurse) Rebecca Eisler as witnesses. The victim's story was firm. With an immediate telephone call, I had the sergeant's packet removed from the promotion board, which was meeting that same weekend. I then contacted my group commander, Colonel Mark Widmer's replacement, and requested an external investigation. Instead I was instructed to, "Just transfer the sergeant to another unit." Refusing to let this sergeant escape accountability, I contacted 90th Regional Support Command Human Relations Office and requested an investigation. In turn, I was informed that would be too much work. Trying to maintain loyalty to my commander, I recognized the end result would be putting him on report if I brought this matter to the Inspector General. The first question would be, "Did you talk to your commander?"

Evaluating the pros and cons of further options, I informed the violating sergeant either that he would immediately retire or I would press for a court-martial. Unaware I was receiving no top cover, the sergeant accepted immediate retirement. As for my colonel who wished to do nothing, six months later I received a telephone call from the commanding general, instructing me to take command of the group headquarters as he had fired that same colonel for inefficiency.

One excuse I frequently heard from people who did not take my warnings seriously was "All commanders claim zero tolerance, but no one ever enforces it." This comment was a double dose of pathetic. First, no one should expect to be able to commit a wrong, especially a violation by another, because they believe they will not be held accountable. The second reason for this being such a pathetic comment is this was a very true statement. I never had a moral problem creating an environment where the dishonest fear the honest, just a problem with the majority of my peers and seniors not having the same commitment. Their sharing a professional commitment would have made my job easier and improved the lives of all affected subordinates.

The Active Component Finally Learns the Meaning of Accountability

On the active component front, two things that really made the difference were downsizing and the reintroduction of a long-lost concept – accountability. A massive number of substandard officers and non-commissioned officers (NCOs) left the Army in the late-90s, both voluntarily and involuntarily. As a result, the Army's average of ethical standards among its leadership was perhaps the highest level ever experienced.

For years I was not sure of the extent of our work. The answer came during a series of active duty tours between 2003 and 2010. In August of 2005, while serving on the Pentagon's Army Operations Center (OAC) Crisis Action Team (CAT), we were about to commence the morning briefing to numerous one, two, and three-star generals when Major Jim Bevens called out, "Stand By!" That meant a four-star general, either the Chief or Vice Chief of Staff, had stepped onto the floor. It was the Vice, General Richard Cody.

Walking to the front of his subordinates General Cody stated, "Yesterday, the Chief and I fired General Brynes. If you do not know why we fired him, you do not have a need to know. But I will tell you this...". General Cody made it clear that ethics and standards were being enforced at all levels. If anyone else was discovered crossing the line, they too would be held accountable. General Brynes had been the four-star Commander of Training and Doctrine Command. Brynes had

been willfully involved in an extra-marital affair and ignored warnings to cease and desist. Listening to General Cody “reading the riot act” to his subordinates I said to myself, “We won, we won.”

EXAMINING THE BATTLEFIELD

In this section, I revisit the fight for justice and accountability in the United States Army. While recognizing what successes achieved, I also acknowledge failures of certain components within the Army to fully integrate the reforms, the dangers of losing great soldiers and future leaders if self-serving individuals are allowed to destroy the lives of subordinates, and the need to always be vigilant against corruption and abuse of authority.

The corrective actions and change of culture that were taking place in the active component did not resonate in the reserve forces. Reservists did all the required training, but the good-old-boy culture and long-term relationships that permeated the system were not going to change easily. The best example was the abuse at Abu Ghraib Detention Facility in Iraq. This facility was almost completely operated by Army Reserve Forces.

Abu Ghraib Scandal

In October of 2003, I warned Brigadier General Jan Karpinski, a former 1977 Officer Basic Course classmate, that she had a total lack of adult supervision at Abu Ghraib. I had just completed a force protection assessment of the facility where military professionalism was non-existent. There was no real command operation at Abu Ghraib, just a poorly supervised gaggle. Three months later Jan telephoned me and asked for a meeting. The now infamous photographs revealed the command environment at Abu Ghraib was far more serious than either of us could have imagined (Hersh, 2004; Mersh, 2004; Nasr, 2009). Every one of the photographs verified how much the perpetrators were enjoying themselves. Furthermore, junior soldiers were leading seniors in a massive violation of human dignity. The widespread problems at Abu Ghraib would not have happened with active duty soldiers in 2003.

In 2004 I was the Headquarters, Department of the Army, Crisis Action Team Chief to first receive the report of the senior Army Reserve sergeants hosting mud-wrestling competition among their female soldiers at the Bucca Detention Facility in Iraq. The report and photographs came not from the Army, but from the media which was in the process of going public. I had to inform senior Army leadership of this situation. First to be briefed was Brigadier General Doug Robinson who said it best. “Every time something like this happens, it is with Helmly’s troops.” Lieutenant General James Helmly was then Chief of the Army Reserve.

Unfortunately, even the clean-up of the active component did not last. The continuous deployments hit military families hard, resulting in a massive number of outstanding junior officers and enlisted soldiers leaving the ranks. The truth of the matter is Bush 43 had no legal justification to send us into Iraq and, in doing so, his trust in Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld was seriously misplaced. Had the 380,000 soldiers called for in the then-classified invasion plan been deployed, instead of the 140,000 identified by Rumsfeld, Iraq could have been stabilized.

Because too many good soldiers left the ranks, vacancies were available for people who never should have been retained. This was no surprise. In 2006, Major

General Jack Gardner and I discussed what was coming. Gardner remains one of the most ethical and professional officers I have ever had the pleasure of knowing. Assessing the long-term situation, Gardner stated that unless someone gets caught committing a felony the chances of making lieutenant colonel or senior sergeant are pretty certain. He was right. Almost everything fought and gained in the 1990s is gone. The ethical standards being practiced in the field have gone down. As a result, the overall culture has deteriorated.

This is fed by another core problem of the 1990s which has resurfaced. It can be argued the problem never went away, but it just did not have as much of an impact when the overall quality of the senior ranks was higher. In the mid-90s Hackworth published an article titled "Evaluations Encourage Corruption at All Levels" (1996). The main point of that article was Army performance evaluations of officers and sergeants were cluttered with flowery terms while failing to address incompetence and character problems. Hack was right, as borne out by the ROTC chain of command I endured and the scandals that overwhelmed the Army.

Rather than hold someone accountable, especially on performance evaluations, raters seem to believe it is easier to provide a glowing evaluation and pass the problem individual on to the next supervisor. That is exactly what happened with the racist, alcoholic, sexual predator sergeant I took down. Problem soldiers are not going to clean themselves up. They have no reason to do so because for years their antics have been tolerated. Meanwhile they drive other good people from the ranks, allowing yet more vacancies for substandard performers and problematic people.

Whistleblower Retaliation

One area still needing to be fixed is holding seniors accountable for slander-ridden cover-ups against subordinates who stand for the truth. Too frequently the mechanisms for reporting misbehavior of seniors are used as information detection systems. The goal of pre-emptive slandering is to discredit the subordinate, or at least to "age the problem." Usually it takes months and years for the whistleblower to disprove the slanderous attacks, especially if seniors two or three levels above join in the cover-up to protect themselves from accountability for allowing the dysfunctional environment to exist in the first place. Being that accountability for pre-emptive attacking of the whistle-blower is never conducted, there is no incentive for the violators not to resort to never-ending method of self-preservation. My experience with Cadet Command is an excellent testimonial to this fact.

Extremely rare are commanders willing to stand in front of troops, inform them of "kill zones," and then enforce those zones. General Dick Cody was one of those. General Ray Odierno, who served as Army Chief of Staff from 2011 to 2015, was another. General Odierno made it very clear ethics will be enforced and toxic commanders will not be tolerated. Many made the mistake of not believing the seriousness of Odierno's warning. I witnessed that first-hand. When Odierno was commanding all U.S. Forces in Iraq, I was called back into that country to testify at the court martial of a battalion commander who was subsequently convicted of sexual misconduct, abusing subordinates, and severe mishandling of classified documents. Odierno never hesitated to stand by his words.

Unfortunately, we do not have enough Codys and Odiernos throughout the ranks. What we do have are the vast majority of supervisors who will lie to avoid confrontation. Hackworth captured this problem with his previously referenced

“evaluations” article. The following three paragraphs from “In Search of Accountability” remain as true today as when I wrote them two decades ago:

A lot of publicity is currently being directed towards the Army for letting down its female soldiers. The leadership of the Army has let down its female soldiers. The leadership has also let down all soldiers who want to ensure that the Army is a fair and honest place to serve. That same leadership has long since been warned that serious problems exist that go far beyond sexual harassment. We treat cancer when it eats away at a body's ability to function. Lack of accountability is a cancer that has been eating away at the Army's effectiveness. Because of the involvement of Congress and the American press, Army leadership is running around like fire fighters frantically trying to extinguish sexual harassment. Instead of trying to correct symptoms, they should go after the root cause. They should work to develop an environment that protects integrity and enforces justice.

We can talk theory about how the system is supposed to work. However, the attention the Army is now receiving proves that the system is broken. It will never be repaired until violators of the UCMJ, no matter what rank, are held totally accountable. If that includes taking actions to end the careers of self-serving officers and NCOs, then so be it. We must stop undermining the effectiveness of the Army by protecting those who are out for themselves.

The two most important missions we have between wars are to maintain readiness and prepare for the next conflict. We can't achieve maximum results when our good soldiers are either being destroyed or compromised by bad officers and NCOs. Furthermore, we can't expect soldiers to willingly risk death in wartime when senior leadership will not stand up for them in peacetime. Unfortunately, too many good soldiers have been leaving the ranks because of bad soldiers. These departing good soldiers will never become tomorrow's outstanding leaders. This loss will be felt most on the future battlefield. The price will be paid with the blood and lives of young Americans (Martin, 1998).

As stated at the beginning of this article, warriors despise paying for the same real-estate twice. That is exactly what is happening, and will continue to happen, until leaders at all levels have the dedication and commitment to do what is expected of them in the first place. As mentioned earlier, “Consideration of Others” and “Army Values” are nice, but there is nothing in either that is not already covered in basic leadership. Unfortunately, the West Point Prayer, calling for the harder right over the easier wrong, is too frequently ignored in the field for the sake of self-interest and lack of ambition.

A balance of justice must be achieved, both for the victims and the falsely accused. When the system is as broken as it currently is, lives of innocent people can easily be permanently destroyed. That, in turn, has a domino effect. In my own situation, had I not corrected the career damage directed toward me for having defended cadets and staff members from abuse while assigned to Cadet Command, I would not have been available to later serve as the senior Antiterrorism/Force Protection Officer for all Coalition Forces in Iraq (2003-2004). I would not have been on the streets of Najaf with Police Chief Aziz, to identify and close the vulnerabilities for the pending Ashara celebrations. The Al Qaeda plot to kill the moderate

Grand Ayatollah Sistani, discovered by U.S. military intelligence, would have succeeded. Iraq would have erupted into immediate civil war and tens of thousands of people would have been killed.

Three units of Cobalt 60 radioactive devices were stolen (later recovered) at Habbaniyah Testing Site in Iraq. In order to appoint an officer to conduct the investigation, Lieutenant General Sanchez personally reviewed all the files of his colonels to determine who had a radiological security background. I was the only one. After identifying the causes of the security problem and without waiting for authorization from General Sanchez, I went to Al Tuwaitha and exposed an identical situation there. Armed with information previously denied to him, the on-site battalion commander implemented the corrective actions. Had I not taken immediate action, rebel cleric Moqtada Sadr's militia would have had easy access a thousand units of Cobalt 60. That would have made a lot of dirty bombs and stay-behind devices. The War on Terrorism would have taken a very dark turn. Sanchez was always appreciative for my not taking the typical staff officer approach and waiting to be scheduled for a meeting to ask his permission to implement what obviously needed to be done.

The security vulnerabilities I exposed at the Baghdad Trade Fair provided Ambassador Bremer the justification he needed to close the event. Hundreds of people would have been slaughtered there. A pre-positioned bomb planted at the Baghdad's doctors' convention killed no one, because days earlier I had successfully fought to have the meeting location moved to a building inside the Green Zone, secured by a company of the 82nd Airborne.

ONE LIFE TOUCHES MANY, PROVIDING IT SURVIVES IN THE FIRST PLACE

Like George Bailey in "It's A Wonderful Life," (Liberty Films, 1946) one life touches many in unexpected ways. Mine was just one life. As covered in my "In Search of Accountability," destruction of dedicated soldiers will result in critical human assets being unavailable when later needed.

I fought against sexual harassment and abuse of authority on three fronts: inside a dysfunctional Cadet Command environment; against senior Army leadership while my more immediate commanders were nipping at my heels; and on behalf of the soldiers of my six commands. I know success can be achieved. The fighting against denial and cover-ups by senior Army leadership has been won. The E Ring of the Pentagon got the message a generation ago. Generals like Cody and Odierno rose to the top and became the champions of that fight. The Pentagon's continuing willingness to take down general grade officers comes as proof the success of that fight remains solid.

What is now having to be fought again is the rebuilding of Frank Serpico's environment where the dishonest fear the honest, and not the other way around. Hackworth was right when he stated the only lives you can be guaranteed to positively effect on a continual and permanent basis are those of the people assigned to your commands. Troops at all levels need to understand what is unacceptable. Innocent troops need to know they have a champion at local command levels willing to fight for them and for their dignity.

Announcing "kill zones" was definitely politically incorrect, especially considering I was doing it in the 1990s. That stated, good troops never had a problem

with those zones. To them I was announcing zones in which they knew they would be protected. It wasn't the announcing of the "kill zones" that brought an end to sexual harassment and other problems in my commands – it was enforcement. Changing the mindsets of problematic people produces rare achievements. Behavior modification is much more achievable. When a command's behavior changes long enough, the entire command climate will then change – all the way up the ranks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgement must start with the bravery of each person subjected to sexual harassment and abuse of authority who takes a stand against the perpetrator(s). These warriors for justice prove themselves to be the heroes and not defeated victims in their own lives. Their fights are twofold. The first is against their tormentor(s) and the second against a system in which people in authority are not always prone to do the harder right over the easier wrong.

Acknowledgement is also warranted to Major General Robert Shadley who could have tried to cover-up the sexual misconduct when it was discovered in his command at Aberdeen. Instead, being a professional leader dedicated to the principles of duty, honor, and country he immediately opened up an investigation and brought in the Army's Criminal Investigation Command.

Special acknowledgement is rendered to my mentor and best friend Colonel David Hackworth. Having in 1971 blown the whistle on the failing Vietnam strategy, Hackworth suffered the consequences of his convictions. Hackworth stayed the fight as did Colonel John Pitchford. Without their involvement, the Army's top sergeant and the Army's Deputy Inspector General would never have been court-martialed.

There were other heroes not mentioned in this document, but the number of all soldiers combined who aggressively fought for justice in the late 1990s only add up to a small fraction within a single percentage point. Yet their uncoordinated and simultaneous efforts came together at the right time to force reform within a broken system.

The success they achieved should not be lost. As stated at the beginning of this report, "Warriors despise having to pay for the same real estate twice."

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Colonel Wesley Martin retired from active duty in 2010. During his rise from private to colonel he accumulated over ten years of command time, including two battalions, one group, and one base. During his two combat tours he served as the senior Antiterrorism/Force Protection Officer for all coalition forces in Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom 1 and 2, as Senior Operations Officer for Task Force 134 (Detention Operations), and as Commander of Forward Operating Base Ashraf (working with the Iranian Mujahedin). During his three Pentagon tours of duty he served as Force Protection Assessment Team Chief, Army Operations Center Crisis Action Team Chief, and Department of Army Information Operations Chief. Colonel Martin completed his military service as the U.S. Forces Korea (USFK) Information Operations Chief. As the Antiterrorism Officer in Iraq, Colonel Martin's lead from the front/on ground style of leadership resulted in blocking Al Qaeda from killing the moderate Shia Grand Ayatollah Sistani and blowing up the Baghdad doctors' convention. He also prevented the theft of over one thousand Cobalt 60 radioactive sources and an attack on the Baghdad trade fair. As the USFK Information Operations Chief, Colonel Martin developed the Computer

Network Operations oversight program that became the template for all U.S. Department of Defense major commands. He is also a retired Member of Technical Staff at Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories. While at Sandia he came through the ranks as a member of the Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) force, Protective Force Lieutenant, Operations Security Program Manager, and served as Operations Chief of the Laboratory's Security Force. Colonel Martin earned his Bachelors' degree from Northeast Missouri State University (Law Enforcement and Corrections) and earned two Masters' Degrees (International Politics and International Business) from Webster University. He has testified numerous times before the U.S. Congress and parliaments of Canada, Great Britain, and European Union. Colonel Martin has scores of published articles focusing on leadership, military history, Europe, Middle-East, and Africa.

RECOMMENDED CITATION

Martin, Wesley. (2020). Combating sexual misconduct and abuse of authority in the United States Army: Same long fight. *Dignity: A Journal of Sexual Exploitation and Violence*. Vol. 5, Issue 1, Article 1. <http://doi.org/10.23860/dignity.2020.05.01.01>
Available at <http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/dignity/vol5/iss1/1>

REFERENCES

- Brook, Tom Vanden. (2016, August 24). New details show how “swinger” Army general’s doubt life cost him his career. *USA Today*.
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2016/08/24/new-details-show-how-swinger-army-generals-double-life-cost-him-his-career/89220810/>
- Brook, T.V (2018, February 16). Army strips star from general over flirty texts with wife of enlisted soldier. *USA Today*
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/02/16/army-strips-star-general-over-flirty-texts-wife-enlisted-soldier/343190002/>
- Chung, Connie (1998, April) The Business of Getting “The Get”: Nailing an Exclusive Interview in *Prime Time*. https://shorensteincenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/d28_chung.pdf?x78124
- “General demoted after affair.” (2016, December 16) General demoted after affair, “swinging” lifestyle revealed. *CBS News*. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/david-haight-army-major-general-demoted-after-affair-swinging-lifestyle-revealed/>
- Graham, Bradley (1997, February 11) Sgt. major suspended in harassment case. *The Washington Post*
https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1997/02/11/sgt-major-suspended-in-harassment-case/fdfbb512-9d18-4944-b056-784381f28476/?utm_term=.b198177ee676
- Gross, Jane (1998, March 14) Former Top Sergeant Is Acquitted of Sex Charges. *The New York Times*.
<https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/library/national/031498mckinney-verdict.html>
- Hackworth, Colonel David H., Sherman, Julie. (1989). *About face: The odyssey of an American warrior*. New York City, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hackworth, Colonel David H. (1996, January 22). Evaluations encourage corruption at all levels. *Army Times*.

- Hawkins, Kari (2019, February 11) Retired general speaks out on stopping sexual abuse in the workplace. *U.S Army*.
https://www.army.mil/article/217299/retired_general_speaks_out_on_stopping_sexual_abuse_in_the_workplace
- Hersh, Seymour M. (2004, May 10) Torture at Abu Ghraib. *The New Yorker*.
<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2004/05/10/torture-at-abu-ghraib>
- Judicial Proceedings Panel Remarks. (2015, July). *Protect Our Defenders*.
<https://www.protectourdefenders.com/judicial-proceedings-panel-remarks-from-major-general-robert-d-shadley-u-s-army-retired/>
- Leigh, I. & Lustgarten, L. (2011, January 18). Five volumes in Search of Accountability: *The Scott Report*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-2230.1996.tb02687.x>
- Marshall, S. L. A. (1947). Men against fire; the problem of battle command in future war. Oxford, England: *The Infantry Journal Press*
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1948-00880-000>
- Martin, Wesley. (1997, October 1). Plan on blowing the whistle, here's what you have to look forward to. *Defending America* (Electronic newsletter)
- Martin, Wesley. (1998, April 7). In search of accountability. *Defending America* (Electronic newsletter).
- Martin, Wesley. (1998, October 21). Don't give up the ship. *Defending America* (Electronic newsletter).
- "Misconduct by armed forces' general, admirals detailed in newly released files." (2014, January 27) *The Washington Post*.
<https://www.dailynews.com/2014/01/27/misconduct-by-armed-forces-generals-admirals-detailed-in-newly-released-files/>
- Montgomery, Nancy. (2018, February 18). Flirty messages with subordinate's wife lead to general officer's demotion, forced retirement. *Stars and Stripes*.
<https://www.stripes.com/news/europe/flirty-messages-with-subordinate-s-wife-lead-to-general-officer-s-demotion-forced-retirement-1.512403>
- Myers, Meghann (2017, June 23). Disgraced 2-star blames op tempo for inappropriate relationship with junior officer. *Army Times*.
<https://www.armytimes.com/news/your-army/2017/06/23/disgraced-2-star-blames-op-tempo-for-inappropriate-relationship-with-junior-officer/>
- Octavia Nasr (2009, May 21) Abu Ghraib photos provoked shock, then anger, for Arab. *CNN*.
<http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/05/21/iraq.abu.ghraib.impact/index.html>
- Pitchford. (1998, March 17) Letter to the editor. *USA Today*.
- Sawyer F. (1997, July 19.) Army sexual harassment: Brenda Hoster. Story No. ABCDCBA82774A-0. <http://www.aparchive.com/metadata/ARMY-SEXUAL-HARASSMENT/2f3298e893124ab3bb08c5f24d6c5062?query=brenda+hoster¤t=4&orderBy=Relevance&hits=9&referrer=search&search=%2fsearch%3fstartd%3d%26endd%3d%26allFilters%3dABC%2bNews%257C100487%253APartner%253APartner%26query%3dbrenda%2bhoster%26advsearchStartDateFilter%3d%26advsearchEndDateFilter%3d%26searchFilterHdSDFormat%3dAll%26searchFilterDigitized%3dAll%26searchFiltercolorFormat%3dAll%26searchFilteraspectratioFormat%3dAll&allFilters=ABC+News%7c100487%3aPartner%3aPartner&productType=IncludedProducts&page=1&b=6c5062>
- Shadley, Robert D. (2013). *The GAME, unraveling a military sex scandal*. Minnesota: Beaver Pond Press.

- Tan, Michelle (2017, February 9) Army demotes defence secretary's 3-star aide after scathing IG investigation. *Army Times* <https://www.armytimes.com/news/your-army/2017/02/09/army-demotes-former-defense-secretary-s-3-star-aide-after-scathing-ig-investigation/>
- Whitlock, Craig. (2017, June 22). Army busts another general for improper relationship with woman. *The Washington Post*.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/army-busts-another-general-for-improper-relationship-with-woman/2017/06/22/3cbccf42-5755-11e7-ba90-f5875b7d1876_story.html?utm_term=.75d4055ea6fb
- Whitlock, Craig (2017, August 25). In rare spectacle, Army court-martials a retired general. *The Washington Post*.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/in-rare-spectacle-army-court-martials-a-retired-general/2017/08/25/473fc440-89ac-11e7-a50f-e0d4e6ec070a_story.html?utm_term=.3dcdabb68d30
- Zoroya, Gregg (2014, March 20) General avoids jail time in case of involving affair with subordinate. *USA Today*.
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/03/20/sinclair-general-affair-subordinate-army-sexual-assault/6557033/>