superior British force. In chapter 2, he extrapolates critical leadership lessons from decisive points in our history that are just as vital today. He writes, “No great change comes without leadership and sacrifice.”

Chapter 3 explores the notion that our nation transitioned through change constantly, always adapting to the new normal, and that leaders must recognize change to be successful. The general describes the key variables he sees in America’s latest new normal and expands this discussion to the global environment in chapter 4. How have “extreme population density, the incredibly fast transmission of information, the rise of terrorism, the interconnectedness of business, and the growth of the ranks of the poor” created the new normal and shaped the global environment of today and the near future? The author offers his keen insights on causes and effects and correlations.

Honoré’s 37 years of service in demanding command and staff assignments under tremendously adverse conditions (think of South Korea and Germany in the dead of winter and the desert heat of the Middle East—or perhaps worse, the political firestorm in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina) shaped his understanding of leadership in changing environments. What leaders learn about leadership itself and mission command when trying to inspire subordinates to accomplish a mission when they are cold, wet, hungry, and tired is invaluable. Honoré shares his lessons learned and answers questions in chapters 5 through 8, which concern how leaders instill a culture of mission command in their subordinates and organizations, how leaders know and recognize the right problems to solve, and how leaders motivate their organizations.

One of the author’s most passionate themes throughout the book is the importance of practicing good leadership (and followership) at home. Look around at the next retirement ceremony (or funeral) and determine if that individual followed the general’s counsel about leadership at work and at home.

This is an easy read with plain and simple language that is packed with lessons for any leader in any capacity. It is a great follow-up to his book Survival: How a Culture of Preparedness Can Save You and Your Family from Disasters (Atria Books, 2009). JFQ

Associate Professor Gerald L. Mitchell teaches Joint Operations Planning at the Joint Forces Staff College.
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The United States faces a stark decision on how to prosecute and conduct future warfare. According, every national policymaker and decisionmaker should read Killing Without Heart to be better informed on the morality of unmanned and autonomous weapons systems. With advancements in technology, the Nation has the capability to continue down the path toward a military of unmanned and autonomous robots on the battlefield. Continuing on this path will isolate the men and women in uniform from the dangers of the modern battlefield, calling into question the morality of how we fight and whether we can achieve national ends states without sending actual people into combat.

Riza provides a detailed analysis of the limits of robots in warfare. First and foremost is the absence of the empathy that will always reside in human beings. Robots lack that sense much as psychopaths do. They do not feel guilt or sympathy or any other emotion when taking a life. When robots kill, the question of who is responsible for the deaths will always be an issue. Employing a robot that mistakenly kills a family at a checkpoint or drops a bomb on a funeral procession can have strategic effects without a definitively responsible party. Is the commander who employed the robot responsible although he did not man, equip, or train the robot? Or is it the designer, the programmer, or nobody?

In addition to the lack of empathy and other feelings unique to human beings, the difficulty in employing lethal robotics on the battlefield is displayed in second-, third-, and fourth-order effects. Soldiers and Marines and fighter pilots on the battlefield must often make instantaneous decisions on the use of lethal force. They consider not only whether someone seen through the scope is an enemy, but also what taking that life will create more enemies or sympathy or any other emotion when taking a life. Psychopaths do. They do not feel guilt or sympathy or any other emotion when taking a life. When robots kill, the question of who is responsible for the deaths will always be an issue. Employing a robot that mistakenly kills a family at a checkpoint or drops a bomb on a funeral procession can have strategic effects without a definitively responsible party. Is the commander who employed the robot responsible although he did not man, equip, or train the robot? Or is it the designer, the programmer, or nobody?

In addition to the lack of empathy and other feelings unique to human beings, the difficulty in employing lethal robotics on the battlefield is displayed in second-, third-, and fourth-order effects. Soldiers and Marines and fighter pilots on the battlefield must often make instantaneous decisions on the use of lethal force. They consider not only whether someone seen through the scope is an enemy, but also what taking that life will mean for the local populace, the tribal leaders, and the individual’s family, and whether taking that life will create more enemies in the long run. It is difficult to imagine that robots will consider such factors or will even have the capability to sort the relevant from the irrelevant.

The author brilliantly contrasts what the U.S. military can achieve today and in
the anticipated future against the morality of its capabilities. Striking enemies from a longer distance using unmanned and autonomous robots removes the element of mutual respect between combatants on the battlefield, which has persisted over time. Without mutual respect, it becomes nearly impossible to conduct dialogue with adversaries. Without dialogue there is no way to achieve endstates, which in turn leads to persistent conflict. Moving to robotic unmanned and autonomous systems removes the risk to combatants on one side of the fight and transfers it to noncombatants on both sides.

Riza warns that in our effort to minimize casualties among our own Servicemembers on the battlefield, we have opened a Pandora’s box of unanticipated second- and third-order effects. Are remote pilots in Nevada who are controlling unmanned aerial vehicles in Pakistan legitimate targets on their way to work? More broadly, if our enemy cannot engage us on the battlefield, do Servicemembers become legitimate targets in the homeland? We are taught from the time we are young lieutenants and ensigns that our adversaries adapt. Riza postulates how they may adapt to robots and the risk we take when we remove actual people from combat.

A shortfall in Riza’s analysis lies in not explaining some of the practical albeit low-level advantages robotics and autonomous systems provide. They do not get driving-under-the influence citations; they do not return home after a deployment with post-traumatic stress disorder and beat their wives and children; they do not visit the payday loan shops and gentlemen’s clubs often found outside military installations. Financially, robots do not need TRICARE benefits, nor do they receive a pension after 20 years of service.

_Killing Without Heart_ leads us to the ultimate conclusion that how we win wars is as important as winning itself. Riza is able to weave in the writings of Michael Walzer and combine his theories of just war with the strategic guidance that today’s American military operates under. This is the seminal book for considering the ethics and moral standards of a future battlefield filled with everything but human beings. Riza warns against becoming a nation that is more warlike without becoming a nation of more warriors. JFQ

---

Major Daniel P. Sukman, USA, is a Strategist in the Army Capabilities Integration Center at the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.
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The Flawed Strategic Debate on Syria
by Richard Outzen

Opponents of forceful U.S. action in Syria have warned of dire consequences, but have generally failed to address the costs of inaction. The results of episodic and ambivalent action are also dire. Those arguing against robust assistance to the opposition have used Afghanistan and other historical analogies to support their positions, but the arguments frequently employ faulty history and faulty reasoning. There are options for coherent, effective action with regional support in pursuit of limited, achievable goals.
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