AU/ACSC/137/1998-04

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

MORAL LEADERSHIP IN AN INCREASINGLY AMORAL SOCIETY: IS THE UNITED STATES MILITARY VALUE SYSTEM SUITABLE IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICA

by

Drew D. Jeter, Major, USAF

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Lieutenant Colonel William J. Paulk

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 1998

20020129 111

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

Page

DISCLAIMER ii

LIST OF TABLES v

PREFACE vi

ABSTRACT vii

INTRODUCTION 1
- Background and Significance 1
- Limitations and Scope of the Study 2
  - Scope 2
  - Assumptions 3
- Preview of the Argument 3

MORALS, VALUES, AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS 5
- Morals 6
- Values 7
- Social Problems 7

US MILITARY VALUE SYSTEM 11
- Its Existence 11
- Its Evidences 12
  - Military Law 12
  - Military Doctrine 13
- Its Static Nature 13
- Comparison to Functionalist Perspective 14

AMERICAN SOCIETAL VALUE SYSTEM 15
- Its Manifestations 15
- Its Changing Nature 16
- Comparison to Conflict Perspective 18

CLASH OF VALUE SYSTEMS 20
- Adultery 21
  - US Military Perspective 21
  - American Societal Perspective 22
  - Case Study: Lieutenant (Lt.) Kelly Flinn 22

Homosexuality 23
US Military Perspective 23
American Societal Perspective 24
Case Study: DOD's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Policy 26

SHOULD THE US MILITARY VALUE SYSTEM CHANGE? 28
Consequences of Liberalization 29
Functionalist vs. Conflict Perspectives 29
Other Views 29
Similarities & Differences Between the Military & Society 32
Moral Leadership 34
Conclusion 35

APPENDIX A: CASE STUDY: LIEUTENANT (LT.) KELLY FLINN 39

APPENDIX B: CASE STUDY: DOD'S "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL" POLICY 41

GLOSSARY 43

BIBLIOGRAPHY 45

Tables

Page

Table 1. Sociological Perspectives of Social Problems 9

Preface

I undertook this study as a matter of great personal and professional concern. However, the issue under consideration—the compatibility of military and societal values—is one which affects all military personnel, and should be a matter of attention for every military member, and in particular military leaders. As today's professional officers look to lead the next generation of Americans in tomorrow's military, they will need confidence in their own personal moral compasses, understanding of the ever changing norms of society, and convictions of what ought to be done about the differences between the values of the military establishment and the society which it defends.

I'm pleased to acknowledge the considerable contributions of my faculty research advisor, Lieutenant Colonel William J. "Jack" Paulk. His encouragement and guidance, focussed on the content of the argument more than style and grammar, were invaluable. He invested himself to help steer me through the minefields of developing a meaningful research paper on a subjective, emotionally-charged issue. Moreover, he provided this support while transitioning from the ACSC faculty to taking command of the 42d Comptroller Squadron at Maxwell AFB. I'd also like to give special thanks to my wife Laurie, my dad Kent, and my close friend Lieutenant Colonel Porter Clapp for taking the time to read and comment on earlier drafts. All three are great readers, and more importantly, models of the moral leadership to which I aspire.

Abstract

The US military has a clear track record of how it has defined what is right and wrong behavior for its members. From military law to doctrine, regulations, and policies, the military establishment has exhibited and employed a relatively stable moral value system to maintain good order and discipline. Conversely, American society has become more attuned to the rights of individuals. Contemporary society encourages members of its diverse population to establish their own values, consequently de-emphasizing any particular set of "rights and wrongs," and seemingly abandoning its historical moral basis in many areas. In light of this contrast in values, the military faces the challenge of assessing the degree to which it may be "out of step" with the society it serves, and deciding what, if anything, needs to be done about this difference.

The primary questions to be answered in this research paper are: (1) How is the US military value system in conflict with the American societal value system; and (2) should the military's value system change to correspond to society's? The methodology employed consisted primarily of a literature examination, including: textbooks from the fields of philosophy and sociology; public documents such as the Uniform Code of Military Justice, Manual for Courts-Martial, and Congressional testimony; various books, reports, articles and speeches identifying pros and cons of contemporary societal and military values; and recent periodicals which covered current examples where the two perspectives have collided (e.g. adultery and gays in the military).

Chapter 1

Introduction

> *...the moral elements are among the most important in war. They constitute the spirit that permeates war as a whole, and at an early stage they establish a close affinity with the will that moves and leads the whole mass of force, practically merging with it, since the will is itself a moral quantity. Unfortunately they will not yield to academic wisdom. They cannot be classified or counted. They have to be seen or felt.*
>
> —Carl von Clausewitz
> *On War*

Moral elements, though they can be difficult to define, comprise an important aspect of how best to lead and operate a military force. Due to its willingness to embrace and embody moral virtues, the US military has historically occupied a position of leadership as a strong moral institution in American society. However, just as leaders and followers often have different perspectives, the moral values by which the US military functions are becoming increasingly incongruous with those of society. This paper explores this dilemma, and addresses whether or not the US military needs to make changes to narrow this widening gap between its moral value system and that of American society.

Background and Significance

The US military has a clearly observable track record of defining what is right and wrong behavior for its members. From the statutory Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) to military personnel regulations and policies, the military establishment has

employed a strict value system in order to maintain good order and discipline. Most of these laws and standards, which the military has unashamedly applied, have not changed significantly over time. On the other hand, the normative value system of the American society has become increasingly more relaxed in deference to the rights and freedoms of individual citizens in our diverse population to establish and live by their own values. "Morality" has become a dirty word in many societal circles as criteria for determining right and wrong has been relativized.

The professional military member is stuck in the middle of this division, being on the one hand a member of a dynamic society, and on the other hand called to lead in a military establishment still relying on traditional moral principles. At an institutional level, the US military establishment faces the challenges of properly assessing the degree to which it is "out of step" with the society it serves, and deciding what, if anything, to do about it. Likewise, the military member faces the same formidable task on a personal level.

Limitations and Scope of the Study

Scope

The scope of this paper is limited to comparing the value systems of the US military and American society. Even so, as Clausewitz alluded to in the opening quotation, studying moral elements is not an easy task. Identifying and comparing over time the implied moral value systems of large groups like the American society and the US military could become an investigative sinkhole well beyond the scope of this research

paper. Therefore, this paper will limit its examination and discussion to the following tasks:

1. Establish that the US military has an identifiable moral value system that has not changed significantly over time.
2. Identify key characteristics of American society's normative value system and that this system has undergone considerable changes.
3. Compare and contrast the military and current societal value systems, using accepted methodological approaches to examine the two systems and current issues which highlight their differences.
4. Address whether or not the military ought to make changes to its value system to more closely correspond to society.

Assumptions

In order to produce meaningful discussion, analysis, and conclusions on complex subjects like morality, value systems, and social problems, it is necessary to make generalizations with respect to trends, traditions and conditions over time. The observations and conclusions of this study are intended to characterize the collective value systems of the American society and the US military. This study is not intended to address the many varied positions of individuals within society or the military.

Preview of the Argument

The moral dimension is a critical foundation for the conduct of the military. The US military has historically been an institution embodying clear, conservative moral standards and occupying a role of moral leadership in American society. Although the military's value system evolved from traditional values of society, several of society's values have subsequently changed—creating a widening gap between military and societal value systems. A sociological examination of how different groups view social problems reveals not only why the military and society might have different perspectives but offers possible justification for why the military, by nature of its unique purpose,

needs to maintain a strict, conservative value system. Additionally, as an important institution of American society, the military has a societal leadership responsibility to model high standards in recognition of the importance of the moral dimension of leadership and the potential dangers awaiting an American society which continues to experience moral erosion.

Chapter 2

Morals, Values, and Social Problems

> *The spirit and other moral qualities of an army, a general or a government, the temper of the population,...the moral effects of victory or defeat—all these vary greatly. They can moreover influence our objective and situation in very different ways.*
>
> —Carl von Clausewitz
> *On War*

Before examining and comparing the moral value systems of the US military and the American society, it is necessary to understand how this study will use key terms like *values* and *morals,* as well as the social sciences which define and apply them. Two fields of study which have produced volumes of text in this area are *ethics* and *sociology. Ethics* is a branch of philosophy which primarily concerns itself with philosophical thinking about morality, moral judgements and moral values.[1] Alternatively, *sociology* is the science of society and its social institutions,

> ...the systematic study of the development, structure, interaction, and collective behavior of organized groups of human beings...the scientific analysis of a social institution as a functioning whole and as it relates to the rest of society.[2]

This paper will rely primarily on the field of *ethics* to establish a basic understanding of the terms *morals* and *values,* and turn to *sociology* to see how these elements behave in the social issues that impact the US military and American society.

Morals

The issue of morality is primarily concerned with distinguishing between things considered right or good and those judged wrong or bad. Thus, the right or good is often referred to as *moral* or *ethical,* in contrast to the wrong or bad which is deemed *immoral* or *unethical*[3]. In keeping with these simple definitions, this paper regards *amoral* as that which is considered morally neutral—neither right nor wrong. The field of ethics views morality as a social phenomenon. While individuals and small groups may have their own moral codes to distinguish right from wrong behavior, philosophers see morality as bigger than and preceding the individual. The individual is inducted into, and becomes a participant in it. Morality becomes "an instrument of society as a whole for the guidance of individuals and small groups."[4] Morality is multi-faceted and complex. "Considered as a social system of regulation, morality is like law on the one hand and convention or etiquette on the other."[5]

Morality also varies between different cultures. Philosophers have noted a distinct individualistic emphasis in the western world's moral systems compared to the rest of the world.[6] Nevertheless, even here morals impose a sense of right and wrong on individuals. This interaction may begin as a set of culturally defined objectives and rules governing how to achieve them. Although initially imposed on the individual, these provisions are usually internalized by the individual, who uses them to guide their own behavior. Through application and reasoning, the individual matures into a moral agent who can validate or criticize these rules of society based on experience and beliefs.[7]

Values

While values do not necessarily distinguish absolute right from wrong, they often function in a similar fashion to morals. Behavioral scientist Milton Rokeach defines values as "core conceptions of the desirable within every individual and society. They serve as standards or criteria to guide not only action but also judgement, choice, attitude, evaluation, argument, exhortation, rationalization...."[8] Dr. Rokeach further acknowledges the interaction between the collection of values (or *value system*) of the individual and that of society. The primary factor attributing to value formation is actual or perceived need. A person's needs translate into individual values. Likewise, societal values usually represent societal goals and needs. Commenting on the struggle between individual and societal value systems, Rokeach observes, "all persons raised within the context of society are caught from the moment of birth between their own individual needs and society's goals and demands."[9] He notes that the resulting individual value system normally reflects a combination of perceived individual needs and the internalization of societal demands.[10]

While there are obviously numerous similarities between morals and values, for the purposes of this paper, *values* represent beliefs which express preference or desirability, and *value systems* are a collection of these beliefs. When combined with the concept of morality, a *moral value system* refers to a collection of beliefs which establish preference based on what is considered to be right or wrong.

Social Problems

This paper is concerned with how the US military and the American society use morals and values in addressing internal social issues. Since much of the comparison

between military and societal values centers on conduct prohibited by the military, this section will focus on social problems. As described by sociologist Dr. John Farley, a *social problem* is a condition that:

1. is widely regarded as undesirable or as a source of difficulties,
2. is caused by the actions or inactions of people or of society,
3. affects or is thought to affect a large number of people.[11]

Two key aspects of this definition are the need for widespread awareness of the condition and the significant belief that the condition is undesirable. These elements, although established by consensus, are very subjective. A condition labeled by one group as a social problem may not be considered to be one by another group. Similarly, a condition considered a social problem yesterday may not be considered to be one today..[12]

At this juncture the role of values comes to center stage in defining social problems. Science cannot determine which opinions are correct. The answer is a values issue. People's values necessarily determine what gets defined as a social problem, emerging from people's awareness of a condition and their values concerning it.[13] Furthermore, the determination of what is right and wrong in dealing with a social problem becomes an issue of moral values.

The field of sociology provides two distinct perspectives for studying social problems: the *functionalist* (or *order*) perspective and the *conflict* perspective. The *functionalist* perspective is based on assumptions about the strong roles of interdependency, stability, and consensus. It believes social issues can best be explained in terms of their usefulness to, or the functions they perform for, society. Conversely, the *conflict* perspective assumes that important resources in society (e.g., power, wealth, etc.) are unequally distributed. It is in the best interest of those who have the resources to keep

things as they are, and in the interest of the "have-nots" to seek social change. While there may be an appearance of order and stability, there is a long-term tendency toward conflict, which serves to challenge social imbalances.[14] The table below compares the differences between these two perspectives in their views of social problems.

Table 1. Sociological Perspectives of Social Problems

	Functionalist (Order) Perspective	**Conflict Perspective**
View of Social Problems	Order & stability are key. Danger lies in division, conflict, lack of cooperation with society well-being.	Concerned with reason for conflict. Conflict can be desirable as way to address human inequality.
Biggest Social Problem	Social disintegration	Social domination
Tendency	Conservative, fearing social change's if potential to overwhelm social system	Radical, more willing to challenge norms to bring fairness
Causes of Social Problems	Absence of: stability, consensus, order, cooperation	Concentration of wealth & power. (Do not view rapid social change as problem.)
Recommended Answers	Assimilation. "Everyone can play but must play by the rules."	Challenge power structure since "haves" will rarely willingly give up power.
Method of Evaluation	Look at whether the social arrangement serves a functional need to society.	Look at whether the social arrangement discriminates against particular groups.
Example: Sexuality	Problem is explosion of sexual freedoms & promiscuity.	Problem is ignorance, repression, societal pattern of male / religious dominance.

Source: Farley, John E. *American Social Problems: An Institutional Analysis.* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall, 1987), 10-19.

In the following chapters, this paper will examine and compare the value systems of the US military and the American society. It will look at the social problems of adultery and homosexuality in order to demonstrate a growing difference in the US military and the American society views. The functionalist and conflict sociological perspectives will also be used to help explain the differences between the military and societal values.

Notes

[1] William K. Frankena, *Ethics* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall, 1973), 4.

[2] *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 10th ed. (Springfield, Ma.: Merriam-Webster, Inc., 1993), 1115.

[3] Frankena, 5.

[4] Ibid., 6.

[5] Ibid., 7.

[6] Ibid., 7-8.

[7] Ibid., 8.

[8] Milton Rokeach. *Understanding Human Values* (New York: The Free Press, 1979), 2.

[9] Ibid., 3.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Farley, John E. *American Social Problems: An Institutional Analysis.* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall, 1987), 2.

[12] Ibid., 3.

[13] Ibid., 4-5.

[14] Ibid., 10-14.

Chapter 3

US Military Value System

Our military service is based on values—those standards that American military experience has proven to be the bedrock of combat success. These values are common to all the Services and represent the essence of our professionalism.

—Joint Publication 1
Joint Warfare of the Armed Forces of the United States

The US military establishment, like other social institutions, has its own identifiable value system. Dr. Rokeach, in his book *Understanding Human Values*, says most sociologists agree "that the most distinctive property or defining characteristic of a social institution is its values."[1] He concludes that if the most defining aspect of an institution is its value system, then its most distinctive functions are transmitting, implanting, and implementing those values (i.e., behavior regulation).[2]

Its Existence

Based on the previous chapter's discussion, it is reasonable to derive that the US military establishment uses a moral value system to determine right and wrong conduct. Merging its beliefs of what is right and wrong with what it values as necessary to accomplish its mission, the military establishes standards of behavior based on what it views as desirable. Supplemented by Dr. Rokeach's observations above, it is also fair to conclude that the value system which the military employs is somewhat unique to the

military. Through the military's transmission and application of that value system it helps define the US military's identity within society.

Its Evidences

Although defining the full scope of the military's value system would be very difficult, it is not hard to find clear written evidence of this value system's existence and its nature. This documentation includes:

1. federal laws which govern military conduct,
2. organizational doctrine which guides military operations,
3. regulations and instructions prescribing the proper way to accomplish the tasks required to fulfill its missions, and
4. policy letters written by individual military leaders clarifying specific issues for subordinates.

This paper will briefly look at examples from the first two of these types of evidences.

Military Law

According to the Manual for Courts-Martial (MCM), "Military law consists of the statutes governing the military establishment and regulations issued thereunder, the constitutional powers of the President and regulations issued thereunder, and the inherent authority of military commanders."[3] In a limited sense, the term *military law* has been equated with the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). The UCMJ is the public law, in effect since 1951, governing the conduct of all members of all branches of the US Armed Forces.[4] The MCM, in turn, is a regulation issued by the President, prescribing the detailed procedure to be followed by the military in applying and adhering to the UCMJ.[5] Taken together, these items provide an articulate, extensive expression of what is considered right and wrong for military members, as codified into law.

Military Doctrine

Military doctrine is a collection of fundamental principles that guide military goals, operations, and conduct. It usually avoids the specificity of strategy and policy, but provides the broad underlying concepts upon which military planning, training, and employment should be based. In this sense, it is considered authoritative guidance. The major collection of doctrine applying to the entire US military establishment is the joint doctrine publications ("pubs") system of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The opening quotation to this chapter comes from Joint Pub 1, one of the two capstone publications in the joint doctrine hierarchy. This statement opens the chapter entitled "Values in Joint Warfare," which describes five primary values fundamental to the joint US military force: *integrity, competence, physical courage, moral courage,* and *teamwork.*[6] This provides another evidence, not only of the US military's value system, but also of its moral dimension. Joint Pub 1 describes *moral courage* as, "essential to military operations. This includes the willingness to stand up for what we believe is right, even if that stand is unpopular or contrary to conventional wisdom."[7] Likewise, each of the military services has its own list of core values to which it requires adherence.

Its Static Nature

A review of both military law and doctrine documents over the last few decades indicates little significant change in the basic content of the military value system. Revisions in law seemed to most often be for the purpose of clarification. Changes in doctrine usually appeared to be more a matter of shift in emphasis rather than wholesale change in values. This relatively static nature of the US military value system is consistent with the functionalist sociological perspective presented in Chapter 2.

Comparison to Functionalist Perspective

The functionalist perspective relies on order and stability achieved through cooperative behavior and lack of internal conflict—everyone "playing by the rules." It fears disintegration of this stable environment and is leery of significant internal changes as a potential threat to this stability. These aspects of the functionalist perspective might explain how the military deals with its own behavior collectively, and how it views the conduct of its members. The great body of US military laws, regulations, instructions, and policies has imposed an enduring state of stability for the millions who've served in the Armed Forces. The fact that it has not changed much over the years could indicate a reluctance to embrace significant social change which might threaten good order and discipline.

Notes

[1] Milton Rokeach, *Understanding Human Values* (New York: The Free Press, 1979), 51.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Department of Defense, *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States,* 1995 ed., (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1995), I-1. The MCM goes on to state: "The purpose of military law is to promote justice, to assist in maintaining good order and discipline in the armed forces, to promote efficiency and effectiveness in the military establishment, and thereby to strengthen the national security of the United States."

[4] Richard C. Dahl and John F. Whelan, *The Military Law Dictionary* (New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1960), 102, 155.

[5] Ibid., 98, and DOD, *Manual for Courts-Martial,* II-1.

[6] Joint Pub 1, *Joint Warfare of the Armed Forces of the United States* (10 January 1995), II-1-6

[7] Ibid., II-2.

Chapter 4

American Societal Value System

Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.

—President John Adams

A nation which does not remember what it was yesterday, does not know what it is today, nor what it is trying to do. We are trying to do a futile thing if we do not know where we came from or what we have been about.

—President Woodrow Wilson

As previously indicated, the fields of ethics and sociology presuppose that a society relies on a value system to judge, choose and encourage that which it deems to be desirable. Just as behavioral scientists have identified the usual tensions between individual and societal value systems, the value system of the American society is a complex reflection of the values shared by many, but not all, Americans.

Its Manifestations

Similar to the US military, one of the chief indications of what American society deems to be right and wrong (i.e., morals), or at least preferable (i.e., values), is the body of laws it uses to govern itself. These laws, enacted by public officials which society has elected, should provide a fairly strong indication of the American value system. Many of the significant laws governing American social conduct also have a moral basis. For

example, it is wrong in the American legal system to murder, steal, kidnap, or enslave. In addition to public law, there are numerous other arenas of society where we can find expressions of the normative values of the American society. These include public and corporate policy, education, religion, the arts, entertainment and mass communication media. Trends in these areas reveal a great deal about American likes and dislikes, as well as whether or not these value judgements are seated in a deep sense of right and wrong, or are merely an issue of preference.

Its Changing Nature

It would be an enormous task to try to bound the American societal value system. However, it is not difficult to show that this value system has been changing over the last several decades, as manifested in the many arenas of society previously listed. Furthermore, although this change has by no means been homogeneous, a significant trend of value liberalization is easily observed. It does not take behavioral science credentials to see that standards in many areas of society, whether for good or bad, are not as strict as they used to be.

One of the most noticeable areas of liberalization in society is in the growth of sexual freedoms. In his book *The Sexual Wilderness,* which thoroughly examined changes in American male-female relationships, author Vance Packard noted, "The bewilderment and normlessness characterizing so much of the male-female relationships today are in large part caused by the dislocation in our way of life produced by rapid social change."[1] He goes on to quote an authority on social change at the Russell Sage Foundation, who stated, "By any crude measurement, the contemporary [western] world appears to be changing more rapidly than at any other time in human history…"[2]

Sociologists such as Larry Petersen and Gregory Donnenworth have documented in sociology journals, "a substantial decline in support for traditional beliefs about premarital sex" within American society.[3] They note that American attitudes about premarital sex "became significantly more permissive during the 1970s and 1980s."[4] They go on to show that the role of religion in America, which had previously exerted strong influence in establishing and maintaining traditional beliefs about abstaining from premarital sex, has eroded in its ability to significantly affect public opinion.[5]

Packard observed the same decline of religious influence, and added the crumbling of traditional controls, the rise of individualism (glorifying individual rights), and the growing disarray of moral concepts as significant forces shaping rapid social change in the liberalization of sexual values. He quoted Oregon State University sociology professor Lester Kirkendall as saying, "No one system of sex values is currently accepted in theory or in practice by the great majority of Americans."[6]

There are reams of similar writings to corroborate the premise that several areas of American society's value system have undergone significant relaxation of traditional standards and criteria of acceptability. Furthermore, one of the frequently cited causes of this liberalization is the decay of moral principles upon which the traditional values were based. Packard suggested there is a public trend of looking more to social scientists (like sociologists and psychologists) to analyze social issues than to values and morals that had long played a predominant role. This would significantly affect resulting value system changes since scientists are trained to offer moral-neutral and value-free data.[7]

The results of this trend can be observed in the American legal system, which by its nature can be a difficult institution in which to achieve change. Nevertheless, within the

last quarter-century, America has seen the legalization of abortion, legal rulings in favor of homosexual marriage and physician-assisted suicide, and the banning of corporate prayer in public schools. These are all changes which disregard previously deeply-held moral principles of society and redefine the American value system based on terms other than morality.

Another area more susceptible to change, and a potentially more responsive reflection of societal values, is the entertainment industry. For instance, there is not much dispute that an abundance of material now frequently shown in the television and movie industries would not have been tolerated even a decade ago because society regarded it as immoral. In a *US News and World Report* article previewing the Fall '95 television season, Marc Silver proclaimed, "The family hour is gone. There's still a splattering of guts in prime time, but the story of the fall lineup is the rise of sex."[8]

So, unlike the fairly static US military value system, the normative American society value system has been undergoing significant changes. Much of this social change is occurring in conjunction with a separation of that value system from moral beliefs that had strongly influenced traditional values. This rapid change may be further illuminated by comparing it to the conflict sociological perspective presented in Chapter 2.

Comparison to Conflict Perspective

The conflict perspective is concerned with social inequity created when powerful elements of society exert controlling influence on other groups. Fearing social domination, it views radical social change as a generally positive way to combat social patterns of dominance. These aspects of the conflict perspective shed light on why the American society has been allowing modification to occur in several areas of its

traditional value system, and in how it may collectively view those resistant to such change. Society has systematically disconnected its value system in several areas from moral principles, perhaps fearing that institutions promoting those morals (e.g., religion) were exerting undue influence.

Notes

[1] Vance Packard, *The Sexual Wilderness* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1968), 18.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Larry R. Petersen and Gregory V. Donnenwerth, "Secularization and the Influence of Religion on Beliefs about Premarital Sex," *Social Forces,* vol. 75, no. 3 (March 1997): 1071.

[4] Ibid., 1071-1072.

[5] Ibid., 1071-1073.

[6] Packard, *The Sexual Wilderness*, 68.

[7] Ibid., 74.

[8] Marc Silver, "Sex and Violence on TV," *US News and World Report,* 11 September 1995, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 5 November 1997, available from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/sex&viol.htm.

Chapter 5

Clash of Value Systems

America, then is engaged in an ongoing and intensifying cultural war.

At the end of the day, somebody's values will prevail.

—Dr. William Bennett
The De-Valuing of America

In his book *The De-Valuing of America,* William Bennett draws on his experience as Secretary of Education, Director of Office of National Drug Control Policy, and Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities to describe a major American social battle between value systems which he terms the *culture war.*

> The battle for the culture refers to the struggle over the principles, sentiments, ideas, and political attitudes that define the permissible and the impermissible, the acceptable and the unacceptable, the preferred and the disdained, in speech, expression, attitude, conduct and politics.[1]

Bennett credits a large part of this culture war to a relatively new class of liberal elite (predominantly intellectuals active in numerous social institutions of society like the arts, humanities, and education) who have been able to exert "disproportionate influence" on American life and culture, causing the erosion of traditional values.[2]

The premise of this paper is that, within this culture war, a clash is growing between the value systems of the US military and the American society. The US military, as established in Chapter 3, has maintained a fairly stable value system over time. This value system, consistent with many of the traditional norms of society, has been based in

large part on moral principles which distinguish right from wrong. On the other hand, Chapter 4 discussed how current society has taken strides in several areas to disconnect its value system from such traditional moral tenets, thereby fashioning a contemporary value system which is much more amoral (where acceptability is not based on right and wrong). This chapter will illustrate this clash by examining the US military and American society positions on two significant social issues—adultery and homosexuality.

Adultery

US Military Perspective

The US military perspective on the social arrangement of adultery is most clearly portrayed in the Manual for Courts-Martial (MCM) which, expounding on Article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), lists *adultery* as a punishable crime. It defines *adultery* as consisting of the following elements:

1. That the accused wrongfully had sexual intercourse with a certain person;
2. That at the time, the accused or the other person was married to someone else; and
3. That, under the circumstances, the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces or was of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces.[3]

The MCM sets the maximum punishment for this offense as "dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 1 year."[4] This longstanding provision of military law is an unambiguous part of the military value system.

As previously mentioned, the source for this authority is Article 134 of the UCMJ. Article 134 is entitled *General Provision* and is a sort of catch-all clause applying to any conduct detrimental to the order and discipline of the armed forces or likely to bring discredit upon it. By identifying adultery as one of these types of behaviors, the MCM

makes a value judgement that adultery, as defined above, is unacceptable to the extent of being punishable by law. The MCM definition also reflects a moral verdict by using the term "wrongful" to describe the act. Based on this country's strong Judeo-Christian roots, which condemn adultery as immoral, it is reasonable to assume that this value judgement was established based on traditional moral principle, such as is expressed in the seventh of the bible's "Ten Commandments:"

> You shall not commit adultery. (NIV) (Exodus 20:14)[5]

American Societal Perspective

Society's position on this issue is not as clearly defined as the military's. While the American legal system used to have numerous state and municipal laws prohibiting adultery, most of these have either been deleted over time or neutralized through lack of enforcement.[6] As noted in Chapter 4, the public trend in sexual norms reflects an increasingly more tolerant position on sexual promiscuity, to include adultery, than in the past. A 1997 New York Times study, which included national poll results and numerous interviews, found that although many still believe adultery is wrong, the majority view it as a human frailty which should not be illegal. Typical interview statements included:

> Everybody's sex life is their own business.
>
> A marriage commitment is a very personal thing. It shouldn't be used to judge someone's character.
>
> I am really against anything like that. But it seems in this day and time, it's going on everywhere, and I mean everywhere.[7]

Case Study: Lieutenant (Lt.) Kelly Flinn

A relatively recent example of the clash between the military and society values concerning adultery can be seen in the case of Lieutenant Kelly Flinn, who the Air Force

charged in January 1997 with adultery, failure to obey a lawful order, and three other offenses. Spurred on by mass media's portrayal of Lt. Flinn as victim of a pious witch hunt, public opinion was strongly behind Lt. Flinn and against the Air Force. Before the legal proceedings were concluded, with Lt. Flinn's general discharge from the Air Force, it became evident that in the court of public opinion, the US military was the one on trial. Although adultery was only one of the serious charges against Flinn, the media and public seemed to focus on it as the key issue in which the military was out of touch. [8] A more detailed description of this case is located at Appendix A.

Homosexuality

US Military Perspective

Even more explicit than its handling of adultery, military law expressed in the MCM and UCMJ are clear on the US military view of homosexual behavior. UCMJ Article 125, *Sodomy,* declares: "Any person subject to this chapter who engages in unnatural carnal copulation with another person of the same or opposite sex or with an animal is guilty of sodomy. Penetration, however slight, is sufficient to complete the offense."[9] This provision is more explicit than adultery, which the MCM calls out as a specific example of unacceptable behavior only generally covered by the UCMJ as detrimental to order, discipline, and image of the military. Conversely, the UCMJ explicitly cites homosexual behavior (sodomy) as illegal conduct.

The MCM provides a detailed description of what it considers "unnatural copulation" that clearly addresses the sex acts of homosexuality. It sets the maximum punishment for guilt of this offense as dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and

allowances, and confinement from 5 years up to life (depending on whether the act is consensual and whether the act is committed with a child).[10] This is another longstanding provision of military law. Many would argue that the relatively new DOD policy on homosexuals in the military called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" has rendered the military position on this issue somewhat ambiguous. This paper will further discuss the policy change later in this chapter.

By citing homosexual behavior—sodomy—as an illegal act, punishable by maximum penalties including dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and life imprisonment, military law makes a strong value judgement of its unacceptability. Moreover, by describing this conduct as an "unnatural" act, the UCMJ and MCM make a moral determination that homosexuality itself is wrong. Indeed, there is no mention in the UCMJ Article 125 nor in the applicable MCM provision of the need to prove a negative influence of this activity on order, discipline, or image of the armed forces. Conduct of the act alone is enough to constitute guilt. Similar to adultery, there is a historical moral basis of condemning homosexuality in the American society, leading this study to conclude that this value judgement is also based on traditional moral principles, such as those found in the bible:

> Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman. (NIV) (Leviticus 18:22)[11]
>
> In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion. (NIV) (Romans 1: 27)[12]

American Societal Perspective

The American society's position on this issue has changed even more dramatically than its view of adultery. Laws against sodomy in this country go back to the American

colonies, which enacted strict prohibitions against homosexual acts based on the strong influence of bible-believing colonists.[13] By 1868, 34 of 37 states in the Union had enacted sodomy statutes.[14] According to R. Slovenko, "Until 1961 every American state had criminal statutes forbidding the practice of sodomy, and punished sodomy, even of a private and consensual nature, as a criminal offense."[15] In 1961, Illinois became the first state to decriminalize private, consensual, homosexual relations. Connecticut became 2nd in 1971. By 1993, only 24 states and the District of Columbia still had criminal statutes forbidding private, consensual sodomy on the books. The rest had either been repealed or struck down by courts.[16] Going even further, 1990's court rulings in Hawaii have opened the door for it to be the first state to legalize homosexual marriage.[17]

There are numerous other evidences of American society's growing acceptance of homosexuality. In the 1970's Dr. William Masters gained great notoriety with his research on human sexuality, including the pronouncement that homosexuality was normal behavior.[18] Congressman William Dannemeyer details in his book *Shadow in the Land* how homosexual rights groups, after adopting in 1972 the *Gay Rights Platform,* aggressively pressured the American Psychiatric Association into removing homosexuality from its list of disorders and declaring it to be normal.[19]

A 1992 US Government Accounting Office (GAO) study, using information from three national polls conducted in the 1980s and early 1990s found that society's thinking on homosexuality had shifted to one of much greater tolerance in areas of the legality of homosexual relations and equal job opportunities.[20] Dennis Altman, an historian of the gay movement, wrote in his 1982 book *The Homosexualization of America:* "The greatest single victory of the gay movement over the past decade has been to shift the

debate from behavior to identity, thus forcing opponents into a position where they can be seen as attacking the civil rights of homosexual citizens rather than attacking the specific (as they see it) antisocial behavior."[21]

Case Study: DOD's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Policy

One of the recent indications of societal acceptance of homosexuality was then Presidential candidate Bill Clinton's promise during his 1992 election campaign to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military. Immediately after taking office, President Clinton ordered the Secretary of Defense in January 1993 to draft an executive order to lift the ban by July of that year. The military establishment, led by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Senate Armed Services Committee vehemently resisted this effort. The resulting compromise policy called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" allowed that homosexuality would still be considered incompatible with military service and be grounds for separation, but the military would no longer ask recruits and troops about their sexual orientation.[22]

The confusing compromise policy and the heated battle between the military and administration leading to its settlement provide another example of the clash of value systems between the US military and American society. Many proponents from both sides of the issue were dissatisfied with the resulting policy. A more detailed description of this case is located at Appendix B.

Notes

[1] William J. Bennett, *The De-Valuing of America: The Fight for Our Culture and Our Children* (New York: Summit Books, 1992), 25.

[2] Ibid., 26.

[3] Department of Defense, *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States,* 1995 ed., (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1995), IV-95.

[4] Ibid.

Notes

[5] *The Holy Bible, New International Version,* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), 70.

[6] Carey Goldberg, "On Adultery Issue, Many Aren't Ready to Cast First Stone," *New York Times,* 9 June 1997, A1, A18.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Tony Cappacio, "Pilot Errors," *American Journalism Review,* October 1997, 18-26; and Richard J. Newman, "Flinn's Affairs and the Military's Reality Check," *US News and World Report,* 2 June 1997, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 5 November 1997, available from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/970602/2usnb.htm.

[9] DOD, *Manual for Courts-Martial,* A2-27.

[10] Ibid., IV-77.

[11] *The Holy Bible, 108.*

[12] Ibid., 1029.

[13] Brassey's, ed., *Gays: In or Out?: The U.S. Military & Homosexuals: A Source Book* (Washington D.C.: Brassey's (US), 1993), 105.

[14] Ibid., 106.

[15] Quoted in Brassey's, 106

[16] Brassey's, 107.

[17] Gallagher, John, "Marriage, Hawaiian Style," *Advocate,* 4 February 1997, 22.

[18] Brassey's, 119.

[19] William Dannemeyer, *Shadow in the Land* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989) in Brassey's, 72-73.

[20] Quoted in Brassey's, 39.

[21] Quoted in Brassey's, 118-119.

[22] Brassey's, 6-7; and Fred E. Cleveland and Mark A. Ohl, "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' – Policy Analysis and Interpretation," Master's Thesis (Monterey, CA.: Naval Postgraduate School, 1994) 2-10.

Chapter 6

Should the US Military Value System Change?

A general dissolution of principles and manners will more surely overthrow the liberties of America than the whole force of the common enemy. While the people are virtuous they cannot be subdued; but when once they lose their virtue they will be ready to surrender their liberties to the first external or internal invader.

—Samuel Adams
Signatory of the Declaration of Independence
and US Congressman

This study establishes that the US military has its own value system, much of which has a moral basis. It is a system which has not changed significantly over time. It further explains how society has increasingly de-emphasized traditional moral tenets and become more responsive to contemporary norms, social science observations, and the rights of the individual. This has resulted in the liberalizing of society's value system and a growing gap between society's values and the military's. It is now necessary to bring this comparison to conclusion by addressing whether or not the military value system ought to be revised to correspond to changes in societal norms. This task will begin with a review of the nature of sociological change—particularly the liberalization of values—and a look at its potential effects on the groups which experience it. Then similarities and differences between the military and society as groups will be discussed. Finally, this chapter will highlight the leadership role of the military within society before making conclusions based on these considerations.

Consequences of Liberalization

Functionalist vs. Conflict Perspectives

As shown in Chapter 2, sociology provides two different models from which to view social changes. The functionalist perspective is most concerned with order and stability. Consequently, it is leery of change and the effect it could have in unraveling the social fabric itself. It is likely to embrace only those changes which it views as serving a function which benefits society. As discussed in Chapter 3, the US military shares many of these concerns and likewise views sweeping changes through the lens of whether or not it serves a useful purpose to the military establishment. This perspective and resulting stable value system has served the US military well thus far in maintaining needed order and discipline.

On the other hand, the conflict sociological perspective views change itself as necessary to prevent parts of society from being unfairly dominated by those who control the power base. As Thomas Jefferson said, "God forbid we should ever be twenty years without such a rebellion."[1] Much of the change occurring in American society's value system has been consistent with this view. The legitimacy of this concern in several areas of society is credited with effecting positive changes such as the abolition of slavery, unfair labor practices, and discrimination against those born of a different race or gender than the white male majority.

Other Views

While there are many in society who believe the military must update its value system to correspond to society's trend of value liberalization, there are also many authorities who warn that pursuing this change via the abandonment of moral principles

will prove disastrous for society. In his recent book, *Slouching Toward Gomorrah,* Judge Robert Bork (former US Supreme Court nominee) argues that the classical liberalism upon which the United States was founded has been replaced by a modern version of liberalism in which radical egalitarianism and radical individualism are preeminent. Bork says that this modern liberalism is responsible for a great decline across most areas of the American culture "and that the rot is spreading."[2]

> A nation's moral life is, of course, the foundation of its culture....What we experience now is not the subtraction or addition of one or another of the elements of our moral life, but an assault that aims at, and largely accomplishes, sweeping changes across the entire cultural landscape. Large chunks of the moral life of the United States, major features of its culture, have disappeared altogether, and more are in the process of extinction.[3]

Judge Bork describes how these destructive agents of modern liberalism have already brought America to "the suburbs of Gomorrah"[4] (an ancient city known for its great moral decay which resulted in its ultimate destruction). He warns Americans to resist the moral corrosion of these radical forces before they bring this country to its likely destination of destruction.[5]

Former Minneapolis Chief of Police Tony Bouza acknowledges in his book *The Decline and Fall of the American Empire* that there are good and bad forces within every society affecting its overall health. But he believes that the scales have tipped in a decidedly destructive direction, with self-gratifying, unconstrained hedonism gaining control.

> If we can see the decline of families and cities and remain smugly confident of our inviolability, if we can witness the corruption of high figures and be blind to their connection to our prospects, if we can watch the loss of faith and remain secure in our confidence of salvation, and if we can sense the general moral decline yet think we will survive, then we can assert that we remain happy, dancing, singing, drinking passengers on the Titanic.[6]

In a 1987 speech, William Donohue, a Bradley Scholar at the Heritage Foundation, put forward a similar thesis on the consequences of removing moral restraint.

> ...the wide range of psychological and social disorders that plague American society are traceable to a flawed conception of freedom. Since the late 1960s, American culture has defined freedom as the abandonment of constraint. Americans have always prized liberty; it is the most defining characteristic of what is meant to be an American. But only in recent years has freedom come to mean freedom from constraint.[7]

He went on to discuss the damaging impact of individualism which ignores the public good and abandonment of moral traditions in favor of unrestrained tolerance.[8]

Author Norman Ream agrees that our country is suffering due to the dissolution of moral standards, and says that while many blame failures in the political arena, "politics is merely a reflection of the moral and ethical principles of society at large."[9] He argues that America's Founding Fathers foresaw this threat, quoting John Quincy Adams:

> This principle, that a whole nation has a right to do whatever it pleases, cannot in any sense whatever be admitted as true. The eternal and immutable laws of justice and morality are paramount to a legislation. The violation of those laws is certainly within the power of a nation, but is not among the rights of nations.[10]

Similar concerns about what the future holds for a society which shuns its moral moorings led political commentator and two-time Presidential candidate Patrick Buchanan to conclude:

> The world is turned upside down. In the 1950s, it was the mark of a moral man that he would not rent a hotel room to an unmarried couple. Now, if you do refuse to rent to homosexuals in D.C., you can be prosecuted and suffer the seizure of your property. America has ceased to be a moral community. We do not agree on whether God exists, whether there is a higher moral law than a show of hands can produce, whether abortion is killing a child, whether gay is good, whether promiscuity or smoking is worse for the young, whether drugs should be a matter of choice. And a country that ceases to be a moral community will cease to be a country.[11]

Similarities & Differences Between the Military & Society

Another aspect of determining whether the military value system should be more like society's is to examine the similarities and differences between the groups themselves. There are numerous elements which the US military and the American society have in common. At a basic sociologic level, they are both population groups, having to deal with similar social factors, forces and issues. More specifically, the military is a subset of the American society, sharing a common language, culture, history, laws and practices. As such, the element which these groups share most is the population itself, for all US military members are also members of American society.

On the flip-side, there are also a number of significant differences between the US military and the American society as social entities. One major aspect distinguishing the military from society is its purpose. While society has a myriad of major functions to include governing a diverse people, promoting social welfare, facilitating a strong economy, managing national resources and the like, the military has one specific aim—to provide for the common defense. All other functions within the military establishment are secondary to and should contribute to the mission of fighting and winning our nation's wars. The military's business is a matter of life and death, with the measure of its success being the continued physical security and liberty of this nation. As such, the military has a unique vantage point (with striking similarities to the functionalist sociological perspective) concerning factors like order, obedience, discipline, and authority, all of which have an impact on its continued readiness to fight and win wars.

The American legal system has long recognized this difference in a concept called *military necessity*. Based on this principle, courts of law, Congress, and other institutions

have historically recognized a distinction between normal standards of society and those employed by the US military society, in which typical societal considerations are routinely subordinated to military concerns. The mission, unit, and service take precedence over individual concerns and interests.[12]

In the 1983 case *Chappell v. Wallace,* the US Supreme Court stated:

> ...centuries of experience has developed a hierarchical structure of discipline and obedience to command, unique in its application to the military establishment and wholly different from civilian patterns. Civilian courts must, at the very least, hesitate long before entertaining a suit which asks the court to tamper....[13]

The courts have historically deferred to the judgement of military leadership in matters concerning military personnel and recognized the unique nature of the military and its necessity to maintain good order, discipline and combat effectiveness.[14]

This primary concern for combat readiness causes the US military to approach social issues and problems differently than contemporary society. For example, in spite of its moral basis, military law pursues adultery as a crime only in cases where it has a detrimental impact on good order and discipline, or brings discredit upon the military. Similarly, homosexuality, not withstanding moral condemnation, is not a civil rights issue to the US military but one of destructive behavior. In spite of the American Psychiatric Association's (APA's) removal of homosexuality from its list of disorders in the 1970's (see Chapter 5), Dr. Richard Isay, one of the APA members instrumental in effecting this change, wrote as late as 1992 in *Psychiatric News*:

> There is nevertheless, continuing conviction among most, although not all, dynamically oriented psychiatrists in general and psychotherapists in particular, that homosexuality can and should be changed to heterosexuality by a 'neutral' therapy that uncovers repressed childhood conflict that interferes with 'normal' heterosexual development.[15]

To those who proposed that lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military was akin to the black civil rights movement of the 1960's, General Colin Powell, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) and the first black CJCS, said:

> Skin color is a benign, non-behavioral characteristic. Sexual orientation is perhaps the most profound of human behavioral characteristics. Comparison of the two is a convenient but invalid argument.[16]

Another distinguishing characteristic of the military *is* its value system. As mentioned in Chapter 3, sociologist Milton Rokeach says that each social institution's value system is the most distinctive part of its identity. He further states that "different social institutions can be conceptualized as specializing in the enhancement of different subsets of values."[17] Thus, when major social institutions like the military maintain their identities through value systems unique to their respective functions, it may actually have an important balancing affect on society.

Moral Leadership

Many recognize that the US military establishment possesses a unique role within American society as a significant social institution. William Bennett places great emphasis on the roles and power of social institutions such as education, the military and religion in determining the moral health of society. He believes the issue of values lies at the root of all important public policy and exhorts Americans to accept their civic duty by reclaiming these social institutions to reverse society's decline.[18]

Former US Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare John Gardner, who also served as director of major corporations like Shell Oil and American Airlines, makes a strong case for the moral dimension of leadership in his book *On Leadership.* In a chapter entitled "The Moral Dimension," Gardner argues that effectiveness alone is an

insufficient criterion to judge leadership. Otherwise, leaders like Hitler, Idi Amin, and Mussolini would be popular examples of good leaders. Gardner argues that productive leaders must also have a sound moral basis to be judged as favorable leaders.[19]

The US military, as an important American institution, has a responsibility to itself and society to set and adhere to high moral standards. This requires the kind of moral courage which Joint Pub 1 says is critical to successful military operations.[20] It also models a healthy value system for a society which may be in danger due to its own abandonment of such traditional values. And though this approach may lead to conflict between value systems, it is the very nature of leadership to promote virtuous behavior for itself and those who follow rather than passively follow the crowd which is liberalizing its values to accommodate contemporary social trends. As Clausewitz said:

> If the theory of war did no more than remind us of these [moral] elements, demonstrating the need to reckon with and give full value to moral qualities, it would expand its horizon, and simply by establishing this point of view would condemn in advance anyone who sought to base an analysis on material factors alone.[21]

Conclusion

Links between the military's value system and the society of which it is a part are inevitable. The US military value system has not been absolutely static, nor has the American society's value system completely changed. Other studies could be conducted to investigate the degree to which the military value system has actually shifted, even if that change is slight, in response to changes in society, or the aspects of the societal value system which have remained fixed. Nevertheless, there is a significant clash between these two value systems which is unlikely to disappear.

The unique and potentially lethal mission of the US military on behalf of the American society, and the leadership role it occupies within a society possibly facing internal dangers from moral decay, dictate that the US military maintain a conservative course so it can continue to successfully defend the security of America. Furthermore, this author maintains that equally as important as the principles of military necessity and leadership within society, the US military must retain, maintain and reinforce its value system because morally it is the right thing to do. While this study has shown the lack of popularity in contemporary society of addressing morality, it has also cited numerous sources which argue that the moral dimension is critical. Moral strength is essential to successful military operations, as well as to the health of a nation.

> Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it. (Abraham Lincoln)[22]

> He who walks righteously and speaks what is right, who rejects gain from extortion and keeps his hand from accepting bribes, who stops his ears against plots of murder and shuts his eyes against contemplating evil—this is the man who will dwell on the heights, whose refuge will be the mountain fortress. His bread will be supplied and water will not fail him. (NIV) (Isaiah 33:15-16)[23]

General Charles Krulak, Commandant of the US Marine Corps, has chosen to address this value system conflict head-on. Facing the dilemma of recruiting future Marines from amongst young Americans with markedly different values than the Corps, General Krulak decided to provide recruits a clear presentation of the value system required to be a US Marine. Consequently, the Marine Corps has lengthened boot camp, inserted a multi-challenge endurance test called "The Crucible," and changed initial operational assignments so that new Marines from boot camp stay together to ensure continued indoctrination through greater unit cohesion. General Krulak acknowledges that an individual's value system cannot be changed in a 12-week boot camp, but

believes the Corps has an obligation to itself and recruits to clearly communicate and exhibit the Marine Corps moral ethos. The Marine Corps is very pleased with early results of this approach. While parts of society may view this method as barbaric or archaic, General Krulak reminds us that the military must take very seriously its task "to build a warrior that can do the types of things that their nation will require of them."[24] To General Krulak this task necessitates the reinforcement of a strong moral value system.

It is critical that today's professional military officers prepare themselves to deal with the value systems clash described in this study. The gap between the US military and the American society appears to be widening on many fronts. As members of society and those called to lead a new generation of young troops and officers, it is probable that military leaders will have ample opportunity to demonstrate the importance of moral leadership. This author proposes, based on the principles of military necessity, moral leadership and doing what is morally right, that the US military has an obligation to this nation to hold the high ground and meet the culture war face-to-face. Giving extra care to its moral foundation, the US military should defend and reinforce the moral value system which has made it strong.

Notes

[1] Quoted in *BilLee's Fabulous Quotes,* n.p.; on-line, Internet, 18 February 1998, available from http//www.cp-tel.net/miller/BilLee/quotes/index.html

[2] Robert H. Bork, *Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline* (New York: Regan Books, 1996), 2, 4-5.

[3] Ibid., 12.

[4] Ibid., 342.

[5] Ibid., 341-343.

[6] Tony Bouza, *The Decline and Fall of the American Empire: Corruption, Decadence, and the American Dream* (New York: Plenum Press, 1996), 3.

[7] William A. Donahue, "The Limits of Liberty: Individual Freedom and Social Disorders," Speech, Washington D.C. 8 December 1987, 2.

[8] Ibid., 5-8.

Notes

[9] Norman S. Ream, "Morality in America," *Patriarch,* no. 24 (September 1997): 23.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Patrick J. Buchanan, "The Dividing Line," *The Enterprise,* vol. 26, no.3 (23 June 1997): 22.

[12] Brassey's, 10.

[13] [462 U.S. 296 (1983] quoted in Brassey's, 18.

[14] Brassey's, 18.

[15] Quoted in Brassey's, 119.

[16] Quoted in Thomas, *Gays in the Military*, iv.

[17] Milton Rokeach, *The Nature of Human Values* (New York: The Free Press, 1973), 327.

[18] Bennett, 34-36, 258.

[19] John W. Gardner, *On Leadership* (New York: The Free Press, 1990), 67-71.

[20] Joint Pub 1, II-2.

[21] Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976), 184.

[22] Quoted in *BilLee's Fabulous Quotes,* n.p.

[23] *The Holy Bible*, 656.

[24] General Charles Krulak, USMC, interviewed by Dr. James Dobson, Focus on the Family radio program, aired 12 February 1998.

Appendix A

Case Study: Lieutenant (Lt.) Kelly Flinn

In January 1997 the US Air Force charged 1st Lt. Kelly Flinn, a B-52 bomber pilot, with adultery, plus three other charges (conduct unbecoming an officer, failure to obey a lawful order, and making a false statement) stemming from an adulterous affair she had with an enlisted woman's husband at Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota. She was also charged with fraternization for a previous sexual relationship with an enlisted man at the same base.[1] The Air Force pursued court-martial proceedings and processed this case up its chain of command to the Secretary of the Air Force for a final decision of general discharge. During this process, the media, supported by a large segment of public opinion, was strongly sympathetic to Lt. Flinn, viewing her as a victim of an overzealous military establishment. In an American Journal Review article assessing media coverage of this situation, Tony Cappacio credits Flinn supporters with waging an effective public relations war through the media. Quoting a private attorney specializing in military law he cites, "What [Flinn's lawyer] did was go public and framed the debate,…'You're going to put my girl in jail for what? Adultery? For a lapse in judgement? For a romance?' The press picked that up and ran with it."[2]

Public opinion followed the lead of the sympathetic press, magnifying the cultural divide between the value systems of the US military and contemporary society. Richard

Newman very aptly described the value system clash in an *US News and World Report* article, "Kelly Flinn might be facing prison time if not for public opinion, which views the adultery and fraternization charges against her as out of touch with reality....Yet the charges made her a pop icon rather than a pariah. Movie offers poured in after news reports portrayed her as a victim of rigid rules selectively applied. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott said the Air Force had 'badly abused' her. . . . But the military may find itself on trial for policies that 'don't conform to what most of us see in the norms of life,' said Democratic [Representative] Nita Lowey of New York. The policies are aimed at 'good order and discipline,' but they conflict with society's more permissive standards."[3] Although adultery was only one of the serious charges against Flinn, the media and public seemed to focus on it as the key issue in which the military was out of touch with society.

Notes

[1] Tony Cappacio, "Pilot Errors," *American Journalism Review,* October 1997, 25.
[2] Ibid., 21.
[3] Richard J. Newman, "Flinn's Affairs and the Military's Reality Check," *US News and World Report,* 2 June 1997, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 5 November 1997, available from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/970602/2usnb.htm.

Appendix B

Case Study: DOD's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Policy

During his 1992 election campaign, then Presidential candidate Bill Clinton promised to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military if elected. True to his promise, immediately after taking office, President Clinton ordered the Secretary of Defense in January 1993 to draft an executive order to lift the ban by July of that year. This effort was initiated without consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Senate Armed Services Committee.[1] The extremely negative reaction of the military establishment and its supporters revealed the opposing side of a major value system clash over this issue, resulting in a compromise policy called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."

In a Naval Postgraduate School Master's Thesis, *"Don't Ask, Don't Tell:"–Policy Analysis and Interpretation,* researchers Fred Cleveland and Mark Ohl presented a detailed chronology of the relatively contentious six-month struggle over the proposed policy. On the one side, President Clinton instituted interim policy preventing further discharges of homosexuals while awaiting the draft executive order he requested.[2] Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, formed a Military Working Group to develop and assess policy options while he simultaneously commissioned the RAND Corporation's National Defense Research Institute to conduct a study in support of the policy development which cost $1.3 million.[3] Additionally, GAO responded to a request from

three congressmen, including admitted-homosexual Representative Gerry Studds, by producing a brief study of the ban clearly supporting the proposed policy change.[4]

On the other side of the fence, led by Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Sam Nunn and Senate minority leader Robert Dole, the policy's opponents on Capitol Hill grumbled openly.[5] Congress held several hearings in which it received testimony from both supporters and opponents of the ban.[6] The most noticeable opposition came from the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) who, consistent with the majority of military members, openly opposed the policy change and testified that lifting the ban would have a devastating effect on military morale and discipline, ultimately threatening readiness of the force.[7]

Finally the compromise policy endorsed by the JCS called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" emerged, in which recruits and troops would no longer be asked about their sexual orientation, but homosexuality would still be considered incompatible with military service, and be grounds for separation if personnel either committed homosexual acts or said they were gay.[8] Many proponents from both sides of the issue were dissatisfied with the resulting compromise policy.

Notes

[1] Brassey's, 6-7.
[2] Fred E. Cleveland and Mark A. Ohl, "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'–Policy Analysis and Interpretation," Master's Thesis (Monterey, CA.: Naval Postgraduate School, 1994) 2-3.
[3] Ibid., 5-6.
[4] Brassey's, 2-44.
[5] Cleveland, 3-4.
[6] Ibid., 8-9.
[7] Ibid., 6-8.
[8] Ibid., 10.

Glossary

DOD	Department of Defense
Lt.	Lieutenant
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff (i.e., Military Service chiefs)
MCM	Manual for Courts-Martial, United States
NIV	New International Version (of *The Holy Bible*)
Pub	Publication
UCMJ	Uniform Code of Military Justice
US GAO	United States Government Accounting Office

amoral. That which is considered neither right nor wrong, i.e., morally neutral.

conflict perspective. Assumes that important resources in society (e.g., power, wealth, etc.) are unequally distributed, and those who have the resources will try to keep things as they are while the disadvantaged seek social change. There is a long-term tendency toward conflict, which is necessary to prevent social domination.

ethics. A branch of philosophy which primarily concerns itself with philosophical thinking about morality, moral judgements and moral values.

functionalist (or order) perspective. Based on assumptions about the strong roles of interdependency, stability, and consensus. It believes social issues can best be explained in terms of their usefulness to, or the functions they perform for, society.

immoral. That which is judged to be wrong or bad.

military law. The statutes governing the military establishment and regulations issued to carry them out. In a limited sense, the term has been equated with the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) and Manual for Courts-Martial (MCM).

military necessity. The principle recognizing a distinction between normal standards of society and those employed by the US military society, in which typical societal considerations are routinely subordinated to military operational concerns.

moral. That which is considered right or good.

moral value system. A collection of beliefs which establish preference based on what is considered to be right or wrong

sociology. The study of society and its social institutions, which examines the factors behind the collective behavior of organized groups of human beings as social entities and as they relate to the rest of society.

value. A belief which expresses preference or desirability.

value system. A collection of beliefs of what is preferred or desirable.

Bibliography

Bennett, William J. *The De-Valuing of America: The Fight for Our Culture and Our Children.* New York: Summit Books, 1992.

BilLee's Fabulous Quotes, n.p. On-line, Internet, 20 February 1998. Available from http://www.cp-tel.net/miller/BilLee/quotes/index.html.

Bork, Robert H. *Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline.* New York: Regan Books, 1996

Bouza, Tony. *The Decline and Fall of the American Empire: Corruption, Decadence, and the American Dream.* New York: Plenum Press, 1996.

Brassey's, ed. *Gays: In or Out?: The U.S. Military & Homosexuals: A Source Book.* Washington D.C.: Brassey's (US), 1993. *{This book combines two other works in their entirety. 1st work originally published: Ray, Ronald D. Military Necessity & Homosexuality. Louisville, KY. : First Principles, 1993. 2nd work originally published: United States General Accounting Office. Defense Force Management : DOD's Policy On Homosexuality. Washington, D.C. : Government Printing Office, 1992.}*

Buchanan, Patrick J. "The Dividing Line." *Enterprise,* vol. 26, issue 52 (23 June 1997): 22.

Cappacio, Tony. "Pilot Errors." *American Journalism Review,* October, 1997, 18-27.

Cleveland, Fred E. and Mark A. Ohl. "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'–Policy Analysis and Interpretation." Master's Thesis. Monterey, CA.: Naval Postgraduate School, 1994.

Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War.* Edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Dahl, Richard C. and John F. Whelan. *The Military Law Dictionary.* New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1960.

Donohue, William A. "The Limits of Liberty: Individual Freedom and Social Disorders." Lecture. The Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C., 8 December 1987.

Farley, John E. *American Social Problems: An Institutional Analysis.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1987.

Flood, Robert. *The Rebirth of America.* Philadelphia: The Arthur S. Demoss Foundation, 1986.

Frankena, William K. *Ethics.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973.

Gallagher, John. "Marriage, Hawaiian Style." *Advocate,* 4 February 1997, 22.

Gardner, John W. *On Leadership.* New York: The Free Press, 1990.

Joint Publication 1. *Joint Warfare of the Armed Forces of the United States.* 10 January 1995.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. 10th ed. Springfield, Ma: Merriam-Webster, Inc., 1993.

New York Times, 9 June 1997.

Newman, Richard J. "Flinn's Affairs and the Military's Reality Check." *US News and World Report,* 2 June 1997, n.p. On-line. Internet, 5 November 1997. Available from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/970602/2usnb.htm.

Packard, Vance. *The Sexual Wilderness.* New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1968.

Petersen, Larry R. and Gregory V. Donnenwerth. "Secularization and the Influence of Religion on Beliefs about Premarital Sex." *Social Forces* 75, no. 3 (March 1997): 1071-1088.

Rand Corporation. *Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Options and Assessment.* National Defense Research Institute Report MR-323-OSD. Santa Monica, CA., 1993.

Ream, Norman S. "Morality in America." *Patriarch*, no. 24 (September 1997): 22-23.

Rokeach, Milton. *The Nature of Human Values.* New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Rokeach, Milton. *Understanding Human Values.* New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Silver, Marc. "Sex and Violence on TV." *US News and World Report,* 11 September 1995, n.p. On-line. Internet, 5 November 1997. Available from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/sex&viol.htm.

The Holy Bible, New International Version. Grand Rapids, MI.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984.

Thomas, Cal, et al. *Gays in the Military: The Moral and Strategic Crisis.* Franklin, TN: Legacy Communications, 1993.

U.S. Department of Defense. *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States.* 1995 ed., Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1995.

U.S. House of Representatives. *Assessment of the Plan to Lift the Ban on Homosexuals in the Military: Hearings before the Military Forces and Personnel Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.* 103d Cong., 1st sess., 1993.

U.S. Senate. *Policy Concerning Homosexuality in the Armed Forces: Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services.* 103d Cong., 2d sess., 1993.

DISTRIBUTION A:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Air Command and Staff College
Maxwell AFB, Al 36112