STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

BELIEF IN GOD AS A FOUNDATION FOR STRATEGIC PLANNERS -- A NEW LOOK AT VALUES AND OLD CHURCH AND STATE ISSUES

BY

CHAPLAIN (COLONEL) WINFIELD D. BUZBY
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited

19960603 277

USAWC CLASS OF 1996

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

USAWC STRATEGIC RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

BELIEF IN GOD AS A FOUNDATION FOR STRATEGIC PLANNERS-- A NEW LOOK AT VALUES AND OLD CHURCH AND STATE ISSUES

by

Chaplain (Colonel) Winfield Dickenson Buzby

Chaplain (Colonel) John Brinsfield
Project Advisor

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Winfield Dickenson Buzby, Ch (COL), USA

TITLE: Belief in God As A Foundation For Strategic Planners--A New Look At Values and Old Church And State Issues

FORMAT: Strategic Research Project

Date: 1 March 1996 PAGES: 25 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The responsibilities of strategic leaders are as diverse as they are awesome. One of the critical prerequisites which all strategic leaders must possess, however, is a clear and comprehensive understanding of the relationship which exists between national values, national purpose and national military strategy. Historically, one of the most important national values for the citizenry of the United States is the right to believe in God as one chooses, and the freedom to act upon that belief. Provided for in the Declaration of Independence, guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution, and codified by every branch of the Federal Government this fundamental premise has been a prime source of inspiration, motivation, courage, commitment, and compassion for America's military personnel of all ranks and positions from the Revolutionary War to the present. This paper looks at the fact and results of belief in God and religion as a foundational underpinning of strategic planning by examining historical documents and policy, and by reexamining church and state issues.

BELIEF IN GOD AS A FOUNDATION FOR STRATEGIC PLANNERS-- A NEW LOOK AT VALUES AND OLD CHURCH AND STATE ISSUES

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to examine whether strategic leaders can legitimately include belief in God as a factor in strategic planning. In so doing, two questions must be answered. First, according to U.S. policy what, if any, connection exists between values and strategic planning? And the second and more complex question: is belief in God in fact a U.S. national value?

STRATEGIC PLANNING--LOOSE CANNON OR CROWNING CENTERPIECE

The question that must first be answered is the ontological one: where does military strategy come from? Does it have roots or is it free-floating, self-determining and self-evaluating? Does it have a life of its own, or is it part of a system known collectively as American government, culture, and way of life?

President Clinton provides a response in the 1995 National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement. In citing America's raison d'etre, the U.S. Commander-in-Chief states that: "Our national security strategy reflects both America's interests and our values. Our commitment to freedom, equality, and human dignity continues as a beacon of hope... around the world."[1]

But the question remains. What is strategy, and from whence does it come? In some sense "strategy is an art, and a highly creative one at that."[2] At the same time, however, "it is also somewhat scientific, in that it follows certain patterns which require a common understanding of terminology, adherence to certain principles, and disciplined, albeit creative thought

processes."[3] Thus, strategy does not exist in a vacuum. Rather, there is a codified procedure for strategy development which ensures the military is subservient to civilian leadership, and that national purpose and values are the starting point, not an incidental of the process. So then, as the Department of National Security and Strategy has stated, national values shape national interests, which in turn shape strategic appraisal, which in turn shapes national policy, which in turn shapes national strategy, which in turn shapes military strategy, which both informs and is informed by risk assessment.[4] Developing that concept, it is apparent that "Nations, like individuals have interests--derived from their innate values and perceived purpose--which motivate their actions."[5] This gets to the essence of what the United States is all about. How important are values to this nation and its strategic planning? "U.S. national values represent the legal, philosophical and moral basis for continuation of the American system. U.S. values are the core of national interests."[6] Thus, national values are hardly ancillary.

The case then is clear. If something is a national value, it impacts upon and is relevant to national strategy. How then can people say that belief in God is not relevant to the planners of national strategy? There is only one way. They must assume that religion is not part of America's traditional national values. The question is whether or not history, and the legal, philosophical, and other kinds of documents alluded to above support such a thesis. So the search moves to items of national prominence and secular history filed in the National Archives and

the Library of Congress. History can and must speak for itself.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

Beginnings are important. The poet has well said, "As the twig is bent, so inclines the tree."[7] No doubt this too is as true of nations as it is of individuals. What then does history record as the beginning of government in colonial America?

The Mayflower Compact

The first six words of American government are these: "In the Name of God, Amen." That phrase introduces the Mayflower Compact--the "first agreement for self-government ever put in force in America,"[8] signed 11 November 1620. The Mayflower's passengers had completed an arduous journey, and faced a harsh and rigorous winter. It was a matter of survival for each individual as well as the community. To that end certain governing policies needed to be established. Therefore, they drafted and signed the Mayflower Compact.

The document contains seven references in all to God, His attributes, or faith in Him. Simply stated, the first words of American government begin, end, and are fully interspersed with references to God and religion. What must be determined is whether such a document is typical or atypical of American history, government and political thought.

The First Constitution

When Alexis de Toqueville visited America in the 19th century he wrote: "In the laws of Connecticut, as well as in all those of New England, we find the germ and gradual development of that township independence which is the life and mainspring of

American liberty of the present day...."[9] Appropriately enough, it was precisely there in Connecticut that the first American Constitution was drafted for three towns in 1638. It has been called "the first written constitution in the history of the nations."[10] Writing in 1884 George Walker says that "Charter of public rule was a document far in advance of anything the world had ever seen in its recognition of the origin of all civil authority as derived under God from the agreement and covenant of the whole body of the governed."[11] That constitution begins with significant and repeated reference to God and His word as the shaping influences of American government. The first sentence is as poignant as it is long.

> Forasmuch as it has pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of his divine prudence so to order and dispose of things that we the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, Harteford and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and upon the River of Conectecotte and the lands thereunto adjoining; and well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasions shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one Public State or commonwealth; and do, for ourselves and our successors and such as shall be adjoined to us at any time hereafter, enter into combination and confederation together, to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ which we now profess....[12]

Of such kinds of government Thomas Jefferson would later write: "Those wards, called townships in New England, are the vital principle of their governments, and have proved themselves the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government, and for its preservation."[13] Before assuming leadership roles at the Federal level Jefferson would

study and master New England's system and basis of government.

A Sampling of Sentiments from the Nation's Infancy

In 1843 Daniel Webster, writing about the great political experiment in America during the 17th and 18th centuries, contrasted the French and English. He said the English colonists avoided a French Revolution by a change of venue, "carrying with them the intellectual and moral culture of Europe, and the personal and social relations to which they were accustomed, but leaving behind their political institutions."[14] He adds insight into that compound leaving-and-taking process by writing:

> It has been said with much vivacity, that the felicity of the American colonists consisted in their escape from the past. This is true so far as respects political establishments, but no farther. They (the colonists) brought with them a full portion of all the riches of the past, in science, in art, in morals, religion, and literature. The Bible came with them. And it is not to be doubted, that to the free and universal reading of the Bible, in that age, men were much indebted for right views of civil liberty.[15]

A letter written in Braintree, Massachusetts in November 1775 from Abigail Adams to Mercy Warren captures the prevailing sentiments of the colonies and the era. With passion she writes:

> A patriot without religion in my estimation is as great a paradox as an honest Man without the fear of God. Is it possible that he whom no moral obligations bind can have any real Good Will towards Man, can he be a patriot who by openly vicious conduct is undermining the very bonds of Society, corrupting the Morals of Youth and by his bad example injuring the very Country he professes to patronize more than he can possibly compensate by his intrepidity, Generosity and humor? The Scriptures tell us righteousness exalteth a nation.[16]

For Abigail Adams the syllogism is both clear and simple. Morality is the basis of society on the new continent. And religious values are the cornerstone of morality. Without such

values both the patriot and the state are endangered species.

Upon his passing, George Washington was eulogized before Congress as a man "first in war; first in peace; first in the hearts of his countrymen." In many ways, he was the first U.S. precedent. Knowing that, he weighed his words carefully. Concerning lessons he learned before, during, and after his years of service to the nation he would later write:

> Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, "Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert our oaths...?"[17]

Washington had incorporated those principles into his public service. One of the best examples is his Prayer for the Nation, written June 8, 1783 at Newburgh, New York, his final Headquarters at the end of the Revolutionary War. He wrote:

> Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in thy holy protection, that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large.
>
> And finally, that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy nation.
>
> Grant our supplications, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.[18]

It is significant that Washington penned those words following

his serving as Commander-in-Chief of American troops in combat, that he circulated them to the governors of the states, and that several wars later both the U.S. Army and Navy chose to incorporate them in the World War II Ship and Field Hymnal.

The Declaration of Independence

The Declaration of Independence is a monumental and seminal document which caused the birth of this nation. But what, if anything, does it have to do with the issue of God and religion?

The first paragraph asserts that a nation's place in the world is an entitlement based on both the Laws of Nature and the God of Nature. The second paragraph reminds the reader that some truths are self-evident: namely, the endowment upon all men of certain inalienable rights to include the well known trilogy of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This endowment (by implication) is not via human instrumentality to include government, but, in contrast, by a sovereign act of a common Creator. The concluding paragraph affirms that the signers of the Declaration of Independence "mutually pledge to each other (their) lives, fortunes, and sacred honor" in support of the document and in "firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence." Thus, to the signers of the Declaration it is the Creator God who makes the nation possible, endows rights and dignity equally to all men, and who enables and sustains them as they act in courage in accordance with their conscience. Upon those truths they were staking the nation's survival, their lives, and everything they ever hoped to be or own.

Constitutional Convention

In 1787 the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia to draft a new governing document. After a stalemate and significant impasses and frustrated attempts to balance states' rights concerns with issues of a strong centralized Federal authority, the revered Benjamin Franklin took the floor and addressed his fellow delegates. In an impassioned plea he challenged his colleagues to remember how they had depended on the blessing of God through prayer to sustain them during the rigorous trials of the Revolution. He wondered why they should not return to that practice, and enjoined the body to offer daily prayer to guide the deliberations henceforth--a practice that was adopted and became a foundational element in framing the Constitution.[19]

The First Amendment

And yet, as good as the Constitution was, it was not flawless. In 1789 amendments were proposed to fine tune that document, of which ten were eventually ratified by the states to become the Bill of Rights. The first amendment, commonly known as the Freedom of Speech Amendment, could just as well, using the introductory phrase, be referred to as the Freedom of Religion Amendment. In that amendment Congress enacted legislation limiting its future lawmaking purview with regard to religion. The amendment states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...." The two prongs of "establishment" and "free exercise" would become pivotal factors in facilitating future generations' understanding of the intent of the founding fathers.

Congress thereby limited itself so that it could neither do anything to make religion happen (such as a state church), or to preclude the free practice thereof. In a real sense the amendment is merely an extension of what was already imbedded in the body of the Constitution in section 3 of Article VI. There was to be "no religious Test ever required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." There was no requirement in the Constitution for any public or private citizen to be religious; but neither was anyone restricted from being so. Thereby, representatives of church and state could collaborate to achieve distinct but mutually supportive goals.

The U.S. Army Chaplaincy

Perhaps one of the best examples of church and state issues is the establishment of the U.S. Army Chaplaincy. Included here as an outgrowth of the sentiments of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution, chronologically it actually preceded them. Congress established the Army Chaplaincy on 29 July 1775--just 45 days after the nation's Army was formed. That makes the Army Chaplaincy almost a year older than the nation itself, and older than every service in the Department of Defense except for the Army. And, older than almost every branch within that service. Why is that important? For two reasons. First, the military chaplaincy was definitely not an afterthought. And second, the same founding fathers who drafted and signed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were the ones who created the Army Chaplaincy. Clearly there was no disconnect in the minds of the founding fathers that would preclude a military chaplaincy.

Perhaps the regimental crest of the U.S. Army Chaplaincy says it best: "Pro Deo et Patria"--For God and Country. The meaning is readily apparent. Service to one need not ipso facto in any way deny the possibility of simultaneous service to the other.

The National Anthem

In 1814 Francis Scott Key wrote a poem, entitled the Star-Spangled Banner, which would later be set to music. Key wrote the words while being detained on a British warship and thereby witnessing the British shell Baltimore's Fort McHenry with over 1500 shells, weighing as much as 220 pounds each.[20] Seeing the national colors still flying after the bombardment, he was inspired. For Key it was evidence of the providential hand of God.

Key's lyrics had four stanzas, each one ending with the familiar and proud words: "land of the free and home of the brave." But the last verse also contained another important phrase that was destined to become part of America's heritage. Key wrote: "Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation." That exhortation was followed by these words: "Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just, And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust.'" It is significant that in 1931 Congress designated that song (to include those words) to be the national anthem. In 1814, as well as in 1931, religion and trust in God were an integral part of American life and patriotism--officially condoned, while not, of course, being mandated.

Early Presidential Views on Church and State

Sometimes it is difficult to tell if something is an anomaly or part of a representative pattern. What follows are quotes

from five of the first six presidents of the United States, whose leadership guided the Republic through its infancy, and whose administrations spanned from 1789 to 1829.

George Washington has already been cited. No doubt this quote best sums his sentiments in this regard, however. "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."[21]

Washington was followed in the White House by John Adams. He recognized both the power and purview of religion in the democracy when he said: "We have no government armed with power which is capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion."[22] He went on to say that "our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."[23]

The third president, Thomas Jefferson, is perhaps best remembered for his "wall of separation" statement made to a group of Danbury Baptists--some eleven years after the drafting of the Constitution. Jefferson's so-called "separation of church and state" comment is often taken out of context and seldom balanced by the totality of his life and beliefs. But these words of Jefferson are etched for posterity at the Jefferson Memorial:

> Can the liberty of a nation be secure where we have removed a conviction that these liberties are a gift from God? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just. That his justice cannot sleep forever.[24]

James Madison has been called the "Father of the Constitution." His view of religion in the democracy is enlightening.

> Religion, or the duty we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason

> and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore, that all men should enjoy the fullest toleration in the exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience, unpunished and unrestrained by the magistrate, unless under the color of religion any man disturb the peace, the happiness, or safety of society, and that this is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity to each other.[25]

But perhaps Madison showed his best insight into the human experiment in government and religion when he said:

> We have staked the whole future of American civilization not on government, far from it. We have staked the future of all our political institutions upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves according to the Ten Commandments.[26]

Yet it was John Quincy Adams who was able to articulate exactly what it was that the American Revolution had done. He said: "The highest glory of the American Revolution was this: it connected in one indissoluble bond the principles of civil government and the principles of Christianity."[27]

Supreme Court Rulings

The founding fathers established three branches of government as checks and balances to guide the fledgling democracy and keep it on course. What did the Supreme Court have to say, if anything, about such matters during these formative years and during the decades that followed?

In a 1796 decision the Supreme Court ruled in the Runkle vs. Winemiller case that "by our form of government, the Christian religion is the established religion and all sects and denominations of Christians are placed on the same equal footing."[28] Rendered within a decade of the ratification of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, the ruling provides valuable insight into the Court's sentiments during that era. In 1811 the Supreme Court

continued to annotate the fact that religious beliefs were not hazardous, but in fact favorable, to the survival of the union. It said: "Whatever strikes at the root of Christianity tends manifestly to the dissolution of civil government.[29] In a decision at the turn of the century the Supreme Court ruled in 1892:

> Our laws and institutions must necessarily be based upon and embody the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind. It is impossible for it to be otherwise, and in this sense and to this extent our civilization and our institutions are emphatically Christian.[30]

That Church of the Holy Spirit vs. the United States case made it clear where the Supreme Court stood on church and state issues.

But perhaps one of the most instructive writings from the Court was penned by Chief Justice William O. Douglas in 1952 in the Zorach vs. Clausen case. He wrote with clarity of insight.

> The First Amendment... does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. That is the common sense of the matter. Otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other--hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly.... Municipalities would not be permitted to render police or fire protection for religious groups. Policemen who helped parishioners into their places of worship would violate the Constitution. Prayers in our legislative halls; the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamation making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; "so help me God" in our courtroom oaths--these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies, would be flouting the First Amendment. A fastidious atheist or agnostic could even object to the supplication with which the Court opens each session: "God save the United States and this Honorable Court."[31]

House Judiciary Report

As the third branch of government, Congress certainly isn't excluded from the process. It has its own Judiciary Committee. What was the thinking in that body in the mid 19th century, even

as they looked back to the founding fathers? This report from the House Judiciary Committee dated 27 March 1854 shows the place of religion in America, and while not being exclusionary, demonstrates an incontrovertible biblical basis for the government in America as established and practiced.

> Had the people during the revolution had any suspicion of any attempts to war against Christianity, that revolution would have strangled in its cradle. At the time of the adoption of the constitution and its amendments, the universal sentiment was that Christianity should be encouraged, but not any one sect... In this age there is no substitute for Christianity....That was the religion of the foundation of the republic, and they expected it to remain the religion of the descendants. The great, vital and conservative element in our system is the belief of our people in the pure doctrines and divine truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ.[32]

The Gettysburg Address

The Civil War chronicles one of the low points of American history. In the middle of that war, the Chief Executive, President Abraham Lincoln, both challenged and spoke for Americans throughout the Union when he delivered his brief but memorable Gettysburg Address. It was not off the cuff, but scripted and well prepared. Only two words were added extemporaneously--not found in his original written document, but part of his oral delivery thereof. In the final sentence he added the words "under God" to modify "this nation." Apparently in Lincoln's mind the nation's existence, new birth of freedom, and government of, by, and for the people were all attributable to God, and to His sovereign benevolent hand over the nation-state.

Pledge of Allegiance

The pledge first appeared in an 8 September 1892 edition of the Youth's Companion Magazine. Originally it was a pledge to

"my flag" which some 30 years later was changed to "the flag of the United States of America," bringing it to the basic form of today. With one important exception. In 1954 Congress added the same words to the pledge that Lincoln had added to his Gettysburg Address: "under God" to modify "one nation."[33] Thus, based on an act of Congress in 1954 (not 1754 or 1854), Americans' allegiance was thereby pledged to a nation which was indivisible, that espoused liberty and justice for all, and that existed under the sovereign hand of God. It seems plausible to believe that Congress enacted that change with intentionality and purpose, and saw it as no breach of any church and state protocol or values.

National Motto

Webster defines motto as "a word, phrase, or sentence chosen as expressive of the goals or ideals of a nation or group." As such it can be used to represent what a nation stands for, and what its people care about and deem important.

Following several union defeats and general disarray, Reverend M.R. Watkinson, of Ridleyville, Pennsylvania wrote Salmon P. Chase, the Secretary of Treasury, on 13 November 1861. The pastor stated: "From my heart I have felt our national shame in disowning God as not the least of our present national disasters."[34] He went on to say that one way to make amends, raise national consciousness, instill hope, and invoke the blessing of God would be the "recognition of the Almighty God in some form on our coins."[35] Using the authority of his office, Secretary Chase mandated that designs be prepared so that coins could be struck with the words "In God We Trust" upon them, and backed

legislation to authorize the same. It was not until 1864 that the phrase actually appeared on U.S. coins, however, appearing and disappearing intermittently until 1955 when Congress passed a law making the phrase appear on all U.S. coinage and paper money. As a follow-on, in 1956 Congress enacted legislation making "In God We Trust" the official U.S. national motto.[36] It reflected national values and proclaimed to the U.S. citizenry as well as to the world that religion was a vital part of the U.S. national identity. The seeds had of course been sown a century and a half earlier in the song which in 1931 had become the national anthem.

The National Prayer Breakfast

During the Eisenhower Administration era another important custom was initiated--the National Prayer Breakfast. Continuing to this day, it is a time each year when civilian and military leaders at every echelon from the President on down celebrate and are thankful for America's heritage and for the men and women who have fought and died to preserve it. In addition it is a time of seeking God's face and favor for blessings in the future and asking for wisdom for those who set the course of the nation.

The Oath of Office

For members of the military, perhaps one other document should be considered: the oath of office, taken by all officers, regardless of branch or service. The first oath, enacted by the First Congress in 1789 simply pledged support of the Constitution.[37] Congress legislated the oath's current form in 1884:[38]

> I, (name), do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same;

> that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

The oath is important because it inextricably links God and the Constitution. There are several implications for the military and God. God is assumed to be capable to enable the oath-taker to fulfil his/her duties, and to possess the inherent knowledge and authority to hold him/her accountable for the performance of them. It seems clear from the oath that the government acknowledges the existence and authority of God in the world, and places the exercise of one's military duty in the context of His omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience and resultant judgment.

A Negative Example--Camelot or Sophisticated Machiavellianism

Kennedy and his cabinet were bright, articulate, and well educated. Yet members of his own inner circle indicted him for lacking the moral and ethical framework to make crisis decisions intuitively. Chester Bowles, Kennedy's technical foreign policy advisor, wrote in May 1961, a month after the Bay of Pigs fiasco, a critique that was as prescient as it was condemnatory.

> The question which concerns me most about this new Administration is whether it lacks a genuine sense of conviction about what is right and wrong....
>
> Anyone in public life who has strong convictions about the rights and wrongs of public morality, both domestic and international, has a very great advantage in times of strain, since his instincts on what to do are clear and immediate. Lacking such a framework of moral conviction or sense of what is right and what is wrong, he is forced to lean almost entirely upon his mental processes; he adds up the pluses and minuses of any question and comes up with a conclusion....
>
> What worries me are the conclusions that such an individual may reach when he is tired, angry, frustrated, or emotionally affected. The Cuban fiasco demonstrates how far astray a man as brilliant and well intentioned as Kennedy can go who lacks a basic

moral reference point.[39]

What is true of the individual is equally true of the nation. Without a solid value system in place with a reference point that is firmly entrenched, the risk looms large that well-intentioned ideas which emanate from an otherwise brilliant strategy may not in fact well serve the nation or its interests in the world.

Desert Storm

Countless examples could be cited of religion as a moving force in America's values, purpose, and strategy. From recent history it is easy to recall political, civic, military, and ecclesiastical authorities joining together in their call for prayer for the service men and women who were to face the "Mother of All Battles" in Iraq. Leaders and followers united together unashamedly in vigilant prayer. God heard and answered. While some received flags "on behalf of a grateful nation," thankfully that number was "miraculously" few--the word General Schwarzkopf had carefully chosen to describe relatively light U.S. casualties.

It is well to remember that at 0230 before the attack General Schwarzkopf had asked Chaplain (COL) Dave Peterson, his Command Chaplain, to offer a prayer. Just prior to that, General Schwarzkopf had read his message to the troops. It contained references to the United Nations, the President, the Congress, and the American people. But it ended with these awesome words: "Now you must be the thunder and lightning of Desert Storm. May God be with you, your loved ones at home, and our country."[40] In a public document the CINC had linked the American way of life and cause to the providential care and keeping of Almighty God.

1995 Thanksgiving Day Presidential Proclamation

In proclamation number 6849, dated November 9, 1995, President Clinton made reference to Governor William Bradford's celebration with Puritans and Indians in 1621 of the first harvest in the new land. The President noted:

> More than 300 years later, the tradition inspired by that gathering continues on Thanksgiving Day across America--a holiday that unites citizens from every culture, race, and background in common thanks for the gifts we receive from God.

President Clinton said "we are deeply grateful for the abundance that keeps America strong and prosperous," and enjoined all Americans to open their "hearts to the grace that makes all good things possible and acknowledge God's care for our world." He said that "with God's help, we can shoulder our responsibilities so that future generations will inherit the wealth of opportunities we now enjoy." In proclaiming 23 November 1995 a National Day of Thanksgiving, he said:

> I encourage all the people of the United States to assemble in their homes, places of worship, or community centers to share the spirit of goodwill and prayer; to express heartfelt gratitude for the blessings of life; and to reach out in friendship to our brothers and sisters in the larger family of mankind.

Interestingly enough the President tied this thanks-giving to two important events by describing this year as "the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth." In his message church and state issues are present in a cooperative way.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to examine whether belief in God is a bonafide consideration for planners of U.S. national and

military strategy. To prove the possibility of such a relationship two questions needed to be answered in the affirmative. Are national values related to the nation's strategic planning? And, is belief in God in fact part of U.S. national values? Historical evidence suggests the answer to both is "yes." No doubt the planner's Bible, FM 100-5, Operations, says it as well as any.

> The Army reflects the highest ideals of the nation it represents--a nation built on a unique set of values and aspirations expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. These enduring values influence virtually every facet of American society, its laws, domestic programs, and foreign relations. A special relationship exists within any nation among the government, the people, and the military; national values address this relationship....
>
> The Army serves as a repository of its national values and embeds them into its professional ethos. Proper subordination to political authority, loyalty, duty, selfless service, courage, integrity, respect for human dignity, and a sense of justice are all part of the Army's identity. These values directly influence the Army's behavior in peace and war.[41]

Whether or not political realists like it, "strategy is about preferences, about value judgements, about not just the type of world that is attainable, but also what is preferable."[42] Thus America's leadership, both political and military, "must decide not only what the United States can do with a more effective military force, but also what it should do."[43] It is the application of values that causes what should and must be done to surface from among the possible options.

Religion as part of America's national values is an enduring theme throughout U.S. History. The importance of religion to the U.S. military is demonstrated in Doctrine for Joint Operations. By doctrine fire support coordinating measures are used to protect four precious commodities: forces, populations, critical infra-

structure, and sites of religious and cultural significance.[44]

Given then the fact that belief in God is a valid consideration for strategic planners, what are the ramifications? The observations and suggestions that follow are a basis for thoughtful reflection and application.

"There are two parts to a mission: the task to be accomplished and the reason or intent.... Of the two, the intent is predominant."[45] What the commander's intent is to the tactical mission, so national purpose, as a reflection of national values, is to national strategy. Strategic leaders must not only examine the "what" of U.S. national policy, but also the "why?" In addition they must be able to conceptualize and articulate the relationship national military strategy has to national purpose and values. When the full planning process is short-circuited, initiated with interests rather than at the beginning, it can promptly degenerate into Machiavellianism, be it ever so subtle in content or sophisticated in form. The resultant policy or strategy can, in effect, become unAmerican in the sense that it is neither rooted in nor in service to the national purpose. If Irangate taught this nation one thing it is this: in the American democracy how a decision is made is as important as the decision itself. In short, it is difficult to overemphasize the importance of national values in strategic planning. They are foundational. And religion has long been held a cornerstone of national values.

Perhaps national political and military leaders need to revisit the concept of the relationship of church and state in America. Based on an examination of the historical evidence it

is tenable to hold that the preponderant question of the founding fathers was never whether or not church and state would cooperate. Rather, it was always about how they would. Granted, it is equally true that this nation is much more pluralistic than it was at its inception some 220 years ago. But the Declaration of Independence and Constitution still remain in effect. Leaders must look for creative ways for church and state issues to be addressed, and to ensure that the rights of all are respected, and that none are infringed upon--be that a minority or majority.

History is replete with examples of the timing of a military operation with a religious holiday. The Tet Offensive, for example, was launched in conjunction with the Vietnamese holy days at the new year in 1968. The 1973 "Yom Kippur" War was so named because Egypt and Syria launched their attack against Israel on Yom Kippur--the highest holy day of the year for Judaism. When the struggle for this nation's freedom was floundering, George Washington felt he needed a victory to bolster the morale in the Clausewitzean "remarkable trinity" of people, army and government. His solution? He launched a bold strike across the Delaware River into Trenton. The date of that attack was Christmas Day 1776. In World War II the Japanese commitment to fight to the death was in part attributable to the Allies' initial insistence that the Japanese emperor must step down--for the Japanese, not only a matter of political surrender, but of religious demise. Strategic leaders today must be aware of the religious calendar and religious sites and customs, and of their import to national strategy and battlefield tactics.

Joint strategic planners in the Pentagon responsible for all out nuclear war have a street name for their plans--Armageddon. The biblical allusion is obvious. But unfortunately, the title is often kept while the taxonomy is discarded. Perhaps planners should consult chaplains and religious leaders to see what Bible prophecy has to say about such things as the Revived Roman Empire, Israel, the land of the North (Russia?), an invasion of Palestine by an army of 200 million from the east (China, no doubt), and a period of increased natural disaster activity to include pestilences, earthquakes and famines. While Bible prophecy often portrays future events using broad brush strokes, it still has utility. General Bruce Clarke's words are worth remembering in this regard: "In the land of the blind, the one-eyed man is king."[46] That's especially true of the future, which as Yogi Berra quipped, "ain't what it used to be". Better to see through a glass darkly with the Apostle Paul than not see at all.

A significant ramification pertains to the nation of Israel. Personnel in the military tend to be as conservative and religious as their civilian counterparts in the nation at large. The question is, what do conservative Bible-believing Christians feel about going to war with Israel? Chaplain (COL) Timothy Tatum, former instructor at the U.S. Army War College, writes:

> It has been demonstrated that the evangelical right is one of the strongest supporters of Israel and her future as an independent nation. Much of this support is based on the Biblical promise, "He who blesses Israel I will bless.[47]

Chaplain Tatum says this impacts on things from arms sales, to military advisors, to support of Israel's claims in border disputes based on "the original land grant given by God in

Genesis."[48] Continuing, he makes some noteworthy observations.

> There is no accurate way of determining how many evangelical men and women in uniform hold firmly to the beliefs outlined above. There are a few flag officers who have privately shared many of these beliefs with the author. Will these soldiers ever go to war against Israel? Probably not. They fear the loss of blessing to them personally, and to our nation generally, if we fought such a war. Furthermore, they see Israel's successes on the battlefield as proof that God is not through with Israel and is continuing to bless them as a nation. "To fight against Israel is to fight against God," is a strong factor in picking allies and enemies.[49]

The ramifications for Pentagon and CENTCOM planners are many.

It is axiomatic that as the Army trains, so will it fight. Planners must consider such kinds of religious factors. Examples could be cited of units in Europe conducting training events in the field over Easter one year after another. And, of exercises conducted in CONUS over both Passover and Easter. Obviously, such conflict with the religious calendar cannot always be avoided. Sometimes units simply must be in the field at that time. But, planners who don't even take such religious dates and their importance into consideration when scheduling training, either because they don't care to, or don't know any better, fail both their commanders and the soldiers and families of the command. The collateral damage in such cases to command credibility, trust, loyalty, family life, and morale can be more than incidental. When making long term field commitments, planners must take into account such religious holidays as Christmas, Easter, and Passover--not to mention such oft over-looked ones as Ramadan, and others that are significant though perhaps less well known. And yes, sometimes the accommodation simply must be made on an individual rather than unit basis.

To be considered a value, something must be chosen freely, prized and cherished, publicly affirmed, and part of a pattern of behavior.[50] This nation and its military must get serious about what they intend to do with "In God we Trust" and "One nation under God." Until those words are changed, they represent national values. As such, they can and should evaluate behavior, and not conversely. While neither commanders nor chaplains are authorized to proselytize those serving in their sphere of influence, neither are they called upon to forsake their faith, nor to induce others to do so--either by design or default.

More importantly, one must never forget that despite the greatness of the United States, it is not the kingdom of God. It has been well said that God doesn't stand for the national anthem. That isn't because he is anti-American. Rather, it is because he is supra-American. It is worth remembering what the Declaration of Independence postulated with regard to a Divine Creator and the resultant rights of the created, and the Biblical beatitude that "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

The application of the principle of cooperation of church and state that the founding fathers envisioned, provided for, and intended should be continued at the strategic as well as tactical levels. Belief in God as part of America's national values will help ensure that she has a rudder and an anchor as she navigates uncharted waters of international relations in war and in peace in the future. But faith can't be practiced by a nation at large. Only, as in the days of Washington--one person at a time. The consummate effect is that America's strategy can indeed be Grand.

ENDNOTES

1. U.S., President, A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement (Washington, D.C.: The White House, 1995), p. iii.

2. Department of National Security and Strategy, Core Curriculum, Course 2--War, National Policy and Strategy (Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1995), p. 106.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 107.

6. Ibid.

7. Alexander Pope, Moral Essays, Epistle I, p. 149, as quoted in The Quotation Dictionary, edited by Robin Hyman (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962), p. 203.

8. World Book Encyclopedia, 1994 ed., s.v. "Mayflower Compact."

9. Verna M. Hall, A Christian History of the Constitution (San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1972), p. 248B.

10. Ibid., p. 249.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., p. 253.

13. Ibid., p. 279.

14. Bertha Roethe, The Daniel Webster Reader (New York: Oceana Publications, 1956), p. 104.

15. Ibid.

16. Verna M. Hall, The Christian History of the Constitution, p. 410.

17. Tim LaHaye, Faith of Our Founding Fathers (Colorado Springs, Colorado: Master Books, 1994), p. 106.

18. Ivan L. Bennett ed., Song and Service Book for Ship and Field (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, Inc., 1942), inside front cover.

19. Tim Lahaye, Faith of Our Founding Fathers, pp 57-59, 122-124.

20. Hana Umlauf Lane ed., The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1984 (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1984), p. 453.

21. David Barton, America's Godly Heritage Videotape (Aledo, Texas: Wallbuilders, 1993).

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

24. Tim LaHaye, Faith of Our Founding Fathers, p. 193.

25. Ibid., p. 127.

26. David Barton, America's Godly Heritage Videotape.

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. Tim Lahaye, Faith of Our Founding Fathers, p. 10.

32. David Barton, America's Godly Heritage Videotape.

33. Hana Umlauf Lane ed., The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1984, p. 453.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Department of National Security and Strategy, Volume I, Part A, Course 2: War, National Policy and Strategy (Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1995), p. 48.

38. Ibid., p. 49.

39. David Halbertstam, The Best and the Brightest (New York: Randolph House, 1972), p. 69.

40. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, It Doesn't Take A Hero (New York: Bantam Books, 1992), p. 413.

41. Department of the Army, Fm 100-5: Operations (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1993), p. 1-2.

42. U.S. Army War College, Course 3: Implementing National Military Strategy, Volume I (Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1995), p. 7-68.

43. Ibid.

44. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Pub 3-0: Doctrine for Joint Operations (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995), p. III-33.

45. John H. Cushman, Thoughts for Joint Commanders, (Annapolis, Maryland: Whitmore Printing, 1993), p. 12.

46. Second Armored Division Conference Room, Headquarters, Second Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas. The author observed the plaque containing the inimitable words of General Clarke while assigned to the division and serving under General George S. Patton III in 1975.

47. Timothy C. Tatum, The Evangelical Right and a Biblical Forecast of Military Operations in the Middle East, (Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1986), p. 42.

48. Ibid., p. 43.

49. Ibid.

50. Sidney B. Simon, Meeting Yourself Halfway (Niles, Illinois: Arnus Communications, 1974), p. xv.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barton, David. America's Godly Heritage Videotape. Aledo, Texas: Wallbuilders, 1993.

Bennett, Ivan L., ed. Song and Service Book for Ship and Field. New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, Inc., 1942.

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Joint Pub 3-0: Doctrine for Joint Operations. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995.

Cushman, John. Thoughts for Joint Commanders. Annapolis, Maryland: Whitmore Printing, 1993.

Department of National Security and Strategy. Core Curriculum, Course 2--War, National Policy and Strategy. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1995.

Department of National Security and Strategy. Volume I, Part A, Course 2: War, National Policy and Strategy. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1995.

Department of the Army. FM 100-5: Operations. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1993.

Federal Register, vol. 60, number 219, 14 November 1995. S.v. "1995 Thanksgiving Presidential Proclamation."

Halberstam, David. The Best and the Brightest. New York: Randolph House, 1972.

Hall, Verna M. A Christian History of the Constitution. San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1972.

Hyman, Robin, ed. The Quotation Dictionary. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.

LaHaye, Tim. Faith of Our Founding Fathers. Colorado Springs, Colorado: Master Books, 1994.

Lane, Hana Umlauf, ed. The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1984. New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1984.

Price, David E. The Congressional Experience: A View From the Hill. San Francisco, Westview Press, 1992.

Rothe, Bertha. The Daniel Webster Reader. New York: Oceana Publications, 1956.

Schwarzkopf, H. Norman. It Doesn't Take A Hero. New York: Bantam Books, 1992.

Simon, Sidney. Meeting Yourself Halfway. Niles, Illinois: Arnus Communications, 1974.

Tatum, Timothy. The Evangelical Right and a Biblical Forecast of Military Operations in the Middle East. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1986.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. Democracy in America. Translated by J.P. Mayer. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969.

U.S. Army War College. Course 3: Implementing National Military Strategy, Volume I. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1995.

U.S. President. A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement. Washington, D.C.: The White House, 1995.

World Book Encyclopedia, 1994 ed. S.v. "Mayflower Compact."