**Episode 21 - Loyalty Outline**

**INFORMATION:** Discuss loyalty as a leadership concept, both good and bad.

<http://www.quarterdeck.org/WindsOfChange/111-129%20MCPON%20Bushey.htm>

**History Segment:** MCPON Duane Bushey

Duane Bushey thought so too. He never planned to make the Navy a career. It just happened.

One summer's night in 1962, while sitting on a sand dune at Ocean City, Maryland, Bushey told his childhood sweetheart, Susan, that he wanted to go see what was on the other side of that ocean. She didn't understand. Her plans were made to go off to college in September. He had sent in applications too. She didn't know that during his last month of high school, he had decided to join the Navy and see the world.

"Where does that leave me?" she asked.

"I'll come back and get you," he promised.

Three days later, he and his friend, Paige Pilchard, found a recruiter in Salisbury, Maryland, and joined the Navy.

Although he never took a book home to study while he was in high school, Bushey scored high enough on the entrance exam to be guaranteed any "A" school he wanted in the Navy. He signed a contract with that guarantee.

Somewhere around the fifth week of boot camp, he went to see the classifier.

"My classifier was a great big, burly chief," Bushey said. "He had tattoos all up and down both arms. I've said over the years that he was a boatswain's mate but I really don't know what he was. He looked down at me and said, 'What do you want to be, boy?"'

Bushey had prepared himself for the question by looking at the pictures of ill the different ratings in a book the recruits were given.

"I want to be an aviation electronics technician," he answered.

The chief opened Bushey's high school record. He saw some "Bs," a few more "Cs," and a lot of "Ds," but none of what he was looking for. To go into his chosen field, Bushey needed the tough courses he had opted not to take in high school: algebra, trigonometry, calculus.

"Why don't you be a sonarman?" the chief classifier suggested.

"I don't want to be a sonarman," Bushey answered. "I want aviation."

"You're too dumb to be an aviation electronics technician," the chief growled. "Why don't you be a sonarman?"

Bushey continued to hold his ground.

Finally, the classifier gave him other choices in the aviation field and Bushey picked aviation electrician's mate. That too required more math courses than he had in his school record.

The chief said: "You're too dumb to be that too. Why don't you be a sonarman?"

But Bushey wasn't an ordinary recruit. He had a signed contract with a guarantee. If the Navy couldn't give him what he wanted, in his mind, the contract was broken.

After another round, in which neither he nor the chief made headway, Bushey decided it was time to take his contract and go home.

When he stood up to leave, the chief s eyes opened wide.

"I didn't tell you to leave," he yelled at the recruit. "Where are you going?"

"I'm out of here," Bushey told the chief. "I signed a contract in Salisbury, Maryland, that said I could be anything I wanted to be in the U.S. Navy. I picked one and you said I couldn't be that. I picked another and you told me I couldn't do that either. I'm going home. I know how to drive tractors and I got a farm back there and, by God, I'm going back to Salisbury, Maryland. I don't have to put up with this."

Bushey got his orders to aviation electrician's mate "A" school and for the next several months he spent long days and nights trying to prove the chief wrong. He was not dumb and he would not "flunk out."

"I graduated number three in my class, but that chief was right," he said, recalling the incident 29 years later. "I had to take remedial math to catch up with everybody else. My rear end is so small because I spent from 10 o'clock at night until 2 o'clock in the morning sitting in the head on a john because that was the only place you could have lights on at that time of night in the barracks. I would go in there to study algebra and trig, a slide rule, and calculus. But I wasn't about to flunk out because he told me I was going to."

Today, Bushey admits that the burly chief probably did the "best thing he could ever do for me."

"Now that I'm more senior," he said, "I realize the value in motivating people through that kind of play acting. He certainly made a big impact on me. If I was a better artist, I could sit down and draw his face today. I can't tell you his name but I saw his face every day through "A" School."

Chiefs Make Big Impression

The classifier wasn't the only chief who made an impression on Bushey as a young sailor. Recently, when asked by a young petty officer who, in his naval career, had made the biggest impact, Bushey told him it was the "chiefs community as a whole."

"My company commander in boot camp was an engineman chief named Lamb," he said. "The meanest son of a gun I ever met. But he taught me something that I never forgot. One day, we were waiting to get our dress blues issued. I was standing by my locker and he walked by. I came to attention and he looked at me and asked why I was just standing around. I told him I was waiting to get my blues issued. He made me do 50 pushups. When I was through, he walked off but 15 minutes later, he came back and I was standing in the same place. He asked me again why I was just standing around and I gave him the same answer. He made me do 50 more pushups. Well, we did this about three or four times and finally, he stopped me and said, 'You sure aren't very smart, Bushey. Haven't you figured out why you are doing these pushups?' And I said, 'No, sir.' He said, 'Well, I'm going to give you a hint. In the U.S. Navy, you never just stand around waiting for something to happen. You make things happen. There is always something to do."'

Bushey said that lesson stayed with him throughout his career.

"If I was standing somewhere not doing something, I felt that I was going to have to do 50 pushups," he said. "I didn't want to do that, so I always found something to do."

Comparing today's leadership with chiefs like Lamb and his classifier, Bushey believes that both were right for the times.

"It was a different style of leadership back then," he said, "but it was effective because young sailors like me feared and respected authority. We didn't ask questions like sailors do today. I'm not saying the way we do it today is wrong. It's just different. Everybody who grew up in society today is different."

The Seventh MCPON

On June 17, Admiral Carlisle A.H. Trost announced that he had selected Bushey to be the seventh Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy.

"I feel like the alarm clock is going to go off soon and I'll wake up," Bushey told a reporter for Navy News during a phone interview shortly after the announcement.

During early interviews with the media, he listed physical fitness, education, integrity, and quality family time among his personal priorities.

He promised to support family programs already in place, to put continuing emphasis on the need for child care facilities, and to place more emphasis on financial planning to help sailors balance their checkbooks. Before taking office, he advocated the use of Direct Deposit System (DDS) in a video for the Navy Accounting and Finance Center.

A CNO'S Assessment

His sense of humor makes him accessible to all ranks: here MCPON Bushey ask for a second helping of field chow.

"To be a good leader, to give the kind of leadership that this demanding service requires of us, we need to be proactive. We need to be aware of potential problems before they become real problems. We need to address ourselves to causes and not just to symptoms of causes. We need to be wise, knowledgeable, and farsighted and then we need to handle all the emergent problems anyway.

"What we find is that no matter how much wisdom, knowledge, and farsightedness we possess, we cannot lead alone. No matter what we think is the reality of a situation, there is probably another reality on the deck plates, and our people need and deserve leaders who know what that reality is. The way we do that is first, to get out on the deck plates ourselves and see what is going on; and second, to have people, at all levels of command, who are, by whatever term we use, the chiefs of the boat who can take the pulse of the command and give us the straight information, perhaps better than we can get it for ourselves.

"The Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, like his counterparts in hundreds of Navy commands around the world, is chartered to observe and act, not to supersede the regular chain of command, but to strengthen it and make it work better. His or hers are the experienced eyes that can see the reality of the deck plates. His or hers is the persuasive, tactful voice that can give just the right encouraging word to junior or senior alike, that will turn a potential problem into a working solution. Indeed, he or she is the pulse taker of the command."

"Speak the Truth"

The new MCPON made a commitment to himself and to the enlisted community to "speak the truth."

"I hope people will learn that I'm going to be honest with them," he said in his first interview with All Hands. "I'm not going to try to build false hopes. I believe sailors will do anything in the world for you, as long as they know why they're doing it."

Bushey also promised to listen more than he talked when visiting with sailors.

"God gave me one mouth and two ears," he said. "I should do twice as much listening as talking, and that'll be my priority."

Bushey used the term "preventive maintenance" to describe his role in protecting people programs already in place. He found himself in good company. Bushey was impressed with the concern that the Navy's senior leadership had for sailors. "In every issue that comes up, they say, 'How is that going to impact the people?”.he told the editor of NAVALOG at Newport, Rhode Island.

Family support programs, such as family service centers, family advocacy, the ombudsman program, and child care had become an integral part of Navy leaders commitment to quality of life. "The focus of my intentions for the next three years will be our sailors and their families," Bushey said. "Anything the Navy policy‑makers, Congress and my office can do to improve the work and home situations of our sailors is where my attentions and efforts will be."

Hectic Pace

During his first four months in office, Bushey set a hectic pace. On the road, he visited with sailors on the East, West, and Gulf Coasts, inland at Millington, Tennessee, Albuquerque, New Mexico, and El Paso, Texas. In December, he and Mrs. Bushey made an 18‑day WestPac tour with stops in Hawaii, Guam, Tokyo, Yokosuka, Atsugi, Japan and Seoul, Korea.

In Washington, he began working issues such as the High Year Tenure (HYT) policy, the recently introduced peer ranking system for enlisted evaluations, and a pending policy statement on fraternization.

With the HYT policy, Bushey picked up the revised policy where Plackett had left it. The battle was not yet won but Bushey finally succeeded in getting OPNAVINST 1160.5B issued, which established a formal High Year Tenure Selection Board to consider continuation beyond professional growth points.

"We have an instruction, we have the boards established and now we need to follow the rules to make it fair to everyone," he said in a Sea Services Weekly article in February, 1989. "The system has to be equitable in order to allow our young sailors advancement opportunities and that's where we're headed right now."

The policy sets the maximum number of years personnel are allowed to serve by pay grade at: E4‑10 years; E5‑20 years; E6‑23 years; E7‑26 years; E8‑28 years; E9‑30 years. HYT boards, composed of master chiefs, meet quarterly and consider each waiver request on an individual basis. Since 1989, the instruction has been revised to modify eligibility and redesign waiver criteria.

Peer ranking, which requires reporting seniors to rank the top 50 percent of 4.0 performers in pay grades E‑6 through E‑8, was one of the first issues that Bushey tackled as MCPON. Bushey spent a great deal of time in Washington and in the fleet clarifying the intent of the policy.

"The purpose of peer ranking is to pick out the cream of the crop," he explained in one interview, "so you can surface the top ones out. There are many confusions about peer ranking and NMPC and I are working to get the word out to the fleet."

Three years later, Bushey reports that commanders have learned to use peer ranking to produce more "honest evals."

The fraternization issue landed on Bushey's desk shortly after taking office in the form of a proposed instruction. Bushey objected to the wording and made his suggestions for improvement. Pushed by MCPON's report of concern in the fleet for a policy statement, the recommendation of a Women in the Navy Study Report in 1987, and Congressional pressure, OPNAVINST 5370.2 was finally released in February 1989. In it, fraternization was defined as any personal relationship between an officer and an enlisted member which is unduly familiar and does not respect differences in rank and grade. For the first time in its long history, the Navy had put its custom of frowning on unduly personal relationships among its members, particularly between officer and enlisted, in writing. It also included relationships between senior and junior enlisted, a factor usually overlooked in the traditional policy.

In an interview with Navy Times before the instruction was issued, Bushey said he didn't believe the Navy needed a fraternization instruction.

"It's just good common sense," he said. "You don't mix sexual relationships, or friendly relationships, with work."

Temporary Halt

On January 29, 1989, Bushey's own work came to a temporary halt. He was admitted to Bethesda Naval Hospital with a respiratory infection similar to bronchial pneumonia. Though his recovery was more rapid than doctors anticipated, Bushey's travel schedule was put on hold for the next few weeks.

During his recuperation, on February 13, Navy Times ran a cover story on the new MCPON that had a big impact on its readers and helped to build his reputation as a MCPON who "tells it like it is."

"In his first few months in office," the article said, 'Bushey has stepped on more than a few toes, proving he is not a very political person for someone filling what many fleet sailors see as a very political job."

A side article in that same issue featured "straight‑talk" from the MCPON. On the physical fitness program, he said: "I don't think we can back off. And there're some COs that we ought to nail right to the wall. If they'd get off their ass and get on with the program we'd quit killing sailors. We do not take care of our people when it comes to health. We don't feed them properly. {Congress} says we've got to have real butter. We've got whole milk. They build our ships so the only way we can cook things is to deep‑fat fry 'em or fry 'em on a grill. Maybe the young kids can take that; the older people can't."

On retention and quality of life: "Sailors love what they're doing and they will continue to do it as long as they can maintain a decent living. We don't want a Cadillac. We don't want a five‑bedroom house with six baths. We want an old Ford pickup truck, we want an average home, and we want to be able to take mother out and do the normal things, go to the movies, have dinner. We've been able to do that, the pay has been O.K."

On the quality of sailors: "You can take all the statistics you want and throw at me. I came from the deck plates, and I can tell you right now that even though we got more high school graduates, I'm getting more and more people that are coming in that can't read. These guys aren't dirtbags because they're Category IVs (CAT IVs). They're CAT IV probably because they can't read. So we set up a good remedial reading program so we can pull those people up, some of them through proper training."

On his own job: "I was appalled that my office had so much power and that people had so much respect for the office that every little single thing I said in that trip report, somebody was calling me up and saying, 'Well, what exactly did you mean by this because we know the admiral is going to ask questions."'

In the wake of the article, sailors wrote letters to the Navy Times editor praising the new MCPON's courage and willingness to "speak out."

MCPON Bushey's comments on the use of butter in Navy messes and a point paper he submitted to Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command spurred a change to that portion of the Navy Ration Law prohibiting the use of oleomargarine. Effective January 1, 1991, general messes began offering patrons a choice of butter or margarine. Alternate preparation methods to reduce frying, inclusion of fruit, and potato service bars, more fish, poultry, fruit and vegetable recipes are among the "healthy choices" offered to sailors today. The changes were all part of a Navy‑wide program to enhance nutrition and weight control.

Additionally, the instruction governing the Navy's health and physical readiness program was revised in 1990. OPNAV Instruction 6110. 1D did not change body fat or PRT standards, but established a requirement that officer fitness reports, as well as enlisted evaluations, contain an entry on physical condition. In a February 1990 Navy Times article, MCPON Bushey applauded the change, saying that the new rules should help eliminate the enlisted resentment toward the program.

NAVLEAD

By the time the 1990 Spring CNO MCPO Advisory Panel convened, the Navy Leader Development Program (NAVLEAD) had replaced the Leading Petty Officer and Chief Petty Officer Leadership and Management Education and Training courses. One‑week courses replaced the two‑week LPO and CPO LMET curriculum and attendance was made mandatory for advancement to E‑7 and E‑8.

MCPON Bushey always believed in the Total Force, One Navy concept. During a drill weekend with a reserve unit, Reserve Naval Mobile Construction Battalion (RNMCB‑23) Washington, D.C., the seventh MCPON applied his brand of teamwork.

To revitalize enlisted leader development at every level of professional development, indoctrination courses were included for petty officer and chief petty officers.

Also covered by the NAVLEAD umbrella were a command indoctrination program and for the first time, a command master chief course. For the first time since formal leadership development courses were introduced in 1974, the Navy had a comprehensive, training program institutionalizing all leadership courses under one sponsor, the Command Excellence and Leadership Development Division in BUPERS.

"He spent a lot of time reading the material, writing changes, and chopping the final product," Kyle said. "He really pushed it through. It was his recommendation that the curriculum for the CPO course be written by chiefs."

Bushey praised NAVLEAD as a "quantum leap forward" in leadership training.

"I think one of the biggest things I came into town thinking about was that the Navy needed to focus on leadership," he said. "I felt like we had outstanding people in the Navy, but sometimes our focus and directions weren't in the right arena."

Bushey also views NAVLEAD as a positive step in lowering attrition rates.

"One of the things that has really helped drive the whole leadership development movement is the attrition," he said, adding that the CNO Master Chief Panel had made many of the recommendations upon which NAVLEAD is based.

"A lot of us feel that good, sensitive leadership can solve some of the attrition problem," he said. "In this technical Navy, we've concentrated so much on teaching people how to be technicians, we forgot that the most complicated equipment we have is people. If I'm having trouble getting you to perform, I can't open a manual and it says, 'OK, to get you to do this, this is what I've got to do.' I can't do that. I've got to learn how to interpret what you're telling me."

New CNO and a Quick Test

In July, 1990, Admiral Trost was relieved as CNO by Admiral Frank B. Kelso II, former Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet. As a participant in the ceremony held at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, Bushey presented the flag to the outgoing CNO.

On August 2, 1990, the All‑Volunteer Force was handed its first major test. Iraqi troops and tanks invaded Kuwait and threatened to move into Saudi Arabia. Eight U.S. Navy Middle East Force ships were present in the Persian Gulf. On August 6, the Secretary of Defense received permission to send U.S. warships through the Suez Canal. Within days, the Navy began providing the ships, aircraft and sailors that, along with the other U.S. and Allied armed services, would become the task force for Desert Shield. By January 16, 199 1, when Desert Shield became Desert Storm, the Navy had 108 ships and 60,000 personnel in the area.

Three months after the beginning of Desert Storm, with the number of sailors involved in the operation increasing daily, MCPON Bushey flew to the Persian Gulf area to visit with sailors aboard ships, at personnel staging areas, in fleet hospitals set up in the desert, and with the Marines on the front lines. He heard problems about pay, supplies, the mail, advancement exams, and the lack of recreational outlets. But he also saw high morale everywhere he visited, sailors adapting to longer working hours and a difficult environment, and a heightened state of readiness. By the time he returned to Washington, the problems that he had reported back to his office by phone were well on their way to solutions or were already fixed. Some problems, however, like slow mail delivery would take time and were never completely resolved. But his visit reassured sailors in the area that someone in Washington was listening.

Throughout the force buildup and the hostilities, Bushey continued to travel around the fleet, telling sailors at Submarine Base Bangor, Washington, on the eve of Desert Storm, that he had considered cancelling his trip due to the war, but that he had decided it was important to "come out and talk to sailors about continuing to work on the future." He carried reassurances from Washington that as soon as possible, operations tempo would return to six‑month maximum deployments, that quality of life programs would receive increased attention from legislatures in the wake of Desert Storm, and that pending force reductions did not mean good sailors would be told to go home.

"There are a lot of good things that come out of getting smaller," he was quoted in the Yorktown Naval Weapons Station newspaper, The Booster.

"We're fortunate that we don't have to take the cuts right now that some of the services are going to have to take. We've been able to program out into the future, so we're going to be able to do it without hurting people. We're not going to be using severance pay because we're not going to RIF people."

When the war ended, Bushey sent a congratulatory message to those who participated and to those who supported the effort.

"You validated our principles of training and leadership, and our tradition of pride and professionalism," he said. As part of the combined effort by the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Coast Guard, both Active and Reserve, you set new standards in cooperation, mutual respect and commitment. Well done."

**I. Introduction**

 A. Attention (Loyalty is complicated. It’s a selfless action, a selfless choice.)

 B. Motivation (Junior Sailors should understand loyalty and its application in Naval service and leadership in order to best serve the Sailors they lead, work for and with.)

 C. Overview (Loyalty as a topic is something I am both passionate about and confused by. Confused in that I see many selfish people claiming to be loyal. That doesn’t work. It’s not possible to be loyal to another person while having selfish motivations for doing so, they cancel each other out. You can be loyal to yourself, which is essentially just being selfish. But you can’t be loyal to someone for your own gain. That’s NOT loyalty. But it’s common. I see it all the time. It’s a misrepresentation of loyalty that is hurting Sailors at all levels and hindering mission accomplishment as a result. It’s maddening.)

 D. Plug “Ask DGUTS!” segment. dontgiveuptheshippodcast@gmail.com

**II. Body**

 A. Main Point 1 (What is loyalty?)

 1. Sub-point (Definition) – faithful to one's oath, commitments, or obligations; faithful to any leader, party, or cause, or to any person or thing conceived as deserving fidelity; characterized by or showing faithfulness to commitments, vows, allegiance, obligations, etc.

 2. Sub-point (Relation to Naval Service) – It’s important to process loyalty in relation to what you do every day – serve in the Navy. So how does it fit in to Naval service? We practice it every day, from day one. You become a part of a team, a group of Sailors at Recruit Training called a “division”. You develop relationships with those people. Some become great friends. You develop that relationship and as a result, become loyal on some level to that person as their friend. There are things you would do for them that you would not do for others, a stranger for example. You would defend their reputation when they aren’t around, speak up for them if it could help them advance in some way. You also develop loyalty to your service, the Navy, as we build pride in being part of the organization through its heritage. You develop pride in being known as a “Sailor” and in wearing the uniform. And finally, you build a type of loyalty to your superiors – at that point, mainly out of fear and respect for their rank than any relationship, but that develops when you arrive at your permanent duty stations with your direct supervisors.

 2. Sub-point (Relation to Naval Leadership) – For leaders, loyalty is something you primarily cultivate. Of course, as a leader, I practice the same forms of loyalty mentioned previously in my roles as a peer and subordinate but as a leader, I want people loyal to ME. And when I say “me”, I really mean the TEAM. And that is where the line is between good loyalty and bad loyalty. When we identify that as leaders, we’re cultivating loyalty to a team who’s goal is mission accomplishment, then we’re doing it right. When we lose sight of the team and we get caught up in developing loyalty to us as individuals, to us personally, that can be dangerous. Loyalty for leaders can also be tough when as an individual leader you disagree passionately with the direction the organization has chosen. There are many times when our duty is to lead the team we are charged with in a direction we don’t believe in as an individual leader. Loyalty to the mission and to the organizational leaders is what you often hear called “buy-in”. You have to buy in. You do! If it’s not harming your Sailors or mission accomplishment, and you expressed your concerns but they chose another direction, then that just became YOUR DIRECTION. That’s what loyalty looks like in practice by leaders.

 B. Main Point 2 (Types of Loyalty)

 1. Sub-point (Seniors/Mission) – Loyalty TO seniors and the mission is an important concept to understand. I feel like maybe next to blind loyalty, which we’ll talk about later, is the most misunderstood. Loyalty to the unit’s mission and specifically to the senior leaders charged with it’s accomplishment is mischaracterized as “kissing butt” or being subservient to “the man”, or whatever. This is an extremely narrow and immature point of view. Like we always say, think, be critical while being open minded with your evaluation of your leaders. However, assuming you have done that and have identified them to be at the very least competent leaders with your best interest at heart, then what sense does it make to battle that? Leaders, true leaders, only care about taking care of you. Taking care of you so that you may take care of the mission. And as we have also mentioned previously, if you are not contributing to those leaders success, you’re LITERALLY working against yourself. Loyalty to that leader is you investing in their success. Investing in successfully accomplishing the mission.

 2. Sub-point (Peers) – Loyalty to peers, to those you work with on a daily basis is teamwork. This will be a small glimpse into a topic I plan to do next, “Your Competition is NOT Your Problem”. Loyalty to your peers is what you see when you see a high functioning team. When you watch them work well together, at a high level, to accomplish the mission, you’re watching loyalty to the team members in action. It’s helping others. It’s going out of your way to ensure everyone has what they need. It’s contributing in any way you can to the success of your team.

 3. Sub-point (Subordinates) – Loyalty to subordinates is what inspires trust. Their trust is what inspires them to follow you. It’s your responsibility as a leader, whether you like them or not, whether they are performing at a high or low level, whether they absolutely make your blood boil! It’s your RESPONSIBILITY as a leader to be loyal to your subordinates. To demonstrate loyalty to them regardless of what is happening. To do for them what they NEED to develop and be taken care of as Sailors both personally and professionally at all times.

 C. Main Point 3 (Blind Loyalty)

 1. Sub-point (What is it?) – So now we need to look at the really dangerous side of loyalty. I’ve spoken to why loyalty at all levels is important, but there is a negative side to everything. And the negative side of informed loyalty is blind loyalty. Blind loyalty is someone who is loyal just because. Who is loyal to a mission or leader because they said so. That doesn’t understand why they are doing what they’re doing. That doesn’t bother to question someone’s motives or think for themselves. When someone is blindly loyal, for whatever reason, they will blindly and unquestioningly follow someone down any road. This is where hostile command climates come from. This is where “bad apples” come from. This is where almost every, single NJP comes from. This is where attrition from our Navy is born.

 2. Sub-point (Why is it bad?) – When Sailors at ANY LEVEL don’t think, don’t use their brains, and are blindly following a bad leader or bad example we are failing. It all seems to come back to the constant reiteration by me of “THINK!”.

 3. Sub-point (How to avoid it.) – THINK DAMMIT. Don’t allow someone to make decisions for you. Question everything. This can be REALLY DIFFICULT. You may have to question leadership. You may have to defy policies! You may have to say uncomfortable things to leaders or groups of peers and subordinates. But blindly following because it’s comfortable or easy is cowardice. Absolute cowardice. You have to have the courage to stand up and ask questions. Whether it’s in your mind or of your leadership, ask questions. Push back if needed. Get clarification. Don’t ever blindly follow anyone anywhere. GOOD LEADERS WILL TELL YOU, THEN SHOW YOU. Good leaders will answer your questions. They will inspire TRUST THROUGH LOYALTY TO YOU.

**III. Conclusion**

 A. Summary (We talked about…)

 1. What loyalty is and the different types…

 2. How it relates to Naval leadership and service…

 3. And the pitfalls of loyalty, specifically BLIND loyalty…

 B. Re-motivation (Junior Sailors should understand loyalty and its application in Naval service and leadership in order to best serve the Sailors they lead, work for and with.)

 C. Closing – Loyalty can be easy or hard. It can be comforting and scary. But you will not have a high functioning mission accomplishing organization without it. You just won’t. Loyalty inspires trust. Trust inspires a group to follow a leader towards a common goal. Without it, the team fails. It’s critical to everything we endeavor to accomplish! And when it’s absent or in the process of becoming absent you need to open your mouth and say something. I’m in the midst of this RIGHT NOW. I’m in the midst of fighting to fix this. I won’t go into any kind of detail because I’m in the midst of it but I’m having incredibly difficult conversations that will hopefully lead to what will be hard but necessary change. It’s not something I wanted to do. I wanted to fix it at my level. I wanted them to listen and get on board. To be loyal to their subordinates…to their team. But when I exhausted all my options I arrived at a moment where I had to decide. Decide whether or not I would bear the weight of my responsibilities and elevate it to the next level or…not. Not would have been easy. Comfortable. But it would have betrayed my team. Betrayed the loyalty I have to my team. And I can’t do that. I’ll never stop putting myself in those positions if need be because it’s my RESPONSIBILITY. As it’s yours.

 D. Plug “Ask DGUTS!” segment. dontgiveuptheshippodcast@gmail.com