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The military must assess how nine years of war and an era of persistent transparency have affected the understanding of what it means to be a professional soldier. According to Gen. Shinseki, the most important responsibility of an officer is to manage transitions. The military is currently going through a transition. Officers must preserve the military’s expert knowledge, commitment to continuing education, values, service, and apolitical stance.


No matter how seemingly innocuous, the comments of senior military officers who represent the organization, the institution, and the profession, could have significant (and unintended negative) consequences. Senior leaders are strategic communicators whose words and actions count. Comments by leaders set the tone and the climate within organizations—for good and for bad—and they are never neutral. Gen. McKiernan was relieved as the commander in Afghanistan because he did not build trust with civilian leaders. Gen. McChrystal was relieved as the commander in Afghanistan because he operated outside of policy and publicly spoke negatively of the president. Both disregarded civilian control of the military.


Protracted conflicts corrode the values of popular government and the code of military conduct that honors the principle of civilian control while keeping the officer corps free from the taint of politics. American citizens need to reclaim ownership of the military by insisting that Washington abandon its *de facto* policy of perpetual war. Alternatively, the United States must become a nation truly at war in terms of civic obligation, fiscal policies, and domestic priorities. One of these two courses of action must be chosen or else disrespect for civilian control will continue to be shown by officers, as in the Gen. McChrystal case.

The Constitution asserts the principle of civilian control and attempts to secure that principle by distributing responsibility for military affairs between the states and the national government and within the federal government between the Congress and the Executive branch. The civil-military relationship that evolved during the first century and a half of American history should be seen as a bargain or contract. U.S. culture sees the military life as inherently different from civilian life. Acknowledging this difference is the key to stable civil-military relations.

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA517944

“Both the trends in the U.S. political military environment and the lack of an operative distinction between policy and strategy demand a more rigorous definition of military professionalism for the Long War. Senior military leaders should respond more forcefully in private in how they shape foreign policy while avoiding either criticism or advocacy in public. They should build cultures and institutions which can supply superb expertise and background ranging from the purely military to civil-military operations and be accepting of whichever roles civilian authorities demand. Finally, they resign more often in the face of poor policy decisions and attempts at scapegoating by civilian leaders. These normative tests of military professionalism remain rooted in that deep personal vow taken by every commissioned officer—the Oath of Office.”


Ethical leadership is the bedrock for success in the military. Courage and competence win battles, but character wins wars. The military can never lose sight of that.

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA519853

Successful senior leaders possess certain character traits, professional knowledge, and experience that distinguish them from other leaders. Senior leaders deal in the upper levels of leadership and the outer edges of situations—the gray areas. The environment in
which a strategic leader operates will consist of diverse actors, hybrid threats, unpredictable indigenous partners, global media, and interagency partners. To be successful, leaders should have the boldness, vision, creativity, and mental agility to make critical decisions based on information received from those upper levels and gathered from gray areas. Academic education, self-education, and personal experience opportunities provides superior education that broadens senior leaders’ perspective and prepares them to meet future challenges. The main purpose of this education should be to develop future strategic leaders and critical thinkers.


A 1999 survey found that the majority of military officers were Republicans, which many people viewed as a departure from political neutrality and the professional military ethic. Betros argues that nothing in the military voting patterns suggests that casting a ballot undermines responsibility or officer professionalism. Any decline in professionalism is more likely due to the officer corps losing its focus on fighting and winning the nation’s wars. Officers must understand the political system to more effectively provide military advice and protect the interests of the profession. Exercising their right to vote is a logical extension of that awareness.


Effective national defense requires social, political, and military harmony, but harmony is unlikely unless civilian and military leaders base their thinking and action on common concepts. In liberal democracies, the basic concepts that underpin civil-military relations are those few essential ideas that define such democracies in the first place.


The Republicanization of the military over the last 30 years has had distorting effects on public debates about national security, making it almost impossible to question Republican national security policies without being labeled “anti-military.” The inability to question policy threatens democratic ideals of civilian control. The trend towards Republicanization has been reversing since 2004, and the military is becoming non-partisan again.
To respond effectively to complex challenges, the U.S. military must develop and maintain a high degree of adaptability within the officer corps. Twenty-first-century military officers must learn and embody enduring principles of warfare and leadership, but the teaching and training of officers must also change to meet the contemporary demands and opportunities they are likely to face. In addition to demonstrating a high degree of proficiency in conventional warfare, officers must also develop a broader knowledge of politics, economics, and the use of information in modern warfare to cope with a more complicated and rapidly evolving international environment. Emerging strategic trends and threats also highlight the importance of some new attributes and career development options. This will require rethinking the balance between the need for specialists and generalists at different ranks and the specific responsibilities and requirements of generals, field-grade officers, and company-grade officers. Service leadership must determine the proper balance between deep expertise in one small subset of requirements of officership and the broader strategic perspective that is necessary for senior leadership of a branch or service. [Executive Summary Extract]

The character of warfare may change but the nature of the duty of the Army will not. The Army fights to protect the Constitution and thereby the rights of the citizen. As a professional army, we have an obligation to maintain our professional ethic by taking control of our codes and culture and the self-regulation of our members to ensure we satisfy our duty. We do this by ensuring how we fight is faithful to why we fight. We own our profession by fulfilling both our profession’s duty and its ethic.”

The Army is an American Profession of Arms, a vocation comprised of experts certified in the ethical application of land combat power, serving under civilian authority, entrusted to defend the Constitution and the rights and interests of the American people. An American Professional Soldier is an expert, a volunteer certified in the Profession of
Arms, bonded with comrades in a shared identity and culture of sacrifice and service to the Nation and the Constitution, who adheres to the highest ethical standards and is a steward of the future of the profession.

**Center for Army Profession and Ethics. U.S. Army Combined Arms Center Information Paper on American Civil-Military Relations, 1-4.**

Military officers swear an oath to defend the Constitution rather than commit allegiance to a sovereign. As a servant to the nation, the military must be subordinate to duly elected government officials. Through all the military does, it must aim to strengthen its bonds with the civilian leadership as well as the American public.

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/03/AR2011010303444.html?hpid=opinionsbox1](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/03/AR2011010303444.html?hpid=opinionsbox1)

The all-volunteer military has enabled America to fight two wars while many of its citizens do not know of a single fatality or even of anyone who has fought overseas. This is a military conscripted by culture and class - induced, not coerced, indoctrinated in all the proper cliches about serving one's country, honored and romanticized by those of us who would not, for a moment, think of doing the same. A couple of things are wrong with this picture. First, this distant Army enables us to fight wars about which the general public is largely indifferent. Had there been a draft, the war in Iraq might never have been fought - or would have produced the civil protests of the Vietnam War era. The Iraq debacle was made possible by a professional military and by going into debt. George W. Bush didn't need your body or, in the short run, your money. Southerners would fight, and foreigners would buy the bonds. The other problem is that the military has become something of a priesthood. It is virtually worshipped for its admirable qualities while its less admirable ones are hardly mentioned or known. It has such standing that it is awfully hard for mere civilians - including the commander in chief - to question it.


Gen. Kevin P. Byrnes was relieved of his command following an investigation into accusations that he was involved in a consensual relationship with a female civilian. Adulterous affairs are prohibited under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Officers can be disciplined, demoted, or relieved from their post for such behavior.
http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2010/02/4419089/

Eliot Cohen wrote, “statesmen must actively and, if need be, relentlessly question their top generals on operational issues and defense management, challenging their responses and holding them accountable for results. Civil-military relations are thus an unequal dialogue with the civilian superior establishing the boundaries between executive authority and military expertise.” Officers should offer their advice to civilian leadership in private settings. Retired officers should not endorse political candidates because this behavior might unduly influence former subordinates or be interpreted as the views of the armed forces as a whole. The Joint Chiefs of Staff should consider issuing a code of conduct for retired military officers.

http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/21/world/asia/21captain.html?_r=1&emc=eta1

America’s front-line troops entrust their lives to junior officers. These officers, in their 20s and early 30s, do much more than lead soldiers into combat. They must be coaches and therapists one minute, diplomats and dignitaries the next. They are asked to comprehend the machinations of Afghan allies even as they parry the attacks of Taliban foes. The Army each year faces an exodus of captains from the service. Burnout, second-guessing by superior officers, and the prospect of dull administrative jobs after deployment are often cited as reasons.


Then Maj. Dempsey believes that Duty is the essential value of the military profession. He finds the definition of Duty in FM 100-1 to be inadequate and proposes a definition of Duty based on these five imperatives: defense of the United State, support of the government in the performance of its constitutional duties, dedication to the military profession, selflessness, and courage. He calls for an emphasis on Duty in education.


Rapid technological advancements are making the security environment more competitive and placing a greater premium on leaders who can adapt. U.S. enemies have decentralized and used commercial technology to empower their networks. Officers must
now be capable of conducting full spectrum operations in wide area security missions and combined arms maneuver missions. Projections should be grounded, and situations should be developed through action. The command and control warfighting function should be redefined and reintroduced as mission command. New cognitive and developmental tools are needed to understand problems before seeking answers.


“The proper balance would give civilian leaders authority over political decisions and the military wide leeway in making the operational and tactical decisions about how to complete a mission. The line between the two realms is not always perfectly clear, and sometimes military considerations affect political decisions, and vice versa. Whenever the civil-military balance is off-kilter in either direction, the country suffers as a result.”


The authors propose changing military culture to promote character-based development. The think this can be done by following John Kotter’s eight steps in changing an organization’s culture: 1. establish a sense of urgency, 2. create a guiding coalition, 3. develop a vision and strategy to integrate character and competence, 4. communicate the change vision using senior leaders, 5. empower broad-based action by removing barriers to change, 6. generate short-term wins by integrating character education into the curriculums, 7. consolidate gains and produce more change, and 8. anchor new approaches in the culture by challenging others in the organization to talk about the change.


Leader development is one of the most important responsibilities of the United States Army. After more than eight years in combat, the Army has predictably come to rely too heavily on operational experience as the predominate driver of leader development at the expense of formal education and self development. Self-development is an area that has typically been under-emphasized in the past, yet is becoming increasingly important to prepare leaders to win in the operational environment of the future. This paper examines the current leader development doctrine, and makes recommendations on how to improve the self-development learning domain to meet the demands of the future. This aim can be
accomplished by applying appropriate leadership—that is, purpose, direction, and motivation in the self-development domain by enacting the recommendations outlined in this paper. Taken all together, enacting this host of proposals will successfully strengthen the organizational culture of leader development, and better prepare the Army to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.


Political correctness can greatly undermine civil-military relations because it replaces sound, apolitical judgment with opportunistic and often self-serving pandering to popular fashion. Apolitical candor is always appropriate in the private councils of government. However, candor often should not be expressed publicly.


A nation's structure and culture of civil-military relations are important and largely overlooked factors in explaining the performance of armed forces involved in complex expeditionary operations. The U.S. model of “Huntingtonian,” with its divided civil-military structures and poor interagency cooperation, makes the US military less suited for complex expeditionary operations. British civil-military relations involve a Defence Ministry that conscientiously integrates military and civilian personnel, as well as extensive interagency cooperation and coordination. This “Janowitzean” integrated form of civil-military relations makes the British military more likely to provide for the planning and implementation of comprehensive campaigns that employ and coordinate all instruments of power available to the state, as well as troops in the field displaying the flexibility and cultural and political understanding that are necessary in complex expeditionary operations.


A compilation of articles addressing professional military ethics, leadership, and the morality of counterinsurgency operations.
The Army should reevaluate whether it can afford to continue calling its Soldiers *warriors*. The dissonance implied by “warriors” can produce conflicting psychologies. History and literature have attached a stigma to the word “warrior.” The idea of creating “information warriors” is self-defeating. The Army is full of great Soldiers, not literal warriors, and their mission is to protect, not destroy.


Gibbons recommends that the military community should continue to reinforce honor codes in military schools and service academies. Also, the military community should continue to emphasize military core values in military schools and in the military workplace. Finally, formal ethical training should be a part of the curriculum in war colleges and senior enlisted schools.


Civil-military relations are vital to the nation writ large. The military must remain apolitical, and professional advice should be given privately to civilian leaders. Military accountability must be maintained.


Military forces face increasing challenges in an increasingly complex world. The potential for state on state hostilities has diminished but not disappeared, while the spectrum of conflict has extended to encompass many other actors with a bewildering range of aims, motives and means. These challenges require that the education and development of military leaders evolves to match them. To the fundamental skills of battle management and combat must be added cultural awareness and historical knowledge, as well as a firm foundation of ethical understanding. Leaders must be able to lead, but they must also be ready to liaise, persuade and cooperate, however alien the protagonist or strange the environment. This alone will require personal skills and self
awareness qualities of a high order. The ability to discriminate and judge the quality and accuracy of information will be vital, as will the effective management of command and control systems, both upwards and downwards. Above all, military leaders must be able to lead as effectively as any in the past, inspiring their subordinates to excel and sustaining them through any setbacks, however severe.


Three steps must be taken to advance the military profession’s moral development. First, the military must generate a simple, inspirational approximation of the professional military ethic that is easily remembered and understood. Second, the military must generate a longer, more in-depth exploration of this ethic that provides the rationale for the principles included in the shorter version. This should explain the principles more fully and help our profession determine the kinds of actions the principles indicate and the way to apply them. Third, the military must reinforce the professional military ethic in all aspects of military service, including garrison operations, field training, and deployments.


President Obama stated that Gen. McChrystal’s negative comments about superiors, including the president, did not meet the standard that should be set by a commanding general and undermined civilian control of the military. Col. Moten said that the military should be an apolitical instrument of the state. At Fort Leavenworth, Army instructors are re-writing training manuals, everything from ethics to how a senior officer can offer policy advice without being seen as disloyal. The military plays a major role in the political process. Adm. Mullen encouraged officers to give their advice to policymakers privately, which might not always be possible, given that Congress can call service member to testify in open hearings.


There is a growing rift between junior officers and generals in the U.S. Army. Junior officers are losing faith in the civilian leadership and questioning U.S. strategies in Iraq. The generals support the decisions of civilian leaders and will not listen to dissent among
junior officers. Generals say that junior officer do not know what it is like to be a senior officer so they cannot judge the decisions of their leadership.


By studying the key documents and events in America’s history, military officers can gain better insight into their oath of office and the moral implications of their actions. Junior officers should focus on how to well and faithfully discharge the duties of their office. For senior officers, the oath should carry even greater significance as they use a more indirect style of leadership to instill in their followers the service’s core values. Officers must develop the skills to make the appropriate leadership decisions when guidance may be vague on how best to support and defend the Constitution. They must take the time to identify capabilities for addressing the entire spectrum of conflict and wrestle with ways of resolving conflicting priorities in coalition warfare. Individuals at all levels must focus on the needs of the nation rather than on the desires of their services. Finally, officers must embrace the moral foundation symbolized in the phrase *so help me God* since it is the heart and soul of the success of future generations of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.


Kohn predicts that four problems will intensify the friction inherent in civil-military relations: 1. the endgame in Iraq, 2. unsustainable military budgets, 3. the mismatch between twenty-first century threats and a Cold War military establishment, and 4. social issues, such as allowing homosexuals to serve openly.


The slide towards partisanship signifies a serious erosion of military professionalism. Since Vietnam, many officers have conflated the role of advice with advocacy, not just in private but publicly, and not only for service or professional needs but for policy outcomes to their likening. Partisanship suggests that this generation may not be content merely to advise the government.

The Supreme Court ruling on the *Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights, Inc.* opened university campuses to military recruiters. Universities cannot accept federal Education or Health and Human Services Department funding while restricting military recruitment on campus. The military should take advantage of the high human capital available at universities and increase recruiting efforts.


In the nine years since the U.S. military defeated the Taliban in Afghanistan, the Army has examined and questioned almost every aspect of its operations in order to adapt and improve its ability to fight a counterinsurgency. In this period, the Army has published numerous revisions to doctrine and tactics, and has adjusted Professional Military Education in order to improve battlefield success. Although the Army has continuously adjusted how it fights, one area that has not seen significant change is its ethical training program. The Army has issued no top-down guidance for improving ethical training and education programs. This leaves leaders at the small-unit level to act on their own to address the ethical challenges of the COIN environment. A bottom-up leader emphasis on ethical development is not only necessary, it will be far more responsive to units as leaders are able to share tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs) for addressing ethical challenges, and it can help shape Army-wide ethical programs.


“The record is clear: The US military was anything but politically neutral throughout much of its history; its leaders were not always willingly subordinate to civilian authority; and they did not often agree to an unwritten standard of behavior. Rather, there was in essence a “permeable membrane” between the military and political spheres that allowed men to pass back and forth between the two as it suited their purpose—and the purpose of the political parties and even the nation.”
Marcel Bigeard, who died on June 18 at the age of 94, was a paragon of a new type of professional warrior that arose during the Cold War. For while the United States and the Soviet Union (and their many allies) built large-scale militaries for an eventual hot war, what came instead were proxy wars in places like Vietnam and the Congo. These did not require the technology-laden and discipline-heavy units prepared to fight in the Fulda Gap, but instead small, mobile units of soldiers dedicated to an intense operational tempo. And they required resourceful officers, able to adapt the methods of guerrillas and willing to lead by example. Bigeard, who rose from the ranks to four-star general, was such a soldier: emphasizing physical fitness and endurance, preferring to live rough with his men, and a master of the topography of battlegrounds. He refused to carry a weapon into combat, feeling his job was to lead not to fight. (In the U.S. Army, men like Charlie Beckwith, the founder of Delta Force, and Richard Meadows, leader of the Son Tay Raiders, had similar careers and maintain similar legends.)


When faced with a moral dilemma, the military officer not only has grounds for dissent, but also, if his code of ethics and oath of office so guide, has a duty to disobey. He is obligated to exercise moral autonomy, and in so doing, must use his professional ethics to guide him down a path that is by no means clearly defined. Just as civilian leaders have an obligation to challenge military leaders if the latter appear to be pursuing a strategy that undermines policy, military leaders are committed to challenge their civilian masters if the policy appears to be unconstitutional, immoral, or otherwise detrimental to the military institution. Civilian control of the military does not obviate this obligation and should not be viewed simply as a unilateral and hierarchical relationship with clear boundaries. This is especially important now in this era of complex operations that blur the boundaries between military strategy and policy.


The professionalism of a military force should be judged based on objective control, military doctrines, force design, relationship with other national institutions, technical expertise, level of education and training personnel receive, relationship with the civil population, voluntary service, institutional ethos, internal reciprocal relationships, and the standards of military ethics. NATO and the EU should strive to raise professional military standards.
The Army officer corps has both a need and an opportunity to better define itself as a profession, forthrightly to articulate its professional ethic, and clearly to codify what it means to be a military professional. The stresses of war on the force and their likely continuation in a long period of conflict present both an opportunity and a requirement to define the Army’s ethical standards clearly. The Army must reform itself as it fights. The essence of the professional ethic needs no radical change. Yet the ethic has never been clearly and succinctly codified.

Adm. Mullen emphasizes that military activities must support rather than lead foreign policy. The ongoing wars have proven that the military serves best when it is a part of an approach that employs all elements of national power. He states that by operating with allies and partners, supporting the interagency process, and working outside organizations, the military will provide the United States with the security that the Constitution guarantees.

“Our professionalism must remain beyond reproach. The American people, and their political leadership, closely scrutinize our conduct, and rightly so. Respect for them – and for our oath, demands that we continue to remain an apolitical instrument of the state. That means being apolitical in our acts and in our words, whether outside the wardroom, on the flightline, within the barracks, or in the halls of the Pentagon. Over nine years of close quarter combat has changed many aspects of what we do. It must not change who or what we are as a professional, disciplined force.”

New command and control arrangements must be within the Navy to provide situational awareness, reduce time, tighten decision loops, and ensure agility in responding to changing circumstances. Acceptance of more risk and the rearrangement of accountability may be necessary to meet these new requirements. The Navy must
pursue the operational, watchstanding, and administrative shipboard organizations that will allow the force to outthink, outmaneuver, and outfight a cunning adversary.

Mullen, Michael G. “Grove City College Commencement Speech.” U.S. Navy Website (May, 20, 2006).

“In my profession we seek leaders of character. Character that inspires trust and confidence that people can follow on the darkest night. Character which keeps you on course no matter what winds or waves try to push you towards dishonesty and doubt. It means driving yourself—setting high standards first for yourself then for others. It means doing your best and doing the right thing. It means doing it every time—no matter who is watching and who isn’t. It is that type of character that I see in America’s sailors today as I visit them across the globe.”


The U.S. military is ready to accept whoever the American people elect as president to be the commander in chief, regardless of that person’s demographics. Civilian control of the military must be maintained. Retired officers are free to express their views and to align themselves with politicians. However, Adm. Mullen does worry that these views get construed as the beliefs of the military as a whole.

https://digitalndulibrary.ndu.edu/u?/ndupress,20483

“What the Nation expects is that military personnel will, in the execution of the mission assigned to them, put aside their partisan leanings. Political opinions have no place in cockpit or camp or conference rooms. We do not wear our politics on our sleeves. Part of the deal we made when we joined up was to willingly subordinate our individual interests to the greater good of protecting vital national interests.”


“Integrity is being truthful to yourself—morally and ethically. It is a character and credibility issue. Responsibility is at the crux of the military profession because it boils down to a commitment to take care of your people. Successful officers understand their
sailors’ needs, both professionally and personally; they make sure expectations are clearly understood while fulfilling or exceeding the expectations of their sailors.” Leaders must also take the initiative, establish goals, and remain flexible.


“Leadership: Everything starts and ends with leadership. Nothing else we accomplish, no other priority we pursue, is of much consequence if we do not have sound and effective leadership in place to enact it. We all have a responsibility to develop our own leadership potential and that of the sailors in our charge. Accountability and Integrity: Wherever we go, whatever we do, we represent the ideals and the people of this nation. We must hold ourselves accountable to high standards and comport ourselves with the integrity and honor befitting the service. Alignment: Alignment is the degree to which resources, processes, and communications support our vision and mission. A properly aligned organization can accomplish anything it attempts. Every sailor should share and understanding of our vision and mission and be able to describe how he or she contributes to them.”


Adm. Mullen states that the military should remain a neutral instrument of national power. He then says officers should remain apolitical when they retire. He quotes Samuel Huntington, saying, “A political officer corps, rent with faction, subordinated to ulterior ends, lacking prestige but sensitive to the appeals of popularity, would endanger the security of the state. A strong, integrated, highly professional officer corps, on the other hand, immune to politics and respected for its military character, would be a steadying balance wheel in the conduct of policy.”

Mullen, Michael G. “Landon Lecture Series Remarks.” Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS (Mar. 3, 2010).

Adm. Mullen argues first that U.S. foreign policy is too dependent on the military. He states that more emphasis should be placed on soft power. He thinks the military should only become involved if other instruments of national power and allied forces are also ready to engage. Second, he advocates for applying force in a precise and principled way, which aims to protect civilians while degrading the influence of the enemy. Third, he states that policy and strategy should constantly struggle against one another to ensure that military strategy will be challenged and change as operations evolve.

Chief of Staff Ronald Fogleman resigned because he disagreed with the policies of the administration. Resigning illustrates military deference to its civilian masters. Gen. Fogleman had privately offered his advice to civilian officials and opted to leave when he felt that he could not carry out the decisions of his civilian superiors.


“Our nation will rely on new young military leaders to do as they have done in the past—to defend our nation here and abroad, to conduct themselves honorably with or without specific guidelines, and to enable our nation to survive in some of the most challenging times we have faced. Our military personnel have had to become more than soldiers. Now they are our diplomats, our peacekeepers, our nation builders as well. There is much to do and no blueprint for doing it.”


http://www.the-american-interest.com/ai2/article.cfm?Id=290&MId=14

Civilian graduate school is valuable for officers for six reasons. First, it takes officers out of their intellectual comfort zones. Second, it exposes them to different views and opinions. Third, school provides officers with skills and knowledge that they can use in their careers. Fourth, it helps officers refine their communication skills. Fifth, it improves officers’ critical thinking skills. Sixth, school imparts a degree of intellectual humility.


http://www.the-american-interest.com/ai2/article.cfm?Id=290&MId=14

To construct a useful military education system for the 21st century, the military would need to discard the current system and start afresh. Language skills must be emphasized. Advanced degrees should not be required for promotions. Intelligent generals are needed but intellectual generals should be feared because theory can be detrimental in such an active profession. Soldiers should also be instilled with the sense of duty to tell the truth to civilian leaders.
Dr. Pierce postulates that the ability of a professional organization to develop future leaders in a manner that perpetuates readiness to cope with future environmental and internal uncertainty depends on organizational culture. He examines the degree of congruence between the Army’s organizational culture and the leadership and managerial skills of its officer corps senior leaders. At the macro level, the results of his research strongly suggest a significant lack of congruence between the U.S. Army’s organizational culture and the results of its professional development programs for its future strategic leaders. Dr. Pierce recommends that the leaders of the Army profession initiate an organizational culture change effort. Specifically, he recommends changes to the more informal aspects of the professional development program, such as the less-than-lifelong commitment to the Army profession, the “up-or-out” personnel policy, and the officer evaluation system which may be creating an underlying assumption that failure will not be tolerated regardless of the circumstances. In the current culture, senior leaders may be exercising an excessive degree of structured supervision which reinforces the culture of stability and control despite the formal education system which attempts to teach the opposite. Therefore, it is not surprising that junior professionals learn to distrust their senior leaders and to then subsequently perpetuate the cycle of over-control or depart the profession altogether.


“It may be concluded that an officer has the duty to be familiar with the Constitution to which he has sworn fidelity, for his first allegiance is to the Constitution. A commissioned officer of the Armed Forces of the United States, like his civilian counterpart, is accountable to the law as it is judicially determined to be notwithstanding his standard of ‘implicit obedience.’ Furthermore, officers of the Armed Forces of the United States must act in compliance with the directives of competent authorities. Finally, it is incumbent upon the command structure of the United States Armed Forces to provide information to its officers to keep them well informed on constitutional matters and to provide fresh, rigorous, and imaginative courses of instruction on the meaning of an officer's oath during all phases of career schooling. National preservation will be sustained by adherence to the principles of the Constitution which time has proven to be equal to the changing stresses that have affected our nation.”
The oath military officers take is to the Constitution and to the agencies and offices it has created, not to any individual. The oath of the civil authorities is essentially the same. The moral and ethical codes of society and government require more scrutiny. The erosion of the public’s confidence in the president and his advisors must be halted and reversed.


The Army’s understanding of professional responsibility includes the essential concept of mutual obligations, moral duties that exist reciprocally between leaders and those they lead. Empowering Soldiers with discretionary judgment is one of those fundamental obligations which Army leaders owe to their Soldiers. Fulfilling that leadership responsibility is essential for maintaining the welfare of the individual Soldier, ensuring the highest quality of mission accomplishment, and strengthening the resiliency of the force in the present environment of persistent conflict. To be sure, it is a challenging responsibility. The Army might easily choose to forego it in the name of limited time and resources, but it would do so at great risk.


"We cannot tolerate actions which appear to condemn inappropriate conduct one moment, condone it the next, or even worse, reward it," General Fogleman said in a message to Air Force commanders on July 11. "Accountability is critically important. To do less will undermine good order and discipline of the force and destroy the trust of the American public." He later stated, “We are held to a higher standard by the public, and we are held in high regard by the public because of the integrity we demonstrated by holding ourselves accountable."


"Commanders are responsible for the actions and decisions they make," Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Shalikashvili said, "and where appropriate, they should be held accountable for actions and decisions that fall short of what we can reasonably expect of them. This is not something new or recently fashionable. It is the cornerstone of our profession."

The authors believe that civil-military relations could be more effective, and they offer recommendations for achieving this. They state that individual relationships are important. Trust should be built on transparency and clarity of roles. Military officers should remain apolitical, but civilian leaders should respect officers’ advisory role. Military dissent should not be tolerated, and retired officers should not engage in political activity that might undermine civil-military relations. Accountability in defense policy-making is critical.


Samuel Huntington’s work on military professionalism focused on active-duty commissioned officers. The authors suggest that senior noncommissioned officers, reserve commissioned and noncommissioned officers, civil servants, and civilian contractors be considered in discussions of military professionalism. They write that this expanded definition will increase the likelihood that the behavior of force will meet the professional standards to which it is held, and increase the effectiveness of the military.


Adm. Mullen argues that overwhelming force can be counterproductive when fighting a counterinsurgency. Collin Powell had previously set the following preconditions for implementing military force: force should be used only when vital national interests are at stake, when support from the public and its elected representatives is assured, and when overwhelming force is to be committed. Adm. Mullen suggests replacing the overwhelming force criteria with a new precondition: implementing force only when other instruments of national power are also ready to engage.


Ethics is the application of personal values to a professional situation requiring choice. The profession is not ethical—people are ethical; the profession does not adhere to values—people do. But people can make their profession the symbolic repository of their ethics and values.
http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA477064

“The professional ethic of the Army in the modern era has held that, in civil-military relations, the military is the servant of its Constitutionally-mandated civilian leaders, both those in the Executive branch and in the Congress. As Samuel Huntington noted, “loyalty and obedience” are the cardinal military virtues. This precept has remained embedded in the Army’s professional ethos to this day, especially for the strategic leaders of the Army Profession. An act of public dissent is to be exceptionally rare, undertaken only after the most careful analysis and determination of its absolute necessity.”

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA518901

Civilian control of the military is rooted in America’s traditional distrust of standing armies. The U.S. military identifies itself as an apolitical entity. DOD policy makers must be aware of the potential moral hazard in the gap of perceived ideological leanings within civilian and military spheres and how it may affect the perception of military advice in the policy arena. It is also vital that the DOD be proactive in this debate and continue to put forth scholarship and sponsor data collection in both military and civilian spheres to understand and counter the consequences of this potential moral hazard, which threatens to undermine the role of the military as key provider of defense expertise on policy matters.


The military needs a clear ethic that reflects the fundamental values of the nation and satisfies the unique needs of the professional soldier. This set of values must include loyalty to the institution, loyalty to the unit, personal responsibility, selfless service, competence, commitment, candor, and courage.


The basic function of the military is to be prepared to fight the nation’s wars and, if necessary, to conduct military operations in order to achieve political goals set forth by
the commander in chief. The essential tools of the military profession are doctrine, equipment requirements, organization, and training.


If Obama really is to marshal his generals (not to mention his allies), then he must have a policy which meets and channels operational effects. This is only one facet of the challenges that he confronts, and he will not be able to give his operational commanders clear and consistent guidance without significant opportunity costs—costs which will be borne in both regional and domestic politics. The McChrystal affair has brought these issues into sharp relief. Resolving the latter has not removed the pressures of the former. As Henry Kissinger observed of McChrystal’s dismissal, “America needs a strategy, not an alibi.”


“Actual or perceived partisanship is detrimental to the military profession because it can undermine its legitimacy. Legitimacy in this context is the trust citizens have that members of the military possess expert knowledge and will apply it effectively for the country’s benefit. A profession’s legitimacy erodes when the clients become skeptical of the profession’s expertise or believe that the profession pursues its own interests rather than those of the clients. Loss of trust in a profession for either reason may result in more societal control over the profession and ultimately the loss of professional status.” Endorsement of political candidates by retired officers and the public political affiliations of active duty officers has contributed to the erosion of military nonpartisanship.


This article is designed to lay out a framework for discussion of the limits of proper conduct by those who hold the President's commission, active and retired, and to answer the question: What is an Ethic of Officership?

Upon commissioning, officers take an oath “to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic” and to “well and faithfully discharge the duties” of an officer. An officer must have a complete knowledge of his own job, must be able to teach subordinates to do their jobs, must maintain physical fitness, must be reliable, must be ethical, must be concerned for the wellbeing of his men, and must be loyal. The ultimate measure of the professional worth of an officer is his ability to carry out difficult and dangerous tasks successfully at minimal cost in accordance with the decisions of his superiors.


The five key attributes of the army profession are: expertise, trust, development, values, and service. The five key attributes of an army professional are: skill, trust, leadership, character, and duty. Starting with these attributes, this paper attempts to answer the following questions. 1. What does it mean for the Army to be a Profession of Arms? 2. What does it mean to be a professional Soldier? 3. After nine years of war, how are Soldiers as individual professionals and as a profession meeting these aspirations?


Col. Truscott recalls an ethical struggle that he encountered during his service. Three guns went missing from his battalion. The options available to him seemed to reward dishonesty and severely punish honesty.


A perennial ethical issue for senior U.S. military officers lies in the tension between their responsibility to cultivate and offer professional military advice and their Constitutional subordination to civilian leaders who may or may not heed military advice. The Constitution clearly requires and expects that senior military leaders will give unvarnished and honest professional opinions to the Congress. The fear of dismissal should not deter honesty.

The U.S. military needs to subscribe to a single set of civil-military norms that regulate its participation in policymaking. To do this, the military must accept two key principles. First, there is a distinct difference in the responsibility and authority of military and civilian leaders, even though expert knowledge might overlap. Second, military service takes place within the context of a society with a particular set of political and social values and within a specific democratic political system with unique processes of civilian control.


“You military people have chosen to serve the Nation through service in the Armed Forces. The key word is “service.” You serve in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. You don’t work for them. The reason for your service is because “We the People” agreed to provide for our common defense. You serve the people, and you do it best by helping preserve the peace by preparing for war. The people of this Nation need to have confidence that you do not promote war. You don’t advocate war, but war is in fact your business and you are ready for it. Inseparable from the concept of service is the concept of integrity. The citizens of this great nation place great trust in their military services. They will continue to judge us by stricter rules that they apply to themselves. And they should do that because, ultimately, their security rests with us and the way we perform our duties.”


The increasing involvement of U.S. armed forces in operations other than war (OOTW) requires military personnel to adjust both cognitively and affectively to the military’s shifting strategic objectives. If recent trends hold, and the armed forces continue to be charged with peace operations, leadership training should foster the capacity of future officers to shift focus and adjust effectively between combat and noncombat roles.
Developing leaders through experience, formal training, and education is a long-standing hallmark of the U.S. Army. Maintaining its excellence as a developmental organization requires vigilance, however. Authorized strength and inventory mismatches, an inverse relationship between responsibility and formal developmental time, and sparse nonoperational development opportunities are serious challenges the Army must address. Doing so requires a talent development strategy firmly rooted in human capital theory. Such a strategy will recognize the value of continuing higher education, genuinely useful evaluations, and the signals associated with professional credentials.

Efficient talent employment is at the core of the Army Officer Human Capital Model, which is based on assessment, development, retention, and employment. However, the Army’s current employment paradigm is unequal to the needs of a professional volunteer Army facing the twin challenges of a competitive labor market and an increasingly complex global operating environment. It unduly prioritizes "fairness" when making assignments, has a narrowly defined pathway to senior leadership ranks, cannot see the talent it possesses, and suffers from severe principal-agent problems. Optimal employment theories, information age tools, and well-regulated market mechanisms can help the Army match individual officer talents against specific work requirements, reducing risk and achieving the depth and breadth of talent it needs, both now and in the future.

Warfare is the ultimate extension of conflict politics, and sadness is the present reality. Wouk expresses his sadness at the historic trap the world is in and the hope that mankind will yet find its way to the light.
American generals have failed to prepare U.S. armed forces for war and advise civilian authorities on the application of force to achieve the aims of policy. Generals have a responsibility to society to provide policymakers with a correct estimate of strategic probabilities. America’s generals in Vietnam and Iraq failed to perform this responsibility. Finally, remedying the crisis in American generalship requires the intervention of Congress.
Disagreeing with policies pre-decision and post-decision


Maj. Gen. Atkeson raises the question of whether or not officers during the Vietnam War should have saluted and followed orders from Washington or made a greater effort to persuade their superiors that the country was on a strategic course with no closure. Officers can use resignation as a trump card when they believe the President does not heed advice that they believe essential to success. The key elements in a decision to resign over a matter of policy or strategic concern are the importance of the matter and the clarity of the issue at stake. Once an officer has firmly established these essentials in his own mind, he must in good conscience carry through. By accepting flawed policy, an officer becomes party to the policy.


“Instead of military professionals offering disinterested advice to help policymakers render sound decisions, the history of this civilian-military relationship is one of conniving, double-dealing, and mutual manipulation. As generals increasingly played politics, they forfeited their identity as nonpartisan servants of the state. Presidents Harry Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy, each for different reasons, came to see the members of the Joint Chiefs as uniformed political adversaries.”


In 2007, Sergeant Liam Madden presented Congress with an “Appeal for Redress from the War in Iraq,” which called for the quick withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Iraq. This redress and the Generals’ Revolt both signal military discontent and military experimentation with lobbying. The now well-educated troops are more opinionated than past generations and expect their opinions to be heard.


Adm. Fallon stated that he did not lose his job because he publicly voiced his personal opinions against the administration’s policy but because confidence in the chain of
command was diminishing. Doubts in the chain of command pull attention away from the priority issues, so he resigned to reorient the focus of the military and the commander in chief back to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.


“Resigning over advice not taken, policy disagreements, or moral or ethical qualms undermines the relationship between military officials and their civilian superiors and destroys the professionalism of the U.S. armed forces.” Resigning is a form of disputing the judgment of civilian leaders and violates civilian control of the military. Officers cannot know all of the national and international considerations that go into policy decisions, so they are not informed enough to make a judgment. An officer who resigns abandons his or her troops and lowers overall military morale.

http://www.ndu.edu/press/breaking-ranks.html

When faced with a moral dilemma, the military officer not only has grounds for dissent, but also, if his code of ethics and oath of office so guide, has a duty to disobey. He is obligated to exercise moral autonomy, and in so doing, must use his professional ethics to guide him down a path that is by no means clearly defined. Just as civilian leaders have an obligation to challenge military leaders if the latter appear to be pursuing a strategy that undermines policy, military leaders are committed to challenge their civilian masters if the policy appears to be unconstitutional, immoral, or otherwise detrimental to the military institution. Civilian control of the military does not obviate this obligation and should not be viewed simply as a unilateral and hierarchical relationship with clear boundaries. This is especially important now in this era of complex operations that blur the boundaries between military strategy and policy.


Chief of Staff Ronald Fogleman resigned because he disagreed with the policies of the administration. Resigning illustrates military deference to its civilian masters. Gen. Fogleman had privately offered his advice to civilian officials and opted to leave when he felt that he could not carry out the decisions of his civilian superiors.
Adm. Fallon publicly undercut the Bush administration’s Iran policy by speaking to Al Jazeera and the *Financial Times*. As commander of CENTCOM, Adm. Fallon was charged with executing the administration’s policy. He defied civilian control of the military by actively working to undermine the policy. Before the policy decision was made, he could have privately conveyed his concerns to civilian policy makers, or Congress if necessary. Adm. Fallon stepped down; but had he not, President Bush likely would have fired him to restore civilian control of the military.


A perennial ethical issue for senior U.S. military officers lies in the tension between their responsibility to cultivate and offer professional military advice and their Constitutional subordination to civilian leaders who may or may not heed military advice. The Constitution clearly requires and expects that senior military leaders will give unvarnished and honest professional opinions to the Congress. The fear of dismissal should not deter honesty.


Some argue that officers have a moral responsibility to sway a policy debate by going public with their objections, leaking information to the media, or sabotaging policy decisions by deliberate foot-dragging. If the military is required to accept openly gay service members or to execute what it believes is a premature draw-down of troops from Afghanistan, open military dissent could force a corrosive military-civilian showdown damaging to both sides. By law and tradition, military officers are encouraged to debate ideas and offer their opinions before a decision is made, either by a more senior officer or by civilian authorities.
Voicing concerns publicly versus privately

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA530445

No matter how seemingly innocuous, the comments of senior military officers who represent the organization, the institution and the profession, could have significant (and unintended negative) consequences. Senior leaders are strategic communicators whose words and actions count. Comments by leaders set the tone and the climate within organizations—for good and for bad—and they are never neutral. Gen. McKiernan was relieved as the commander in Afghanistan because he did not build trust with civilian leaders. Gen. Mcrystal was relieved as the commander in Afghanistan because he operated outside of policy and publicly spoke negatively of the president. Both disregarded civilian control of the military.

http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,914937,00.html

In an interview with the *Washington Post*, Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub stated that Carter’s plan to gradually withdraw U.S. troops from Korea will encourage the North to launch a second invasion on the South. There was fear that such intense public criticism by an active duty officer could upset U.S. SALT negotiations with Russia because it could serve as an indicator that Carter was not in control of the military.


“Both the trends in the U.S. political military environment and the lack of an operative distinction between policy and strategy demand a more rigorous definition of military professionalism for the Long War. Senior military leaders should respond more forcefully in private in how they shape foreign policy while avoiding either criticism or advocacy in public. They should build cultures and institutions which can supply superb expertise and background ranging from the purely military to civil-military operations and be accepting of whichever roles civilian authorities demand. Finally, they resign more often in the face of poor policy decisions and attempts at scapegoating by civilian leaders. These normative tests of military professionalism remain rooted in that deep personal vow taken by every commissioned officer—the Oath of Office.”

33
Collins cites Eliot Cohen, who wrote that “statesmen must actively and, if need be, relentlessly question their top generals on operational issues and defense management, challenging their responses and holding them accountable for results. Civil-military relations are thus an unequal dialogue with the civilian superior establishing the boundaries between executive authority and military expertise.” Officers should offer their advice to civilian leadership in private settings. Retired officers should not endorse political candidates because this behavior might unduly influence former subordinates or be interpreted as the views of the armed forces as a whole. The Joint Chiefs of Staff should consider issuing a code of conduct for retired military officers.


When given a morally objectionable assignment, there are four ways in which officers can respond. First, stay quiet and hope for the best. Second, depart quietly. Third, depart with public protest to draw public attention to the situation. Fourth, quietly obey for as long as possible and then depart, walking a fine line between discreet silence and public protest. The context determines which option is the most appropriate.


“The current prohibition against contemptuous speech directed against the President is contained in Article 88 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). From its earliest days, this military prohibition has been a mechanism to ensure the foundational cornerstone of our Republic, that military power is subordinate to the authority of our civilian leadership. Additionally, like other punitive articles that criminalized disrespect and insubordination to military superiors, this provision of military law serves to enhance discipline and to protect the hierarchical system of rank within the military.”


Instinctive loyalty to, and respect for, the chain of command disinclines military professionals from airing disagreements. This is as it should be unless and until that
loyalty and respect becomes interpreted publicly as ideological agreement that contradicts their true professional judgment. Civilian control of the military does not mandate open support, or even silent acquiescence, to the partisan views of the military’s civilian masters.


Following Gen. McChrystal’s negative comments about the administration, which were published in *Rolling Stone*, the DOD directed attention towards Directive 5122.05, which was published in 2008. This Directive gives the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (ASD(PA)) the sole release authority for official DOD information to news media in Washington. The ASD(PA) will coordinate all media activities through appropriate public channels. This directive serves to limit the comments that active duty officers can make publicly.


Sec. Gates released a memo to DOD military and civilian employees reiterating preexisting guidance concerning how DOD employees should interact with the media. Gates notes that he has lost commanders in Afghanistan due to their missteps in dealing with the media and has had to reprimand others for speaking out inappropriately on sensitive foreign policy issues. He hopes that this reminder will improve how DOD communicates with the public through the media.


Adm. Mullen stated, “The military must remain apolitical and must always observe, indeed hold sacred, the principle of civilian control of the military. We execute policy. We do not make it or advocate for it. That said, I realize my role is advising policy as Chairman, but that advice is always private. And once the decision is made, we move out. That’s what our military does, and we do it well.”
Following a public statement criticizing Bush’s Panama strategy, Gen. Frederick F. Woerner was pressured to retire and was replaced by Gen. Maxwell R. Thurman as the commander of American Forces in Central America. Pentagon officials said Gen. Woerner had displeased Sec. Cheney and the National Security Council by criticizing the Administration's Panama policy in public. In a speech, Gen. Woerner publicly charged that the Bush Administration was not prepared to deal with Panama's political crisis because of a "policy vacuum" caused by the change of administrations.

President Obama stated that Gen. McChrystal’s negative comments about superiors, including the president, did not meet the standard that should be set by a commanding general and undermined civilian control of the military. Col. Moten said that the military should be an apolitical instrument of the state. At Fort Leavenworth, Army instructors are re-writing training manuals, everything from ethics to how a senior officer can offer policy advice without being seen as disloyal. The military plays a major role in the political process. Adm. Mullen encouraged officers to give their advice to policymakers privately, which might not always be possible, given that Congress can call service member to testify in open hearings.

Public remarks by active duty officers against the President have become more prevalent, often using the Internet as the medium of communication. The Uniformed Code of Military Justice allows senior level officers to go as far as court-marshalling servicemen for publicly criticizing the administration. When a commander does determine that certain speech or behavior is having a detrimental impact on unit discipline, readiness, and morale, the UCMJ provides plenty of tools to ensure that timely, fair, and appropriate discipline is administered in the best interests of justice. Discipline should be implemented more readily to counteract the rising public criticism of the president by active duty servicemen.

Gen. McChrystal and members of his staff reportedly spoke negatively about the administration to a Rolling Stone journalist. Several of the comments might have been considered grounds for court marshal if the individuals had been identified. In her blog, Kushlis states that active duty officers should not make public comments on political issues, and the military should be more careful to restrict access anti-war journalists have to the troops to limit the negative press.


Lt. Com. Terry Lakin has refused to follow military orders until the commander in chief, President Obama, releases his birth certificate, proving he is an American citizen and is eligible to be the president in accordance with the Constitution. LTC Lakin stated on his blog that he has been required to provide his birth certificate for jobs and that he will only take orders from a leader who has provided the same proof of citizenship.


President Obama relieved Gen. McChrystal of command of the war in Afghanistan after McChrystal publicly made negative comments about the Obama Administration. Sec. Gates encouraged civilian and military leaders to privately provide apolitical advice to the president, while maintaining respect for civilian control of the military. Public criticism of the administration by active duty officers could strain political-military relations and lead the public and enlisted military personnel to question the motives, strategies, and tactics of ongoing campaigns.


The Marine Corps punished an officer who wrote a newspaper column referring to President Clinton as an “adulterous liar.” This action was in line with Article 88 of the Uniform Code of Justice that prohibits service members from speaking “contemptuous words” about the president or other civilian leaders of the military.
“Uniformed officers have an obligation to stand up to civilian leaders if they think a policy is flawed. They must convey their concerns to civilian policy makers forcefully and truthfully. If they believe the door is closed to them at the Pentagon or the White House, they also have access to Congress. But the American tradition of civil-military relations requires that they not engage in public debate over matters of foreign policy, including the decision to go to war. Moreover, once a policy decision is made, soldiers are obligated to carry it out to the best of their ability, whether their advice is heeded or not. The idea that a general or admiral—including those on the retired list—should publicly attack government policy and its civilian authors, especially in time of war, is dangerous.”

Adm. Fallon publicly undercut the Bush administration’s Iran policy by speaking to Al Jazeera and the Financial Times. As commander of CENTCOM, Adm. Fallon was charged with executing the administration’s policy. He defied civilian control of the military but actively working to undermine the policy. Before the policy decision was made, he could have privately conveyed his concerns to civilian policy makers, or Congress if necessary. Adm. Fallon stepped down. Had he not, President Bush likely would have fired him to restore civilian control of the military.

Peters states that the greatest shortcoming of generals today is that they have failed in their duty to inform decision-makers as to what war means and requires. They should continue to give honest advice, even at the cost of their careers. Generals must shoulder part of the blame for the mistakes made in Iraq since they failed in their duty to offer professional advice.

Active duty Lt. Col. Paul Yingling published an article criticizing the officers leading the war in Iraq. He recommends overhauling the way generals are picked to get Congress more involved. He also states that the performance of senior generals should be reviewed by Congress when they retire and that Congress should reserve the right to retire them at a lower rank if their performance was inferior over the course of their service.
Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney dismissed Gen. Michael J. Dugan, the Air Force Chief of Staff, for publicly discussing Pentagon contingency plans for waging a war against Iraq, including specific targets for American Air Strikes. Sec. Cheney praised Gen. Dugan's 32-year military record, but said that "it's incumbent upon senior officials to be discreet and tactful in their public statements, and I found those qualities lacking" in Gen. Dugan's comments.

An Air Force inquiry has concluded that a Maj. Gen. Harold N. Campbell made disparaging remarks about President Clinton in a speech he delivered at a banquet. General Campbell's superior, Gen. Ronald W. Yates, the head of the Air Force Materiel Command, is expected to give Maj. Gen. Campbell one of two types of written reprimands: either a written reprimand or a more serious written rebuke that typically includes forfeiting pay. General Yates has ruled out a court-martial, although this would have been allowed, according to the UCMJ.

Sec. Gates issued a memo requiring Pentagon and military leaders to notify the office of the DOD’s assistant secretary for public affairs prior to interviews or any other means of media and public engagement with possible national or international implications. He demanded adherence to the law forbidding the release of classified information.

On 23 June 2010, President Obama relieved Gen. McChrystal of his command in Afghanistan. In the view of most commentators, the president had little choice. Had Obama failed to act, the norms of civil–military relations would have been overturned. As the president put it, the article had undermined “the civilian control of the military that’s at the core of our democratic system.” Gen. McChrystal had not set out to challenge that norm. His dignified response, and his refusal to try to justify or explain
away the remarks attributed to him, confirmed his disciplined acceptance of his own constitutional position. What he had done was something rather different: he and his colleagues had vented their frustration at the lack of clear political guidance within which McChrystal’s own operational concepts were to be placed. The operational level of war is the level of command situated between the tactical and the strategic, between the company or battalion commander in the field and the president in the White House. It is in the exercise of operational art that today’s senior generals, like McChrystal, hope to reach the acme of their professional careers. The bulk of the planning done by their staffs is devoted both to preparing for that opportunity and then to applying their skills in order to manage the characteristic chaos of war. But to do that, operational art needs direction; it requires of policy a degree of clarity and a consistency of purpose that can frequently be at odds with the realities and contingencies of politics.


Following the June 2010 *Rolling Stone* interview, Gen. Stanley McChrystal and his staff were not criticized for their lack of military competence, for their dissent over policy, or for failure to implement strategy. However, their professionalism—especially those professional competencies related to understanding the roles and responsibilities of the civilian political leadership in the context of democratic civil-military relations was found lacking. Furthermore, they exhibited a fundamental lack of understanding of American democratic institutions and the norms governing civil-military relations in a democracy, especially civil-military relations norms related to dealing with the media. A return to a foundational approach to officer development focused on constitutional foundations, developing civil-military competencies consistent with democratic principles that also contribute to strategic success, and a focused study of the profession at every stage of officer development will prevent the fall of future commanders who have been fully equipped to lead.


Some argue that officers have a moral responsibility to sway a policy debate by going public with their objections, leaking information to the media, or sabotaging policy decisions by deliberate foot-dragging. If the military is required to accept openly gay service members or to execute what it believes is a premature draw-down of troops from Afghanistan, open military dissent could force a corrosive military-civilian showdown damaging to both sides. By law and tradition, military officers are encouraged to debate ideas and offer their opinions before a decision is made, either by a more senior officer or by civilian authorities.
Since the creation of the all-volunteer military, the membership of the military has become more conservative. This has led to an overt affiliation with the Republican Party. As a profession that requires support from Congress and the American People and acts on the orders of the President, this affiliation may have adverse effects on the effectiveness of the U.S. military. The military needs to understand the cause of this underlying trend and determine if any action is required to try to change or mitigate this trend.

A recently survey on civil-military relations revealed that a large majority of military officers claim an affiliation with the Republican Party. The finding suggests that officers have violated their professional ethic by abandoning the tradition of political neutrality. This paper first examines the reasons for the Republican bias, which include the conservatism of the GOP vis-a-vis the Democratic Party and institutional changes within the military. Second, it assesses the effect of the Republican bias on officer professionalism. It argues that the officer corps’ voting preference does not constitute partisan activity and is not, by itself, harmful to professionalism and civil-military relations.

Military officers give up their right to participate actively in partisan politics when they take their oath as an officer. This is stated in the Officer’s Guide. If officers continue to align with the Republican Party, then the credibility of the military will be called into question every time there is a Democratic president or when the Democrats control Congress. This will decrease the government’s trust in the military and has the potential to negatively affect the decision-making process concerning U.S. national security.
Meilinger, Phillip S. “Soldiers and Politics: Exposing Some Myths.” *Parameters 40.2* (Summer 2010), 74-86. 

“The record is clear: The US military was anything but politically neutral throughout much of its history; its leaders were not always willingly subordinate to civilian authority; and they did not often agree to an unwritten standard of behavior. Rather, there was in essence a “permeable membrane” between the military and political spheres that allowed men to pass back and forth between the two as it suited their purpose—and the purpose of the political parties and even the nation.”

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA449308

This paper analyzes the impact of a culturally homogeneous group on strategic decision-making and policy recommendations. The United States’ military’s organizational climate has shifted steadily to the right since the Vietnam War. Today's Armed Forces are increasingly identified with conservative Christian and Republican values. This change in group dynamics can inhibit the decision-making process by preventing a thorough review of relevant courses of action, in accordance with the Rational Decision Model. The nature of in-groups and their influence on the decision process can have a deleterious effect on sound decision making, even if only inadvertently. Today's conservative voice has a strong influence on national policy decisions. This makes it imperative that strategic leaders understand the culture shift in today's military, as well as how group dynamics can limit creativity and proper analysis of alternatives. The failure to do so can cause a divergence of opinion between military and civilian leaders and thereby widen the gap in civil military relations.

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA434870

This article walks through the various laws regulating the role that active duty and retired military officers can play in politics and recommends changes.
Voicing Personal Opinions While in Uniform


No matter how seemingly innocuous, the comments of senior military officers who represent the organization, the institution, and the profession, could have significant (and unintended negative) consequences. Senior leaders are strategic communicators whose words and actions count. Comments by leaders set the tone and the climate within organizations—for good and for bad—and they are never neutral. Gen. McKiernan was relieved as the commander in Afghanistan because he did not build trust with civilian leaders. Gen. McChrystal was relieved as the commander in Afghanistan because he operated outside of policy and publicly spoke negatively of the president. Both disregarded civilian control of the military.


Lt. Gen. Boykin issued a statement through the Pentagon clarifying that he is not “anti-Islam” and apologized to those who had been offended. LTG Boykin said that he would stop giving such speeches and asked Sec. Rumsfeld to initiate an investigation into his conduct. Sec. Rumsfeld passed this responsibility on to the Inspector General.


Following Lt. Gen. Boykin’s speech that equated the war in Afghanistan to a religious war, the Interfaith Alliance appealed to President Bush to reprimand the general, and the Council on American-Islamic Relations demanded that LTG Boykin be reassigned. The Senate Armed Services Committee took action to examine the matter.


Sen. John Warner suggested that Sec. Rumsfeld should rethink his decision to leave LTG Boykin in his high position following comments equating the war in Afghanistan to a Christian religious struggle. Sec. Rumsfeld did not criticize LTG Boykin’s remarks until President Bush had done so. There is also concern that LTG Boykin used government resources to prepare for his talks.
LTG William G. Boykin linked the battle against Islamic militants to a struggle against Satan in front of audiences at evangelical gatherings. President Bush stated publicly that he disagreed with LTG Boykin’s comments and that Boykin’s comments were not the views of the U.S. government or military. LTG Boykin apologized for offending anyone but stated that he would not resign.

The Senate Armed Services Committee recommended that the Secretary of the Army take appropriate corrective action with respect to LTG Boykin’s negative remarks towards Muslims while in uniform. The committee cited LTG Boykin following Pentagon rules and talking to lawyer about the propriety of his speeches in advance as a mitigating factor.
RESPONDING TO A POSSIBLE CHANGE IN “DON’T ASK, DON’T TELL” STATUTE

A number of faculty members from the Service Academies and Military Universities released a statement after the second day of congressional hearings on the repeal of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ statute. They stated that the following unprecedented claims were made by the Chiefs testifying: (1) General Casey said that the premise of the 1993 “don’t ask, don’t tell” law is no longer correct, in that the presence of a gay service member in a unit no longer undermines cohesion. (2) General Amos said that concerns about retention and recruiting are unwarranted. (3) Several of the Chiefs confirmed that Chaplain attrition rates will be low, and that sponsoring denominations will continue to sponsor Chaplains subsequent to repeal. (4) Generals Amos and Casey said that the Pentagon Working Group was correct in declining to include a survey question as to whether or not the troops want “don’t ask, don’t tell” to be repealed.

The study group recommends that Congress repeal “don’t ask, don’t tell” and return authority for personnel policy to DOD; that DOD eliminate the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy but maintain authority to discipline misconduct that affects unit cohesion; that DOD change the language of all military directives to make them neutral with respect to sexual orientation; and that DOD establish safeguards for the confidentiality of all conversations between service members and chaplains, doctors, and mental health professionals.

The Southern Baptist Convention adopted a resolution condemning allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military. The Southern Baptists have more active-duty chaplains than any other denomination. Southern Baptist leaders have warned that their chaplains may have to leave the military if the statute is repealed.
Lt. Gen. Mixon wrote a letter to the editor stating that the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute should remain intact. Sec. Gates said that this letter was inappropriate, and Adm. Mullen suggested that Mixon should resign. DOD officials admitted that there is no clear guidance concerning who can publicly express views on the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy. Military personnel have first amendment rights but an officer urging others to action appears to be inappropriate. However, he did not violate an order.


Marine Corps Commandant General James Amos' said that the repeal of "don't ask, don't tell" could cause a "distraction" to troops and potentially endanger lives. Palm Center Director Dr. Aaron Belkin responded by saying, "Gen. Amos' statement on the impact of openly gay service embraces stereotypes over the evidence, plain and simple. Gen. Amos arrived at his conclusions by interpreting the Pentagon Working Group's report through the lens of personal bias. The report has conclusively demonstrated that the only rationale for retaining 'don't ask, don't tell' is prejudice. Amos is listening to troops who anticipate problems, yet ignoring those Marines who actually serve alongside gay troops and report that it is no big deal. Unfortunately, Gen. Amos has chosen not to talk with any of his foreign counterparts, for whom the evidence has shown openly gay service to be a non-event."


The homosexual discharge process was halted during the first Gulf War, and this did not undermine unit cohesion or readiness. Homosexuals can serve openly in 24 foreign militaries, and none of these countries have reported any negative impacts on effectiveness or quality. Polls have found that most U.S. service members are comfortable serving with homosexuals. “Don’t ask, don’t tell” should be repealed and replaced by a new policy that sets a single standard of conduct for all personnel, the benefits of which should be explained to active duty service members. Repeal should not be delayed to accommodate further studies, as this increases the chances of backlash.

Chaplains fear that they could be disciplined under the military’s nondiscrimination policy if they continue to preach against homosexuality after the repeal of ‘don’t ask, don’t tell.’ A group of retired chaplains wrote a letter to Obama and Gates urging them to uphold ‘don’t ask, don’t tell.’ They said they were speaking out because active chaplains could be accused of insubordination if they publicly oppose repealing ‘don't ask, don't tell.’


Brouwer examines the testimonies of over thirty military witnesses during four days of 1993 congressional hearings addressing the controversy over gays and lesbians serving openly in the United States military. Witnesses dispute two major topics: the "nature" of the military, and the "nature" of homosexuals. These topics parallel dual meanings of "corps" that structure this controversy-corps as a social body and corps as the flesh of physical bodies. Brouwer argues that the rhetorical strategies of incorporation and disincorporation function as indices of power, for these strategies are unequally available to the disputants and engender disparate rhetorical effects.


President Obama and gay rights groups are pushing to repeal the “don’t ask, don't tell” statute, but Congress is unwilling to move forward on this issue at the moment. The American public and the younger rank and file in the military largely support repealing the statue, but most senior officers are against taking action on it.


A study on the transition of foreign militaries to allowing openly homosexuals to serve concluded that a quick implementation of the change is not disruptive. Foreign militaries have not installed separate facilities for homosexual troops, and benefits for gay partners are normally in accordance with the country’s existing benefits for homosexuals.
Adm. Mullen supports the repeal of the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute. For the past five years, he has been working with a task group to study the effects that repealing the statute would have on the military and what can be done to make this a smooth transition should Congress choose to repeal it. Gen. Powell also supports repealing the law.

A survey of West Point cadets found that they were roughly split for and against openly gay service but that most did not feel strongly about their views. The cadet’s opinions were often shaped less by the military than by their own personal backgrounds.

An article published in Joint Force Quarterly said that there is no scientific evidence to support the claim that unit cohesion will be negatively affected if homosexuals serve openly. Elaine Donnelly, president of the conservative Center for Military Readiness, countered by equating homosexuals serving openly with having women in the military cohabitate with men.

This report summarizes the history of the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy and discharge rates based on homosexual behavior. It explores the effects that H.R. 1283, the Military Readiness Enhancement Act of 2009, and S. 3065, the Military Readiness Enhancement Act of 2010, would have on current policy if enacted.

Canada, Australia, and Great Britain all allow homosexuals to serve openly in the military, and studies have shown that this has not undermined unit cohesion. African Americans were successfully integrated into the U.S. military despite the initial backlash. Both of these facts indicated that the U.S. military would likely be able to adapt to successful integrate openly homosexual people in the military if the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute was repealed. Success integration will require time; a low-key approach; support from the leadership of all of the branches; a universal, comprehensive strategy; a planning committee that includes homosexual individuals; and a system to judge individuals on their own merit.


This three paragraph statements says that the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute should continue to be upheld because repeal would have negative impacts on morale, discipline, unit cohesion, and overall military readiness. It would also undermine recruiting and retention, affect leadership, and have adverse effects on the willingness of parents to allow their children to serve, ultimately breaking the all-volunteer force. This statement was signed by 1,163 retired flag and general officers. All of these signatures are on file at the Center of Military Readiness.


A Los Angeles-based denomination with a predominantly homosexual membership is pressing the Department of Defense to allow chaplains representing their denomination in all branches of the military. The church has applied to the Defense Department for recognition as a religious body, the first step toward assigning chaplains. Church leader, Perry, said homosexuals in the military need chaplains from the Metropolitan Fellowship to speak to their needs and that he is willing to take this case to the Supreme Court if necessary.
The controversy among religious leaders over the proposal to allow gays to serve in the military is discussed. Fundamentalists and conservative evangelicals have condemned the proposal, while liberal Jewish and mainline church leaders generally support it. Catholic leaders took different positions on the issue.


Marine Corps commandant Gen. James Amos said that allowing homosexuals to serve openly would create a distraction and undermine unit cohesion. Cohen suggests that the military will be able to contain and limit homosexual relationships in the same way that they do heterosexual relationships. Cohen states that Gen. Amos is not in a position to implement new policies since his subordinates know that he does not support allowing homosexuals to serve; and thus Gen. Amos would be undermining unit cohesion.


Adm. Mullen stated that he believed that asking people to lie about their sexual orientation is incompatible with the military’s focus on personal integrity. He thinks that society is leading the way and that the military should change its policies to allow openly homosexual individuals to serve. He claims to currently be focusing on ensuring that a repeal of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ statute will not affect readiness, unit cohesion, retention, or recruiting.


Maj. Dayhoff gives three recommendations to officers to quell concerns over the potential repeal of “don’t ask, don’t tell.” First, in order to affect effective implementation of policy change toward the inclusion of homosexuals, leadership at all levels must be active and involved in managing both the expectations of their heterosexual population and the inclusion of newly acknowledged homosexuals. Second, the adaptation of any policy or regulation in regards to sexual harassment must remain gender-neutral; harassment is harassment, and misconduct is misconduct—period. A way of accomplishing this aspect of implementing new Army policy is to adopt an agreed upon translation of the British Armed Forces’ “Guiding Principles,” which commanders
at all levels use concurrent to the implementation of a United States Army Service Test. Finally, the Army must continue to engender the Code of Conduct for Fighting Forces as the foundation of the military way of life.

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA518901

When there is a conflict between equal opportunity and military necessity, the needs of the military must come first. Elevating the individual over the mission is the antithesis of military service. Policy changes involving political coercion, compromised standards, and elevated risks of social disruption would undermine the culture of the military and complicate the lives of thousands of men and women in the military whose voices are rarely heard. It cannot be assumed that because foreign militaries have allowed homosexuals to serve without negative consequences that the same will be true for the U.S. military due to differences in culture. The “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute should be upheld.


Captain Dumont argues that repealing “don’t ask, don’t tell” is not about sanctioning homosexual behavior but about fairness and respect for all citizens. The privilege of serving should be offered to all who are physically, morally, and mentally qualified, regardless of sexual orientation. Awarding waivers to individuals with drug, theft, and assault offenses will do more do destroy the military than admitting openly homosexual individuals.


In October, Family Research Council President Tony Perkins, a former marine, received an invitation to speak at a National Prayer Luncheon on February 25 at Andrews Air Force Base outside Washington, D.C. on the theme “Getting Back to the Basics.” In January, Perkins and FRC spoke out against President Obama’s plan to repeal “don’t ask, don’t tell” and urged Congress to retain the current law which excludes homosexuals from openly serving in the military. Two days later, Perkins received a letter from the chaplain's office at Andrews AFB rescinding the invitation to speak at the prayer luncheon, citing FRC statements “which are incompatible in our role as military members who serve our elected officials and our Commander in Chief.”
Two retired generals and one retired admiral, all of whom are homosexual, stated that the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy is ineffective and undermines the military’s core values: truth, honor, dignity, respect, and integrity. They said that they were forced to lie about who they really were and sacrifice the possibility of having a family to serve their country. This far surpasses the sacrifice required of their heterosexual counterparts. The statute is essentially a ban on homosexuality since it requires homosexuals to remain celibate during service, in an effort to hide their sexual orientation and thus preserve their jobs.

The “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute can only be altered or repealed by Congress, and the Department of Defense is obligated to abide by the law so long as it remains in existence. Sec. Gates announced changes to the “don’t ask, don’t tell” regulations to ensure that it is enforced in a fair manner. The level of officer authorized to initiate and conduct a fact-finding inquiry was raised to the level of lieutenant colonel, Navy commander, or above. Inquiries will no longer be based on overheard statements or hearsay to ensure that information is credible. Confidential information disclosed to lawyers, clergy, psychotherapists, medical professionals, or public-health officials will no longer be used to support discharges. Sec. Gates and Adm. Mullen agreed that it is inappropriate for an active duty officer to publicly state his or her personal opinions on the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute.

Gates writes that the military must perform an assessment of all the issues and potential impacts associated with repeal of the “don’t ask, don’t tell” law so that military leaders will be able to effectively implement any legislative changes. A working group will be created for this review, and a final report must be submitted by Dec. 1, 2010. Gates outlines the objectives and methodology of the review.
Sec. Gates ordered a working group to examine the proper repeal of the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute so that DOD will be prepared should the law be changed. This review aims to help inform the legislative process. Adm. Mullen stated before Senate Armed Services Committee that he believes the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute should be repealed and that the military will be able to adapt to this change.


The legislative branch could repeal the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute, forcing the military to implement this change in social policy. Marines are free to debate and discuss the issue before a decision is made, but if the change becomes law, then marines must silently accept it. Individuals must reconcile their personal beliefs or leave the force.


Under current legislation, any repeal must be delayed until the military certifies that changes won’t hinder the ability of U.S. forces to fight, and the Pentagon is in the midst of a comprehensive review to determine how to fully integrate openly gay men and lesbians. Some conservative denominations that endorse chaplains have expressed worry that a formal recognition of the rights of gay men and lesbians to serve openly in the military could lead to limits on what their chaplains can preach.


The author’s wrote, “Based on all we saw and heard, our assessment is that, when coupled with the prompt implementation of the recommendations we offer, the risk of repeal of ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ to overall military effectiveness is low. We conclude that, while a repeal of ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ will likely, in the short term, bring about some limited and isolated disruption to unit cohesion and retention, we do not believe this disruption will be widespread or long lasting, and can be adequately addressed by the recommendations we offer. Longer term, with a continued and sustained commitment to
core values of leadership, professionalism, and respect for all, we are convinced that the U.S. military can adjust and accommodate this change, just as it has others in history.”


Successful implementation would require leadership to set an example, a strong emphasis on the professional obligations of all military personnel, and respect for all individuals. There must be a pre-repeal stage in which new policies are clearly articulated, and implementation stage which involves educating all troops as to the new policies, and a sustainment stage which will involve follow-on reviews and monitoring.


In a statement, the Rev. Troy Perry, moderator of Metropolitan Community Churches, said the church had renewed its request to the Pentagon to allow its ministers to serve as chaplains. At that time, the church had submitted the name of the Rev. Dusty Pruitt, a lesbian who was thrown out of the Army Reserves in 1983 and sued the Army for discrimination. If the Pentagon approves a sexually active homosexual as chaplain, it would be taking a step beyond what most of the nation's major churches will permit. With few exceptions, most denominations reject homosexual candidates for the ministry who are sexually active.


This group of chaplains waited until they were retired to speak against government policy out of respect for the president as Commander in Chief of the Armed Services. The retired chaplains expressed concern that repealing “don’t ask, don’t tell” would threaten the religious liberty of chaplains and Service members. Normalizing homosexuality would force chaplains to either speak against official policies or compromise their beliefs and teachings.

The officers who wrote this article claim that allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military would cause a large number of officers and enlisted men to leave the military. The U.S. cannot afford this loss while involved in two wars. These officers believe that repealing the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute would undermine recruiting and retention, affect leadership at all echelons, have adverse effects on the willingness of parents who lend their sons and daughters to military service, eventually breaking the all-volunteer force.


McHugh states that “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute remains the law of the land and that he was incorrect to say that there was a moratorium on discharging homosexual service members. The Army will continue to uphold this law.


A study by Nathaniel Frank of the Palm Center found that in Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa, and Israel allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military improved the command climate, decreased harassment, helped retain critical personnel, and enhanced respect for privacy. He says there is no operational justification for another year-long study. Since the 1993 Rand study, various groups have been reaching the same conclusion that repealing “don’t ask, don’t tell” will not harm military readiness.

*Michael D. Almy, Anthony J. Loverde, and Jason D. Knight (Plaintiffs) v. U.S.*


“This is a civil action to reinstate plaintiffs Michael D. Almy and Anthony J. Loverde into active duty in the United States Air Force, and to reinstate plaintiff Jason D. Knight into active duty in the United States Navy, following the plaintiffs’ unlawful discharges from their respective branches of the military by defendants on account of the federal law colloquially known as “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” concerning gay, lesbian, and bisexual armed forces service members (“DADT”). This action is also brought to declare unconstitutional the discharges of plaintiffs Almy, Loverde, and Knight under DADT,
and to declare the DADT statute, 10 U.S.C. § 654, and the regulations, policies, and guidance that implement it, unconstitutional on their face.”

**Mixon, Benjamin R.** “Let Your Views be Known.” *Stars and Stripes* (Mar. 8, 2010).  
[http://www.stripes.com/opinion/let-your-views-be-known-1.100083](http://www.stripes.com/opinion/let-your-views-be-known-1.100083)

Lt. Gen. Mixon’s letter to the editor calls for military personnel to write to elected officials and officers expressing a desire to retain the current “don’t ask, don’t tell policy.”

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/03/AR2010060304149.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/03/AR2010060304149.html)

Peter Moskos states that his father advocated “don’t ask, don’t tell” because he believed that military personnel should be allowed to maintain their privacy. Moskos believes that his father would now support Colin Powell’s stance that the statute should be repealed and would work to help the military best implement this change.

**Most Continue to Favor Gays Serving Openly in Military.** Pew Research Center, Nov. 29, 2010.  

This article analyzes polls regarding the level of military support for the repeal of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ statute.


In seeking a chaplain's post, Carolyn Dusty Pruitt could also raise the profile of her denomination, the Metropolitan Community Churches (MCC). Founded in 1968 by the Rev. Troy Perry, a Pentecostal preacher, the MCC teaches that "Jesus Christ died to take away your sins, not your sexuality." Its 32,000 members in the United States are mainly gay men and lesbians. The MCC first filed an application for a chaplain's post on Pruitt's behalf last July, but that was blocked when the Armed Forces Chaplains Board voted in the fall to defer action on it, the denomination said. Chaplains must be sponsored by a larger church or religious denomination. Perry, the denomination's moderator, or top official, said he worries that the negative reaction triggered by President Clinton's proposal to lift the military ban on homosexuals could include attacks on MCC members and property.

On Sept. 21, 2010, the FY11 Defense Authorization Bill, which contained an amendment repealing “don’t ask, don’t tell” was voted down. A district judge in California ruled that “don’t ask, don’t tell” is a violation of the First Amendment and gave the federal government until Thursday to appeal. Multiple homosexuals who were discharged on this ground are arguing to be reinstated, claiming that homosexuals should not be discharged unless it is necessary to further military goals.


Patti, who is retired from the Navy, says that the Pentagon must be clear about treating all members of the U.S. military equally, which means that it must recognize gay marriage as legal and a right of every soldier, sailor, airman and Marine. Patti believes that these rights almost must extend to their spouses, just as they do to the spouses of straight servicemen and women, to include health care, retirement benefits, GI Bill eligibility and commissary privileges.


The manner in which “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy change is implemented is likely to determine whether it is accepted with minimal disruptions. Based on a review of organization theory, implementation research, and the military's own experience with racial integration, the study team identified several key elements of an implementation strategy: the policy change must be communicated clearly and consistently from the top; the policy selected should be implemented immediately; emphasis should be placed on conduct, not on teaching tolerance or sensitivity; leadership must send messages of reassurance to the force; leaders at all levels should be empowered to implement the policy; and a monitoring process should be established to identify any problems early in the implementation process and address them immediately.

Key officials of Reform Judaism and most major Protestant denominations generally support gays and lesbians serving openly in the military. Top officials of five major religious bodies jointly wrote to President Clinton, saying that the ban on gays and lesbians in the military “solely on the basis of sexual orientation is intolerable.” The religious leaders said that although believers disagree about whether homosexual relations are moral or immoral, “there is a growing consensus that homosexuality should not be the cause for discrimination.”


A chaplain of the Marine Corps distributed to senior military officers a position paper that says homosexuals in the armed forces are a “physical and psychological” threat to other troops. The paper, which has won praise from the Marines' top general, staunchly defends the armed forces’ ban on gay men and lesbians, arguing that repealing the prohibition would hurt recruiting, undermine morale and increase the number of AIDS cases in the military. The paper states that, “In the unique, intensely close environment of the military, homosexual conduct can threaten the lives, including the physical (e.g. AIDS) and psychological well-being of others.”


There are those in the military who say there is little difference between serving among comrades who hide their homosexuality and those who are openly gay, but the Joint Chiefs of Staff object to lifting the ban. JCS Chairman Gen. Colin L. Powell listed the following concerns relating to allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military: morale and discipline, recruiting, cohesiveness among combat troops, personal privacy, and even the spread of AIDS. Those who support lifting the ban say that morale was temporarily weakened but not destroyed when blacks and women were permitted in the military, that allowing gay people to declare their sexuality without fear of reprisal is long overdue, and that openness about sexual issues has proved an effective way to fight AIDS.


At Obama’s request, the Supreme Court decided not to review a lawsuit challenging the military’s “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy. In response to news that Obama might change
the policy, a group of retired flag officers has claimed that allowing homosexuals to serve openly would undermine military readiness and end the all-volunteer force.


Shalikashvili argues that it is time to consider allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the U.S. military. He cites polls that indicate the majority of U.S. service members returning from Iraq and Afghanistan are comfortable with allowing homosexuals to serve openly. He notes that allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the Israeli and British militaries has not harmed their recruitment nor undermined unit cohesion.


Gen. Peter Pace apologized for publicly expressing his personal view that homosexuality is immoral and admitted that he should have focused his remarks on his support for the “don’t ask, don’t tell” statute. Gen. Shalikashvili said that allowing openly homosexual individuals to serve will not undermine the efficacy of the armed forces. Many retired officers and congressmen are working to repeal the policy.


Army Gen. George W. Casey Jr. and Air Force Gen. Norton A. Schwartz expressed concern about rapidly moving to repeal “don’t ask, don’t tell.” Adm. Mullen supports repeal of the statute but requested a year for the Pentagon to conduct a study on how to implement the changes.


The President, DOD, and military officers must all show a strong will and determination to implement any change to “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy. Some of the issues that will need to be addressed include: equality of pay and benefits, whether or not homosexuals should be given separate living quarters, and whether or not service members discharged under “don’t ask, don’t tell” should be reinstated. Directives should be prepared, and military personnel should be trained on new policy before implementation begins.
Schultz, Tammy S. “Why are the Marines the Military’s Biggest Backers of ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell?’” *The Washington Post* (Nov. 21, 2010).
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/11/19/AR2010111902930.html

Schultz states that there is widespread fear in the Marine Corps that the repeal of ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ would dilute the warrior ethos, on which the service is built. She believes that repealing the statute would allow homosexual marines to serve with integrity, rather sacrificing this value which is so esteemed by the Marine Corps by lying about their sexuality.


Many chaplains argue that allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military will force all military personnel to accept that value; a value that the Bible condemns. Paul Vicalvi, a retired Army chaplain, said that the military was not created to “be a social experiment or testing ground for society at large.” Conversely, some chaplains from the United Church of Christ believe that repeal of this statute will not affect the ability of chaplains to minister and perform their military duties.


Cardinal Roger M. Mahony said he was open to gays and lesbians in the armed services. The controversy has split religious leaders of various faiths. Mahony's conditional acceptance of gays in the military appears to contradict Archbishop Joseph T. Dimino, the U.S. Roman Catholic Church's ranking military prelate. There was nothing in the cardinal's latest remarks on gays in the military that contradicted that teaching. Mahony continues to draw a line between supporting gays serving in the military and condemning sexual acts outside of heterosexual marriage.


“A majority of Service members perceive that the effect of a repeal of DADT will be neutral—that is, it will have either “no effect” or will affect their immediate unit “equally as positively as negatively.” A smaller, but still substantial, group said that repeal will affect their unit “very negatively/negatively,” and an even smaller group said that repeal will affect their immediate unit “very positively/positively.” This pattern of responses
holds true across all the major areas of interest, including unit cohesion, unit effectiveness (both for those who have been deployed to a combat zone and those who have not), personal and unit readiness, and personal morale. This same pattern of the relative size of neutral, negative, and positive perceptions also extends to questions relating to the impact of repeal on retention and recruitment.


The effort to lift the military's ban on homosexuals is the top priority of homosexual activists because the military is the last bastion of traditional morality. The author claims that if the military caves in, it is only a matter of time before homosexuals win the right to “marriage,” adoption of children, the teaching of children that homosexuality is on par with traditional sexual norms, and the legal clout to bully groups like the Boy Scouts into accepting homosexual men as role models for young boys.

“A group of retired chaplains interviewed service members returning from Afghanistan and Iraq and determined that they would support the repeal of “don’t ask, don’t tell.” They argue that repeal of the statute would help recruiting and retention. They said, there are already “tens of thousands of known gay service members currently working and fighting alongside their straight peers; and there is no demonstrable negative impact on unit morale, cohesion or combat readiness."


The Pentagon commissioned a private firm, Westat, to spend about $4.5 million to ask 400,000 active duty and reserve military men and women what they think about serving alongside gays. Responses showed that the majority of troops were accepting of homosexuals serving openly in the military. Service members generally care about whether or not an individual is capable of doing his or her job, not his or her sexual orientation.


Webster says that to repeal ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ would be to give political validation to homosexuality, which defies biblical morality. He writes that repealing the statute would have a debilitating effect on the mission of the armed forces and the morale of individual service members. He argues that all Christians should work to keep this statute intact.
Some argue that officers have a moral responsibility to sway a policy debate by going public with their objections, leaking information to the media, or sabotaging policy decisions by deliberate foot-dragging. If the military is required to accept openly gay service members or to execute what it believes is a premature draw-down of troops from Afghanistan, open military dissent could force a corrosive military-civilian showdown damaging to both sides. By law and tradition, military officers are encouraged to debate ideas and offer their opinions before a decision is made, either by a more senior officer or by civilian authorities.
Public criticism of policy and strategy

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA485882

In general, dissent should not be tolerated within the military or in respect to military subordination to civilian leaders. However, at times it is the obligation of military professionals, since they are *professionals*, to go beyond conduct governed by the rules derived from more routine contexts.

https://digitalndulibrary.ndu.edu/u?/ndupress,21107

Adm. Mullen states that retired flag officers have the right to express their opinions on ongoing operations, but the U.S. public should question how much these people really know about what is actually happening on the ground. He states that only active duty flag officers should share their opinions with civilian leaders and that this should be done in private and in a manner that maintains “purity from partisanship.”

http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA514082

Professionally improper dissent on the part of retired generals and the widespread perception that they speak for their former colleagues still on active duty threaten the public trust in the military’s apolitical and nonpartisan ethic of service as well as the principle of civilian control.


Lieutenant General Greg Newbold was the Pentagon's top operations officer and retired after he voiced his objections to the Iraq War. He explains why he thinks the Iraq War was a mistake. Newbold discusses how the rationale for war did not make sense, his regret of not more openly challenging those who were determined to invade Iraq, the consequences of successive policy failures, and what needs to be done.

“Uniformed officers have an obligation to stand up to civilian leaders if they think a policy is flawed. They must convey their concerns to civilian policy makers forcefully and truthfully. If they believe the door is closed to them at the Pentagon or the White House, they also have access to Congress. But the American tradition of civil-military relations requires that they not engage in public debate over matters of foreign policy, including the decision to go to war. Moreover, once a policy decision is made, soldiers are obligated to carry it out to the best of their ability, whether their advice is heeded or not. The idea that a general or admiral—including those on the retired list—should publicly attack government policy and its civilian authors, especially in time of war, is dangerous.”


Criticism of strategic civilian leadership by retired military officers is permissible. Retired officers can, and should, challenge national defense policy in the interests of national security. Before the debate ensues, officers must meet a set of strict moral criteria prior to and during their public display of dissent. The paper evaluates the actions of the six generals who revolted in 2006 to determine whether or not their actions were appropriate.

Publicly calling for the firing or resignation of the Secretary of Defense


A panel discusses the current state of civil-military affairs and the apparent mistrust that the military feels towards the Pentagon, given that retired generals stepped forward to publicly call for the resignation of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld.


In 2006, a group of retired generals called for the resignation of Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld. Even if President Bush had wanted to fire Rumsfeld, he could not after this event because it would undermine civilian control of the military. The generals wanted to change the way in which the war was being executed but speaking out publicly made it
less likely that things would change in this case. Officers have an ethical obligation to
make their concerns known to civilian leaders but this should be done in private. Also,
officers are most influential before a decision is made. Once the decision is made, it is
unlikely that it will be changed due to public criticism from retired officers.


The six retired generals who stepped forward to publicly attack Secretary of Defense
Donald Rumsfeld's handling of the Iraq war had to overcome a culture of reticence based
on civilian control of the military. These six men individually called for Sec. Rumsfeld’s
resignation. Some scholars of military-civilian affairs said that the six imperiled civilian
control, undermined military mores and morale, and jeopardized the military meritocracy
and the trust between senior and junior officers. Critics said that the time for these men
to have spoken out was while they were still in uniform, through the chain of command.

Moten, Matthew. “Strengthening the Political-Military Relationship.” *Foreign

In 2006, six retired generals publicly called for Rumsfeld to resign, and in 2008, multiple
retired officers spoke against the DOD on national television. By engaging in such
activities which are not allowed while on active duty, these officers could undermine
ongoing military campaigns when they provide advice without knowing the actual
situation in theater. These former officers should distance themselves from the armed
services and make it clear that they speak as private citizens and in no way represent the
views of the military.

**Endorsement of political candidates**

Becker, William R. *Retired Generals and Partisan Politics: Is a Time-out Required?*
http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA391263

Retired general officer participation in partisan politics is increasing, and many in the
military and civilian sector believe this participation will politicize the military. The
United State military has a mixed history of apolitical behavior. This was proper when
the United States was isolated in its early history, when there were an adequate number of
veterans in governmental positions, and when the survival of the nation was at stake
during the Cold War. Today, the United States is the world's only superpower, there are
fewer veterans representing the military's interests in government, and future national
security strategy must contend with a vague, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous world.
While the active duty military must stay non-partisan, retired general officer participation
in partisan politics will ensure national security strategy issues take a proper role in
public debate. The support for a candidate by a retired general officer should be provided
singly. Forming a coalition of retired general officers carries a disproportionate weight and can have a negative impact on the Armed Forces.


Joseph cites Eliot Cohen, who wrote that “statesmen must actively and, if need be, relentlessly question their top generals on operational issues and defense management, challenging their responses and holding them accountable for results. Civil-military relations are thus an unequal dialogue with the civilian superior establishing the boundaries between executive authority and military expertise.” Officers should offer their advice to civilian leadership in private settings. Retired officers should not endorse political candidates because this behavior might unduly influence former subordinates or be interpreted as the views of the armed forces as a whole. The Joint Chiefs of Staff should consider issuing a code of conduct for retired military officers.


“Active and public participation of retired military officers in partisan politics, in their capacity as retired military officers, should be discouraged as potentially damaging to the U.S. armed forces in both material and philosophical ways. If the military of a democracy is politically partisan, it is, in effect, damaging to democracy itself in that the military does not serve in the fullest, most impartial manner.”


In the presidential race, Bush and Kerry both had generals endorse them. When a retired officer runs for a political office, he runs as a partisan, dropping any pretense of neutrality. When a retired officer endorses a candidate, then he appears to the public to be speaking as a representative as the military institution as a whole. Richard Kohn is quoted as saying, “Politicization erodes the cohesion, morale, and professional dedication of the officer corps.” Greater involvement of retired officers in politics might give the military undue influence over decisions that should belong to civilians.
The U.S. military is ready to accept whoever the American people elect as president to be the commander in chief, regardless of that person’s demographics. Civilian control of the military must be maintained. Retired officers are free to express their views and to align themselves with politicians. However, Adm. Mullen does worry that these views get construed as the beliefs of the military as a whole.

Retired flag officers have the right to endorse political candidates. In the 2008 election, more than a hundred retired officers publicly endorsed one candidate. This gave the new president reason to be suspicious of the political loyalties of the armed forces. The military must maintain an apolitical stance and accept civilian control.

A group of 26 retired diplomats and military officers urged Americans to vote President Bush out of office in the elections. The group stated that they had lost confidence in the ability of the Bush administration to advocate for American interests or to provide the necessary leadership. They did not explicitly endorse John Kerry.

Out of a 1.4 million-person military, the U.S. has fewer than a thousand generals and admirals on active duty; it is an elite group of men and women who have risen to the top of a remarkably meritocratic system. Once they retire they deserve, and usually receive, a degree of deference and opportunity unmatched by those in other professions. When the country is at war, they get a respectful hearing on strategy and tactics. Informally they exert a great deal of influence on today's military, filled as it is with their former subordinates and protégés. They appear prominently in the web of consultancies, advisory panels, Congressional hearings, and defense contractors that makes up the informal defense establishment. They carry weight because of their experience, and the expectation that they speak with the voice of disinterested patriotism. molded by a
hierarchic, orderly, technical culture, they have decidedly mixed records at the open and chaotic business of running for office and governing. There are exceptions, no doubt, to the rule that generals make poor political activists. Who would want to exclude Eisenhower from American politics? Then again, does anyone really think there is an Eisenhower out there? And are the records of Grant, MacArthur, LeMay and Westmoreland so inspiring that retired flags should be encouraged to plunge into politics?


Other research has shown that civilians and the military differ in their views about when and how to use military force; that the opinions of veterans track more closely with military officers than with civilians who never served in the military; and that U.S. civil-military relations shaped Cold War policy debates. The authors assess whether this opinion gap "matters" for the actual conduct of American foreign policy. They examine the impact of the presence of veterans in the U.S. political elite on the propensity to initiate and escalate militarized interstate disputes between 1816 and 1992. As the percentage of veterans serving in the executive branch and the legislature increases, the probability that the United States will initiate militarized disputes declines. Once a dispute has been initiated, however, the higher the proportion of veterans, the greater the level of force the United States will use in the dispute. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]


Allowing officers to vote in elections has not undermined the political impartiality of the military in the execution of its duties. Active duty officers should not cross the line into politics, outside of the act of voting. When officers retire they share the same responsibility as private citizens to participate responsibly in the political process. Retired officers can publicly endorse candidates so long as they are clear that they are speaking based on their individual opinions, not the views of the military.


This paper walks through the various laws regulating the role that active duty and retired military officers can play in politics and recommends changes.
Interaction with the Media


The Times published an investigation of a Pentagon public relations program intended to win favorable coverage of the Bush administration's war on terror through retired officers working as military analysts on television. The report, "Behind TV Analysts, Pentagon's Hidden Hand," revealed a program that gave the analysts talking points and unusual access to top officials—contacts, the article said, that some of the officers hoped would benefit military contractors with whom they had ties.
The age of terror poses a series of challenges to the orthodox model of Western civil-military relations. This paper investigates three particular challenges: the changing security environment, issues relating to the use of force, and issues relating to the role of Western militaries in the reconstruction of weak and failed states. The changing security environment is characterized by the semi-permanent focus on the current War on Terror, a condition that is outside the current paradigm of threat environments. Issues relating to the use of force are characterized by the practical and political difficulties in bringing military power to bear against transnational terrorist structures. Counter-terrorism is essentially a form of limited warfare, and as such will provide frequent opportunities for civilians and militaries to rehearse their different perspectives on the utility of force. Issues of reconstruction are characterized by Western militaries' role expansion, inviting new concerns about whether Western militaries are in fact being dragged in the direction of “new professionalism.” The paper argues that in relation to each of these challenges an increase in civil-military tensions in Western societies should be expected. It further asserts that the cumulative impact of those heightened tensions across all three areas may be of such a magnitude as to drive Western societies towards new models of military organization and civil-military affairs.


Military chaplains are considering offering same-sex marriage ceremonies as a gesture to help homosexuals in the military feel more at ease in the Canadian Armed Forces.


Professionalism involves superior knowledge, practical expertise, and a sense of corporate responsibility. The officer corps should be made up of leaders who have been educated and trained so that they are imbued with broad conceptual knowledge, hands-on-expertise, and a deep-seated sense of obligation. Canadian military professionalism is declining. During peace time, public support for funding a large military declines, and
the Services search for non-warfighting roles to gain bureaucratic approbation, compromising professionalism.


Military officers in the Defence Department destroyed and faked official documents relating to Somalia with clear and direct orders from superiors to do so. Three senior officers received disciplinary action.


C8B63&scp=1&sq=World%20Briefing%20Americas:%20Canada:%20Gay%20Soldiers%20Wed%20at%20Base&st=cse

The military confirmed that a sergeant and a warrant officer, both men, were married last month in a ceremony at a military base in Nova Scotia. It was the first time the military has presided over a same-sex marriage, now legal in almost all of Canada following a series of court decisions over the last two years. The soldiers were married by a United Church minister after the base chaplain, an Anglican, refused to officiate for religious reasons. The guidelines of the armed forces treat same-sex couples the same as unions between men and women. Legislation to expand marriage rights to gay couples nationwide is awaiting enactment in Parliament and has the support of Prime Minister Paul Martin.


Canadian civil-military relations underwent notable shifts between 2005 and 2008, with the military first gaining, then appearing to lose, a degree of influence over defence policy and a level of political clout unseen in generations. This paper argues that three interrelated factors allowed the Chief of Defence Staff (CDS), Rick Hillier, to strengthen the Canadian Forces' (CF) position in the civil-military relationship. First was the desire by recent government to erase Canada's image as a defence free-rider. Next was the civil authority's decision to loosen a key bureaucratic-level monitoring mechanism over the military. Third was the CF's deployment to Kandahar, Afghanistan, which boosted public support for the military and granted the CF a recognized expertise in the use of force to safeguard national security. The paper concludes by examining recent efforts by the civil authority to contain the military's newfound influence.

Scott Taylor and Brian Nolan wrote the book *Tarnished Brass* to advocate depoliticizing the military by separating it from the Department of National Defence. This structure has blurred the functions and loyalties of civilians and military officers. They also advocate revamping the military justice system, slimming the officer ranks, and restructuring the Defence Department.


The field of civil-military relations examines the relationships between military leaders and the duly constituted authority that exercises civil control of the military. Some have questioned whether these relationships have changed since Canada's involvement in the war in Afghanistan and called into question the appropriate public role for military leaders. This thesis argues that the principle of civil control remains firmly established in Canada both in theory and in practice. However, there has been significant change in the civil-military dynamic, which is the complex web of relationships that determine how this control is exercised. The thesis identifies three clusters of relationships in this web and examines how the players in these clusters contributed to the constantly changing nature of civil-military relations over three distinct time periods. Given the assumptions of traditional liberal-democratic civil-military relations theory, this thesis examines whether these changes are problematic or merely an evolution to a new state of affairs. The change, this thesis argues, has altered the relationships in a way that does not threaten the principle of civil control. This new reality has, however, had a significant impact on the formulation and implementation of the government's overall policy agenda during the past five years.

**Czech Republic**


This paper presents a number of theoretical models regarding the democratic control of armed forces. The authors give an account of democratic control in the Czech Republic as well as the evolution of civil-military relations since the 17th century. The authors conclude that the democratic control of the Czech Republic's armed forces has yet to reach the level customary in Western Europe, and that a comprehensive Czech security policy has yet to be formulated.
A state’s comprehensive security policy should be transparent and attractive to the public for reasons of practicality, legality, constitutionality, and legitimacy. The EU should form and execute policies in a way that respects popular mandates involving parliamentary elections. The European challenge of this century is how to find a common European response that builds on the strengths and the natural diversity of nations, and that makes national governments more, not less, legitimate in their peoples’ eyes.

The essence of accountability mechanisms is to ensure that armed forces are both professional and committed to democracy, the rule of law and human rights. This study analyses which internal military mechanisms contribute positively to the democratic disposition of the members of the armed forces. Internal accountability mechanisms can be divided into five categories, the first of which is the internal regulatory framework that delineates the laws and regulations which apply to the armed forces. Secondly, there are regulatory institutions which serve to enforce this framework through the investigation and prosecution of breaches of regulations and laws. Thirdly, the rights and duties of personnel form the basis of what individual members of armed forces may legitimately do and how they can expect to be treated within the military. Fourthly, command responsibility serves to ensure that both standards of professionalism and the aforementioned regulatory framework are adhered to. Finally, military training and socialization are designed to fulfill a preventative role, ensuring that a particular set of values and standards are engrained at all levels within the armed forces.

The following conclusions can be drawn from thinking through the future roles of the armed services and relationships they have with their wider civilian societies. First, we need to think of civil-military relations in both broad and narrow senses: the politics of civil-military relations exist in a wider social framework, while any discussion of military-society relations that fails to include a sense of the political context of the
potential power of state organized violence is missing something important. Second, all armed services have to balance the competing demands of functional and societal imperatives, which in turn need to be considered in a ‘non-zero sum’ fashion. Third, all states should preserve a war fighting capacity unless defense planners are sure that threats to national security would not require a war-fighting capacity or, that it had ready and reliable access to friends and allies to provide that capacity for it. Fourth, states need to be careful in thinking through the advantages and disadvantages of an AVF. Fifth, in the politics of civil-military relations, old and new democracies have to manage the political assertiveness to be expected of the military profession even though the risks of destabilizing military professionalism are for the most part quite remote.


The professionalism of a military force should be judged based on objective control, military doctrines, force design, relationship with other national institutions, technical expertise, level of education and training personnel receive, relationship with the civil population, voluntary service, institutional ethos, internal reciprocal relationships, and the standards of military ethics. NATO and the EU should strive to raise professional military standards.

France


After publicly questioning the reliance on a nuclear deterrent as the basis of French defense strategy, Air Force Gen. Etienne Copel resigned. While on active duty, he published a book suggesting that the French should not depend on the United States for defense. Gen. Copel’s actions go against the tight-lipped French tradition.

http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/their-do-and-die

Marcel Bigeard, who died on June 18 at the age of 94, was a paragon of a new type of professional warrior that arose during the Cold War. For while the United States and the Soviet Union (and their many allies) built large-scale militaries for an eventual hot war, what came instead were proxy wars in places like Vietnam and the Congo. These did not require the technology-laden and discipline-heavy units prepared to fight in the Fulda Gap, but instead small, mobile units of soldiers dedicated to an intense operational tempo. And they required resourceful officers, able to adapt the methods of guerrillas and willing to lead by example. Bigeard, who rose from the ranks to four-star general, was such a
soldier: emphasizing physical fitness and endurance, preferring to live rough with his men, and a master of the topography of battlegrounds. He refused to carry a weapon into combat, feeling his job was to lead not to fight. (In the U.S. Army, men like Charlie Beckwith, the founder of Delta Force, and Richard Meadows, leader of the Son Tay Raiders, had similar careers and maintain similar legends.)

**Great Britain**


Active duty Col. Calamity Crawford gave military advice to active politicians in the SNP. Col. Calamity opted to retire and enter into politics since military regulations restrict the involvement of active duty service members in politics. He had to wait three months for his resignation to come into effect, meaning that he could be court martialed if he advised politicians during that time period.


A nation's structure and culture of civil-military relations are important and largely overlooked factors in explaining the performance of armed forces involved in complex expeditionary operations. The U.S. model of “Huntingtonian,” with its divided civil-military structures and poor interagency cooperation, makes the US military less suited for complex expeditionary operations. British civil-military relations involve a Defence Ministry that conscientiously integrates military and civilian personnel, as well as extensive interagency cooperation and coordination. This “Janowitzean” integrated form of civil-military relations makes the British military more likely to provide for the planning and implementation of comprehensive campaigns that employ and coordinate all instruments of power available to the state, as well as troops in the field displaying the flexibility and cultural and political understanding that are necessary in complex expeditionary operations.


British campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan exposed a lack of institutional memory of the lessons of previous interventions. Twenty-first century security challenges have defied the traditional organizational boundaries within (and between) the military, civil service and government. Although there have been efforts to move towards the so-called comprehensive approach and create truly joint frameworks, the overhaul of government institutions has not been radical enough. A fresh, bold set of reforms is required to rework the institutions of state power to be effective in the present security environment.

The unanimous decision by the European court, based in Strasbourg, France, means that Britain will almost certainly be forced to allow openly gay men and women into the military for the first time. “Politically the government, which has made human rights part of its manifesto, cannot be seen to be ignoring the policy of the European court,” said Di Luping, a lawyer for Liberty, a human rights organization. She took to the court the case of two people who were discharged from the military when their homosexuality was discovered. The Defense Ministry, which responded to the legalization of homosexuality in Britain some 30 years ago by forbidding gay men and lesbians to serve in the armed forces, said that as a result of the ruling, it would halt pending disciplinary cases involving military personnel suspected of being gay. But beyond that, it said the government would have to review the decision and decide how to proceed.


U.S. General Martin Dempsey said that in the future military power will be measured in terms of the ability of a force to adapt. The authors believe that the British Ministry of Defense must give the capacity to adapt greater attention and should promote strategic thinking. The behaviorist approach will be more effective than kinetic power at undermining the enemy’s will to continue fighting.


Through assessing the extent to which the reciprocal expectations of the armed forces and the British public are realized, this article will argue that the moral contract, although under stress, is not breaking. Underlying social trends and the use of doctrinal concepts such as the military covenant have, combined with recent operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, altered the expectations of both sides causing tensions within military-societal relations. Yet, while the armed forces do harbor unrealized expectations of the British public who are unwilling or unable to support the use of the military in recent conflicts, neither the public nor the military is so disillusioned with the performance of the other for the relationship to be described as breaking or broken.

The modernization of military doctrine writing in the United Kingdom since 1989 came up with many new definitions of the nature of fighting power and military effectiveness, broadly dividing them into the physical, conceptual and moral “components” or dynamics. Devising comprehensive and comprehensible doctrine for the moral component has proved the most difficult, and consequently the official publications have been few in number. Normative military ethics has been expressed as values and standards within the utilitarian and pragmatic tradition. The nature of military risk was described in 2000 as unlimited liability, an analogical phrase coined by General Sir John Hackett in 1983. Fairness in the treatment of individuals by the Army as an institution, the Ministry of Defence and the civil population generally, was given the title military covenant. It was devised to indicate service in armed forces at best as a vocation within a “moral community,” the covenant being conceived in the Abrahamic tradition. There have been difficulties in sustaining the arguments about the unlimited nature of liability for volunteer servicemen and women in wars of national choice, rather than national survival. The chief difficulties are those of language and law. The military covenant has been diminished by over-use and politicization. The nature of risk and fairness needs further analysis.


Gen. Richard Dannatt, the British army chief of staff, said publicly that Britain should withdraw from Iraq. Robinson argues that officers should fight on the battlefield as well as in the briefing room. He believes that Gen. Dannatt should have voiced his concerns to civilian officials in private. Robinson believes that Gen. Dannatt should have resigned first if he wished to speak out publicly about his personal views of the war in Iraq.


The services are finding it difficult to recruit and hard to retain personnel, undermining their military effectiveness. In the 20th century, the rite of passage to adulthood became a university education, not mandatory conscription. Most middle-class Britons want to join as officers or not at all, meaning that most of the ranks are from poor families and often dropped out of school at age 16. Homosexuality was tolerated by the military during war due to the need for personnel, but during peace, homosexuals were court-martialed and discharged. Homosexuals could not serve openly until 2000, although private homosexual acts between two consenting adults was decriminalized in Britain in 1967. Many servicemen are taking advantage of the free education provided by the military and then leaving to find civilian jobs after serving minimum terms. Consequently, many
don’t serve full careers. Strachan offers suggestions that over time will help to narrow the civil-military gap.


On 23 June 2010, President Obama relieved Gen. McChrystal of his command in Afghanistan. In the view of most commentators, the president had little choice. Had Obama failed to act, the norms of civil–military relations would have been overthrown. As the president put it, the article had undermined “the civilian control of the military that’s at the core of our democratic system.” Gen. McChrystal had not set out to challenge that norm. His dignified response, and his refusal to try to justify or explain away the remarks attributed to him, confirmed his disciplined acceptance of his own constitutional position. What he had done was something rather different: he and his colleagues had vented their frustration at the lack of clear political guidance within which McChrystal’s own operational concepts were to be placed. The operational level of war is the level of command situated between the tactical and the strategic, between the company or battalion commander in the field and the president in the White House. It is in the exercise of operational art that today’s senior generals, like McChrystal, hope to reach the acme of their professional careers. The bulk of the planning done by their staffs is devoted both to preparing for that opportunity and then to applying their skills in order to manage the characteristic chaos of war. But to do that, operational art needs direction; it requires of policy a degree of clarity and a consistency of purpose that can frequently be at odds with the realities and contingencies of politics.

Philippines


Sen. Franklin Drilon stated that retired military officers are free to speak publicly on political matters because they are outside of the chain of command and are now ordinary citizens. Defense Secretary Orlando Mercado called for an investigation into the public pronouncements of retired Gen. Fortunato Abat. Drilon said this should be dropped because Gen. (Ret.) Abat retains his freedom of speech.

Russia


The Russian military's extraordinary decline is widely known. This article analyses the military elites' electoral participation, relationship to the executive, and opposition to
state policy—and offers a method for explaining it. To generate a more penetrating understanding of Russian particularities while expanding the theoretical reach, the article combines the civil-military relations literature with that of the institutionalist approach, and more specifically, the concepts of path dependence and institutional decay. Given the many examples of successful democratization experiences in Southern Europe, Latin America, and East-Central Europe in the recent past, it is all too often forgotten that democratization is not necessarily a one-way street that inevitably leads to fair governance. Neither is it an irreversible process. Since the 1993 conflict between the president and the legislature, the Russian polity has been on a steady path toward increasingly authoritarian rule. The deficiencies of civil–military relations accurately reflect the breakdown of Russia’s democratization experiment.

**Thailand**


The members of the Constitution Drafting Committee should prohibit anyone who has served in a uniformed rank above sergeant from filling an elected or appointed government position until he or she has been out of that service for more than 15 years. This will help to demilitarize Thailand’s political processes.
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