

Survey Comments

Ethics web page: http://www.cgscfoundation.org/events/ethics-symposium/

Ethics Blog: http://www.cgscfoundation.org/events/ethics-blog/



Q1- What is your take away from Dr. Bell's opening remarks/presentation.

- Excellent! Raises the challenge to explore if we have a shared vision and, if not, what do we need to do as we develop leaders for our Army/Nation.
- The conflict is not between the military and civilian sectors, but between the Atomistic Liberalism and Civic Republicanism which crosses both the military and civilian sectors.
- Dr Bell's opening remarks definitely show the compare and contrast between the two thoughts of the authors which we were examining. I liked the fact that we will be able to view these two line or viewpoints over the course of the next few days.
- The military and civil society have shared values as Americans and need to work together to live up to these values as a society. The military is held to a higher standard ethically than the "average American" and we should strive to be what the rest of the country should aspire to be iin their lives both professionally and personally.
- Comparing arguments/key points from both authors was very informative. My key take away though already established prior to his presentation is simply: military leaders provide our policy makers the best military advice based on our specialties. The lines should never be blurred nor should we intervene in others responsibilities.



Q1- What is your take away from Dr. Bell's opening remarks/presentation.

- The take away from Dr. Bell opening remarks is that there is separation in military and civil ethics. More over that there is a tension between the two because of the perceived difference. The presentation was while done and thought provoking. His conclusion that there is no difference except for emphasis, form and accountability is safe. The conflict is not between the military and civilian sectors, but between the Atomistic Liberalism and Civic Republicanism which crosses both the military and civilian sectors.
- There were two schools of thought presented with brief explanations, followed by Dr. Bell's position which lies somewhere between the two.
- He was on target with his analysis of the conflicting values between the military and society, which is an expanding gap. I would have like more information or a copy of his paper on this topic. Hand outs would have been nice to have. You could have emailed them to us.
- My take away is that there is supposed to be a gap between military and civilian ethic.
- The military ethic is not really that different from societies ethic.
- A good explanation of Huntington and Janowitz. His presentation, perhaps intentionally, shows his preference towards CR which he holds as the shining example while AL is clearly portrayed as the lesser option. Similar to the way words are used in debates about abortion: Pro-choice, pro-life, anti-abortion, pro-abortion.



Q1- What is your take away from Dr. Bell's opening remarks/presentation.

- Integration with differentiation as a balance between the arguments of Huntington and Janowitz, with the real conflict between atomistic liberalism and conservative realism.
- How does a democracy maintain an Army which protects its democratic values? The Army must be morally integrated into society, yet continue to do its task of defending the nation. One view says there is an ethical gap between civilian and military. Another says there is no ethical gap. Bell argues for CIV/MIL common project of liberty.
- The military ethic is rooted between both civilian and military personnel. The Soldier who is both a military member and civilian when not in uniform has a voice on issues that are ethical in nature.
- The military has its role in executing policy (regarding national security) while the civilian policy body has its role in developing the policy.
- Pointing out common values between the military and larger society resonated with me. We are not any better (ethically/morally speaking) than society. We are just judged differently...perhaps.



- Of course. Our societies "shared vision" is very fragmented. The sharper and more focused our professional shared vision becomes, the more we will be unlike our society. Can we provide the example and the leadership to align the fragmented visions within our society? Should we?
- Yes, but I think the conflict comes from Congress, which does not necessarily adequately
 represent the views of society. I think that Congress pressures the military to do things that
 further their political goals rather than what is best for society.
- As far as the tension between professional military ethic and the state or society the answer is no I don't feel that they conflict with one another. I do believe that the military is a representation of the society as a whole. I think we represent the society enter vast majority of that societies beliefs and values and just as the society occasionally has those which make mistakes and have to be punished for those mistakes so does our profession within the military have those that occasionally make mistakes and have the need to be punished for those mistakes I don't. The military has its role in executing policy (regarding national security) while the civilian policy body has its role in developing the policy.



The Professional Ethic and the State

Survey: Dr. Bell's Opening Remarks

- I feel that society rightfully has high expectations of military leaders. These are standards that they may not live up to in their own lives which can create tension between the military and civil society. What exacerbates this situation is when we in the military do not hold leaders to the standard when they fall short morally. This breaches the trust between the civil society and the military.
- I do feel some tension, however, I believe its simply tension derived from unwilling politicians and ego filled military leaders. We are a profession and therefore work for society carrying out policies developed and approved by our political leaders. A balance between civil-military control and autonomy to operate in an environment in which we train must be agreed upon and attained in the best interest of both parties.
- I do not feel tension between society and military ethics. Dr. Bell spoke about the military and society as if these were groups born from two different classes and raised separately. The military is the state and the society. We are congressmen and women that serve and have served. We are coaches, PTA members, voters, neighbors. The majority of us leave off post. Military's mission is protection of others. Like firemen and law enforcement, we voluntarily give up our freedom to be individuals so that other individuals can pursue life, liberty, and happiness. The difference is indoctrination by the military.



- I do not feel a tension between the professional military ethic and the state and/or society.
- Yes! Having worked in the civilian workforce post military retirement, I've found a stark
 difference in the professional ethics of military people and the lack of a professional ethics in
 many civilians. I believe the military has a calling to a higher standard than civilian by the
 nature of our mission. The profession of arms has to set the example for the rest of the
 social construct in civilian culture.
- I do feel a tension between the military ethic and the society. The civil society is struggling with coping with the extreme of the military profession. I do believe the responsibility to mitigate this gap lies on both sides. The future operational environment will be even more complex, so it will be even more challenging to differ between civil and military actors on the battlefield. I think we already have seen indications on how challenging the future will be, and how challenging it will be to maintain ethically aligned. One indicator was the Blackwater scandal, where a civil company tok advantage of the civil military ethical gap, and made money out of it. The way contractors have taken the soldiers place in the last decade of war, tells us how important this issue is....
- No



- Not particularly, but I'd probably be described as a moral relativist so that may have something to do with that. As Gen Ham discussed today the people place a special trust and confidence in the military and when we fail it betrays that trust and confidence. I also agree with Bell that the ethics of the mil and society it serves are not all that different and his emphasis, form, and accountability explanation is reasonable.
- Yes, but it's been more recent, only in the last few decades, though it seems to be escalating at an increasing pace now, with the moral underpinnings of the American culture shifting away from what they used to be, this is creating the conflict. My personal concern is what we are to do when the culture that we are charged to protect either: is no longer worth protecting (an inflammatory, hyperbolic statement), or does not allow us the latitude to protect her in manner that we have historically used and has proven over time to be the best.
- I do not feel the tension.
- Yes, over the last decade of war, it seems that the military was making the policy decisions of going to war vice be asked to provide recommendations on how we should go about it if civilian policy makes directs.— I feel that this tension is unnecessary stress on the military and believe that civilian policy makers need to address holistic issues and then determine what appropriate national power to use. There should not be an ethical dilemma when or when not to use military force.



Q2- Do you feel a tension between the professional military ethic and the state and/or society? If you do, how do you experience/feel that tension?.

• I feel the tension between the military and society has been exacerbated by the current financial crunch that has cast us as the "haves" by virtue of our seemingly large budget, job security, benefits etc. Ethically, we are victims of our own high standards. So, when we do fall short, it is seen as a severe deviation. But, I do think the higher standard is warranted as we are trusted with the means to wage war.



Survey: Gen. Ham's Remarks

Q1- What is your take away from Gen. Ham's remarks?

- Strong need to reduce the cumbersome bureaucracy placed on junior military officers that prevent them from being authentic leaders and diminish trust among the troops.
- His statement about the pervasiveness of information are interesting, and I'm curious if he sees the transparency it creates as a hindrance to the military. From what he said it seems the service is not worse off today, it is just more visible to the public. If that visibility is the reason to change we're missing the point.
- I agree with his assessment that there really never was "the good old days." I.e. ethical lapses have always happened, its just that current information technologies mean that we live in a panoptic society where sweeping stuff under the rug is no longer feasible.
- Although military organizations do not have a prescribed or ligal consensus or right definition of ethical behaviors, ethical issues chould be handeled seriously at all levels. The efforts to correct the ethical issues must the cosern of the institutional level as well as scholar and operational, and tectical level.



Survey: Gen. Ham's Remarks

Q1- What is your take away from Gen. Ham's remarks?

- Leaders will be challenged with ethical decisions for the rest of their careers. Our organizations Therefore, ethical leaders are vital to our organizations survival.
- Gentle hands remarks were very sincere and very well received. He spoke from the heart and
 everything he said was absolute truth and made absolute sense as far as the direction we
 need to go in order to fix the gaps between current state of the institution and the trust of
 the American people.
- Great speaker and ability to make sense of senior level issues being understood at the tactical-operational level.
- We are not engaged in this profession for personal gain. It is about defending the constitution selflessly.

Fort Leavenworth Ethics Symposium

The Professional Ethic and the State

Survey: Gen. Ham's Remarks

Q2- Would you ever resign (or would you support someone's decision to resign) to make a statement about the folly of a policy decision made from senior leaders? Why or Why not?

- Yes, I would resign depending on the situation and the degree to which ethics are compromised and my position relative to the situation. I would most likely not resign due to political purposes since I would have very little impact. Remaining involved to influence a negative ethical situation might be more powerful than resignation. Too often resignations are seen as "sour grapes.
- Yes on resigning, but not for policy/political reasons. I agree with Gen Ham that as officers we need to be apolitical. His point about not being able to get behind the decided plan is valid. If you cannot execute you need to speak up. I was once told if the commander's decision is not illegal or amoral I need to get behind it.
- I would. General Powell said something to the effect that we can disagree right up until a decision is made. After that, you have to implement the boss' plan as if it were your own. So, if you can't do that, then you need to go.
- I would rather do my best to demonstrate the irrelevance of these decisions through the organizational ways using my experience and my relationships within the organization. My thoughts are that even though I will be subjected to some risks, I will be more effective by doing so.



The Professional Ethic and the State

Survey: Gen. Ham's Remarks

Q2- Would you ever resign (or would you support someone's decision to resign) to make a statement about the folly of a policy decision made from senior leaders? Why or Why not?

- Absolutely. First off, individuals who volunteer for national service in my opinion are of the
 highest character. So as long as they maintain their loyalty and obedience during their
 military tenure, they've answered the calling of defending our nation. Should a policy be
 implemented which they do not agree with and are within their window for choosing to
 discontinue their service, their decision is their prerogative. Not everyone will agree nor
 support decisions while in service. That's what makes us such a great nation founded on
 volunteerism.
- The short answer is yes of course. if I found that I could no longer abide by my oath or if someone I knew felt strongly that they could no longer abide by their oath and support the decisions of those with a clear conscience they felt it their beliefs and their values and their ethics we're going in a different direction than the values and beliefs and ethics of the institution were going in a different direction then most certainly they need to be separated and not necessarily on bad terms and they don't need to be better he served honorably need to be thanked for their service and they should go our separate ways.



Survey: Gen. Ham's Remarks

Q2- Would you ever resign (or would you support someone's decision to resign) to make a statement about the folly of a policy decision made from senior leaders? Why or Why not?

- I would consider resigning if I was folly of a policy decision but at the same time consider all the factors and ensure that I see the big picture before making a decision.
- No. Because once you remove yourself from the process you don't have as much ability to fix the perceived problem. You have an obligation to try and improve the process for the good of subordinates and the nation.



Q1- What is your take away from Lt. Gen. Bolger's remarks?

- Senior leaders (both military and political) must ensure national objectives are attainable thru military action to include developing plans upon the completion of military action.
- That an Iraqi life is worth less than an American life. That the 'you break it you own it'
 doctrine does not apparently apply to the American way of war. I suspect that Colin Powell
 might well disagree."
- general Bolger's remarks today and candor in my eyes took a lot of courage. to stand out there and publicly display and write for public record that the leadership of this institution failed any planning and executing of this war on terrorism the very bold statement and I applaud him for it.
- Very strong comments and truthful to how our Army senior leaders may have misunderstood the problem and courses of action to operationally fix OIF and OEF.
- Very interesting. Personal courage to talk against the status quo.



Q1- What is your take away from Lt. Gen. Bolger's remarks?

- That he and other generals may not have done all they should have in advising our civilian leadership on the two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. He and many believe that the military is best used for "hit hard and get out quick". We need to play chess rather than checkers when dealing with our future issues,
- Bolger is self critical and searching for closure on failed wartime experiences. He is a
 brilliant person who recently wrote a very easy to read book. He does not, however, provide
 mic on the way of solutions. I suppose a take away is have an exit strategy consistent with
 the political and societal will and figure that out before engaging in war
- He hits a common refrain of getting back to blocking and tackling, or the bread and butter, of the army of CAM. The historic record shows stability operations or peace keeping are far more common than large scale conventional warfare (hundreds vs. several) so perhaps his focus is off. Also we are better at CAM so should focus on it is also off.
- The General's remarks were very honest and was encouraging in that it takes the responsibility that I felt was on the brigades, battalion, and company level and places it at the flag officer level.



Q2- What is your moral duty as an officer and what steps would you take if you believe a policy of your government or higher command is wrong?

- Leader trust dependent. As an officer, you have the moral obligation to inform/advise your senior leader in areas that are questionable. If unsuccessful, additional avenues for notification are required of your position.
- Carter Ham covered this eloquently. If you are going to fall on your sword do it quietly.
 Otherwise offer your reasoned perspective and if rebuffed salute, turn to the right and move on.
- I have an obligation to this country to this military to the people in the military to do my best each and every day.when if I'm not for sure when an officer appointed over me is making a decision and I think is wrong or may have third fourth orders of effects i actually in privately let them know that I disagree I tell them why I disagree and tell them what I think would be a better solution. It's my duty to get them options so that they can make an educated decision. And then they make a decision and as long as it's not unethical or criminal I execute to the best of my ability with no remorse and without complaining.
- All leaders and Soldiers have the moral duty to speak up, but as the GEN stated, it also depends on the relationship with the flag officer as well as providing an alternate solution.



Question of the Day- April 21-What is the most important moral/ethical point you heard made today?

- Integrity and the ability to admit fault.....
- If you want to go fast: Go alone. If you want to go far: Go together
- The most important point I heard made today is that the institution known as the united states army is taking steps 2 insure leader development is happening at the institutional level and not just at the self development level in regards to ethics and in character. This means it will be incorporated into all levels of schooling in regards to officer training in NCOES training soldier training at the official schoolhouse level programs of instruction and be validated and tested that's the most important change that we can do to ensure that is enbedded in our profession
- We all make mistakes and that it is crucial that we learn from them.
- Having the American people trust our profession.



Question of the Day- April 21-What is the most important moral/ethical point you heard made today?

- Leaders set the moral and ethical tone in a unit, I may not be able to control much but as General Honoré was quoted "make sure your audio matches your video"! I can control that in my own life and hopefully help set the right tone in my unit.
- Have the moral courage to confront problems before they are uncontrollable.
- I can't pinpoint a single point. The discussion itself is beneficial.
- Leaders have the moral and ethical obligation to have a executable plan that Soldier can be successful.