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.

THE CODE OF THE WARRIOR AND THE KINDER, GENTLER ARMY

BY

COLONEL FREDERICK R. KIENLE
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2001

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

20010430 114

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

THE CODE OF THE WARRIOR AND THE KINDER, GENTLER ARMY

by

COLONEL FREDERICK R. KIENLE
Infantry

COL Frank Hancock
Project Adviser

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

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

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Frederick R. Kienle

TITLE: The Code of the Warrior and the Kinder, Gentler Army

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 1 February 2001 PAGES: 57 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

This study reviews the history, evolution and sources of accepted "warrior" norms, behaviors and values as they exist in today's Army. This is set against sociological, legislated and evolutionary developments that have lead to the perception of a "kinder, gentler Army." The research intends to determine if natural evolution has occurred in support of U.S. national interests or if, in fact, today's Army is less able to meet warfighting and other directed requirements due to a softening of training and operating procedures which violated the warrior code.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....vii

THE CODE OF THE WARRIOR AND THE KINDER, GENTLER ARMY..1

THE U.S. ARMY WARRIOR CODE.....2

THE KINDER, GENTLER ARMY.....14

COMPATABILITIES, CONFLICTS AND INCONSISTENCIES.....25

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION.....32

ENDNOTES.....35

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....45

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The inspiration to explore the warrior creed and the "kinder, gentler military" comes from reflections on the over nine-thousand young Americans I had the privilege to oversee through their Basic Combat Training experience in the Second Battalion, Sixtieth Infantry at Fort Jackson, South Carolina. My own experiences there provided opportunities to encounter numerous committees, politicians, journalists and veterans as they explored and surveyed the soldiers that will become tomorrow's military. These critical looks inspired my own critical thinking.

Special thanks are due to Lieutenant General John Van Alstyne, Training and Doctrine Command Deputy Commanding General for Initial Entry Training. His mentorship and insights enabled me to view our Army from a mature, informed and strategic perspective. Also thanks are owed to the many Drill Sergeants, such as Staff Sergeant Darren Spencer, who forced me to question, understand and reason with the directions our Army and our nation are taking.

THE CODE OF THE WARRIOR AND THE KINDER, GENTLER ARMY

"The warrior ethos is sadly dead in today's society. There are, to be sure, warriors left...but we are a minority."
— Army Sergeant Brian Heitman in Army Times

The code of the warrior and the kinder, gentler Army – conflicting concepts in juxtaposition or complimentary ideas guiding the natural evolution of the U.S. Army?[1] This debate rages on between those who see the U.S. Army misused as a test bed for social experimentation and those who believe the Army is rightfully keeping pace with the society it protects. Many who identify themselves as warriors take issue with the ideas of "feminist zealots and social engineers," while numerous senior leaders and lawmakers horrify these warriors by making "necessary changes" to ensure the success of the modern American volunteer force.[2] These opposing groups employ a myriad of venues and public forums to extol their cases: from editorial columns to the internet and from radio talk shows to one-sided publications there exists a plethora of opinion. Both sides of this argument tend to respond with more passion and emotion than objectivity. This paper attempts to provide a balanced view and assessment.

The warrior code is rooted in history dating to the first evidences of war portrayed in Mesolithic cave drawings over twelve thousand years ago.[3] The American warrior code traces its foundations through western military institutions as ancient as the Spartans. The code has evolved over time in concert with American democratic values and ideals. Whether we call it a code, a creed, an ethos or a set of professional and cultural values is generally a matter of semantics and not particularly germane to this study. The code is more comprehensive than the oath, covenant or promise we swear to. It is a central idea that guides individual and organizational behavior. For our purposes we will suppose that a warrior code is a "system of principals, beliefs or rules" encompassing elements of a unique and specific culture dedicated to the "application of force and management of violence."[4] While there currently exists no single and precise U.S. Army warrior code, one can be roughly derived from multiple sources. This paper attempts to define the essence of the American warrior code.

The term "kinder and gentler" has evolved since popularized by ex-president George Bush to describe a more compassionate America better focused on domestic and humanitarian needs. Today, the term can be considered derisive in its description of a military impacted by the 1991 Tailhook and 1996 Aberdeen sexual misconduct

scandals, sexual harassment charges leveled at senior officers and NCOs, and undisciplined incidents of horrific attacks based on racial prejudices and homophobia. "Kinder and gentler" has become virtually synonymous with "politically correct," a phrase describing ideas, expressions and behavior modified to preclude specific individuals or groups from being offended.[5] A recent publication by Stephanie Gutmann titled "The Kinder, Gentler Military" asserts that the U.S. Army has become "so politically correct, so exquisitely sensitive, so hostile to their own warrior culture, that it may be unable to defend our interests in future conflicts."[6] This paper will explore these assertions, review gender integration impacts and identify other elements often attributed to a kinder, gentler and politically correct military.

While soldiers have long claimed, "it's not as tough as it used to be," the 1973 advent of the All Volunteer Force and ensuing change exacerbated the usual and most common frustrations of traditional American warriors. Modifications to training and discipline, often coincident to the expansion of women's roles in the military, were viewed by many as a softening and reduction of standards. The warrior code was thought to conflict with new demographic trends and resultant policy adjustments. Professional U.S. Army warriors began to view themselves as a separate society or subculture fully capable of developing and living their code without help from uninformed outsiders.[7] The tension between the warrior code and the kinder, gentler Army has steadily grown since 1973 and is worthy of review and greater understanding. This paper endeavors to examine that ongoing tension through exploration of the warrior code, determining what defines a kinder and gentler Army and finally identifying valid agreements and incongruities between the two.

THE U.S. ARMY WARRIOR CODE

> "Back then, we all came into the service with a code – something imprinted on each of us by family, school or church...those who had come from military schools received the imprint from their officers. One way or another, all of us were programmed to believe that what we were doing was not a job; not even a profession; but a calling"
>
> — GEN (ret) Zinni, U.S.M.C. [8]

The warrior code of the U.S. Army is not easily found in some well-publicized catechism with a camouflaged cover. There exists no single document or printed code that embodies the U.S. Army warrior code in toto; there is no ready reference that

comprehensively defines the code to be imprinted on the American warrior's soul. There is no single dogmatic set of rules, overarching behavioral expectations or necessary fundamental beliefs developed to exhort warriors to think and act in one set manner. There is no single authoritative set of principles, maxims or tenets for the American warrior. Instead, there are numerous values, ideals, principles, codes, creeds and beliefs in a multitude of locations that encompass an ethos and culture that define a warrior code. Values, ideals and beliefs, "paradigm examples of sets of ready made rules," reflecting the wisdom of generations of American warriors, reside in Army culture, doctrine and law.[9]

The Army's capstone field manual states, "the Army's institutional culture encompasses the customs and traditions, norms of conduct, ideals, and values that have evolved over 225 years of campaigns and battles, of shared hardship and triumph."[10] But no page or paragraph in this capstone manual is dedicated to the specific enunciation of a concise warrior code, or any Army code for that matter. The manual speaks to the characteristics of the military profession and expresses the Army ethos in terms of seven values: loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity and personal courage.[11] Army Field Manual 22-100, Army Leadership, defines warrior ethos as "the professional attitudes and beliefs that characterize the American soldiers."[12] While both manuals provide hints toward the meaning and basis of a warrior code, it remains necessary to look well beyond this single source to adequately discern an American warrior code.

The U.S. Army's soldier's code, developed in 1998 for distribution as a wallet-sized card to all members of the U.S. Army, was born in the wake of several scandals which leveled embarrassment on the Army from 1996 - 1998. Introduced along with several human relations and values reinforcement training initiatives, the soldier's code attempts to describe the behavior and ethos expected of all soldiers in the U.S. Army. The soldier's code, written as a general creed or oath, captures a part of what may be expected in a U.S. Army warrior code:

> I. I am an American soldier – a protector of our greatest nation on earth – sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States.
> II. I will treat others with dignity and respect and expect others to do the same.
> III. I will honor my Country, the Army, my unit and my fellow soldiers by living the Army values.

IV. No matter what situation I am in, I will never do anything for pleasure, profit, or personal safety, which will disgrace my uniform, my unit or my Country.
V. Lastly, I am proud of my Country and its flag. I want to look back and say that I am proud to have served my country as a soldier.[13]

The soldier's code is lacking in its attempt to be a true and comprehensive warrior code. While the soldier's code generally addresses the seven Army values, it falls short of capturing the full essence of a warrior code. Ideas and words related to war, battle, combat or fighting are included nowhere in the soldier's code and, at best, are marginally related aspects of the code. The soldier's code may be a start point or reference for discerning the warrior ethos, but it doesn't yield a complete and totally acceptable product.

The seven Army values, listed on the backside of the card bearing the soldier's code, were also developed and promulgated in the wake of Aberdeen and similar scandals. These values with definitions are:

Loyalty: Bear true faith and allegiance to the U.S. Constitution, the Army, your unit, and other soldiers.
Duty: Fulfill your obligations
Respect: Treat people as they should be treated
Selfless-Service: Put the welfare of the nation, the Army, and your subordinates before your own.
Honor: Live up to all the Army values.
Integrity: Do what's right, legally and morally.
Personal Courage: Face fear, danger, or adversity (physical or moral).[14]

Posters depicting the seven values and their definitions were produced by U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) and distributed in late 1998 to encourage dissemination and inculcation of the Army values.[15] These same seven Army values are listed in FM1, The Army, and described at length in the Army Leadership Field Manual 22-100.[16] Loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity and personal courage are defined and described in terms of the guidance they provide for the soldierly conduct and character of Army leaders in FM 22-100. For five of the values, short vignettes recount Army leaders' applications of a value in a historical context; three of these vignettes are combat scenarios in Korea, Vietnam and Somalia.[17] Soldiers and leaders, starting with their initial service training, are expected to embrace and live by these Army values "throughout their lives."[18] Like the soldier's code, the Army values provide a basis for a warrior code, but tend to have a broader focus not specifically centered on a soldier's actions or specific roles in fighting, combat or war.

The Code of Conduct for Members of the Armed Forces was promulgated by executive order in August 1955 by President Eisenhower and modified slightly by President Reagan in 1988. Although developed post-Korean conflict with a focus on personal conduct relative to capture by the enemy and ensuing captivity, this code provides some insight into expected behavior of American warriors under unique battlefield conditions:

> I. I am an American, fighting in the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense.
> II. I will never surrender of my own free will. If in command, I will never surrender the members of my command while they still have the means to resist.
> III. If I am captured, I will continue to resist by all means available. I will make every effort to escape and aid others to escape. I will accept neither parole nor special favors from the enemy.
> IV. If I become a prisoner of war, I will keep faith with my fellow prisoners. I will give no information nor take part in any action which might be harmful to my comrades. If I am senior, I will take command. If not, I will obey the lawful orders of those appointed over me and will back them up in every way.
> V. When questioned, should I become a prisoner of war, I am required to give name, rank, service number and date of birth. I will evade answering further questions to the utmost of my ability; I will make no oral or written statements disloyal to my country and its allies or harmful to their cause.
> VI. I will never forget I am an American, fighting for freedom, responsible for my actions, and dedicated to the principles which made my country free. I will trust in my God and in the United States of America.[19]

There are yet other codes or creeds available for consultation in determining the U.S. Army's warrior code. Among these are the Noncommissioned Officer's Creed, the Drill Sergeant's Creed and the Ranger Creed. Clearly accepted as some of the foremost warriors in the world, the U.S. Army Rangers have maintained a specific creed for many years. Within this creed we can determine additional elements of a warrior code:

> Recognizing that I have volunteered as a Ranger, fully knowing the hazards of my chosen profession, I will always endeavor to uphold the prestige, honor, and high "esprit de corps" of The Rangers.
> Acknowledging the fact that a Ranger is a more elite soldier who arrives at the cutting edge of battle by land, sea or air, I accept the fact that as a Ranger my country expects me to move further, faster and fight harder than any other soldier.
> Never shall I fail my comrades. I will always keep myself mentally alert, physically strong and morally straight and I will shoulder more than my

> share of the task whatever it may be. One hundred percent and then some.
> Gallantly I will show the world that I am a specially selected and well-trained soldier. My courtesy to superior officers, neatness of dress and care of equipment shall set the example for others to follow.
> Energetically will I meet the enemies of my country. I shall defeat them on the field of battle for I am better trained and will fight with all my might. Surrender is not a Ranger word. I will never leave a fallen comrade to fall into the hands of the enemy and under no circumstances will I ever embarrass my country.
> Readily will I display the intestinal fortitude required to fight on to the Ranger objective and complete the mission, though I be the lone survivor.[20]

The Ranger Creed specifically embodies the seven Army values while adding several other aspects of a likely warrior code. These aspects include "esprit de corps, fighting hard, mental alertness, physical strength, well trained, unwillingness to surrender and care of equipment."[21] Unlike the soldier's code, the Ranger Creed addresses "arrival at the cutting edge of battle" and "defeating enemies on the field of battle." As the history and experiences of the U.S. Army have traditionally centered on the imperative of combat, the Ranger Creed contributes much to a warrior code for the U.S. Army.[22] Along with the Army values and the soldier's code, the Ranger Creed adds to an existing foundation upon which to further discover a true U.S. Army warrior code.

Major General William G. Boykin, U.S. Army Special Forces Branch Commandant recently affirmed that a "warrior ethos is Special Forces' most defining value" and that warrior ethos or code is "one characteristic that is common and indispensable to all Special Forces soldiers."[23] U.S. Army Special Forces, truly American warriors by any standard, possess their own code or creed worthy of review:

> I am American Special Forces soldier. A professional! I will do all that my nation requires of me. I am a volunteer, knowing well the hazards of my profession. I serve with the memory of those who have gone before me: Roger's Rangers, Francis Marion, Mosby's Rangers, the first Special Service Forces and Ranger Battalions of World War II, the Airborne Ranger Companies of Korea. I pledge to uphold the honor and integrity of all I am – in all I do. I am a professional soldier. I will teach and fight wherever my nation requires. I will strive always, to excel in every art and artifice of war. I know that I will be called upon to perform tasks in isolation, far from familiar faces and voices, with the help and guidance of my God. I will keep my mind and body clean, alert and strong, for this is my debt to those who depend upon me. I will not fail those with whom I serve. I will not bring shame upon myself or the forces. I will maintain myself, my arms, and my equipment in an immaculate state as befits a Special Forces soldier. I will never surrender though I be the last. If I am

> taken, I pray that I may have the strength to spit upon my enemy. My goal is to succeed in any mission – and to live to succeed again. I am a member of my nation's chosen soldiery. God grant that I may not be found wanting, that I will not fail this sacred trust.[24]

The Special Forces Creed embodies many of the same values, behavior and attitudes as the Ranger Creed. In addition, the creed specifically addresses doing all that the nation requires and even calls on God for help and guidance. The creed looks to historical leaders and units to provide some amount of guidance. Once again, recurring and new elements of a warrior code are affirmed or identified.

The U.S. Constitution and U.S. laws contribute or further affirm essential values that inextricably link the warrior code to our national culture; in fact it may be more accurate to say that the Constitution is the absolute basis for any U.S. Army code. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and selected U.S. and international laws must be considered primary sources of the U.S. Army ethos and therefore influencers toward a warrior code.[25] U.S. military oaths affirm allegiance to the Constitution, reinforcing the role of U.S law as an integral component of a soldier's or U.S. Army warrior's code. In fact, every soldier publicly pledges, " to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."[26] This oath borders on a religious experience and demands a sense of mental, moral and physical discipline that separates soldiering from most other professions. From the U.S. Constitution and laws come an undeniable "strong belief in human rights, respect for the dignity of every other person, and an abiding interest in all aspects of human welfare."[27] American warriors, by virtue of oath and laws, are bound to these overarching American ideals that extol the worth, dignity and rights of all individuals. American warriors make a long-term commitment for the common good.

The enduring American suspicion of large, standing armed forces has long impacted the organization, administration and conduct of U.S. armed forces. This suspicion impacted significantly in shaping the Constitution and ensured civilian control of the U.S. military. The framers of the Constitution found a standing, professional Army to be repugnant and ensured absolute civilian primacy over the military. The United States military is more than warriors, it is a guardian class of citizen defenders and one that holds allegiance to a set of principles that are designed to prevent tyranny. By taking an oath to defend the Constitution, the American soldier accepts a set of norms and responsibilities that other citizens do not. Soldiers subordinate their full freedom of

expression to the needs of security and disciplined organizations. In the United States, the concept of "citizen-soldier" plays prominently in the military culture, ethos or code.

The Army culture and ethos is fundamentally historical in nature. The Army, more than most other professions, "cherishes its past, especially its combat history, and nourishes its institutional memory through ceremony and custom. "[28] History provides a lens though which to examine the roots of a U.S. Army warrior ethos or code seeded as early as ancient Greece, Sparta and Rome. This background, infused and tempered with uniquely American culture and ideals, provides a traditional base upon which to build a warrior code. In addition, examination of history provides elements of other warrior behaviors that may have been specifically or unknowingly rejected or modified during the evolutionary development of a U.S. Army warrior culture, ethos or code.

Warriors, by definition individuals engaged in struggle or conflict between competing entities, have long been required to behave differently from the ordinary people of society. Faced with the potential or reality of combat, warriors have long struggled with the necessity to partake in the unnatural act of killing fellow humans.[29] While individuals have again and again proven themselves capable of killing impulsively in anger, killing in war departs from normal instincts.[30] Throughout history, societies have imposed near-religious rituals, customs, traditions, experiences, codes and creeds to assist the transformation from ordinary human being to warrior. These practices gave rise to varied military cultures, ethos and codes.

In the seventh century B.C., after several wars, Sparta concluded that its survival as a state was dependent on the subordination of nearly all considerations to military efficiency. Spartan education focused on producing expert warriors for the military machine, focusing on moral and physical education to the near total exclusion of the arts and athletics.[31] So confident was Sparta of the valor of their soldiers, she refused to build a protective wall around the city. The Spartans' near fanatical emphasis of warrior traits and skills at the expense of other disciplines eventually contributed to her collapse as a city-state. Aristotle tells us "the Spartans remained secure as long as they were at war; but they collapsed as soon as they acquired an empire. They did not know how to use the leisure which peace brought; and they had never accustomed themselves to any discipline other and better than that of war."[32] The Spartan ethic of subverting all else to the military, extreme emphasis on discipline, physical fitness and moral education contributed to a powerful and distinguished army; this same extreme emphasis illuminates the danger of any military code which causes the nation to neglect entirely its

other societal needs and responsibilities. The Athenians, on the other hand, relied on the citizen-soldiery of a democratic nation. Sparta succumbed to internal revolt in 371 B.C. while Athenian principles survive to this day. Athens and Sparta provide an important contrast in the warrior's role and place in society, a key element of any American warrior code.

Different from both the Spartans and Athenians, the Roman legacy contributes other concepts to a western warrior code. The Roman army of the late republic and early empire was a professional and long-service professional army.[33] Raised originally by levy, the Roman army moved toward twenty-year enlistment and service for pay along with the rewards of plunder. Roman soldiers swore an oath (the sacramentum) to the state and, until 216 BC, to their comrades as well. The form of the Roman military oath, with an emphasis on public affirmation and pledge of brave conduct, has proven remarkably durable; this type of oath survives in many armies to the present day.[34] In effect, the code of the Roman warrior called for allegiance to the state and affirmed intent to fight as a 'brave soldier' while incurring penalties should he fail to do so.[35] Loyalty to the state and fellow soldiers and disciplined obedience were hallmarks of the Roman army. Solidarity, obedience and bravery were clearly elements in the code of the Roman soldier.[36]

Discipline in the Roman army is worth noting for it was absolute and gives example of a positive element taken to negative extreme. Punishment in the Roman army was severe in that it included death for desertion, mutiny or insubordination and physical beating for stealing, false witness or wrongful physical weakness. During the time of Emperor Claudius, a Roman soldier was executed for working on field fortifications without wearing a sword, as prescribed by orders, in an effort to strengthen discipline.[37] Discipline, held in the highest regard, was hinged on "punishment and fear thereof" as described by the Roman general Vegetius. Vegetius, in his criticism of the deteriorating state of the Roman army, pointed out that while a certain degree of discipline was necessary "soldiers could be more influenced by hope and rewards." [38] The Roman army contributes a view of the importance of a measured discipline to a warrior ethos while also providing example of discipline carried to an extreme.

The knights of the Middle Ages infused yet another concept into the developing code of the western warrior. During the Middle Ages, the Catholic Church became somewhat militarized while the warrior class of Europe grew more sacral; religion and militarism merged.[39] A previously pacifist Catholic Church found itself struggling to

survive in the centuries after the fall of Rome and subjugation to wave after wave of Viking, nomadic Asian and Muslim Turkish invaders. By the fifth century A.D., when Augustine propounded his doctrine of "just war" – essentially a defensive war, led by recognized authorities and conducted with a modicum of Christian restraint – the Christian notion of "turning the other cheek" became foolhardy.[40] "Chivalry," the Christianized warrior code, began to emerge.

In feudal society, there was little loyalty to king and nation nor was there common organization with effective unity of command.[41] Christendom, as the one truly common social force in a relatively barbarous society, provided the major ingredient for the essentially moral concept of a knightly code of honor: chivalry. Chivalry required that knights be defenders of the weak, meaning women and the unarmed generally, as well as of the church.[42] Chivalry, similar to other warrior codes, encouraged bravery, honor and gallantry. In addition, it codified generous treatment of foes and what we today consider fair and humane conduct. Other components of the chivalric code which today survive in some form or another are: officers are gentlemen, personal loyalty is owed to the commander, warriors are members of a brotherhood and warriors fight for traditional glory.[43] While often over-romanticized in song and story and embellished through the ages, the code of chivalry nonetheless tempers the warrior code of any western army within a Judeo-Christian society. Its requirement was for the things that are right, and its restraints were from the things that are wrong.[44] While in real life knights were not always so virtuous and tended toward conquest and plunder, today we hold the knight's code of chivalry in high regard.

Strict military discipline is often credited with the success of Frederick the Great's Prussian army that dominated Europe from 1740 until the French Revolution. In reality, the discipline was extraordinarily severe. The death penalty for minor infractions was not uncommon and flogging was regarded more or less as a matter of daily military administration. The dominant element in the management of soldiers was fear.[45] In fact though, this severe form of discipline was absolutely "frightful to any but men of iron courage and endurance."[46] Soldier warriors were not held in esteem by society and, at best, shared a position on par with coal miners and foundry workers. Severe discipline, while contributing to the conscript Prussian army's success, also contributed to ensuring a class of warriors "for whom society has no use."[47] Discipline, in Frederick's army, was its greatest strength while also a cause of endemic desertion; it serves as an extreme example of discipline without a sense of warrior values. Discipline was a centerpiece of

Frederick's powerful army and warrior code but would shortly thereafter fail to stand up to the national armies at Jena-Auerstadt in 1806.

A fledgling American Army also saw discipline as a critical component of warrior ethos during the army's darkest days of the American Revolution in 1778. Turning toward the Prussian Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben for assistance, a simple but flexible and uniquely American system was born. Von Steuben, borrowing and adapting from his Prussian, British and French counterparts, developed a system for the American continentals that stressed training in maneuvers, devotion to duty and kind and considerate treatment of the troops to discipline.[48] It was here that the U.S. Army borrowed from history and began to formulate traditions that would contribute to and develop into its own warrior ethos. The U.S. warrior ethos and code were clearly conceived in history and born on the training grounds of Valley Forge then matured through the realities of battle at Cowpens, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, the Meuse Argonne, Omaha Beach, Pork Chop Hill and the Ia Drang Valley.

In a 1960 Department of Defense publication, The Armed Forces Officer, several propositions concerning the "average American soldier under the conditions of battle" were enumerated. It stated that the fighting establishment builds its discipline, training, code of conduct, and public policy around these ideas, believing that what served yesterday will also be the one best way tomorrow, and for so long as our traditions and our system of freedoms survive.[49] Among these were:

> I. When led with courage and intelligence, an American will fight as willingly and as efficiently as any fighter in the world.
> II. His keenness and endurance in war will be in proportion to the zeal and inspiration of his leadership.
> III. He is resourceful and imaginative, and the best results will always flow from encouraging him to use his brain along with his spirit.
> IV. Under combat conditions, he will reserve his greatest loyalty for the officer who is most resourceful in the tactical employment of his forces and most careful to avoid unnecessary losses.
> V. He is to a certain extent machine bound because the nature of our civilization has made him so.
> VI. War does not require that the American be brutalized or bullied in any measure whatsoever. His need is an alert and toughened body. Hate and bloodlust are not the attributes of a sound training under the American system. To develop clearly a line of duty is sufficient to point Americans toward the doing of it.
> VII. Except on a Hollywood lot, there is no such thing as an American fighter "type." Our best men come in all colors, shapes and sizes. They appear from every section of the nation.

> VIII. Presupposing soundness in their officer leadership the majority of Americans in any group or unit can be depended upon to fight loyally and obediently and will give a good account of themselves.

Others propositions in this list from which we can derive possible contributions to an American warrior code include:

> XII. Men who feel strange with their unit, having been carelessly received by it, and indifferently handled, will rarely, if ever, fight strong and courageously. But if treated with common decency and respect, they will perform like men.
> XVII. Soft handling will soften even the best men. But even the weak man will develop a new vigor and confidence in the face of necessary hardship, if moved by a leadership that is courageously making the best of a bad situation.

In 1970, General William C. Westmoreland, then Chief of Staff of the United States Army, expressed his concerns regarding a deteriorating moral and professional climate in the United States Army. Based on a series of "unfavorable events," Westmoreland, perceived a need for an "Officers Code or Creed" to guide Army officers in their exercise of authority and performance of duties. He did not see this as a substitute for regulations, directives or laws but as a compass of sorts to guide attitudes and behavior.[50] The proposed, but never adopted code read:

> I will give to the selfless performance of my duty and my mission the best that effort, thought and dedication can provide.
> To this end, I will not only seek continually to improve my knowledge and practice of my profession, but also I will exercise the authority entrusted to me by the President and the Congress with fairness, justice, patience, and restraint, respecting the dignity and human rights of others and devoting myself to the welfare of those placed under my command.
> In justifying and fulfilling the trust placed in me, I will conduct my private life as well as my public service so as to be free both from impropriety, acting with candor and integrity to earn the unquestioning trust of my fellow soldiers, juniors, seniors and associates, and employing my rank and position not to serve myself but to serve my country and my unit.
> By practicing physical and moral courage I will endeavor to inspire these qualities in others by my example.
> In all my actions I will put loyalty to the highest moral principles and the United States of America above loyalty to organizations, persons and my personal interest."[51]

From proposed and existing codes, from history and tradition, and from national beliefs, norms and values we find numerous underpinnings of an American warrior code. With no intent to propose the most thorough and all-inclusive warrior code for adoption by the U.S. Army, we can nonetheless derive some consistent themes and

concepts that are undeniable components. Recurring concepts in the examples above provide threads of continuity through existing codes, creeds, traditions, expressed values and historical experience. Despite revolutions in military affairs and alterations to combat because of technological developments, these concepts remain virtually timeless. These consistent ideas form the skeleton upon which the American warrior code can be built.

The Army's values developed in 1998 provide the foundation. Loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity and personal courage can be found to some degree in every code, creed, oath and historical example examined. These are, in fact, "fundamental building blocks" that, along with various attributes, define the American warrior's character.[52] Honor and loyalty to the nation are found significantly more than any other concepts in the study above; these are clearly key components. American warriors are a guardian class of citizen defenders that hold allegiance to a set of American principles that are designed to prevent tyranny and to promote freedom. Duty and selfless service, particularly directed toward caring for comrades in arms, are near equally as apparent and addressed as often as honor and loyalty. Courage and integrity are also frequently found in word and concept, particularly courage, with regard to battlefield bravery and gallantry.

Discipline, physical conditioning or toughness and high levels of training are evident throughout the examined codes and heritage. These components of the American warrior code are attributes that describe fundamental qualities and characteristics expected. The levels and degrees of these attributes exist in varying levels throughout history, modified by social and environmental conditions, but can be recognized as important elements of any warrior code. While in historical context the concept of discipline appears more as absolute obedience, the concept moves toward a self-discipline exhibited by restraint, order and respect for law and authority in modern times and particularly within the context of our democratic laws and citizen-soldiery. Enforced obedience to external authority is not nearly as effective as discipline that is self-imposed and springs from the mutual confidence between leaders and led.[53] In terms of the U.S. Army warrior code, self-discipline and physical conditioning represent a soldier's will and ability to fight for the interests of his or her nation.

Other continued threads include near chivalric concepts of respect for the dignity of others and an honorable sense of personal behavior. High behavior standards and moral strength, closely related to honor and integrity but worthy of separate mention,

appear often in our review. Likewise, an acknowledgement and respect for history, traditions and warriors of the past is evident and must be included in any true warrior code. Perhaps the final recurring theme is the appreciation of ingenuity and determination for mission accomplishments. Taken together, the Army values of discipline, fitness, traditions, moral behavior, mission focus and strong commitment to national ideals comprise a credible basis for a warrior code and provide a rough metric against which to evaluate a kinder, gentler Army.

THE KINDER, GENTLER ARMY

> "Soldiers are being nursed and coddled, told to drive safely, to buy war bonds, to avoid VD, to write a letter home to mother, when somebody ought to have been telling them how to clear a machine gun when it jams. They've had to learn...in a matter of days the basic things they should have known before they faced the enemy."
>
> — Army Colonel, Korea, 1950[54]
>
> "The nineties were a decade in which the brass handed over their soldiers to social planners in love with an unworkable (and in many senses undesirable) vision of a politically correct utopia..."
>
> —Stephanie Gutmann, author, The Kinder, Gentler Military[55]

"Kinder and gentler" is not a complimentary description when referring to an army trying to retain a warrior ethic while responding to societal and political pressures. In fact, "kinder and gentler" is generally a pejorative and derisive term when describing an institution dedicated to fighting and winning our nation's wars by conducting sustained combat operations on land.[56] Kinder and gentler has become a catchall phrase, which, along with "politically correct," "soft," "wimpy" and a host of other adjectives is used to describe the post Desert Storm Army. More specifically, the kinder, gentler Army includes the post 1973 All Volunteer Army and the post 1980's downsized force that has been subjected to domestic pressures, political agendas and social engineering.[57] The kinder, gentler Army is alleged to have more emphasis on sensitivity training and touchy-feely non-warrior programs while lowering standards in training, discipline and physical fitness.[58] The kinder, gentler Army, as described in a plethora of articles, websites and publications, is an amalgamation of a host of problems. Mainstream media and professional journals often credit the kinder, gentler

Army as the cause of pervasive low morale that affects the readiness and capabilities of our forces.[59]

Retired Major General William C. Moore, along with others, claims the United States seems to have lost sight of why we "raise, train and maintain" a military force and that one of the basic precepts of the Constitution is to "provide for the common defense." General Moore describes a kinder, gentler Army "co-opted by social engineers whose agenda is to promote equality rather than to prepare forces for the next war." He goes on to state "the military is becoming another laboratory for all the correct causes that are consuming our society." Retired Colonel David Hackworth asserts "we now have the most safety-first, politically correct military force in American history."[60] Stephanie Gutmann, author of The Kinder, Gentler Military, calls this the "New Military" of the late nineties which is tortuously attempting to become "kinder and gentler" by reforming the "warrior culture." She claims that the American military has become so politically correct, so exquisitely sensitive, so hostile to their own warrior culture that they may be unable to defend our interests in future conflicts."[61]

An oft-cited reason for the kinder, gentler military and ensuing degradation of combat capabilities is the "feminization of the services."[62] Critics blame senior military leaders for continued acquiescing to feminists in an attempt to diminish the impacts of scandals like the infamous 1991 Tailhook Convention, Drill Sergeant misconduct at Aberdeen Proving Grounds in 1996 and repeated sexual misconduct by a variety of senior Army leaders. In fact, significantly increased numbers of females began entering the Army with the need to fill the All Volunteer Force as early as 1973 in the wake of withdrawal from Vietnam. Gender integrating the Army, and allowing fifteen percent of the Army's spaces to be filled by female soldiers as compared to about two percent in 1972, is often credited with creating a cascading deterioration in physical fitness standards, unit cohesion and the softening of discipline and training regimens.[63] To Moore, Hackworth, Gutmann and a host of others, the integration of women into the armed forces is a failed policy that could cause the ruin of the U.S. armed forces.[64]

The ability of female soldiers to compete physically with male counterparts is a recurring argument against woman warriors. The bell curve describing the normal distribution of attributes like endurance and upper-body strength in women overlaps but is far from identical to that for men. Many female recruits experience difficulty lifting the tent pole of a standard issue tent or carrying a rucksack loaded with ammunition and basic containment items. The average woman is about five inches shorter than the

average man; she has 55 to 60 percent less upper body strength, a lower center of gravity, a higher fat to muscle ratio and twenty percent less aerobic capacity.[65] These differences that may be irrelevant in the civilian world become more apparent in the more physically demanding environment of the warrior. Many male soldiers cite their fear that, if wounded, a female medic would likely not have the strength to carry them off of the battlefield. In the eyes of some, gender integration has caused physical fitness standards to be lowered until the point where women are being held to a low standard that's as dangerous as it is insulting to women who are fit.[66]

Female physical limitations could risk mission failure is some instances as described by Army Captain Mary Roou in recounting a Desert Storm experience:

> "Women could lift the boxes, but there's no way they're going to lift as many boxes as a guy, as fast. I don't think I'd want my daughter to be an infantry soldier: I'm not saying she couldn't do it, but there's a natural tendency for other soldiers – I guess by that I mean men – to take care of them, to stop what they're doing and make sure you're okay. And there's no way that women can dig foxholes or as many as may be required, as men. There's no way! Unless you had that one woman that maybe is different, you know, lifts three hundred pounds, it just doesn't happen. Unfortunately, when you're in basic training and stuff like that, those foxholes are already dug."[67]

Additional debate related to female physical ability focuses on the Army Physical Fitness Test. The fitness test, a required semiannual event for all soldiers, has a different set of standards for males and females; the test scores are scaled according to age and gender. Normed based on the results of groups tested by the U.S. Army Physical Fitness School at Fort Benning, the performance standards for males are higher than those for females of equal age in two out of three required events.[68] Because of lesser upper body strength and aerobic capacity, females are held to a lower standard of performance in pushup repetitions and two mile run times. These unequal and lower standards are not only seen as "dumbing down" to accommodate "coed training" but are also said to cause morale problems.[69]

Physical fitness ability running groups garner more than a fair share of negative criticism as does the shift from the old Army conduct of physical training in fatigue uniforms and leather combat boots. Ability groups geared to differing individual soldier fitness levels and running proficiency, are seen as a lack of adherence to a single standard for all soldiers. Stephanie Gutmann states "in the Army of 1998, if you can't keep up with your platoon when they run in formation, it doesn't mean you're a

weakling...a wus...a lazy bastard, or any of the taunting, shaming names drill sergeants used in the past."[70] Observers point out that ability groups based on individual running capability remove the effect of peer pressure on motivating a soldier to run faster. Many old soldiers, likely victims of their own experiences, go so far as to point to the wear of athletic shoes for physical fitness training as still another indicator of how soft the Army has really gone.[71]

Increased numbers of female soldier is perceived as a threat to unit cohesion; an essential contributor to the success of combat units. The effectiveness of the military hinges on cohesion – every member must completely trust and respect one another.[72] Old soldiers, keenly aware of the importance of unit esprit built around "bonding" between warriors, quickly point to the presence of females as a roadblock to attainment of a true "band of brothers." The unique love and protectiveness that troops begin to feel for their unit mates is thought to work well in single-sex group bonding but encounters difficulty upon introduction of females into the unit equation.[73] Healthy male and female twenty-year-olds have a very natural sexual attraction to each other; the resulting interplay and competition in mixed sex military units is said to severely challenge group cohesion. Relationships run the risk of advancing beyond platonic and selective male – female pairing off can ensue. The 1997 Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues, chaired by former senator Nancy Kassebaum, concluded that training men and women together in Army Basic Training resulted not only in "less unit cohesion but also presented a significant distraction from the training programs."[74] One 1999 study found that the presence of women in military units on active operations or in garrison had a "generally negative effect on small unit cohesion."[75] A band of warrior brothers is thought to have little room for sisters in a warrior setting. William C. Moore asserts, "unit esprit built around bonding between warriors is now disparaged as an irrelevant concept and one that only serves to rationalize politically incorrect behavior and policies."[76]

Softening of discipline and relaxed training standards are also thought by many to be coincident with the introduction of greater numbers of women into the military. Stephanie Gutmann tells us obstacle courses are now labeled "confidence courses" and non-commissioned officers are warned not to humiliate their soldiers.[77] William C. Moore contends, "there is no question that training standards have been lowered. The Army has discontinued Basic Combat Training for all new soldiers, replacing it with Initial Entry Training, with less demanding standards so as to accommodate women. This

change bothers the warrior, because he wants to be respected as the best in his business and that doesn't start with norming qualifications and standards to the least common denominator."[78] David Hackworth testifies "Army leaders based around the globe are telling me how badly disciplined and trained their new replacements are. The discipline, combat-range marksmanship and physical fitness are so poor that new soldiers couldn't cut it on any previous battlefields."[79] Soldiers describe live-fire ranges as watered down and unrealistic because of leaders' aversions to injuries and a growing zero defects mentality.[80] Still others point to downward performance trend and reduced battlefield proficiency at Combat Training Centers as yet another indicator that the army has "gone soft" on training.

Clearly, the conduct of quality training is influenced by a multitude of variables many of which have little to do with the increase of female service members. Nonetheless, individuals often contend that physical and psychological differences between males and females have forced accommodations that lower the standards of Army training. Using the United States Military Academy as one example, there are instances of physical training activities being made easier or eliminated so that "women would not suffer adverse impact."[81] "Recondo training," a very physical endurance training event during which cadets used to march with full backpacks and undergo other strenuous activities has been eliminated from USMA's schedule and upper-body events in the obstacle course have been modified or eliminated. Many units reportedly conduct rifle runs, running with M-16 rifles in soldier's hands, less frequently or not at all based on numbers of female soldiers assigned.[82] Stephanie Gutmann cites several examples of individual training tasks standards being adjusted so as to accommodate the lower physical strength of female soldiers:

> "Many official regulations describing standard tasks have been rewritten to compensate for weaker soldiers and to avoid the spectacle of female failure – a woman attempting to do a task the way it is described in a training manual and failing. Take stretcher carrying: Evacuating a wounded sailor from a deck and carrying him or her to a safer area means putting that sailor (weight range approximately 130 to 180 pounds) on a standard-issue stretcher (30 pounds) and carrying him or her across an area the size of football fields...Faced with the influx of female recruits, the task of stretcher carrying has quietly "evolved", as a doctor testifying before the Presidential commission put it, from a task that is expected to be performed by two people into a task that is generally performed by "teams" of four, five, or whatever it takes to get the job done."[83]

Other female-prompted adjustments to training have nothing to do with strength but are related to personal modesty and hygiene issues. Old soldiers occasionally point to the increased numbers of portable lavatories ("porta-potties") on field training exercises as a visible sign of female induced softness. In fact, environmental considerations are generally the greater explanation for portable lavatory use rather than merely the presence of females. Female soldiers do, however, complicate some field living arrangements such as tent sleeping space allocation, shower facilities and distribution of female unique personal hygiene items such as tampons. Noted sociologist Charles Moskos identified several unique requirements for expectations of privacy, desires for personal cleanliness and needs for sanitary resupply experienced by female soldiers only in a field training or combat zone location.[84] While not insurmountable, these needs impose certain modifications and perturbations to business as usual.

Army Initial Entry Training, both Basic Combat Training and Advanced Individual Training, certainly attracts much critical press with regard to lowered standards and discipline resulting primarily from the full gender integration established in 1994.[85] In the immediate wake of the sensationalized1996 Aberdeen Proving Grounds sexual scandal involving allegedly predatory drill sergeants and female trainees, Army Initial Entry Training was closely scrutinized. A 1997 survey by the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues found that most recruits, advanced school trainees and newly assigned service members said that "basic training was easier than expected" and the vast majority said that it should be tougher, complaining that "basic training has gone soft."[86] Adjustments to the basic training regimen were incorporated, according to some, to ensure the success of a Department of the Army desired co-ed training environment. "Gender-normed tests, adjusted for physical differences and less-demanding requirements, such as map reading or first aid, were given greater importance" according to many writing about changes to Basic Training.[87] The Federal Advisory Committee further identified specific training events in Basic Training where standards were found to be lessened due to gender-integration and sufficient rigor was not imposed:

> There are different standards for males and females for performance in such areas as obstacle courses (where there are shorter walls versus taller walls and ropes without knots to climb), confidence courses (where women are not required to try to do all of the obstacles), and grenade throwing (where the target is 25 meters from the fighting position for

> females and 35 meters away for males). While some of these different standards are also applicable to smaller males, they are fueling the perception that women are less capable.[88]

The decline in training standards and decrease in training rigor is said to be accompanied by a similar decline in discipline beginning within the IET training base. David Hackworth testifies "Army leaders around the globe are telling how badly disciplined their new replacements are" in his indictment of Basic Combat Training that has become "fun" for trainees.[89] Hackworth describes a basic training environment where discipline is sacrificed to comply with new politically correct policies:

> "The training's no longer "Full Metal Jacket" mean, designed to break down recruits and then rebuild those who soldier through. Sociologists and enlightened generals have eliminated or adulterated techniques that forged Private Ryans from 1776 to the 1980s. The drills' job is no longer to "break 'em but to make 'em in a stress-free environment," commented a sergeant who's swapping his lot as a drill sergeant for college. This easy-does-it way of training soldiers has put the drills in the center of a minefield. If they slip into the no-nonsense mode of how they lead their soldiers in the real rubber-hits-the-track Army, they're immediately in a world of hurt with the brass, who say they're not in tune with the Army's new standard."[90]

"Shock treatment" and intimidation are contrary to Army Training and Doctrine Command regulations and yelling and shouting demeaning comments at trainees is equally unacceptable. Whether gender-integrated Basic Combat Training or all-male One Station Unit Training for combat arms soldiers, drill sergeants are not permitted to touch a trainee for disciplinary reasons and may have "physical contact with a trainee only when making corrections directly related to training."[91] Corrective exercises, such as pushups, are also controlled and must be assigned commensurate with soldiers' conditioning and environmental considerations in accordance with regulations. Additionally, corrective exercises must be selected from among specific physical training exercises enumerated in the Physical Fitness Training Field Manual. Drill sergeants and observers often point to these restrictions on trainer authorities as clear signs that the inculcation of discipline in trainees has declined in importance.

Some old soldiers complain that new soldiers are coddled rather than challenged; therefore giving recruits a taste of a kinder, gentler military for their first and lasting impressions. Hackworth describes a kinder, gentler Basic Training designed to reduce dropouts and cut attrition in the training base:

> "Now the Army recruits actually have their choice of omelets for a leisurely breakfast and get to use a knife and fork instead of the Basic Spoon most vets still consider a primary weapon. Not only are our selfless drill sergeants worried, so are America's fathers. Especially fathers like Nevada's Nick Olguin, a 10-year Army veteran, who says, "Two of my sons are senior Army NCO's. They'll tell you in a heartbeat what the problem is: the old standards of discipline and hard knock which turned boys into men are gone in an Army spending too much time in touchy-feely, non-warrior programs, like the now mandatory 'Sensitivity Training."[92]

Hackworth claims that sensitivity training, human relations classes and "Consideration Of Others" sessions have "just about replaced combat training as the number one priority." Stephanie Gutmann describes the "new army's" belief that it must work on the souls of recruits with "sexual harassment sensitivity training and values training" indicating her skepticism with the way this is conducted in Basic Training.[93] A perceived overemphasis on human relations and proper behavior classes through recurring chain teaching in response to embarrassing events is seen as an effort to appease everyone at the expense of critical military training time. There is no shortage of critics quick to point out their views of the devastating impact gender integration and enforced political correctness has had on Initial entry training.

Drill sergeants, like some other Army leaders, voice frustrations with "politically correct" limitations imposed on their speech, their customs and their actions in and out of uniform; the perceived feminization of the military is an oft cited reason for imposition of those limitations and restrictions. Jodies (rhyming chants used to set the pace and foster cohesion during unit physical training runs) deemed "raunchy" because of lewd, sexual or possibly offensive remarks are banned by most commanders. Military jargon previously considered traditional has been discouraged, cleaned up or altered to preclude offending any ethnic or sexual group. Terms like "cherry jumper," indicating a novice paratrooper, are no longer universally tolerated because of sexual overtones. Pinups (photos of scantily clad women), common to soldiers' lockers in World War Two, are not permitted by many leaders in an effort to ensure other soldiers are not made to feel uncomfortable. Happy hours with flowing alcohol and female "go-go" dancers are no longer seen in officer and NCO clubs. Events such as the Navy's 1991 Tailhook convention, long a raucous and rowdy affair, now run the risk of being career ending episodes for those who take part in the social events after each day's lectures and panel

discussions. Many view these changes as overt attempts to challenge or subvert the American warrior culture.[94]

Previously accepted initiation rituals unique to the warrior culture have been toned down or eliminated; rites of passage previously viewed as integral to the warrior ethos have been reexamined for their overall utility after disturbing 1997 video footage of Marine Corps Recon troopers pounding metal wings into comrades chests made national news. Like the Marines' unofficial wing pinning ceremony and the Navy's traditional equator crossing ceremonies, Army rites of passage such as the legendary airborne "prop blast" initiation and "cavalry spur ceremonies" now receive a good deal of command oversight. Along with the Army's de-glamorization of alcohol, organizational rituals fell out of favor.[95] Heavy drinking and rowdy behavior, long a means for warriors to cope with the stresses of their profession, were no longer condoned.[96] The old hazing rituals so long practiced and embellished by successive generations of warriors are no longer permitted in today's society; the Secretary of Defense proclaimed "zero tolerance" concerning antics similar to those seen in the 1997 Marine Corps videos.[97] Stephanie Gutmann sees this as loss of "a key part of a rough culture...that allows units to test their own strengths, identify weak links and to ensure that one's buddies can be trusted."[98] This prohibition of hazing rituals is viewed by some as an overt attempt to meddle in purely military affairs and dilute the macho warrior spirit.

Pregnancy and childcare concerns are problems new to the U.S. Army and significantly affect the functioning of a kinder, gentler military. No longer requiring woman soldiers to leave the service due to pregnancy, female-friendly policies allow servicewomen to receive limited duty profiles during pregnancy then receive six weeks maternity leave after giving birth. Treated as a medical condition or "temporary disability," pregnancy causes female soldiers to be unavailable for duty with no replacements assigned for extended periods of time. To many male soldiers, this appears to be favoritism and creates resentment about the increased workload experienced by other soldiers remaining in the unit. Deployment exclusions for pregnant soldiers creates yet another perceived "loophole" for pregnant soldiers. A 1992 Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces found that while women were generally more available for deployment than men due to smaller incidence of injuries and disciplinary problems, women were overall four times less deployable than men because of pregnancy. [99] Pregnant soldiers create personnel

shortages in their units and negatively impact morale more than nearly any other facet of the kinder, gentler military.

Former Army First Lieutenant Mark Smythe cited in Stephanie Gutmann's book provided an anecdote detailing the impact of pregnancy within his unit:

> "My supply room is nicknamed the "Maternity Ward." This is extremely demoralizing for a young first lieutenant like myself. I entered the Army to be a warrior, not a babysitter. Both of my supply specialists are female. Both are pregnant...Neither of them can fulfill their duties (lifting supplies, driving military vehicles, conduct refueling operations, conduct vehicle maintenance). Instead, other males suffer, thereby working longer hours to pick up the slack and being forced to divert their attention from their assigned duties, thus reducing the entire readiness of the company."[100]

The unplanned loss of any soldier can impose considerable strain on other unit members, especially losing soldiers with technical skills. This problem is further compounded by under manning units or by heavily populating units with female soldiers. The negative impact of soldier pregnancies and related policies on unit morale and cohesion is undeniable: pregnancy affects readiness and a unit's ability to execute its mission.

Like pregnancy, single parenthood impacts the force and feeds the kinder, gentler military perception. Retired Brigadier General Evelyn Foote stated, "Single parents present an untenable mess; anyone, male or female, who can't perform their mission has no place in the Army."[101] While some contend that unmarried motherhood is a moral issue contrary to military values, the true problem usually identified is the difficulties encountered by male and female single enlisted parents. Many junior enlisted single parents cannot afford adequate housing, transportation and childcare. This financial challenge can cause recurring diversions from duties and adverse effects on units.[102] Installation childcare centers become key support structures to ensure single parents can perform their duties without distraction and commanders are forced to divert funds to maintain requisite childcare. Childcare center hours govern the hours that some single parent soldiers are available for duty. Finally, single parents (and dual military couples) must maintain command approved Family Care Plans detailing alternative childcare plans to be executed in the event of a unit deployment. Unfortunately, Family Care Plans are not always filed in good faith or arrangements are out of date resulting in invalid plans that result in the non-deployment of affected soldiers.[103]

The increase in female soldiers and single parents are not the only demographic thought to be contributing to perceptions of a kinder, gentler military. Fifty-six percent of today's force is married, compared to approximately forty-six percent when the 1973 all volunteer force was initiated.[104] The old cliché that "if the Army wanted you to have a wife, it would have issued you one" is nothing more than an old cliché. This impacts everything from barracks dynamics to duty hours, some of which seem to be moving farther away from a Spartan warrior mode. Additionally, current economic situations encourage most spouses to work outside the home and leave less time available for spouses to support installation, unit or service member related activities; in fact, today's spouses may have less understanding and tolerance of demands on their warrior spouses than in the past. Working spouses with off-base employment are clearly more resistant to the frequent moves and separations that are a reality of military life.[105] Issues such as day care, children's' schools and family quality of life compete with duty related issues while impacting the complicated daily lives of warriors in new ways. Increased focuses on family-related needs are viewed by some as misplaced priorities sure to result in softer, kinder and gentler soldiers.

A perceived aversion to casualties in combat also contributes to perception of a kinder, gentler military. Operations in a post Cold War military have usually centered on missions involving neither vital nor important U.S. interests. Units throughout the force have experienced an overemphasis on force protection that in some cases has been put on par with mission accomplishment.[106] This leads to reduced acceptance of risk and less willingness to sacrifice lives to obtain military objectives. This leads to criticism that units overemphasize force protection, at the expense of mission accomplishment and operational flexibility. Reluctance of U.S. forces to take on risky missions and operate beyond base camps is seen as a sign of a vanishing warrior ethos. Casualty aversion is seen as a direct contradiction to warrior ethos elements such as courage, self-sacrifice and willingness to accept casualties.[107]

As shown, the kinder, gentler military is said to be primarily the result of social engineering and misinformed views by key U.S. decision-makers and military leadership. Political correctness and acquiescence to feminist agendas are blamed for a reduction in standards, morale and operational effectiveness.[108] Apparent confusion and denial of the realities of future combat on the part of senior military and political leaders receive the credit from old and new soldiers, writers and critics for a kinder,

gentler Army. There is no shortage of anecdotal evidence that the U.S. Army is kinder and gentler.

This review has identified many, but not all reasons posited as evidence of a kinder, gentler military. The kinder, gentler military is described as an army with reduced focus on fitness: an army no longer dedicated to tough and rigorous training: an army that corrupted the purpose and intent of Basic Combat Training: an army that fails to recognize the importance of special rituals and male oriented traditions to unit cohesion. Fear of sexual harassment incidents and any negative media attention are thought to outweigh unit readiness concerns of Army leaders. Pregnancy and single parenthood are viewed as irreconcilable distracters to unit readiness and incompatible with the warrior ethos. While feminization is often cited as the primary culprit, observers also point to societal breakdowns that encourage lessened levels of discipline and declining levels of fitness in America's youth, which are passed on to the military. In sum, the kinder, gentler Army is said to be focused on social experimentation at the expense of warfighting with resulting declines in training rigor, physical fitness, discipline, traditions and unit cohesion. At first blush, it appears the kinder, gentler Army is diametrically opposed to the warrior code.

COMPATABILITIES, CONFLICTS AND INCONSISTENCIES

> "We in the West are conditioned to protect the weak. The warrior butchers them. We fight to preserve the rule of law. The warrior thrives on lawlessness and havoc. He does not respect treaties, no matter the flourish with which they are signed, and he doesn't obey orders when he's not in the mood.
> The warrior has been around since Cain killed Abel. It is the soldier, with his codes of conduct, who is new – developed in Europe and America over the past three centuries and imitated elsewhere."
>
> —Lieutenant Colonel Ralph Peters[109]

> "Despite the scope and speed of societal and technological transformation, war itself will remain a constant in which life, death, and personal sacrifice ultimately determine victory in combat. If history is any guide, sustaining an effective military culture in this time of transformation will require the support of timeless values and resources coupled with an improved capacity for rapid adaptation to changing circumstances."
>
> —LTG (ret) Walter F. Ulmer, U.S.A.[110]

Blaming the ills of today's Army on a feminization is inappropriate. Woman and warrior are not mutually exclusive terms. Female soldiers have proven their ability to exhibit the Army values and embody the American warrior ethos while carrying out our nation's missions. Given current funding, recruiting structures and the all volunteer force, there are no feasible alternatives to large numbers of women in the armed forces.[111] Even the generally anti-feminist Kassenbaum-Baker Report stated that "increasing the number of women in expanded roles is an important reason why the United States is able to maintain an effective and efficient volunteer force."[112] Decreasing the number of women in today's volunteer force without significantly changing the propensity of today's youth to serve would force standards to be lowered.

The introduction of females into a male oriented unit is certain to have some effect on unit cohesion.[113] To a true warrior, a comrade should be a comrade whether male or female. The reluctance to fully accept qualified female soldiers into some units is somewhat parallel to a continued reluctance to accept African-American soldiers into units as recently as 1950.[114] As time progresses, women may be expected to experience greater acceptance much as has been seen in numerous police departments. Few would question the cohesion and mission focus of a gender-integrated medical team in an operating room performing open-heart surgery. Most critics point to the sexual attraction and ultimate pairing up of males and females in a unit as a distracter to the warrior ethos. Certainly this is a departure from the traditional brotherhood of warriors, but it is not insurmountable. A 1997 RAND survey found that gender actually had less negative effect on cohesion than divisions along work group or rank lines and in some cases had a positive effect by raising professional standards.[115] Sociologists note that brother-sister relationships were really the norm, not romantic relationships.[116] It is a paradox of sorts that the same critics who believe that today's force does not possess the discipline to be true warriors do not believe that a true male warrior can possess the requisite discipline to resist an attractive young female soldier.

Neither feminization nor a kinder, gentler Army should be blamed for limitations imposed on special rituals or previously male oriented traditions. Cruelty and demeaning actions directed toward fellow soldiers have no foundation in a military code. These actions actually conflict with the mutual respect and dignity integral to the American warrior code. Jim Toner, writing about military ethics, described this best:

> "The bonding, the spirit, the boisterousness that are part of military culture can be good and worthy things. But carried too far – to the point

> of felony itself-such behavior demeans and can destroy the very institutions it is intended to serve. The bravery and high spirits necessary to fly off decks, to jump out of airplanes, or to master commando tactics in the field must never be perverted into bravado and cowardice, resulting in assaults against shocked women in hotel corridors." Anyone in the military who cannot make the distinction between attacking the enemy and assaulting women, is too stupid, too cowardly, and too immoral to wear his country's uniform."[117]

Out of control events have been reined in to curb the appetite to outdo the last wild gathering. Social gatherings such as officer calls and dinings-in have fallen victim more to de-glamorization of alcohol and competing demands for time than to increased numbers of females.[118] With today's busy schedules, parades and ceremonies are too often viewed as training distractors. Rituals and traditions are important to the warrior code and have not disappeared due to women or a kinder, gentler Army but have instead changed to better represent the professional force that exists today.

Treating others, male or female, with dignity and respect supports the American warrior code more than it contradicts it. Profanity, cursing and swearing at others, long a supposed staple of the Army, was first ordered to be curbed by George Washington in an order to the Continental Army. Standard operating procedures from as far back as 1940 forbade the use of vulgar language, but many could debate how often the rule was acknowledged. While some argue that colorful words set the warrior culture apart, those days are long past. There were times when vulgar language was rare in American society and its use set warriors apart; that is not the case today.[119] Today, cursing and swearing reinforces the values from society that warriors usually take issue with. Ridding offensive language to demonstrate respect for others is not political correctness, it is illustrative of an educated and professional force. Self-discipline, respect and dignity support the American warrior code.

Today's Army can meet required physical standards as well as any in recent history. While standard fitness test scoring has been normed based on gender, so too has it been normed based on age.[120] Critics claim that different run time and pushup repetition scoring standards for female soldiers indicate a weakness and inability of female soldiers to live up to the warrior standard. No complaint regarding differing and lower standards based on age for older soldiers could be found. While it is true that most female soldiers are not as strong nor as aerobically fit as their male comrades, they are generally more fit than their civilian counterparts and for every anecdotal story detailing a female's inability to perform a duty-required physical task one can be found

to demonstrate more than sufficient strength. It is likely true that the same physical inadequacies could be found in some male soldiers, particularly new recruits. The fitness test is not, and never has been a test to determine ability to perform occupational related tasks. It is a test to determine a relative level of physical conditioning and because of this, gender and age norming is appropriate.

Ability groups and running attire comes under fire from those claiming reduced fitness standards. This is a specious argument. Ability groups and running shoes facilitate increased levels of fitness for all soldiers while reducing injuries. Reducing injuries is essential because injured soldiers simply cannot train. These modifications from older methods significantly enhance individual physical readiness and unit combat readiness. Believing that "taunting, shaming and peer pressure" are acceptable and modern methods of getting oneself in shape is simply ludicrous.[121] A review of physical fitness standards over the past forty years shows a significant increase in run times and distances. Few units today run at the "shuffle" pace as had been done in boots, a pace that provided minimal cardio respiratory benefit to many soldiers. Fitness and physical toughness are a part of today's Army.

Concerns about insufficient discipline and soft Basic Combat Training with a lack of rigor are nothing new. In January 1949, General Jacob L. Devers, Chief of Army Ground Forces, announced that "every youth drafted into the Army would be treated as a human being, never a raw recruit."[122] Following the 1946 Doolittle Report that highlighted increasing abuses of enlisted men by their superiors (one of the few enduring effects of the Doolittle Report), Devers' announcement was another step toward prescribing more equitable treatment for recruits. This was immediately met by protests from seasoned soldiers questioning their ability to teach and train under such unreasonable circumstances. Today, some training cadre and observers of Army IET level the same concerns that Basic Combat Training has "gone soft" and is not upholding the warrior code.

In fact, Basic Combat Training is as physically and mentally challenging today as ever before. The eight-week program of instruction was increased by one week in 1998, making it longer than at any time in recent history. A renewed emphasis on team-building and self-discipline was instituted in addition to a significant block of instruction designed to inculcate the seven Army Values in all new soldiers.[123] Rigor, in the form of adherence to demanding training standards rather than rigor in the form of physical pain and ridicule, was reinforced. The minimum standard for graduation from Army Basic

Combat Training was increased from completion of four events to the successful completion of eleven events with waivers no longer permitted. These events included key battlefield skills and physical events such as "confidence and obstacle courses."[124] While the fifty point per event requirement to pass the physical fitness test is less than the Army standard, the Army standard of sixty points must be met by the completion of Advanced Individual Training. In addition, all soldiers must complete a demanding seventy-two hour Field training Exercise very similar to the U.S. Marine Corps' highly regarded Crucible exercise. At the completion of the 72 hour field training exercise, a passage of rites ritual is conducted to highlight the warrior ethos and traditions of the service.[125] Nearly all Basic Training is gender-integrated and all requires that soldiers demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the seven Army Values for successful completion. Values, training proficiency, heritage and discipline are certainly instilled while establishing a solid foundation upon which to build a warrior ethos.

The perceived decrease in discipline in today's Army is not without substance. Today's new soldiers are the products of a society where the traditional nuclear family is under stress and good parenting seems to be rarer yet more required. Problems with the emotional maturity and background of new soldiers has somewhat contributed to noteworthy first term attrition.[126] Equally related, though, is a healthy economy and changing generational attitudes toward leaving military service before completion of contractual commitments. That said, today's Army experiences significantly fewer alcohol and drug related disciplinary infractions than did the pre-all volunteer force Army. Similarly, disciplinary infractions that in the past may have been tolerated now generally net discharges for ill disciplined soldiers. Perhaps this is part of the reason for higher first term attrition.

Surveys and focus groups often depict dissatisfaction with the level of discipline in today's warriors.[127] If this is an unwillingness of today's soldiers to submit to blind obedience, survey and focus group respondents are probably right. Today's generation of young soldiers, whether "generation Xers" or "generation nexters," is more skeptical of authority.[128] What may be seen as a lack of discipline to older soldiers is merely normal questioning and challenging assertion in the eyes of the current generation. Additionally, today's Army contains more high school graduates than ever before and generally are better informed than their predecessors about the outside job market, housing trends, technological advances and world events.[129] Smart, informed soldiers of the upcoming generation quickly identify weak leaders professing one set of values

and living by another. Modern leadership methods simply work much better than antiquated Prussian styles of discipline:

> "We are heirs to a training system inherited from Frederick the Great of Prussia and the British Army, where soldiers were taught to be more afraid of their officers and NCOs in peacetime than they were of the enemy in wartime. This style of training was appropriate up to modern times when we fought conventionally and most soldiers would fight under the supervision of their first line leaders and for a draftee army, but it is less now...The problem, in my opinion, is that soldiers raised under the old system believe that the way they were trained is the way "real" soldiers should be trained. They don't understand for example, the way a martial arts teacher mentors a student into becoming a warrior...but either method would identify those recruits who are not suited for military duty."[130]

Although still backed by the threat of punishment and reinforced with drill, modern military discipline emanates more from unit cohesion and the example set by inspiring leaders.[131] The self-discipline, respect for law and acknowedgement of authority demonstrated by today's soldiers engaged in uniquely challenging missions in Bosnia, Kosovo is clearly not indicative of a kinder, gentler Army lacking discipline and order.

Training, a key element of the warrior code, is constrained more by the challenges of decreasing resources than by any modicum of a kinder, gentler Army. Today's Army, despite a higher peacetime operational tempo than ever before, conducted forty-seven Combat Training Center rotations in Fiscal Year 1999 in addition to home station training and joint and multinational training exercises.[132] There is no training slowdown or softening that would indicate a kinder, gentler Army or abandonment of the warrior ethos. One similar to the following 1999 congressional testimony of Command Sergeant Major Robert Hayden can counter every anecdote of easy training:

> "During our deployment to the National Training Center, the weather was nothing short of brutal. I might add that the weather for this rotation was nothing short of brutal. High winds, cold temperatures and blowing sand combined to make the environment miserable. The ability of our soldiers to work through this additional burden was inspiring...I have been on four rotations to the National Training Center and served with the 1st Armored division during Desert Storm and I have never seen a better unit than the 3rd Squadron, 7th U.S. Cavalry. I truly believe we forged a tough trained team, ready for combat."[133]

Despite competition for time and a wide range of missions, today's soldiers are ready to train to the warrior ethos at every opportunity.

Training safety restrictions are derided by some as softening or a response to zero tolerance for injuries instead of simply taking care of soldiers. Stephanie Gutmann in *Kinder, Gentler Military* disparages Risk Assessments and Risk Analysis while failing to understand the unacceptable cost of poorly planned and unsafe training.[134] Safe training is not automatically kinder and gentler, however it is smarter and more effective. Training casualties are simply unacceptable to the American public, just as casualties in combat have become unacceptable if significant U.S. interests are not at stake. The American public was willing to accept the loss of soldiers' lives during Desert Storm where national interests were being defended. The American public will not accept casualties due to improper planning in training or during peacekeeping operations in Bosnia. Caring for others and upholding national interests are part of the warrior code and should not be considered in conflict with self-sacrifice and willingness to give one's life for one's country. Avoiding unnecessary casualties supports this.

Pregnancy and single parenthood are challenges to the readiness of today's Army and two of the most controversial.[135] Soldiers today are infrequently listed as unavailable for duty due to venereal disease and alcohol or drug related illnesses as had been more common in the past. Instead, pregnancy and family issues arise as more frequent reasons for soldiers, primarily female, to be unable to perform assigned duties. Because men may be fathers but rarely bring their wives' pregnant conditions to work with them, men often resent the burden that pregnant soldiers and single parents bring to a unit. Accessible medical care and convenient affordable day care can remedy some concerns, but occasional difficulties will remain. It may be best to temporarily assign pregnant soldiers and single parents with very young children to garrison or "institutional" types of duties. It may further prove advisable to develop a pool of temps for normal duties or deployments as is sometimes done in the civilian workplace. In some ways, this could be likened to a temporary compassionate assignment for the benefit of a soldier and her family. These issues, in their own right, do not indicate a kinder, gentler military. Having a family is not a violation of the values or attributes of the warrior code.

The so-called kinder, gentler military, if it exists at all, is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with the American warrior code as defined earlier. Today's Army generally exemplifies the values and attributes necessary to succeed on the modern battlefield. The majority of today's soldiers are equally prepared to succeed on the technologically dominated battlefield as on the brutally horrific battlefields of recent conflicts.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

> "There are complaints from some that the Corps is lowering its standards and changing its methods to meet a generation of Americans viewed as weaker than those from the past. These complaints were generally from people who knew little about the Crucible (the USMC basic training rite of passage exercise). Those who insist on focusing entirely on the past will probably fail. One can't move forward very well while fixating on the past, because what worked yesterday may not work today or prepare us for tomorrow...Every generation seems to think that the next is misguided and less capable...The "old Corps" was always better, but the definition was related to whom you were talking, not a specific date on the calendar."
>
> — LtCol James Woulfe, U.S.M.C., Into The Crucible[136]

Perhaps one problem that critics have comparing today's military to the warrior code is reconciling the warrior code or even the term "warrior" itself. Samuel Huntington *in The Soldier and the State* and General Sir John Hackett in *The Profession of Arms* write of military professionals and soldiers of a warrior class.[137] To them, a warrior is defined simply as one engaged in warfare. On the other hand, Ralph Peters defines warriors as "erratic primitives of shifting allegiance, habituated to violence, with no stake in civil order."[138] He sees warriors as bloodthirsty and barbaric, quite different from soldier professionals. Given Peters' definition, the concept of a warrior defending American ideals is nearly inconceivable. An American warrior is a soldier upholding American ideals and values above all else. The American warrior code is unique in its attachment to American laws and ideals. This idea seems to escape some critics.

LTG(R) Richard G. Trefry draws a distinction between the terms "warrior" and "soldier." Generally speaking, he classifies a warrior as one engaged in battle," while a soldier is "an individual of military skill or experience." He reminds us that warriors may represent only a small part of the force that is called upon to do the actual fighting.[139] Perhaps a dual standard is acceptable or possibly even preferred, but this study grouped all soldiers together as warriors because our Army is made up of all soldiers who may be called upon to engage in combat in some capacity.

As there is no true comprehensive written American warrior code it often exists in lore, legend and myth. As we have ascertained the key points of a code, others consult those sources and ideas that support their own views. And their own views are tempered by their own experiences and beliefs. For that reason, the warrior code

discerned in this study will not suit everyone. Nonetheless, the traditions and sources consulted yield a suitable beginning for the creation of an American warrior code applicable to all whom through their position as a military person may be called upon to participate in military operations in support of United States national interests.

While exploring the kinder, gentler army we must at some point ask "kinder and gentler than what?" In reviewing the allegations of critics we often find that the answer to this question usually appears to be kinder and gentler than someone's ideal, perception or recollection. Many of the charges claiming a kinder, gentler military are substantiated by little or narrowly selected research, instead relying more on opinion surveys or anecdotal evidence. It is clearly difficult to quantify the term "kinder and gentler," but this does not negate the need to address and review the allegations and understand both sides of the issues.

Having developed the underpinning of an American warrior code and compared it to the most common symptoms attributed to the kinder, gentler Army, it is difficult to find true conflict. In fact, it is difficult to agree that a kinder, gentler military actually exists. Instead, what is found is an Army in a new technological age working to adapt to a wide range of changes. New individual and unit missions, generational changes and societal requirements contribute to the natural evolution of the Army. General Sir John Hackett, in *The Profession of Arms*, explains "What a society gets in its armed services is exactly what it asks for, no more and no less. What it asks for tends to be a reflection of what it is. When a country looks at its fighting forces it is looking in a mirror; the mirror is a true one and the face that it sees will be its own."[140] The United States has an Army composed of capable warriors with the values and attributes required to meet the demands placed on it now and into the future.

Several recommendations come to light from this study. Policies regarding assignment of single parents and pregnant females should be reviewed in light of what is best for the army and the individual soldiers, without concern for fairness. Senior leaders should identify the true reasons training is modified, whether fiscal constraints or safety concerns, and not leave it open for speculation and blame. Finally, the soldier's code should be modified or expanded to include the values and the attributes required of all members committed to fighting and winning our nation's wars, responsive and dominant at every point on the spectrum of operations.[141]

WORD COUNT = 14,261

ENDNOTES

[1] U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, Key Strategic Issues List (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, August 1, 2000), 7. Code of the Warrior and the Kinder, Gentler Army was proposed in a list provided the USAWC class of 2001 as an "important" topic for research.

[2] Bernard E.Trainor, LTG, USMC (Ret), comments regarding Gutmann, Stephanie, The Kinder Gentler Military, (New York, N.Y.: Scribner, 2000) and Patricia M. Shields, Sex Roles In The Military: More Than Just a Job?, also see Charles Moskos and Frank R. Wood (MacClean, VA: Pergammon Brassey's, 1988), 99.

[3] Barbara Ehrenreich, Blood Rites (New York, N.Y.: Metropolitan Books, Holt and Co., 1997), 50.

[4] Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary and John Winthrop Hackett, The Profession of Arms, (Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, United States Army, 1988), 3. Harold Laswell defined described the profession of arms as "ordered application of force" and "management of violence."

[5] See Edith Kurzwell (ed) and William Phillips, "Our Country, Our Culture; The Politics of Political Correctness," Partisan Review, Jan 1995 for description of political correctness arising as a popular term in the 1980s.

[6] Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military: Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting force Still win Wars?, (New York: N.Y.: Scribner, 2000).

[7] Thomas E. Ricks, Making the Corps, (New York, N.Y.: Scribner, 1997),276.

[8] General Anthony Zinni, USMC(Ret), address at the U.S. Naval Institute, July 2000.

[9] Nicolas Fotion and G. Elfstrom, Military Ethics: Guidelines for Peace and War, (Boston, Mass.: Routledge & Kegan) 1986.

[10] Department of the Army, The Army, Field Manual 1, Prototype Draft, Version K, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 2000), 6.

[11] Ibid., 6.

[12] U.S. Department of the Army, Army Leadership, FM 22-100, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1999), 2-2.

[13] U.S. Department of the Army Training Aid, Training and Doctrine Command Values Card and Soldiers Code, 1998.

[14] U.S. Department of the Army, Army Leadership, FM 22-100 and Department of the Army Values Posters, 1998.

[15] Values Posters may be accessed at<www-m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>. Internet. Accessed 15 December 2000.

[16] U.S. Department of the Army, Army Leadership, FM 22-100, 2-2.

[17] Ibid. 2-4 - 2-10.

[18] Louis Caldera and Eric Shinsecki, A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army FY01 (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 2000) Accessed at <http://www.army.mil>. Internet. Accessed 15 December 2000. The seven core Army values are addressed in Chapter 5 of the FY01 Army Posture Statement; the statement asserts "programs and initiatives such as the Human relations Action Plan, Character Development XXI, and the Consideration of Others Program" are necessary to "inspire soldiers to live in accordance with these values today."

[19] Dwight D. Eisenhower, Executive Order 10631, 7 August 1955. Amended in May, 1988 by Ronald Reagan.

[20] U.S. Department of the Army, Ranger Handbook, (Fort Benning, Georgia: United States Army Infantry School, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978), ii and U.S. Department of the Army, Ranger Handbook, (Fort Benning, Georgia: United States Army Infantry School, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988), A-3.

[21] Ibid.

[22] James Burk, "Military Culture," in Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict, vol. 2, Lester R. Kurtz and Jennifer Turpin, editors (San Diego, California: Academic Press, 1999), 447-461. Also Don M. Snider, "A Uniformed Debate on Military Culture," Orbis 43, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 11-26.

[23] William G. Boykin, introductory note, Special Warfare Magazine (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Spring 2000), cover.

[24] U.S. Army Special Forces Creed.

[25] Walter F. Ulmer, Jr. et al, American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), 2000), 7.

[26] United States Army oath of enlistment.

[27] U.S. Department of Defense, DoD Pam 1-20, The Armed Forces Officer (Washington, D.C.: Office of Armed Forces Information and Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), 4.

[28] U.S. Department of the Army, The Army, FM1, 6.

[29] Barbara Ehrenreich, Blood Rites: Origins and History of the Passions of War (New York, N.Y.: Metropolitan Books, Holt and Company, 1997), 10.

[30] Ibid.

[31] John Hackett, General, The Profession of Arms (New York, N.Y.: MacMillan Publishing, 1983), 10.

[32] Aristotle, Politics, in Words on War, ed. Jay M. Shafritz, (New York, N.Y.: Prentice Hall, 1990), 302.

[33] Hackett, The Profession of Arms, 21.

[34] Richard Holmes, Acts of War: Behavior of Men in Battle, (New York, N.Y.: Free Press, Macmillan, 1985), 32.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Hackett, The Profession of Arms, 19.

[37] Ibid, 21.

[38] Vegetius, Epitoma Rei Militaris, in Roots of Strategy I (Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1987), 23. Translated by Major T.R. Phillips. Vegetius's discourse on the problems of Rome and her army during the decline of the empire.

[39] Philippe Contamine, War in the Middle Ages (Oxford, England: Basil and Blackwell, 1993), 302, and Barbara Ehrenreich, Blood Rites, 167.

[40] Ehrenreich, 167.

[41] Ernest R. DuPuy, and Trevor DuPuy, The Encyclopedia of Military History (New York, N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1986), 245.

[42] Ehrenreich, 169.

[43] Morris Janowitz, The Professional Soldier (New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1960), 217.

[44] Douglas Mac Arthur, address to veterans of the Rainbow Division (42nd Infantry), 11 July 1935.

[45] Hackett, 83.

[46] Thackeray, The Luck of Barry Lyndon, Esq. (1892), 44.

[47] Hackett, 83.

[48] William W. Hartzog, American Military Heritage, (Fort Monroe, VA: U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, U.S. Government Printing Office, June, 1998), 27.

[49] U.S. Department of Defense, The Armed Forces Officer, Chapter 26, Americans in Combat, 235.

[50] William C. Westmoreland, Memo to Commandant of U.S. Army War Colege. Washington, D.C., 18 April 1970.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Department of the Army, Army Leadership, 2-2, also available at Army Digital Library http://155.217.58.58

[53] Holmes, 332.

[54] Marguerite Higgins, War in Korea: The Report of a Woman Combat Correspondent (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1951), 221.

[55] Gutmann, book jacket.

[56] U.S. Department of the Army, The Army, 16. The Army's purpose, functions and core competencies are outline on page 16; in the middle of the Army's capstone document. The Army's fundamental purpose is described as "serving the American people."

[57] Bernard E. Trainor, LTG (RET) USMC, comments on bookjacket, Gutmann, Stephanie, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?

[58] David Hackworth, "Softies Fill Bodybags," March 9, 1999; available from <www.hackworth.com/9mar99.html>. Internet. accessed 15 December 2000.

[59] William G. Moore, MG (Ret), "The Military Must Revive Its Warrior Spirit," The Wall Street Journal, available from <www.hackworth.com/Warrior%20Spirit.htm>; Internet; accessed 20 December 2000.

[60] David Hackworth, "Women as Warriors," 12 February, 1997, available from <http://www.hackworth.com/12feb97.html > p2. Internet; accessed 1 December2000.

[61] Gutmann, 26.

[62] Earl H. Tilford, review of Janet Gutmann's book in Parameters, U.S. Army War College Journal, Vol. XXX, No. 4, Winter 2000-2001, 153.

[63] Nancy Kassenbaum-Baker, Chairman, Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 16, 1997) 3. As the number of females in the armed services has increased since advent of the All Volunteer Force, the number of billets available to females DoD-wide has risen to 260,000.

[64] David Hackworth, comments on bookjacket, Gutmann, Stephanie, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?

[65] Gutmann, 247.

[66] David Hackworth, "Defending America," 23 September, 1997, available from www.hackworth.com/23sep97.html; Internet; accessed 15 December 2000.

[67] Mary Roou, Captain, in Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?

[68] U.S. Department of the Army, Physical Fitness Training, Field Manual 21-20 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987). See annexes regarding Army Physical Fitness Testing (APFT).

[69] Gutmann, 260.

[70] Gutmann, 40.

[71] Gutmann, 67.

[72] Jake Williams, "Women in the Military Combat Roles Considered," Center for Defense Information, 7 August 1996 available from <http://www.cdi.org/issues/women/combat.html.>; Internet; 7 August 1996, accessed 1 December 2000.

[73] Gutmann, 242.

[74] Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues, Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues to the Secretary of Defense (Washington, D.C.; Department of Defense, December 16, 1997) 15. Also available at <www.defenselink.mil/pubs/git/report.html>; Internet; accessed December 10, 2000.

[75] Robert K. Gifford, Laura N. Rosen, Paul D. Bliese and Kathleen A. Wright, "Gender Composition and Group Cohesion in U.S. Army Units: A Comparison of Five Studies," Armed Forces and Society 25, No.3. (Spring 1999): 365-382.

[76] William C. Moore, "The Military Must Revive Its Warrior Spirit," The Wall Street Journal, available at <www.hackworth.com/Warrior%20Spirit.html> Internet; accessed 20 December 2000.

[77] Francis Fukuyama, "G.I. Jane," review of Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?

[78] William C. Moore, "The Military Must Revive Its Warrior Spirit."

[79] David Hackworth, "Fun is Wrong Notion for Basic Training," Sentinel Newspaper, 15 December 2000, sec. B, p.15 and available from <http://www.hackworth.com>; Internet. Accessed 20 December 2000.

[80] Brian Heitman, quoted by David Hackworth, David, "Warrior Ethic: Down, But Not Out," 15 February, 2000; available from <http://www.hackworth.com/15feb00.html>; Internet; accessed 17 November 2000. Also quoted in Army Times Newspaper, 10 February 2000.

[81] Patrick Toffler, Colonel, cited in Robert Knight, "Women in Combat: Why Rush to Judgement?," The Heritage Foundation, available from <http://www.heritage.org/library/archives/backgrounder/bg836.html>; Internet; Accessed 1 December 2000.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?, 257. The individual testifying and specific Presidential Commission hearing are not identified by Janet Gutmann.

[84] Charles C. Moskos, "Army Women," The Atlantic Monthly, August 1990, available at <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/defense/dpmoswom.htm>. Internet; Accessed 15 Dec 2000, 6.

[85] Elaine Donnelly, Testimony before the House National Security Sub-Committee on Personnel, 17 March 1998. Available from <http://www.house.gov/hasc/testimony/105thcongress/3-17-98donnelly.htm>; Internet; accessed 10 December 2000. The army conducted gender-integrated Basic Combat Training from 1978 through 1982 but was discontinued due to study findings that men were not attaining their full potential because they were not being physically challenged enough and women were suffering injuries at far greater rates. The 1994 expansion of assignment positions for females soldiers prompted reinstitution of gender integrated Basic Combat Training to more closely "train as we fight." Elaine Donnelly asserts this was an instance of Secretary of Defense Aspin, Secretary of the Army West and Assistant secretary Lister giving in to feminist activists and DACOWITS.

[86] Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues, Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues to the Secretary of Defense, 16.

[87] Elaine Donnelly, "Women in Combat – Time for a Review," The American Legion Magazine, July, 2000, 13. Also Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?, pg 55. Elaine Donnelly is the president of the Center for Military Readiness and a former member of the Defense Advisory Committee on women in the Services (DACOWITS).

[88] Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues, Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues to the Secretary of Defense, 16.

[89] Hackworth, David, Fun is Wrong Notion for Basic Training, Sentinel Newspaper, 15 Dec 00 and available <at http://www.hackworth.com>; Internet; Accessed 20 December 2000.

[90] David H. Hackworth, "Relaxin' at Jackson," 7 December 2000. Available from <http://www.hackworth.com/DA05DEC00.htm>. Internet; Accessed 20 December 2000.

[91] Department of the Army, Army Initial Entry Training (IET) Policies and Administration, TRADOC Regulation 350-6 (Fort Monroe, VA; United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, November 1999).

[92] Hackworth, David H., "Softies Fill Bodybags."

[93] Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?, 41.

[94] Ibid, 160.

[95] Leonard Wong, Generations Apart: Xers and Boomers in the Officer Corps (Carlisle, PA.: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2000), 21.

[96] Richard Holmes, Acts of War , 250. Holmes describes the role alcohol and raucous celebration had in armies through history. He points to the need for alcohol and related rituals as a means of coping with stresses of war.

[97] David Hackworth, "Lose the Warrior Ethic and Fail," February 12, 1997; available from <http://www.hackworth. com/12FEB97.html>; Internet; Accessed 15 December 2000.

[98] Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military; Can America's Gender Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?, 156.

[99] Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces, Report to the President: Women in Combat, 15 November 1992. Published by Association of the United States Army.

[100] Mark Smyth, quoted in Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?, 235.

[101] Evelyn "Pat" Foote, BG(R), quoted in Charles C. Moskos, "Army Women," The Atlantic Monthly, vol. 226, No.2 (August 1990): 71 – 78.

[102] Elain Donnelly, Testimony before the House National Security Committee, available at <http://www.house.gov/hasc/testimony/105thcongress/3-17-98donnelly.htm>: Internet; Accessed 3 Jan 2001.

[103] Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military; Can America's Gender Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars? , 133. This occurred at a high rate during the

Gulf War when commanders realized Family Care Plans were not properly maintained or verified.

[104] Department of Defense, Defense Almanac, 2000. Available from <www.defenselink.mil/pubs/almanac/index.htm>; Internet; Accessed 20 December 2000.

[105] Walter F. Ulmer, Jr. et al, American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century, 25.

[106] Ibid, 22.

[107] Ibid, 22.

[108] Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military; Can America's Gender Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?, 11, 16, 19, 125 and Earl H. Tilford, Jr., review of The Kinder, Gentler Military; Can America's Gender Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars? in Parameters vol. XXX, No. 4 (Winter 2000-2001),154.

[109] Ralph Peters, "Soldier vs. Warrior", The Washington Post, 7 March 1999, sec. B, p. 1.

[110] Walter F. Ulmer, American Military Culture in the Twenty First Century, 47.

[111] Ibid, 29.

[112] Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues, Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues to the Secretary of Defense, 3.

[113] Robert K. Gifford, Laura N. Rosen, Paul D. Bliese, and Kathleen A. Wright, "Gender Composition and Group Cohesion in U.S. Army Units: A Comparison of Five Studies," Armed Forces and Society 25, No. 3 (Spring 1999), 365-382.

[114] Charles C. Moskos and John Sibley Butler, All That We Can Be: Racial Leadership and Racial Integration the Army Way (New York, N.Y.: BasicBooks, 1996), 31.

[115] Margaret Harrell and Laura Milller, New Opportunities for Military Women: Effects Upon Readiness, Cohesion and Morale (Washington, D.C.: RAND Corporation, 1997), 3.

[116] Patricia M. Shields in The Military, More Than Just a Job?, ed. Charles C. Moskos and Frank R. Wood (Washington, D.C.: Pergammon-Brassey's, 1988), 108.

[117] James H. Toner, True Faith and Allegiance: The Burden of Military Ethics (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1995), 110.

[118] Leonard Wong, Generations Apart: Xers and Boomers in the Officer Corps, 21.

[119] James B. Woulfe, Into the Crucible, Making Marines in the 21st Century, (Novato, California: Presidio Press, 1998), 59.

[120] Department of the Army, Physical Fitness Training, FM 21-20.

[121] Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military; Can America's Gender Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars? , 40. Gutmann believes ability group use removes taunting and yelling as effective methods of physical training.

[122] Edgar L. Jones, "You're in the Army Again," The Atlantic Monthly, vol. 183, No. 4 (January 1949), 31.

[123] Congressional Commission on Military Training and Gender Related Issues, Report of the Congressional Commission on Military Training and Gender Related Issues (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 21.

[124] Department of the Army, Initial Entry Training (IET) Policies and Administration, TRADOC Regulation 350-6.

[125] Ibid.

[126] Walter F. Ulmer, American Military Culture in the Twenty First Century, 23.

[127] Ibid, 24. Between 54 and 86 percent of NCOs surveyed felt recruits lacked discipline.

[128] Ron Zemke, Claire Raines, and Filip Czak, Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in Your Workplace (New York, N.Y.: American Management Association, 2000).

[129] Leonard Wong, Generations Apart: Xers and Boomers in the Officer Corps, 14.

[130] Jefferson Figuerres, Major, quoted in Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?, 65.

[131] Walter F. Ulmer, American Military Culture in the Twenty First Century, 8.

[132] Louis Caldera and Eric Shinsecki, A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army FY01 (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 2000), 8.

[133] Robert M. Hayden, Command Sergeant Major, U.S. Army, Statement presented to Congress, Washington, D.C., 26 February 1999, 3-4.

[134] Stephanie Gutmann, The Kinder, Gentler Military; Can America's Gender Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars? , 38.

[135] Patricia M. Shields in The Military, More Than Just a Job? ed. Charles C. Moskos and Frank R. Wood (Washington, D.C.: Pergammon-Brassey's, 1988), 109.

[136] James B. Woulfe, Into the Crucible, 25.

[137] Samuel Huntington, The Soldier and the State (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957 and John Hackett, The Profession of Arms.

[138] Ralph Peters, "The New Warrior Class," Parameters (Summer 1994), 16-26.

[139] Richard G. Trefry, in The American Warrior, ed. Chris Morris and Janet Morris (Connecticut: Longmeadow Press, 1992), 48.

[140] John Hackett, The Profession of Arms, 158.

[141] Louis Caldera and Eric Shinsecki, A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army FY01 (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 2000), iii.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle. Politics; Quoted in Jay M. Shafritz, Words on War. New York, N.Y.: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces. Report to the President: Women in Combat, 15 November 1992.

Burk, James. "Military Culture;" Quoted in Lester R. Kurtz and Jennifer Turpin, editors, Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict, vol. 2. San Diego: Academic Press, 1999.

Boykin, William G. Special Warfare Magazine (Spring 2000): inside cover.

Blair, Anita K., Chairman. Congressional Commission on Military Training and Gender Related Issues. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997.

Caldera, Louis and Shinsecki, Eric. A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army, Fiscal Year 2000. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999.

Contamine, Philippe. War in the Middle Ages. Oxford, England: Basil and Blackwell 1993

DuPuy, R. Ernest and DuPuy, Trevor. The Encyclopedia of Military History., New York, N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1986.

Donnelly, Elaine. Testimony before the House National Security. 17 March 1998. Available from <http://www.house.gov/hasc/testimony/105thcongress/3-17-98donnelly.htm.> Internet. Accessed 3 Jan 2001.

Donnelly, Elaine. " Women in Combat – Time for a Review," The American Legion Magazine (July, 2000) 13.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. U.S. Code of Conduct. Executive Order 10631, 7 August 1955.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. Blood Rites: Origins and History of the Passions of War. New York, N.Y.: Holt and Company, 1997.

Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues. Report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Gender Integrated Training and Related Issues to the Secretary of Defense. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, December 16, 1997.

Fotion, Nicholas and Elfstrom, G. Military Ethics: Guidelines for Peace and War. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.

Fukuyama, Francis. "G.I. Jane." Book review of Stephanie Guttman, The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?. New York, N.Y.: Scribner, 2000.

Gifford, Robert K., Rosen, Laura N., Bliese, Paul D., and Wright, Kathleen A. "Gender Composition and Group Cohesion in U.S. Army Units: A Comparison of Five Studies," Armed Forces and Society 25, No. 3 (Spring 1999): 365-382.

Gutmann, Stephanie. The Kinder, Gentler Military: Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting force Still win Wars? New York, N.Y.: Scribner, 2000.

Hackett, John Winthrop. The Profession of Arms. Washington, D.C.: United States Army Center of Military History, 1988.

Hackett, John Winthrop, The Profession of Arms. New York, N.Y.: MacMillan Publishing, 1983.

Hackworth, David H. "Softies Fill Bodybags," 9 March 1999; available from <www.hackworth.com/9mar99.html>. Internet; accessed 15 December 2000.

Hackworth, David H. "Fun is Wrong Notion for Basic Training," 15 December 00; available from <http://www.hackworth.com>. Internet; accessed 15 December 2000.

Hackworth, David H. "Lose the Warrior Ethic and Fail," February 12, 1997; available from <http://www.hackworth.com/12FEB97.html>. Internet; accessed 15 December 2000.

Hayden, Robert M. Statement Before Congress, 106th Congress, 26 February 1999.

Hackworth, David H. "Warrior Ethic: Down, But Not Out," 15 February, 2000; available from <http://www.hackworth.com/15feb00.html>. Internet; accessed 17 November 2000.

Hackworth, David H. "Relaxin' at Jackson," 20 December, 2000; available from <http://www.hackworth.com/DA05DEC00.html>. Internet; accessed 20 December, 2000.

Hackworth, David H. "Women as Warriors," 12 February, 1997; available from <http://www.hackworth.com/12feb97.html>. Internet; accessed 1 December 2000.

Hackworth, David H. "Defending America," 23 September, 1997; available from <www.hackworth.com/23sep97.html>. Internet; accessed 15 December 2000.

Harrell, Margaret and Milller, Laura. New Opportunities for Military Women: Effects Upon Readiness, Cohesion and Morale. Washington, D.C.: RAND Corporation, 1997. Also available from <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR896/>. Internet: accessed 17 December 2000.

Hartzog, William W. American Military Heritage. Fort Monroe, Virginia: U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998.

Holmes, Richard. Acts of War: Behavior of Men in Battle. New York, N.Y.: Free Press,

Macmillan, 1985.

Higgins, Marguerite. War in Korea: The Report of a Woman Combat Correspondent. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1951.

Huntington, Samuel. The Soldier and the State. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Janowitz, Morris. The Professional Soldier. New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1960.

Jones, Edgar L. "You're in the Army Again," The Atlantic Monthly vol. 183, No. 4 (January 1949): 31 – 34.

Kurzweil, Edith (ed) and Phillips, William. "Our Country, Our Culture; The Politics of Political Correctness," Partisan Review (January 1995): 18-25.

Mac Arthur, Douglas. A Soldier Speaks. New York, N.Y.: McGraw Hill,1965.

Moore, William C. "The Military Must Revive Its Warrior Spirit," Undated reprint from Wall Street Journal; available from <www.hackworth.com/Warrior%20Spirit.html>. Internet: accessed 20 December 2000.

Moskos, Charles. "Army Women," The Atlantic Monthly vol. 226, No.2 (August 1990): 71 – 78.

Moskos, Charles C. and Butler, John Sibley. All That We Can Be: Racial Leadership and Racial Integration the Army Way. New york, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1996.

Peters, Ralph. "Soldier vs. Warrior." The Washington Post, 7 March 1999, sec. 1A, p.4..

Peters, Ralph. "The New Warrior Class." Parameters (Summer 1994): 16-26.

Ricks, Thomas E. Making the Corps. New York, N.Y.: Scribner, 1997.

Snider, Don M. "A Uniformed Debate on Military Culture." Orbis 43, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 11-26.

Shields, Patricia M. Sex Roles in the Military: More Than Just a Job?, ed. Charles Moskos and Frank R. Wood, 89-110. McClean, Virginia: Pergammon Brassey's, 1988.

Toner, James H. True Faith and Allegiance: The Burden of Military Ethics. Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1995.

Tilford, Earl H., review of Janet Gutmann The Kinder, Gentler Military.; Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars? New York, N.Y.: Scribner, 2000. Reviewed in Parameters Vol. XXX, No. 4 (Winter 2000-2001): 154.

Knight, Robert. "Women in Combat: Why Rush to Judgement?" Undated article from

The Heritage Foundation; available from <http://www.heritage.org/library/archives/backgrounder/bg836.html>. Internet: accessed 1 December 2000.

Trefry, Richard G. The American Warrior, ed. Chris Morris and Janet Morris, 45-55. Connecticut: Longmeadow Press, 1992.

Ulmer, Walter F. Jr., et al. American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), 2000.

U.S. Army War College. Key Strategic Issues List. Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, 2000.

U.S. Department of the Army. Ranger Handbook. Fort Benning Georgia: United States Army Infantry School, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

U.S. Department of the Army. Ranger Handbook. Fort Benning Georgia: United States Army Infantry School, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Department of the Army. The Army, Field Manual 1, Prototype Draft, Version K. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000.

U.S. Department of the Army Headquarters Training and Doctrine Command. Initial Entry Training (IET) Policies and Administration. TRADOC Regulation 350-6. Fort Monroe, Virginia: United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, 10 August 1998.

U.S. Department of Defense. Department of Defense Almanac ; available from <www.defenselink.mil/pubs/almanac/index.html>; Internet. Accessed 20 December 1999.

U.S. Department of Defense. The Armed Forces Officer. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

U.S. Department of the Army. Army Leadership, Be, Know, Do, Field Manual 22-100. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999.

U.S. Department of the Army. Values Card and Soldiers Code, Fort Eustis, Virginia: Army Training and Support Center, 1998.

U.S. Department of the Army. Physical Fitness Training, Field Manual 21-20. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987.

U.S. Department of the Army Office of the Chief of Staff of the Army. United States Army Posture Statement FY 01. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Activities Division, U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000.

Vegetius. Epitoma Rei Militaris, I. In Roots of Strategy I Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1985.

Woolf, Henry B., ed. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, MA: G. and C. Merriam, 1979.

Westmoreland, William C. Memo to Commandant, U.S. Army War College, 18 Apri 1970.

Williams, Jake. "Women in the Military Combat Roles Considered, Center for Defense Information," 7 August 1996. Available from <http://www.cdi.org/issues/women/combat.html>. Internet. Accessed 1 December 2000

Wong, Leonard. Generations Apart: Xers and Boomers in the Officer Corps. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

Woulfe, James B. Into the Crucible, Making Marines in the 21st Century. Presidio Press, Novato, CA.: Presidio Press, 1998.

Zemke, Ron, Raines, Claire, and Filipczak. Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in Your Workplace. New York, N.Y.: American Management Association, 2000.

Zinni, Anthony. Address at the U.S. Naval Institute, July 2000.