



Project  
**MUSE**<sup>®</sup>

*Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.*

torture or for an understanding of how torturers are made. Miles claims that “[n]o characteristic antecedent . . . has been identified in those who torture” and that “[t]orturers defy pop psychology,”<sup>6</sup> a backhanded slap at all the work done by such researchers as Stanley Milgram, Philip Lombardo, Mika Haritos-Fatouros, the psychotherapist Joan Golston, and many others. He prefers to ask “What is the societal function of torture?,” a critically important question, to be sure. One of Miles’ great virtues is his understanding of torture as a social institution and not just a result of personal dysfunction—but not a question that need replace inquiry into the psychological dynamics of those susceptible to becoming torturers.

Nonetheless, Miles has done a great service in the production of this book: a great service to his country, to the victims of torture, and to the rule of law but most especially to the medical profession itself, a profession he no doubt loves enough to call to account when it fails itself and all the rest of us.

**William F. Schulz\***  
**Center for American Progress**

\* *William F. Schulz, a Senior Fellow in human rights policy at the Center for American Progress, served as Executive Director of Amnesty International USA from 1994–2006.*

**William F. Felice, *How Do I Save My Honor? War, Moral Integrity, and Principled Resignation* (Rowan & Littlefield 2009) 232 pages, ISBN 0742566668.**

Honor and shame, unlike guilt, represent the most public forms of cultural discipline applied to personal conduct

and expressions of individual integrity. Shame punishments operate in ways designed to humiliate and embarrass, and, at times, to erode the capacity of the person to live within a cultural community. Honor bespeaks of the public recognition of a person’s willingness to uphold the reputation for behavior that attends communal values. The linkages between honor and shame emerge within and across closed community value systems connecting personal reputation for behavior to disciplinary punishments exerted by community agents acting at the behest of blood, clan, kinship, or regimental cultural orders. Honor arises as a consequence of the cultural legitimacy grounded in beliefs and ideologies that privilege group survival, primordial bonding, and communal loyalty above all other virtues.

William F. Felice, in *How Do I Save My Honor? War, Moral Integrity, and Principled Resignation*, thus refers to the moral conditions confronted by individuals within policy-making situations when their value loyalties become conflicted and ultimately divided in intolerable ways. The central focus of Felice’s analysis looks at how individuals situated in positions of influence or in offices with access to official information respond morally to instances fraught with ethical peril.

The specific sets of cases of interest to Felice are those that arose during the presidency of George W. Bush with respect to the US intervention in Iraq and subsequent revelations regarding various outrages including those infamously associated with Abu Ghraib. These events prompted a small but highly articulate group of individuals within the administration to undertake principled resignation from their official capacity

---

6. MILES, *supra* note 2, at 160.

and to leave office in a way designed to demonstrate their renunciation and rejection of policy. The list of individuals includes John H. Brown, John Brady Kiesling, and Wayne White who found it morally compelling to resign in protest from the US Foreign Service along with Aidan Delgado and Ehren Watada, both of whom resigned in principle from positions in the US Armed Forces. Felice also includes Mary Ann Wright, a US military officer who resigned from the US Foreign Service. Felice adds a separate chapter on British experience based upon members of Parliament and Cabinet during the Blair regime. This cross-section provides a rich tapestry from which Felice draws a poignant portrayal of officials caught in circumstances that make them beholden to communal bonding and ethical strictures of loyalty but who come to realize that continued service represents a profound defection from their own sense of moral integrity based on the very value foundations that make public service such a high calling.

In the course of his interviews with these individuals, Felice explores the political and policy options available to persons caught in the moral predicaments in which public disavowal of policy must come at the cost of one's reputation for loyalty and, by implication, reputation for integrity or honor. The range of choices he considers includes remaining loyal within the organization while attempting to alter policies and decision making, and the possibility of quiet departure in ways that distance one's personal disaffection from the sense of institutional or political dissolution. But such choices are ultimately of little value and significance in Felice's analytical scheme. His scheme seeks to make a case for the role and ultimate moral force of principled resignation where an official addresses an entire polity and, indirectly, history by

delineating the reasons for resignation in ways designed to restore not only one's own honor but the honor of the entire official community that gave rise to and implemented the policies now deemed to be so abhorrent. Felice's book stands as a tribute to those who by means of principled resignation seek, not only to restore personal honor, but as a consequence of the exercise of their public voice, reinvigorate public honor as well. Thus he makes a claim for the importance of a public space in a democratic society for those who, even in war and at times of utter political duress, find it necessary to go public in the name of moral integrity.

Felice builds his case for the importance of principled resignation by examining the unfortunate, sad, and somewhat duplicitous case of General and former US Secretary of State Colin Powell who Felice indicates could have transformed public policy toward US intervention in Iraq had he expressed publically the misgivings he was articulating within the inner decision-making circles of the Bush administration. Felice cites what he calls a "non-interview with Colin Powell" and proceeds to analyze both the "logic" and the "tragedy" of Powell's "staying in." Like Robert McNamara in the case of the US intervention in Indochina, Powell reduced the issues of moral responsibility to the public to a set of technical policy concerns dealing with presidential authority and cabinet processes of consultation and decision making.

Felice's book represents a clear, committed, even passionate cry for moral integrity, particularly with respect to the public right to know in instances of war, belligerence, or states of emergency. His analysis refers to a range of philosophical approaches including realism, utilitarian consequentialism, and deontological theories of reason and right. He stresses

the importance of moral obligation in all circumstances involving hierarchical command, combat, and war. His reflections on deontology and human rights, civil disobedience, Machiavellian notions, and “dirty hands” provide useful guideposts toward a deeper philosophical understanding of the central issues at play.

Felice’s authorial method is to include verbatim large sections of interviews from persons willing to discuss how and in what way they confronted such predicaments. There is value to this in that one comes to understand the inner conflicts experienced almost phenomenologically by and through the narratives contributed by these former officials. On the other hand, Felice may have veered too far in that direction. His book might well have been strengthened by a more systematic probing of the psychological, moral, philosophical, and political conflicts. Nonetheless, Felice has written a clear and well argued presentation that outlines the costs to a democratic polity for a dishonorable loyalty and the need for a deliberative politics that is renewed by the honor of moral integrity expressed through principles of resignation in protest.

**Edward Weisband\***  
**Diggs Endowed Chair in**  
**the Social Sciences**  
**Department of Political Science**  
**Virginia Tech**

\* *Edward Weisband is Edward S. Diggs Endowed Chair Professorship, in the Department of Political Science of the College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences, Virginia Tech University. He was educated at Princeton University, B.A., 1961, Stanford University, M.A., and*

*the School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) of the Johns Hopkins University, Ph.D., 1969. He is also an associated faculty affiliated with the Government and International Affairs Program of the Virginia Tech School of Public and International Affairs and a Senior Fellow of the Virginia Tech Institute for Policy and Governance. In the course of his career he has authored, co-authored, edited, and co-edited a total of eleven books or monographs, published nineteen authored or co-authored book chapters, and authored or co-authored seventeen peer-reviewed journal articles.*

***The International Struggle for New Human Rights* (Clifford Bob ed., Univ. of Pennsylvania Press 2009) 192 pages, ISBN 978812241310.**

*The International Struggle for New Human Rights* edited by Clifford Bob, is a welcome addition to scholarship on human rights transnational networks, global civil society movements, and the rhetorical uses of *rights speak*.<sup>1</sup> The volume builds on and complicates the important contribution of Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink’s well-known, *Activists Beyond Borders*.<sup>2</sup> Keck and Sikkink’s concept of transnational advocacy networks (TANs) develops the concept of organizing civil society volunteerism. In their model, a mobilized, marginalized majority through networks of activists “who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services” work to change norms and achieve their goals.<sup>3</sup> Exemplified by selected human rights movements and environmental movements, TANs, according to Keck and Sikkink, are networks of voluntary associ-

- 
1. THE INTERNATIONAL STRUGGLE FOR NEW HUMAN RIGHTS (Clifford Bob ed., 2009).
  2. MARGARET KECK & KATHRYN SIKKINK, *ACTIVISTS BEYOND BORDERS: ADVOCACY NETWORKS IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS* (1998).
  3. *Id.* at 22.