

AIR WAR COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY



SEXUAL ASSAULT:

THE DARK SIDE OF MILITARY HYPERMASCULINITY

by

Angie Robertson, Lt Col, USAF

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Dr. Margaret Sankey

16 February 2016

DISCLAIMER

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



Biography

Lieutenant Colonel Angenene L. Robertson (Angie) is a force support officer and entered the United States Air Force in 1995. She is a graduate from Charleston Southern University in South Carolina with a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology and Criminal Justice. Additionally, she has earned two Master of Science degrees in Public Administration from Troy University, Alabama and in Leadership Counseling from the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs in Colorado. Colonel Robertson's most recent assignment, prior to attending the Air War College, was Chief, Senior Leader Management Office, Headquarters, United States European Command in Stuttgart, Germany.



Abstract

Tailhook '91 exposed the U.S. Navy and the Defense Department gender integration and sexual assault problems. As a result, the Armed Forces instituted and revamped sensitivity, sexual harassment, and equal opportunity education and training programs and increased more combat roles to women. To provide additional oversight and management of sexual assaults, in 2005 the Defense Department established the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office. Despite their best efforts, sexual assaults continue to occur throughout the Armed Forces and hinder mission effectiveness and unit cohesion. In an effort to understand and explain sexual assaults, this paper focuses on the role a patriarchal society plays in developing and fostering a military hypermasculinity culture. It also examines military hypermasculinity behavior and its link to physical, sexual aggression and assaults, resulting from contradictory feelings of fear and desire for women, a perceived existential threat or challenge to one's manhood, and the endorsement and validation of stereotypical military hypermasculinity behavior within units. This paper includes five recommendations to combat the damaging and destructive effects of sexual assault: 1) mow the grass, or provide continued leadership vigilance and avoid complacency, 2) know thyself, or provide personality, emotional, and hypermasculinity testing for self-awareness of triggers and dark-side traits, 3) conduct more research and analysis for targeted training, 4) empower the next generation of leaders for solution set, and 5) strategic messaging.

Introduction

*"That's what you get when you go to a hotel party
with a bunch of drunk[s]...."¹*

Tailhook Symposium 1991

Imagine you are a junior professional attending an annual conference with your supervisor in an official capacity. Senior-level managers, mid-level managers, and other junior professionals from your organization also attend the conference. You walk back to your hotel room as scheduled conference events and your duty obligations end for the day. Enroute you notice a group of young male, conference attendees drinking in the hallway. As you pass, the gauntlet of men starts grabbing your clothes and groping your body parts. In self-defense you fight back but cannot ward off your attackers. Suddenly, the cheering and rowdy men push you through the gauntlet as hands continue probing and prodding your body. Disgusted and in disbelief of the attack, you make it to your room and immediately report the assault to your supervisor the next day. He dismisses your claim and adds, "[t]hat's what you get when you go to a hotel party with a bunch of drunk[s]...."² Appalled by this comment, you remain hopeful that he, a senior member in the organization, will take appropriate action.

After weeks of inaction, you take matters in your own hands and elevate the issue to a higher level. Ultimately, your complaint lands on the desk of the second in charge of your organization who immediately directs an investigation. As a result, of the approximately 1,500 conference attendees interviewed, only two receive disciplinary actions for this criminal behavior, now downgraded as non-criminal, unprofessional misconduct. Fortunately, senior members external to the organization and the media hear of the incident and potential cover-up to protect the reputation and credibility of the male perpetrators and the organization. Under

increasing pressure and scrutiny, the organization conducts another investigation. As a result of the second investigation, senior leaders either resign or retire and others receive non-criminal, punitive actions. Yet again, no one is prosecuted for this criminal behavior. Most damaging, you receive harassment by and criticism from colleagues and strangers outside the organization. Feeling alienated, angry, and depressed, you leave the organization.

This scenario could happen to anyone, anywhere, anytime, and at any location. Sadly, it occurred nearly 25 years ago in September 1991 to Navy Lieutenant Paula Coughlin whose allegations of sexual assault by a group of naval aviators became known as the Tailhook Scandal, the worst sexual assault case in the United States Navy history.³ LT Coughlin's supervisor Rear Admiral John Snyder, a veteran fighter pilot and the Patuxent River Naval Air Test Center Commander, dismissed her claim and took no action.⁴ Investigations directed by the Vice Chief of Naval Operations and Chief of Naval Operations revealed sexually assaults of 7 men and 83 women during the same weekend.⁵ Of the 1,500 interviewed, the initial reports held only two officers accountable for the crime.⁶ The Secretary of the Navy directed a re-investigation after scrutiny from the public, the media, and Congress for a poorly conducted investigation.⁷

The second investigation yielded different results. "In total, 119 Navy and 21 Marine Corps officers were referred by Pentagon investigators for possible disciplinary actions. They were cited for incidents of indecent assault, indecent exposure, conduct unbecoming an officer or failure to act in a proper leadership capacity while at Tailhook '91. Further, 51 individuals were found to have made false statements during the investigation. None of these 140 cases ever went to trial. Approximately half were dropped for lack of evidence.... Ultimately the careers of fourteen admirals and almost 300 naval aviators were scuttled or damaged by Tailhook."⁸ Additionally, "[s]everal top leaders of the Navy, including the Secretary of the Navy, the Navy

Judge Advocate General, the Navy Inspector General, and the Chief of Naval Operations either retire early, resign, or are reassigned to less prestigious posts.”⁹ Although the victims received some justice, the attackers received non-criminal punishment and continued to serve. LT Coughlin’s continued victimization by her peers and others for the reporting led to her resignation from the US Navy in 1994.¹⁰

Despite damaged careers, the Navy did not hold the attackers criminally responsible for this attack or for the 90 others assaulted. Most disturbing, “[d]espite public outrage and a slew of promises by military leaders, very little, meaningful action was taken in the decade that followed.”¹¹ Instead, the continued media reports of sexual assault highlighted a widespread problem within the Defense Department.

It was not until 2005—more than a decade after the Tailhook scandal and tens of thousands sexual assaults later—that Congress finally ordered the military to establish the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office, or SAPRO, which was tasked with developing a comprehensive strategy to address sexual assault in the armed forces. It took at least another three years for the military to actually implement oversight recommendations to make SAPRO fully operational. In its years of operation, SAPRO has had limited success addressing the problem of military sexual assault and has been criticized as a token office with little actual authority in the military organization. Although SAPRO is now led by a two star general, which gives it more institutional clout, its policymaking functions in relation to the branches remain limited.¹²

Almost 25 years post-Tailhook and 10 years post establishment of SAPRO, sexual harassment and assaults continue today at increasing rates despite Defense Department efforts to address and rectify the issue.

Throughout the military--beginning with recruiting centers and basic training units to service academies and military installations--military personnel of all ranks continue to commit these heinous crimes against their comrades in arms. These unreported and underreported crimes leave a trail of victims physically, mentally and emotionally scarred and violated. On the other

hand perpetrators, perceivably unscathed, unremorseful and unaffected by their behavior, remain free to violate again with little to no regard or respect for their victims, or the sacred trust and commitment or service ethics, morals and values expected of them.

In the aftermath of Tailhook, Secretary Sean O’Keefe, the 67th Secretary of the Navy stated, “[w]e get it.... We know that the larger issue is a cultural problem which has allowed demeaning behavior and attitudes towards women to exist within the Navy Department. Our senior leadership is totally committed to confronting this problem and demonstrating that sexual harassment will not be tolerated. Those who don't get the message will be driven from our ranks.”¹³ What is the cultural problem and is the core of it adequately addressed? Have we spent the last 25 years post-Tailhook addressing the symptoms and not the problem? Most importantly, why are sexual assaults continuing to happen and more perpetrators not thrown out as Secretary O’Keefe stated? Most disturbing, why are senior leaders, who are charged with setting the command climate to combat such behavior, committing these crimes in light of all the SAPRO initiatives, education and training? Do senior leaders really get it or is a zero tolerance policy established to appease the public? Are previous changes adequate? In this paper, I attempt to answer these questions by examining hypermasculinity, the root cause of sexual assault.

I first discuss the history and definition of hypermasculinity and its relationship to a patriarchal society. Second, I discuss the link between military hypermasculinity and sexual assault. Lastly, I argue the Defense Department will experience an increase in reported and unreported incidences due to recent policy changes involving gays openly serving and women in combat. However, to change the current trajectory of sexual assaults, I propose five

recommendations: 1) mow the grass, 2) know thyself, 3) conduct more research and analysis for targeted training, 4) empower the millennials, and 5) strategic messaging.

Thesis

Military hypermasculinity contributes to physical, sexual aggression and assault against servicemembers exhibiting feminine personality traits due to conflicting feelings of desire or fear of woman, the existential threats or challenges to their manhood, and the capitulation of stereotypical hypermasculine behavior.

Gender Roles

Gender roles represent critical components to understanding the root cause of sexual assaults. Sexual assault is not just a male-on-female or female-on-male crime, it also involves male-on-male and female-on-female. Therefore sexual assault is not an issue of sex but of culturally-driven gender roles involving the masculine (strong, dominant, controlling, powerful) versus the feminine (weak, subordinate, inferior, emotional). With a focus on masculinity, various fields of study define it differently. For example Dr. Mic Hunter, a licensed psychologist and therapist, describes the form of masculinity promoted in the military culture as extreme and defines it as hypermasculinity.¹⁴ Additionally, as depicted in Table 1, Janie L. Leatherman, Director of International Studies and Professor of Politics, describes four types of masculinities.¹⁵ She too provides a definition of hypermasculinity similar to Dr. Hunter.

Table 1. Approaches to Sexual Assault and Masculinity

Approach	Definition
Essentialism	Sexual assault or violence occurs due to the aggressive and natural tendencies of humans. It also serves as a tool to reaffirm patriarchal hierarchies....and reassert gender roles.
Structuralism	Certain structural factors in society, such as gender role, economics, religion, ethnicity, race or political affiliation, predisposes women to a greater likelihood of sexual violence.

Social Constructivism	Emphasize the role of norms, rules, beliefs, ideas, and principles influencing expectations for social behavior. Four types:
	1. Hegemonic masculinity: male-centered order that gives men, instead of women, primary access to power and privilege. It organizes the power relations between women and men and the political agenda that sustains this hierarchy. It is defined more by its successful claim to authority than its use of direct violence.
	2. Allied masculinity: Access to the inner sanctum of hegemonic masculinity is open not just to men but even to woman—as long as they do not threaten the link between hegemony and masculinist power.
	3. Hyper-masculinity: exaggerates noncatastrophic masculinities, draws on excessive forms of toughness, and deploys violence in order to maintain or reassert dominance and control in the limited arenas available under extreme circumstances. Women become a target for sexual violence because violence over them is socially constructed as a principal means for men to reestablish lost hegemony.
	4. Marginalized masculinity: creates a feeling of emasculation and powerlessness in the arenas of class and race, even though dominance is maintained in the arena of gender.

Aaron Belkin, an associate professor of political science at San Francisco State University, proposes a different type entitled military masculinity. According to Belkin, military masculinity is “a set of beliefs, practices and attributes that can enable individuals—men and women—to claim authority on the basis of affirmative relationships with the military or with military ideas.”¹⁶ This approach evolved in 1898 as a result of two trends colliding.¹⁷ During this time, “a new form of masculinity emerged, understood as intrinsic to all men, with an emphasis on self-control and ruggedness that mirrored evolving conceptions of military professionalism; and the deepening of the public’s glorification of the military as an institution.”¹⁸ The first trend was a paradigm shift in the definition of masculinity or manliness. The term masculinity evolved from the exclusive, privileged elite to an all-inclusive group of white men. This group, categorized as “primitive and civilized, emphasized ruggedness and

virility on one hand and order and control on the other.”¹⁹ On the same collision course, the second trend developed.

The second trend, which Belkin entitled the “militarization of civilian society” converged with the first trend during the post Spanish-American War era as American society began to revere and respect the military as professional occupation.¹⁴ Additionally, society “portrayed soldiering and war as opportunities for all eligible men to prove their manhood. Military masculinity became a maker of first-class citizenship for any American man who was allowed to embody it.”²¹ This military masculinity initially and for years following, deepened and widened the inequality divide and prohibited minorities, who were considered second-class citizens, from officially and legitimately serving in the Armed Forces.

Military Hypermasculinity²²

As Belkin illustrates, since the start of the 20th century, American society revered military enlistment as a rite of passage into manhood for white males, and therefore did not embrace the inclusion of minorities. For example, as the public law passed through Congress establishing the Women’s Auxiliary Army Corps, one congressman is on record as saying, “[t]ake the women into the armed service, who then will do the cooking, the washing, the mending, the humble homey tasks to which every woman has devoted herself? Think of the humiliation! What has become of the manhood of America?”²³ Fortunately, the strategic visionary, Army Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall’s support and testimony aided in the bill becoming law, granting women official military status in the military in 1942.²⁴

Nearly 30 years later, military leaders openly expressed resistance to the changing role of women in the military. In 1972, the role of women expanded to military occupations other than administration, except combat.²⁵ Expressing reluctance and disapproval to this expansion, U.S.

Army retired General William Westmoreland testified before Congress that, “[n]o man with gumption wants a woman to fight his nation’s battles.”²⁶ In 1980, the U.S. Marine Corps Commandant argued that women’s participation in combat “would be an enormous psychological distraction for the male who wants to think that he’s fighting for that woman somewhere behind...it tramples the male ego. When you get right down to it, you’ve got to protect the manliness of war.”²⁷ As these quotes demonstrate, historically, the concern is not advancement or equality but the preservation of a masculine military and the male ego.

Today, this cultural mindset still remains within pockets of the military and society along with fears the military is losing its masculinity. In a 2011 article, Secretary John Lehman, the 65th Secretary of the Navy, reminisced of a time when, “attributes of naval aviators--willingness to take intelligent calculated risk, self-confidence, even a certain swagger--that are invaluable in wartime are the very ones that make them particularly vulnerable in today’s zero-tolerance Navy. The political correctness thought police...are out to get them and are relentless.”²⁸ Contrary to his beliefs, society and the military still value and endorse risk-taking behavior, self-confidence and swagger, or military hypermasculinity in *wartime*. These traits are critical in executing military strategy and doctrinal terms of dominate and control to penetrate, neutralize, defeat, and weaken an enemy’s center of gravity. Yet, when utilized ineffectively during non-combat or peacetime operations these same highly-valued personality traits can turn to dark-side traits.²⁹ This can hinder mission effectiveness, especially when a mission requires “caring, emotive human beings who feel a connection with other human beings...the very qualities that are required of anyone involved in missions aimed at keeping, creating, promoting, or maintaining something called peace.”³⁰ Military hypermasculinity serves its purpose in combat operations;

left unchecked during peacetime or non-combat operations, then dark-side traits prevail, leading to physical, sexual aggression and assault.

Synthesis

*"Where we find patriarchy, we find sexism.
Where we find sexism, we find women who are not valued, and
we find violence against women"³¹*

As the quote indicates, physical, sexual aggression and assault against woman originates from patriarchy. The traditional norms in patriarchal societies further endorse a society-condoned and military promoted hypermasculine culture, which may lead to sexual aggression. In fact, studies associate past and the propensity or risk for sexual aggression, physical aggression, and alcohol-related physical aggression to hypermasculinity.³² This is a result of conflicting feelings of fear and desire of women, existential threats and challenges to one's manhood, and the endorsement or validation of stereotypical military hypermasculinity behavior within a unit.

Patriarchal Society

In a patriarchal system, traditionally men are in power and control society, government, family, and various aspects of life. This system is also "notable for marginalizing the feminine.... [and] infantilize, ignore, trivialize, or even actively cast scorn upon what is thought to be feminized."³³ In the Armed Forces starting with basic training, the military hypermasculine rejects or scorns the feminized to prove their masculinity and demonstrate a warrior mentality. The basic training environment cultivates "an absence of emotion and a willingness to use violence, [and] excise all that is perceived to be 'feminine.'"³⁴ Those who fail to capitulate to the norm are preyed upon and/or labeled by military training instructors and peers as weak, a sissy, and progressively worse, demeaning names to degrade the male ego. Those who capitulate

in an extreme manner to prove their manhood prey upon those who are feminine (women and gays) during basic training and continuing onto active duty as well.³⁵

Desire and Fear

Once on active duty, the belittling demeaning behavior, in concert with the rejection and scorn of the feminized, progresses in some hypermasculine, male-dominated workplace environments. Insomuch that the “socialization of the hypermasculine male...may script [one] to overvalue a definition of masculinity as tough and unfeeling, violent and exploitative of women, and as seeking the excitement of risking danger.”³⁶ Unfortunately, pockets of society and the military readily condone and endorse this behavior. As a result, some are unable and/or unwilling to discern when this behavior is destructive to the organization or a comrade.

The socialization of hypermasculinity also produces two conflicting impulses of desire and fear of the feminized. Unfortunately, “a solution to the contradictory impulses of desire and fear is to exert physical and sexual power and control over the feared object. As a result, hypermasculinity has been associated with both sexual and physical violence against women.”³⁷ This behavior is unacceptable and inappropriate, yet basic training and the workplace endorse and condone it, thereby creating blurred lines or mixed signaling between appropriate and inappropriate and misbehavior and criminal behavior. Implementing consistent messaging and enforcement of standards and professionalism starting in basic and continuing to active duty is a critical step towards combating sexual assault.

Threatened or Challenged Masculinity

The contradictory impulses of fear and desire are just one characteristic of hypermasculinity leading to sexual aggression. Another characteristic involves the existential threat or challenge to one’s manhood. In a 2003 study, Dominic Parrott and Amos Zeichner

examined and presented evidence associating hypermasculinity with aggressive behavior against women. They conclude, consistent with other researchers that “hypermasculine behaviors (i.e. physical aggression) are motivated by ‘any situation that challenges or threatens masculine identity.’ That is, the fact that the provocation was delivered by a female opponent in an adversarial context may have enhanced the salience of threat...”³⁸ This threat or challenge may take many forms. With the evolution of gender roles and women entering the military, this paradigm shift threatened and challenged the natural rule of patriarchic order. Likewise, due to recent policy changes, the increase of women and gays will increase competition for promotions, awards, employment, and other career opportunities. This will potentially threaten and challenge the hypermasculine and increase sexual harassment and assaults.

Endorsement of Hypermasculinity

A third characteristic of hypermasculinity leading to sexual aggression involves an organization’s endorsement of stereotypical hypermasculinity. According to Hunter, “[o]rganizations that endorse stereotypical masculinity exhibit much higher rates of sexual harassment and assault than do other organizations.”³⁹ The culmination of gender roles, patriarchy, and the military culture, as previously discussed, provides supporting evidence of the existence of stereotypical hypermasculinity in the military. In further examining the military and its sub-cultures, the author proposes a tiered approach for military occupations experiencing low, moderate, or high rates of sexual assault (refer to Table 2). The author also proposes the following: 1) due to the Defense Department previous restrictions of women in combat occupations, Tier 1⁴⁰ occupations, with the exception of pilots and navigators, represent the highest rate of sexual assaults of male victims and potentially the highest masculinity rate; 2) Tier 2 contains a moderate to high level of risk and hypermasculinity, with the majority of the

sexual assaults against women; and 3) Tier 3, primarily support occupations with a greater percentage of women than non-support occupations, exhibits the lowest levels of risk and lowest rate of sexual assaults against men and women, as well as the least likely to exhibit or promote stereotypical hypermasculinity. Without surveys or testing, the author bases this assessment on military cultural norms, occupational dangers, risks and hazards, and occupations with the greatest concentration of Type-A, 18-24 year old males.

Table 2. Occupational Levels of Risk for Sexual Aggression

Tier	Hypermasculinity	Risk of Sex Assault	Military Occupation
Tier 1	High	High	All Services: pilots and navs Air Force: combat control officer, combat rescue/special tactics officer, special operations officer, enlisted combat controller, enlisted tactical air command and control, enlisted pararescue, and enlisted special operations weather Army: armor, cannon, cavalry, field artillery, fire support, infantry, and special forces Marines: fire support, infantry, field artillery, tank, machine gunner, special ops, rifleman, and reconnaissance. Navy: SEAL, special warfare, combatant craft
Tier 2	Moderate to High	Moderate	Airfield operations, maintenance, engineers, logistics, and military police
Tier 3	Low to Moderate	Low	personnel, services, administration, communications, contracting,

acquisitions, finance, public affairs, scientist, intelligence, medical, dental, nurse, chaplain, and legal.

Alcohol and Force

Impulses, existential threats, and endorsement of hypermasculinity are precursors to a sexual assault and two additional factors are noteworthy. The first, alcohol plays a significant role as a weapon of choice by perpetrators. A study reveals that perpetrators use alcohol in their attacks on 47% of women and 19% of men.⁴¹ Parrott and Zeichner provide evidence that “a positive association was found between hypermasculinity and the perpetration of alcohol-related physical aggression.”⁴² The second is the use of force which is more frequently used than alcohol and least discussed. Specifically, 50% of women and 22% of men experience some degree of physical force during an assault because hypermasculinity drives the use of force or physical and sexual aggression.⁴³

Recommendations

*"So I don't want just more speeches or awareness programs or training.... If we find out somebody is engaging in this stuff, they've got to be held accountable--prosecuted, stripped of their positions, court-martialed, fired, dishonorably discharged. Period. It's not acceptable."*⁴⁴

In light of the Defense Department's zero tolerance policy, it is not without incidences. Studies reveal there were approximately 36,000 reported incidences in 2006; 19,000 in 2010; and 26,000 in 2012.⁴⁵ In 2014, approximately 20,300 of the 1.3 million servicemembers experienced sexual assaults.⁴⁶ As with all problems, solving sexual assault is a wicked, messy and complex one, and more noteworthy, the servicemembers are as well. Some argue that "[s]ociety is always reflected in the military. It's where we get our soldiers [sailors, airmen, and marines]...."⁴⁷ However, others argue "[t]he answer cannot be that military is a reflection of society: it is not and never has been. In some cases the institution has been more socially progressive than the

civilian world.”⁴⁸ Ultimately, society trusts the military and expects a higher code of conduct from its member than the average members of society based on institutional values, morals, and ethics. Though recruits originate from small towns or big cities with varied upbringings, once in the military, they must conform to strict adherence of the military’s zero tolerance, integration, equality and its standards, customs, courtesies, and the profession of arms.

As military leaders continue to chisel at the military hypermasculinity’s dark side of sexual assault, I make the following recommendations:

- **Recommendation 1:** Mow the grass regularly.

A professional command climate is significant to any organization and leadership must set and maintain it to ensure effective mission accomplishment. Fortunately, in surveys servicemembers report their leadership does well to set a climate of trust and respect, to emphasize a zero tolerance policy, lead by example, and identify and correct sexual harassment problems.⁴⁹ However leaders must avoid complacency especially considering in 2013, 90% of nearly all unwanted sexual contact occurred on a military installation during duty hours.⁵⁰ It is incumbent upon leaders at all levels to take swift action to thwart deviants from disrupting and undermining the trust of citizens and fellow comrades in arm, to deter demeaning behavior with on-the-spot corrections, and remind all of the golden rule--to treat others as you want to be treated. Leaders must remain vigilant and empower formal and informal leaders to maintain a positive climate at all times, in the absence of leadership, by serving as a brother’s or sister’s keeper.

- **Recommendation 2:** Know thyself.

Prevention is the first step towards addressing sexual harassment and assault. Prevention can take many forms such as training and education. Yet a more proactive approach is testing

for hypermasculinity and sexual assault tendencies utilizing the Hypermasculinity Index (HMI)⁵¹ prior to entering the military. As with fitness testing, aptitude battery, and medical screening, the HMI can also identify in advance one's fit-ness for duty. Those exhibiting high HMIs should receive specialized mental health counseling and targeted training to equip them with tools to identify and control their dark-side hypermasculinity traits which can cause sexual aggression. Possessing the emotional intelligence to know and avoid triggers leading to negative or demeaning behavior will increase mission effectiveness and unit cohesion.

- **Recommendation 3:** Conduct more research and analysis for targeted training.

Currently, the Defense Department SAPRO does not track data regarding a perpetrator's military occupation. If tracked and analyzed, this data may provide a better sight picture and identify potential patterns of behavior from certain groups for targeted training requirements. Research shows that hazing is the cause of 34% of sexual assaults on males.⁵² Tracking occupations will allow the SAPRO to address trends, such as hazing, and tailor training sessions and/or open discussions (one-on-one or small group) for those occupations as needed.

Additionally, with improved demographics about the perpetrator, SAPRO can tailor training with perpetrators as the focus so that he/she can receive the mental help to combat triggers causing their sexual aggression *before* an attack. For example SAPRO education and training programs focus on alcohol prevention and responsible drinking. Among many advantages, this promotes healthy choices and decision-making but focuses on the actions victims should take for prevention. SAPRO should also incorporate into training discussions of actions the perpetrator should take to prevention an assault. Training can include discussions of the perpetrator's use of force, the dark-side traits of hypermasculinity and overcoming them, and the impact of sexual assault with personalized vignettes.

- **Recommendation 4:** Empower the Millennials, the next generation of leaders

Millennials are the military's next generation of leaders who possess characteristics that will bring a different perspective and insight to the workforce. The following lists a few of their traits:⁵³

- Largest generation of all time
- Most diverse
- Most educated
- High self-awareness
- Collaborate with others
- Driven by technology
- Optimistic and hopeful
- Responsible
- Innovative
- Non-cynical and civic-minded
- Politically engaged
- Progressive
- Open-minded and tolerant on social issues
- Overwhelmingly environmental
- Concerned about economics
- Cooperative, multi-level approach to policy
- Good of the government

Though not an all-inclusive list, these characteristics will serve our nation well globally as we strengthen relations with our partners and allies and potentially rebuild and renew relations with others. Millennials are willing to work collaborative and cooperate to find innovative solutions for a whole of government approach. Additionally, their open-mindedness, high self-awareness, tolerance of social issues, and diversity will prove valuable in resolving wicked problems of today, such as gender integration, equality, sexual assault and harassment, and discrimination.

- **Recommendation 5:** Clear, consistent message

Strategic communication, messaging and signaling to our allies, partners and enemies are key to the U.S warfighting capabilities and mission objectives. To maintain our status as a hegemonic power, the Defense Department must send a message that the U.S. is multi-dimensional in its approach to foreign policy, that it possesses a diverse, skilled and talented corps of officers and enlisted, and that it maintains an aggressive, dominating stance to win wars yet caring and emotive to broker peace and win hearts and minds.

This strategic messaging is also vital to recruitment and retention efforts on the homefront. Internally, the Defense Department must clearly broadcast the same message to garner and maintain the trust and support of Congress, taxpayers, and their sons and daughters who are the next generation of servicemembers. Part of this messaging is that the Armed Forces endorse a gender neutral culture of androgynous warriors focused on maintaining equality, respect and human dignity, the cornerstone of U.S. government and foreign policy promoted globally. The Defense Department and the Armed Forces must send a clear and consistent message, those unwilling to accept and support these values, need not apply.

Conclusion

In patriarchal societies, men traditionally fought wars in defense and honor of their country and women, who awaited the safe return home of their warriors. For this reason, enlistment in the military served as a rite of passage for young men to prove their masculinity. Yet with the evolution of gender roles and women entering the military and now combat occupations, this rite of passage is a fading memory. With the Armed Forces leading the way, a paradigm shift from patriarchal to an egalitarian culture is occurring with women challenging the traditional rules of order, the manhood of servicemen, and a military hypermasculinity culture.

In response, some military hypermasculine men are resorting to physical, sexual aggression and assault as a means to re-assert their patriarchal authority.

Secretary O’Keefe in his post-Tailhook statements acknowledged the existence of a cultural problem and the demeaning behavior condoned in the Armed Forces. To seek resolution, we must first address the core cultural problem—that is, military hypermasculinity, SAPRO never discusses in their education and training programs. It appears solving the symptoms is sufficient considering the relatively small number of incidences (20,300 sexual assault of 1.3 million servicemembers in 2014; 1% males and 4.9% women).⁵⁴ Without acknowledging and addressing military hypermasculinity and its dark-side traits, then sexual assaults will continue leaving in its path a life time of personal psychological and physical pain, as well as damage to morale, cohesion, and readiness within organizations. Senior leaders “get it” but they do what they must for mission-critical issues, and with sexual assault, they do what they can.

What can or must we do -- mow the grass, know thyself, conduct more research for targeted education and training programs, empower the millennials, and present clear, strategic messages of zero tolerance and respect for all.

Notes

1. Newsweek Staff, "Tailhook: Scandal Time," *Newsweek*, 5 July 1992, <http://www.newsweek.com/tailhook-scandal-time-200362>.
2. Ibid.
3. Retro Report, *Legacy of Tailhook*, New York Times Video, 12 min., 13 May 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/video/booming/100000002219816/the-legacy-of-tailhook.html?action=click&contentCollection=booming&module=lede®ion=caption&pgtype=article>.
4. Newsweek Staff, "Tailhook: Scandal Time."
5. Joslyn Ogden, "Tailhook '91 and the U.S. Navy," (case study on ethics, The Kenan Institute for Ethics, Duke University), 11.
6. Ibid., 9.
7. Ibid., 10.
8. PBS Frontline, "Punishment After Tailhook '91: The Navy Blues," PBS Online, accessed 15 November 2015, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/navy/tailhook/disc.html>.
9. Ogden, "Tailhook '91 and the U.S. Navy," 1.
10. Paula Coughlin's Resignation (Word Search through Google), accessed 15 November 2015, <http://articles.latimes.com/keyword/paula-Coughlin>.
11. Lindsay Rosenthal and Lawrence Korb, "Twice Betrayed: Bringing Justice to the U.S. Military's Sexual Assault Problem," Center for American Progress, November 2013, 7.
12. Ibid.
13. Melissa Healy, "Pentagon Blasts Tailhook Probe, Two Admirals Resign," *Los Angeles Times*, <http://tech.mit.edu/V112/N44/tailhook.44w.html>.
14. Dr. Mic Hunter, *Honor Betrayed: Sexual Abuse in America's Military* (Fort Lee, NJ: Barricade Books, 2007), 33.
15. Janie L. Leatherman, *Sexual Violence and Armed Conflict* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2011), 13-20.
16. Aaron Belkin, *Bring Me Men: Military Masculinity and the Benign Façade of American Empire, 1898-2001* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 3.
17. Ibid., 15.
18. Ibid., 15-16.
19. Ibid., 14.
20. Ibid., 14.
21. Ibid., 16.
22. As defined by the author, military hypermasculinity is a hybrid term from Hunter, Belkin, and Leatherman, which means personality traits, behavior, and beliefs associated with military personnel which exaggerates non-catastrophic masculinities and toughness, and deploys violence in order to maintain or reassert dominance and control in challenging or threatening circumstances.
23. George C. Marshall Foundation, accessed 1 November 2015, <http://marshallfoundation.org/blog/marshall-wacs-army-rangers/>.
24. Ibid.
25. Women's Army Corps Veterans Association, accessed on 3 November 2015, <http://armywomen.org/wacHistory.shtml>.
26. Joshua S. Goldstein, *War and Gender* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 283.

27. Ibid.
28. John Lehman, "Is Naval Aviation Culture Dead?", *Proceedings Magazine*, vol. 137/9/1,303 (September 2011), <http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2011-09/naval-aviationculture-dead>.
29. Within the fields of organizational behavior and leadership, the "dark side" measure that has received the most attention is the Hogan Development Survey (HDS).... The HDS assesses 11 subclinical traits each of which are theorized to have possible short-term advantages, but also long term detrimental effects on performance and leadership. P.D. Harms Leader Development and the Dark Side of Personality. As cited in P.D. Harms., et al., "Leader Development and the Dark Side of Personality," *Leadership Quarterly* (2011), doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.007, 2.
30. Sandra Whitworth, *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis*. (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2004), 172.
31. "Rethinking Manhood: An Interview with Ted Bunch," *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 67, no. 1 (Fall/Winter 2013), 219.
32. Dominic Parrott and Amos Zeichner, "Effects of Hypermasculinity on Physical Aggression Against Woman." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, vol. 4, no. 1 (2003), 71.
33. Cynthia Enloe, *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire Account* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2004), 5.
34. Whitworth, *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping*, 166.
35. Hunter, *Honor Betrayed*, 11.
36. Donald L. Mosher and Ronald Anderson, "Macho Personality, Sexual Aggression, and Reactions to Guided Imagery of Realistic Rape," *Journal of Research in Personality*, no. 20 (1986), 91.
37. Jay Peters, et al, "Development and Testing of a New Version of the Hypermasculinity Index," *Social Work Research*, vol. 31, no. 3 (September 2007), 172.
38. Parrott and Zeichner, "Effects of Hypermasculinity," 76.
39. Hunter, *Honor Betrayed*, 32.
40. Andrew Tilghman, "All Combat Jobs Open to Women in the Military," *MilitaryTimes* (3 December 2015), <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/pentagon/2015/12/03/carter-telling-military-open-all-combat-jobs-women/76720656/>.
41. DMDC Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program, "2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active Duty Members," Survey Note No. 2013-007 (15 March 2013), 52-53.
42. Parrott and Zeichner, "Effects of Hypermasculinity," 71.
43. DMDC, "2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey," 58-59.
44. Barrack Obama, (Remarks by President Obama and President Park of South Korea in a Joint Press Conference, 7 May 2013), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/07/remarks-president-obama-and-president-park-south-korea-joint-press-confe>.
45. Rosenthal and Korb, "Twice Betrayed, 8.
46. Andrew Morral, et al, "Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment in the U.S. Military: Highlights from the 2014 RAND Military Workplace Study," RAND Corporation, http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9841.html, 2.
47. Karen DeYoung, "Colin Powell Now Says Gays Should Be Able to Serve Openly in Military," <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2010/02/03/AR2010020302292.html>.

48. Carol Burke, *Camp All-American, Hanoi Jane, and The High-and-Tight: Gender, Folklore, and Changing Military Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004), 21.
49. DMDC, "2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey," 278.
50. Morral, et al, "Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment in the U.S. Military." 2.
51. The HMI is a "30-item forced-choice scale (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) measures the extent to which the respondent endorses an exaggerated masculine personality. Although this disposition is expected to relate to sexual aggression, it is also believed to reflect a man's tendency toward physical violence when he perceives a woman as a threat." As cited in Parrott and Zeichner, "Effects of Hypermasculinity," 72.
52. Morral, et al, "Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment in the U.S. Military." 2.
53. Eric Greenberg and Karl Weber, *Generation We: How Millennial Youth Are Taking Over American and Changing Our World Forever*, Emeryville, CA: Pachatusan (2008), 20-55.
54. Morral, et al, "Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment in the U.S. Military." 2.



Bibliography

- Belkin, Aaron. *Bring Me Men: Military Masculinity and the Benign Façade of American Empire, 1898-2001*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Burke, Carol. *Camp All-American, Hanoi Jane, and The High-and-Tight: Gender, Folklore, and Changing Military Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.
- Department of Defense Report to the President of the United States on SAPR. "Provisional Statistical Data on Sexual Assault Fiscal Year 2014."
- Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response. "Department of Defense Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military Fiscal Year 2014."
- DeYoung, Karen. "Colin Powell Now Says Gays Should Be Able to Serve Openly in Military." <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/03/AR2010020302292.html>.
- DMDC Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program. "2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active Duty Members." Survey Note No. 2013-007 (15 March 2013).
- Enloe, Cynthia., *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire Account*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2004.
- George C. Marshall Foundation. <http://marshallfoundation.org/blog/marshall-wacs-army-rangers/>.
- Greenberg, Eric and Karl Weber. *Generation We: How Millennial Youth Are Taking Over American and Changing Our World Forever*. Emeryville, CA: Pachatusan, 2008.
- Goldstein, Joshua S. *War and Gender*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Harms, P.D., et al., "Leader Development and the Dark Side of Personality." *Leadership Quarterly* (2011), doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.007.
- Healy, Melissa. "Pentagon Blasts Tailhook Probe, Two Admirals Resign." *Los Angeles Times*. <http://tech.mit.edu/V112/N44/tailhook.44w.html>.
- Hunter, Mic. *Honor Betrayed: Sexual Abuse in America's Military*. Fort Lee, NJ: Barricade Books, 2007.
- Leatherman, Janie L. *Sexual Violence and Armed Conflict*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2011.
- Lehman, John. "Is Naval Aviation Culture Dead?". *Proceedings Magazine*, vol. 137/9/1,303 (September 2011). <http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2011-09/naval-aviation-culture-dead>.
- Morrall, Andrew, et al. "Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment in the U.S. Military: Highlights from the 2014 RAND Military Workplace Study." RAND Corporation. http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9841.html.
- Mosher, Donald L. and Ronald Anderson. "Macho Personality, Sexual Aggression, and Reactions to Guided Imagery of Realistic Rape." *Journal of Research in Personality*, no. 20 (1986): 77-94.
- Newsweek Staff, "Tailhook: Scandal Time." *Newsweek* (5 July 1992). <http://www.newsweek.com/tailhook-scandal-time-200362>.
- Obama, Barack. (Remarks by President Obama and President Park of South Korea in a Joint Press Conference, 7 May 2013). <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/07/remarks-president-obama-and-president-park-south-korea-joint-press-conference>
- Ogden, Joslyn. "Tailhook '91 and the U.S. Navy." The Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University. <http://kenan.ethics.duke.edu/education/case-studies-in-ethics/institutions-in-crisis/>.

- Parrott, Dominic and Amos Zeichner. "Effects of Hypermasculinity on Physical Aggression Against Woman." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, vol. 4, no. 1 (2003): 70-78.
- Paula Coughlin's Resignation (Search Words). <http://articles.latimes.com/keyword/paula-coughlin>.
- Peters, Jay, et al. "Development and Testing of a New Version of the Hypermasculinity Index." *Social Work Research*, vol. 31, no. 3 (September 2007): 171-182.
- Public Broadcasting System Frontline. "Punishment After Tailhook '91: The Navy Blues." <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/navy/tailhook/disc.html>.
- "Rethinking Manhood: An Interview with Ted Bunch." *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 67, no. 1 (Fall/Winter 2013): 217-223.
- Retro Report. *Legacy of Tailhook*, New York Times Video (13 May 2013). <http://www.nytimes.com/video/booming/100000002219816/the-legacy-of-tailhook.html?action=click&contentCollection=booming&module=lede®ion=caption&pgtype=article>.
- Rosenthal, Lindsay, and Lawrence Korb. "Twice Betrayed: Bringing Justice to the U.S. Military's Sexual Assault Problem." Center for American Progress, November 2013.
- Tilghman, Andrew. "All Combat Jobs Open to Women in the Military. *MilitaryTimes*. 3 December 2015. <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/pentagon/2015/12/03/carter-telling-military-open-all-combat-jobs-women/76720656/>.
- Whitworth, Sandra. *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2004.
- Women's Army Corps Veterans' Association. <http://armywomen.org/wacHistory.shtml>.

