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.

MILITARY MINISTRY TO CIVILIANS IN HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS

BY

CHAPLAIN (LTC) ALVIN M. MOORE III
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

20010605 144

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

MILITARY MINISTRY TO CIVILIANS IN HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS

by

Chaplain (LTC) Alvin M. Moore III
U.S. Army

Chaplain (COL) Peter K. Christy
Project Advisor

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: Chaplain (LTC) Alvin M. Moore III

TITLE: Military Ministry to Civilians in Humanitarian Operations

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 10 April 2001 PAGES: 23 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Chaplain Ministry Teams are always a part of the Task Force in Humanitarian and Peacekeeping Operations. The purpose of these ministry teams is to provide ministry for soldiers, families, and Department of the Army civilians. A question frequently asked in recent situations is: what is the role of the chaplain in ministry to civilians?" The purpose of this research project will be to analyze of the issues surrounding this important question. Examples will be considered of situations where chaplains have been called into question for extending ministry to civilians. Practical, professional, legal, and doctrinal guidelines will also be considered in this paper. At the very heart of this issue is: "what are the limits and boundaries for the ministry team when it is called upon to provide ministry to civilians in Humanitarian/Peacekeeping operations?" Very little has been said or written officially that speaks to this issue directly. Chaplain training in this sensitive area has been neglected, because there is no clear guidance regarding doctrine, policy, and practice. Considerations will be offered as to what Army chaplain policy should be in regard to military ministry to civilians in humanitarian/peacekeeping operations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT III

MILITARY MINISTRY TO CIVILIANS IN HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 2

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MINISTRY TO CIVILIANS ISSUE 5

A DISCUSSION OF CURRENT CHAPLAIN DOCTRINE 8

CONCLUSION AND RECCOMMENDATIONS 10

ENDNOTES 13

BIBLIOGRAPHY 15

MILITARY MINISTRY TO CIVILIANS IN HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS

Over the past ten years there has been enormous growth in the number of Operations Other Than War missions performed by the United States Army. Operations Other Than War (OOTW) include domestic support operations in four categories: disaster assistance, environmental assistance, support to law enforcement agencies, and community assistance. The United States Army conducts peace keeping operations outside the United States and its territories. These operations include support to diplomacy, peacekeeping, and peace enforcement. These deployments are commonly called Humanitarian and Peace Keeping Operations.

> Both the number and intensity of humanitarian emergencies, as well as the number of people in need, will remain at about the same high level or even increase somewhat by December 2000—testing the capacity and willingness of the international donor community to respond adequately. According to the US Committee for refugees, roughly 35 million people are in need of emergency humanitarian assistance. There are twenty-four ongoing humanitarian emergencies and new or renewed emergencies that could appear in the Balkans, Sub-Saharan Africa, Russia, and/or Central America.[1]

In addition, several other major countries and regions may experience conflict, political instability, sudden economic crises, or technological and natural disasters. Judging from past history the Army of the future, FY 2010 and beyond, will be more and more active in these operations.

For over 200 years, military chaplains have accompanied US forces wherever they served. The mission of chaplains and enlisted religious support personnel throughout the operational continuum is to perform or facilitate comprehensive religious support to military members and other authorized personnel. Chaplain ministry teams are always a part of the task force in Humanitarian Operations. Where the Army goes, ministry teams accompany it. Their purpose is to provide nurture to the living, care for the wounded and dying, and honor the dead. Several statutes and regulations authorize the existence, function, and responsibility of the Chaplaincy. "Consistent with their sworn oath, chaplains uphold the First Amendment of the Constitution by ensuring protection of the soldier's right of "free exercise" of religion."[2]

Religion plays a vital role in the self-understanding of many people and has a significant effect on the goals, objectives, and structure of society. In some cases, religious self-understanding may play a determinative or regulating role on policy, strategy, or tactics. It is important for commanders to have an understanding of the religious groups within the theater of operations and the potential impact that they may have on the accomplishment of the assigned

mission. Within this context, ministry teams are vitally important. Though it is not a specific responsibility, chaplains often do country studies concerning religious demographics so they can appropriately advise their commanders and soldiers regarding local religious customs and practices.

Chaplains are "trained to operate within a pluralistic environment,"[3] so that chaplains can advise commanders on pluralism issues. This training is invaluable Humanitarian/Peacekeeping Operations where many civilians, sometimes displaced and suffering, are a part of the population and in need of ministry. A question often raised by military and civilians alike is: what is the chaplain responsibility for ministry to civilians in Humanitarian/Peacekeeping Operations?

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There are numerous examples in recent years where ministry efforts by military chaplains to civilians have been called into question by legal authorities. One example involved 82nd Airborne Division chaplains ministering to homeless civilians during Operation Andrew Humanitarian relief efforts in 1992. A specific issue during the operation involved a chaplain ministry team invited to the home of an elderly woman who had requested a Bible and prayer. The Miami Herald Newspaper wrote an article, complete with photographs, that praised the efforts of ministry teams to extend compassion and a helping hand to suffering people. In another instance chaplains performed worship services that were intended for soldiers, but were attended primarily by the civilian population. One chaplain, in working with his unit, was assigned to work out of a partially destroyed church building. When members of the congregation observed his outstanding diligence and dedication, he was asked by the pastor to conduct Sunday worship services. It was not the intent of any military chaplain to be in violation of the law or to take the place of local civilian clergy. As will be demonstrated later, such ministry efforts by chaplains were met by legal challenges.

These same type situations have occurred in Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia, and most other Humanitarian/Peacekeeping operations. In most instances military chaplains respond to any call for assistance from the civilian population. Chaplains realize however, that their first ministry priority is to soldiers. They also realize that they are staff officers and answer to their commander. "The mission of the Army chaplaincy is to provide religious support to America's Army across the full spectrum of operations. This is done by assisting the commander in ensuring the right of free exercise of religion and by providing spiritual, moral, and ethical leadership for the Army and it's culture".[4] Because chaplains are a part of the commander's

staff and a member of the unit, they feel a responsibility to assist in any way possible in humanitarian operations.

The military objective is to achieve overall mission success in humanitarian operations. "Humanitarian assistance operations relieve or reduce the results of natural or manmade disasters or other endemic conditions such as human pain, disease, hunger, or privation".[5] This means in as much as is possible, caring for physical, emotional, and spiritual needs. Chaplain ministry is expected to be a large part of this effort. "Peace operations require diverse religious support capability. Without augmentation, each commander must share religious support assets to form a religious support system with diverse cultural and religious capabilities".[6] While military chaplains are specifically tasked to work for commanders and to minister to soldiers, in humanitarian operations there is often the call for assistance outside of normal responsibilities. Sometimes these activities "outside the box" have been called into question and herein lie the dilemma of military ministry to civilians.

The issue has been raised on occasion by the Judge Advocate General Corps. During Hurricane Andrew Disaster Relief operations in 1992, 18th Airborne Corps chaplains were advised that chaplain involvement in spiritual activities with civilian disaster victims is prohibited by the Establishment Clause of the United States Constitution. In a memorandum dated 23 November 1992, Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Bucholz, with the Office of the Judge Advocate General, gave the following guidance:

> Ministering to the spiritual needs of civilian disaster victims fails to meet the Supreme Court's three-part test for determining whether a governmental action violates the Establishment Clause's prohibition on government sponsorship of religion (Lemon Vs Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602 (1971). Such activity by chaplains fails the first two parts of the test because it does not have a secular purpose and has as its primary purpose the advancement of religion.[7]

LTC Bucholz further stated that while military personnel and their dependents are frequently placed by the government in situations where, without the chaplaincy, the practice of religion would be denied as a practical matter, the same is not true of disaster victims. Even in the unlikely event that there was a shortage of civilian clergy in the aftermath of a disaster, the disaster could not be construed as governmental inhibition of religion, as could military service without a chaplaincy.

It was the opinion of LTC Bucholz that future involvement of chaplains in activities designed to meet spiritual needs of the members of the civilian community could result in litigation and court-mandated restrictions on the chaplaincy. He suggested restricting chaplains to soldier ministry and refraining from any official involvement with civilian disaster victims, even

that of a secular nature. Even though secular counseling or the provision of other secular services by chaplains to civilian victims would not violate the Establishment Clause, these activities could create the appearance of a violation.

A historical knowledge of the fundamental purpose of the chaplaincy is necessary in order to understand the full scope of this problem. "The relative calm of the Army Chaplaincy was abruptly disturbed on November 23, 1979 when two Harvard University law students filed a lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the chaplaincy as an establishment of religion."[8] The suit was filed in Brooklyn, New York, and alleged that the chaplaincy violated the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This was the first time the constitutionality of the military's religious program was questioned in a formal legal procedure.

When interviewed by a local newspaper, the plaintiffs said, "the state should not take money from its citizens to support religion".[9] The plaintiffs stipulated that the Army chaplaincy violated the First Amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or promoting the free exercise thereof". Their allegations of unconstitutionality included: expenditure of government funds for chaplain salaries, for religious programs, religious education and pastoral care. They also alleged that denominational involvement in the selection of chaplains constitutes excessive entanglement between church and state. They stated further than rather than enhancing the free exercise of religion, the Army chaplaincy program serves to inhibit that free exercise.

The case dragged on for six years. The chaplaincy and Judge Advocate General's Corps made a united effort to oppose the case that in essence wanted to abolish the Army chaplaincy. The plaintiffs first argued that alternative chaplaincy programs led by civilian pastors should support the military. These programs would be privately funded and controlled.

> The government effectively argued that the military environment and demands on clergy is exceedingly different from the civilian environment and pastoral responsibilities. It also reminded the court that civilian clergy serving in the military would not enjoy the protections granted to military chaplains under the provisions of the Geneva Convention regarding treatment of prisoners of war and detainees.[10]

The arguments made by the defense included numerous legal opinions that chaplains have historically been viewed to be authorized by the First Amendment.

In 1982, five General officers provided written statements in support of the Chaplaincy. None was stronger or more detailed than that of Chaplain (Major General) Kermit Johnson. At that time Judge McLaughlin ruled that the chaplaincy was constitutional and that the founding

fathers saw no inconsistency between the first amendment and a paid chaplaincy. Finally, in January 1986, the two plaintiffs dropped the case.

As a result of the court case, the chaplaincy strengthened its resolve to be the instrument of government whereby the free exercise of religion is available to every soldier. It also made chaplains more conscious that they must avoid excessive entanglements between church and state, or any perception of violation of the establishment clause. It also emphasized that there may be limits to what the Chaplain Corps can do and still retain protection as an institution.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MINISTRY TO CIVILIANS ISSUE

While military chaplains are responsible to provide for the religious needs of soldiers during humanitarian/peacekeeping missions, they take on a special role. Much of their effective role resembles social work and they are called to minister to a much wider group of people. There is a spiritual dimension to humanitarian/peacekeeping operations that points to an expanded role for chaplaincy. Looking toward the future, several important factors must be considered.

There is a pressing need to deal with this issue of military ministry to civilians especially in the area of religious support for weapons of Mass Destruction preparedness. Entering the 21st century, weapons of mass destruction are one of the nation's greatest threats. In a recent quote to the Army Times, General Henry H. Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "It is not a question of whether terrorists are going to hit us-but when! We are a global power with worldwide interests. Ultimately, the American people understand that if America is going to be a global power and has interests around the world, then the American servicemen who serve in these areas are going to be targeted, occasionally, by these groups".[11] He cautioned that there are limits to what the military can do to protect against terrorist attacks. " We know no matter what we do, that terrorists will always be looking for the weak link."[12]

Part of the mission of the Unit Ministry Teams in these operations is to coordinate and directly provide religious support to soldiers, families, and authorized civilians. Chaplains serve as critical advisors to commanders and leaders at all levels of the task force by providing essential information on troop and unit morale, quality of life matters, and the impact of religion on the operations. "A unit ministry team responsible for oversight and supervision of religious support to Weapons of Mass Destruction operations must be identified and must have sufficient personnel and be flexible enough to provide religious support across the full spectrum of disaster operations."[13]

Though the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has responsibility to coordinate consequent management activities for domestic activities, unit ministry teams play a critical role in the overall effort. In the wake of disaster there lies a wide path of catastrophic physical, psychological, and spiritual destruction. Disaster usually involves carnage, chaos, and above all, human tragedy. Though environment and construction rehabilitation is essential to disaster recovery, the heart of relief efforts lies in relieving human suffering and restoring a sense of well being to victims. The Army has a long history of responding to American citizens in crisis. The unit ministry team is responsible for meeting the spiritual needs of service personnel. The unit ministry team is prepared and trained to meet fear and despair with hope. In this light of these numerous contingencies, current legal opinions need to be reevaluated by the Office of the Chief of Chaplains. Policy should be rewritten to allow more latitude as ministry teams work with civilians in crisis situations.

Though unit ministry teams provide a stabilizing influence upon victims, the primary focus of chaplaincy during disaster operations is to provide support to the caregivers. The magnitude of the disaster and continual demands for support will tax the resiliency of caregivers. Caregivers will require renewal, encouragement and support to sustain the quality and efficiency of these efforts. "There is a doctrinal implication in weapons of mass destruction operations for unit ministry teams. Doctrine must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate changing conditions. Because of the emergency nature of the operation and the unavailability of civilian clergy, direct support to disaster victims by unity ministry teams may be requested and/or required."[14]

Interaction and coordination with local religious leaders is very advantageous to community rehabilitation. The unit ministry team can serve as an important resource to the local clergy and is a creditable choice to act as liaison between the task force and local religious leaders, as well as religious non-governmental organizations and private volunteer organizations. When the local clergy are supported, they will more quickly become a major source for community stability and recovery.

The possibility must be considered that no local religious leaders will be physically capable of providing support. Chaplains must have the freedom to render all available assistance in these situations.

Although there are many similarities to combat operations, religious support in domestic disaster operations will require adaptation from the combat operation model. Training specifically tailored for disaster operations must be designed. Unit ministry teams must be trained in joint and inter-agency operations and skilled in synchronizing religious support during

disaster operations. The bottom line is that the chaplaincy must be flexible enough to provide religious support across the full spectrum of disaster operations.

The chaplain's role to serve as advisor to the commander can extend to representing or accompanying the commander in many situations, especially in stability and support operations where commanders may need to deal with local authorities. In some situations, where civilian authority has disintegrated, local religious leaders may be essential contacts for establishing trust and for coordinating response to relief efforts.

> Religious support doctrine evolves from a prescribed, fixed framework to incorporate the dynamic changes of full dimension operations. It must be unconstrained and knowledge based. Unit ministry teams must think, 'change.' Religious support doctrine must be versatile, considering joint, multinational, and interagency operations.[15]

As the Army faces expanded numbers of humanitarian/peacekeeping operations in the future, these operations will be more complex. Chaplains will have a unique opportunity, as well as a calling, to bring communities together and to help with post-conflict reconciliation. These opportunities will arise through their relatively free movement across dividing lines and their contacts with locals in order to set up relief efforts. In some cases, their first local contacts will be with clergymen. In most settings clergy have a common background and training, in much the same way as military officers and doctors extend professional courtesy to one another. They often understand each other, even when common language may be limited.

> In many places, religion has been one of the factors that has exacerbated protracted social conflict, and local religious figures play an important role in the community. In some conflicts, religious leaders have political significance. This is the case in Islamic counties. In Bosnia, the Serbian Democratic Party (SDS) has sought to involve senior Orthodox Church leaders in an effort to revitalize Serbian culture, not just to resist Islam, but also to achieve political and cultural legitimacy for the SDS. The Serbian Orthodox Church (SAC), unlike the Roman Catholic Church, is entirely within the former Yugoslavia and specifically linked to Serbian history and culture. Its involvement in Serbian politics was almost inevitable. The relationship between church and state had always been strong, and the SAC was further considered to be guardian of Serb national interests. Radovan Karadzic admits he 'profited very much from his firm connections with the Church.' This understanding opens the way to look at the possibilities inherent in religion for conflict resolution.[16]

Central to potential for conflict resolution is the fact that all religions have strong moral and social values. A second factor is that churches have a strong communications networks with the populace. There is a potential role for military chaplaincy to tap into these avenues and bring together religious leaders and their communities. There is often the call to pray with, and preach to, congregations of civilians, bringing messages of reconciliation as appropriate. These

activities are contrary to the most recent US Army Judge Advocate opinion, yet they are compatible with the role of the chaplaincy. Chaplain interaction with the local community may help to reduce any hostilities the local population has towards the United States. The bottom line is that chaplains can help "build bridges" with the local population. Military chaplains are members of a peacekeeping team, a denomination, and a broader community of faith. They are in a unique position to contribute to the success of peacekeeping and peace building.

A DISCUSSION OF CURRENT CHAPLAIN DOCTRINE

Chaplains have learned many lessons across the years since the Revolutionary War. Their motivations and intentions seemed beyond question for many years, until the 1979 court case put the "spotlight" on military chaplaincy. So, the question that needs to be answered as the army faces a new millennium is: what should be Army religious support doctrine and policy in regard to military ministry to civilians? What is taught to new chaplains and chaplain candidates about this expanding area in military operations? What are the lines and the limits surrounding military ministry to civilians? In what areas are the chaplain's hands tied? How are chaplains being trained to respond in Humanitarian/Peacekeeping operations? Are chaplains being instructed and trained on this important issue? Is chaplain policy defined adequately so that a new chaplain understands the big picture?

Is there a difference between policy and practice in dealing with this important question? The fact of the matter is that there has been very little said or written officially that speaks to this issue directly. The Chaplain School, Chaplain Combat Developments, and the Observer Controllers at the Combat Training Centers have published very little on these issues.

In a publication on Lessons from Recent Contingencies, the US Army Training and Doctrine Command, at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, unit ministry teams dealt only tangentially with the question of ministry to civilians. The publication contains lessons learned on U.S. Army unit ministry teams activities derived from observations made during operations in Somalia, Haiti, Macedonia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

> Religious support operations and concepts are driven by METT-TC. Each course of action must be determined by the UMT on the ground. Contingency operations can be greatly facilitated by establishing a positive relationship with leaders of indigenous religions, especially the leaders of the predominant religion. The JTF Chaplain is the catalyst for these efforts and should work closely with the American Embassy and CA elements. In an overseas deployment, chaplains may well be suited to support activities that benefit the local community, such as aiding orphanages, schools, clinics, and other programs, and, thereby, support the overall mission. Sensitivity to local customs and religions of indigenous people must guide the chaplain's work. For example, situations occurred in Somalia in which Somalis were physically threatened or

harmed for 'converting to Christianity.' Evangelism of the indigenous population should not be the focus of chaplain activity. Nonetheless, the chaplain's effort in assisting the local people can still be successful if it is carefully orchestrated with that of civil affairs personnel.[17]

According to Joint-Pub 1-05 chaplains are given a direct responsibility to be involved in Civil Affairs operations. "Chaplains coordinate, as required, with host nation (HN) civil or military religious representatives in order to facilitate positive and mutual understanding."[18] Chaplains have done great good in Bosnia where Muslim Imams often wanted to have contact with Christian chaplains. The problem in Bosnia was that during the IFOR mission all the chaplains involved in dealing with local religious leaders were Brigade level chaplains and above. "Battalion level chaplains are trained in more basic chaplain skills and as a whole are not trained to do these tasks."[19]

This gets to the heart of the problem- there is little or no emphasis on the chaplain's role in humanitarian/peacekeeping operations. Success is generally dependent on the personal insight of the particular chaplain. Younger and more inexperienced Army chaplains coming out of the parish ministry sometimes have a limited understanding of their role in humanitarian and disaster relief programs. Most chaplains are seminary trained based on the parish model. The fact of the matter is that more and more it will be the junior chaplains (Captains) that will be a part of these operations.

This raises the question of the danger of evangelical zeal on the part of inexperienced chaplains. When this zeal goes unchecked in a multicultural and sensitive environment, the results can be disastrous. Therefore, it is imperative that chaplains be forewarned as to potential problems in this area.

The issue is more complex when one realizes that the chaplains most involved with Humanitarian assistance (Captains) will be the least experienced and generally more evangelically oriented. Young chaplains zealous to do good works must be expected to make some mistakes. When a chaplain sees the hungry and the hurting, it is the nature of a pastor/shepherd to be a caregiver. It is inherent in the call to ministry to reach-out, help, and give assistance. For many chaplains, to do anything less than this violates their conscience. Yet chaplains have on occasion, been instructed not to give to hungry kids MREs (meals ready to eat).

Chaplains historically have gone beyond unit ministry to work with volunteer organizations, orphanages, and non-governmental organizations. There is always a tension because the chaplain is primarily responsible for soldier ministry, but the chaplain often works in an environment involving other civilian clergy. It is easy in a volatile and uncertain environment,

to fear that the chaplain may cross a line and be perceived as going too far. But, in complex situations chaplain ministry should be deemed appropriate if it helped people and was not counterproductive to United States interests.

CONCLUSION AND RECCOMMENDATIONS

The United States Army Chaplaincy is a powerful asset that must be used to the maximum in humanitarian/peacekeeping operations. "Under the right circumstances religious or spiritual factors can effectively contribute to the prevention, amelioration, or resolution of conflict. To some extent, religion has, in fact, been squeezed out of the policymaking equation in the affairs of state—at least in the west."[20] Situations where religious mediation has helped to heal differences have been sufficiently frequent and effective that religious resources should command the attention and support of those who seek new approaches to the current world disorder. Clearly, a spiritual dimension will be required if the cycle of revenge that typically accompanies ethnic hostilities and other conflicts are ever to be broken. Without forgiveness and reconciliation, the pattern of responding in kind will continue.

Although there are many similarities to combat operations, religious support in humanitarian/peacekeeping operations will require adaptation from the combat operations model. Specific training for humanitarian assistance must be designed because these operations are different. The chaplaincy must reassess its current training strategies.

Army Chaplain (MAJ) Jerry Owens, who extensively researched the Establishment Clause in regard to chaplain religious support activities in operations other than war makes three strong statements:

> 1. The Establishment Clause does not preclude chaplains and assistants from active involvement in humanitarian aid to indigenous populations. There is a "secular" purpose to chaplain involvement: the relief of human suffering. That this involvement fulfills the Biblical mandate to feed the hungry, cloth the naked, care for the orphan and widow, is secondary in the eyes of the state. The primary purpose of chaplain religious support activities in humanitarian aid is not religious, although this is certainly a residual consideration. 2. The Establishment Clause does preclude chaplains performing religious services for indigenous populations because in this instance, the primary purpose of the religious support activity is to "advance religion". 3. The reason the courts have upheld the constitutionality of military chaplains is because, in the eyes of the state, they fulfill a primarily secular purpose: chaplains ensure the free exercise of religion for soldiers that would otherwise be deprived of this fundamental constitutional right.[21]

In light of the unique requirements that the chaplaincy will face in the years

ahead three suggestions should be considered. First, the Chief of Chaplains should staff specific written guidance regarding military ministry to civilians through the Chief of Staff of the Army. It would be taught in our service school as an Army doctrine in Humanitarian relief situations. This guidance should be clear enough that there is no question in the minds of Chaplains, Commanders, or JAG officers that ministry was extended to someone in violation of the first amendment. Presently guidance along these lines is not clear.

Second, since every operation is unique and different situations and needs arise involving calls for chaplain ministry, religious support of civilians should be addressed in the Operation Plan Religious Support Plan Annex. The plan is the Commander's plan and provides guidance by specific areas of operations. Such a step relieves the chaplain of making decisions on his/her own.

Since chaplains have rights under the Geneva Convention, discussions of humanitarian action need to be situated within the context of international law. The Geneva Convention of 1949 and the additional protocols of 1997 provide a baseline. This legal framework recognizes the right of civilians to have access to humanitarian assistance. A third course of action would be an addition or revision of protocols to allow chaplains to extend broader ministry efforts to civilians.

During a recent humanitarian operation exercise at the National Training Center in Fort Irwin, California, two role-playing civilians asked the ministry team for a Bible and a cross. SFC Terry Brown, a two- year veteran observer/controller for unit ministry teams was asked whether or not the ministry team should comply with this request. His answer to this question is the key to military ministry to civilians in the future. He answered "yes", because it is the right thing to do and <u>because the civilians made the request</u>. In other words, civilians asked for the ministry and it was not a proselytizing chaplain who initiated this ministry opportunity. CH (MAJ) Harlon Triplett, the senior observer/controller, went on to say that it is a common sense thing to help suffering people when it is within reason and means to do so. Whether these positions are correct technically, they demonstrate the dilemma chaplains currently face in light of the lack of current clear doctrine.

Presently there are over 1300 chaplains in the United States Army. These soldier/ministers are trained to provide comprehensive religious support which includes those pastoral acts, rites, ceremonies, ordinances, worship and educational opportunities, pastoral counseling and visits performed by the unit ministry team. Comprehensive religious support also includes battle fatigue interventions, moral and ethical counsel, social concerns, and advice to the command. Chaplains enter the ministry and the military with a high sense of personal

calling and purpose. They are trained to perform ministry in all types of circumstances, whenever and wherever they find it. They have often been called "combat multipliers" by commanders. These valuable staff officers must be used to the maximum extent.

With the increase of humanitarian operations in the past decade it is apparent that chaplaincy will have a critical role mission in the future. Clarity of their mission will allow chaplains to accomplish the mission more effectively. Specific written guidance and training on military ministry to civilians in humanitarian/peacekeeping operations is a challenge that faces the chaplaincy as it enters the new millennium.

WORD COUNT= 4900

ENDNOTES

[1] National Intelligence Committee, Global Humanitarian Emergencies, (Washington, D.C.: August 1999), 1

[2] Title 10, United States Code, Sections 3073, 3547, & 3581

[3] Department of the Army, Religious Support, United States Army Regulation 165-1, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army) ,1

[4] Office of the Chief of Chaplains, The United States Army Chaplaincy Strategic Plan FY 2000 –FY 2005, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, December 1999), 5

[5] Department of the Army, Joint Doctrine for Military Operations Other Than War, Joint Publication 3-07, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, June 1995), 3-4

[6] Department of the Army, Peace Operations, Field Manual 100-23 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1994), 59.

[7] LTC Ronald Buckholz, Memorandum DAJA-AL 1992/2992,"Review: Utilization of Chaplains in Disaster Relief," Office- Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.: Nov 92.

[8] Isreal Drazin and Cecil B. Currey, For God And Country, (KTAV Publishing House, Hoboken, New Jersey, 1995), 1-3

[9] "Law Students File Suit Against The Army," The Harvard Crimson, 30 November, 1979, p. 1.

[10] John Brinsfield, A History of the united States Army Chaplaincy –1975-1995, (Office of the Chief of Chaplains, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.: 1997), 123

[11] Gen. Henry H. Shelton, " Terrorism in the twenty-first Century," The Army Times, 15 November 2000, 6

[12] Ibid.

[13] Department of the Army, Combat Developments News-Notebook Draft 5, (United States Army Chaplain Center and School Ft. Jackson, South Carolina, Nov 2000), 3

[14] Ibid.

[15] Department of the Army, Religious Support To Force XXI, Training and Doctrine Command Pam 525-78, (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1997), ch2

[16] Canadian Business and Current Affairs, Peace Research, (Brandon University, February 1999), 1

[17] Department of the Army, Lessons from Recent Contingencies, (Training and Doctrine Command, Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas, February 1998),10,20,31

[18] Department of the Army, Religious Ministry Support for Joint Operations, Joint Publication 1-05, (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1996), 4

[19] Randy Dolinger, Chaplain Involvement In Civil Affairs,(United States Army –Joint Readiness Training Center, Ft. Polk, LA, 1999) ,1

[20] Douglas M. Johnston, "Religion and Conflict Resolution, Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, (winter/spring edition 1996), 53

[21] Jerry Owens, The Establishment Clause, (William & Mary University, Williamsburg, Virginia, December 2000),1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brinsfield, John. A History of the United States Army Chaplain Corps 1975-1995. Office of the Chief of Chaplains, Department of the Army, Washington, DC.: 1997.

Buckholz, Ronald. "Utilization of Chaplains In Disaster Relief." Memorandum DAJA-LA 1992/2992, Office Judge Advocate General, Department of The Army, Washington, D.C, November 1992

Dolinger, Randy. "Chaplain Involvement In Civil Affairs." Newsletter no.98-2 Unit Ministry Teams, United States Army-Joint Readiness Training Center, Fort Polk, Louisiana, February 1998.

Drazin, Isreal and Currey, Cecil B. For God And Country, KTAV Publishing House, Hoboken, New Jersey, 1955.

Latham, Stephen R. "Law Students File Suit Against The Army." The Harvard Crimson. November 30, 1979.

National Intelligence Committee, "Global Humanitarian Emergencies." Washington, D.C.: August 1999.

Owens, Jerry. "The Establishment Clause." Research Paper for Ethics Requirement, William and Mary University, Williamsburg, VA. Jan 2000.

Shelton, Henry H. "Terrorism In the Twenty-First Century." The Army Times. 15 November 2000.

Training and Doctrine Command. Lessons Learned From Recent Contingencies. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, February 1998.

Training and Doctrine Command. Religious Support To Force XXI. TRADOC Pam 525-78, Department of the Army, 1997.

United States Army Chaplain Center and School. "Notebook 5 Draft." Combat Developments News. Fort Jackson, South Carolina, November 2000.

U.S. Department of the Army. Religious Support, Army Regulation 165-1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army.

U.S. Department of the Army. The United States Army Chaplaincy Strategic Plan FY 2000-FY 2001, Office of the Chief of Chaplains, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, January 2000.

U.S. Department of the Army. Joint Doctrine for Military Operations Other Than War. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of the Army, June 1995.

U.S. Department of the Army. Peace Operations. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1994.

U.S. Department of the Army. Religious Ministry Support For Joint Operations. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1996.