

**REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

*Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188*

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the Department of Defense, Executive Service Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.**

<b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b> 27042016		<b>2. REPORT TYPE</b> Master's of Military Studies		<b>3. DATES COVERED (From - To)</b> SEP 2015 - APR 2016	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> Social Deceit: The U.S. Military and Social Paternalism				<b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b> N/A	
				<b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b> N/A	
				<b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b> N/A	
				<b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b> N/A	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Durning, Andrew, M. Major, USMC				<b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b> N/A	
				<b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b> N/A	
				<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b> N/A	
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> USMC Command and Staff College Marine Corps University 2076 South Street Quantico, VA 22134-5068				<b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b> Dr. Paul Gelpi	
<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>				<b>11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)</b> N/A	
				<b>12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> Approved for public release, distribution unlimited	
<b>13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b>					
<b>14. ABSTRACT</b> Through social paternalism, progressives within the Federal government have sought to transform U.S. military culture to reform American culture writ large. As a national institution borne of the society it serves, the military has not been insulated from the social evolution of the nation. Just as society and the values, mores, and taboos it espouses are not static, neither too is the military that society employs to serve and protect it. The case examples of racial desegregation, gender and sexual orientation equality, and environmental activism this study offers are but a few social issues in which the military has been or is being used as a sounding board to drive sweeping national paternalistic agendas. The purpose of contextually identifying these cases is neither to champion nor admonish their effects as prognostications for national social reforms. Rather, the purpose is to examine the impact social activism places on the civil-military relationship and test former Secretary of the Navy Richard Danzig's thesis that "... the military itself shouldn't be a driver...but a follower of the consensus of society."					
<b>15. SUBJECT TERMS</b> Civil-military relationship; paternalism, social activism; social contract					
<b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b>			<b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b> UU	<b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 35	<b>19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b> USMC Command and Staff College
<b>a. REPORT</b> Unclass	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b> Unclass	<b>c. THIS PAGE</b> Unclass			<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)</b> (703) 784-3330

United States Marine Corps  
Command and Staff College  
Marine Corps University  
2076 South Street  
Marine Corps Combat Development Command  
Quantico, Virginia 22134-5068

MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES

---

---

**TITLE:**

*Social Deceit: The U.S. Military and Social Paternalism*

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES

**AUTHOR:**

Durning, Andrew M.

AY 15-16

---

---

Mentor and Oral Defense Committee Member: Dr. Paul Gelpi

Approved: 

Date: 25 APRIL 2016

Oral Defense Committee Member: Dr. Bradford Wineman

Approved: 

Date: 25 Apr 2016

## Executive Summary

**Title:** Social Deceit: The U.S. Military and Social Paternalism

**Author:** Major Andrew Durning, United States Marine Corps

**Thesis:** Through social paternalism, progressives within the Federal government have sought to transform U.S. military culture to reform American culture writ large.

**Discussion:** Over the course of the twentieth century and into this new century the unremitting social issue in American society has been civil rights. From women's suffrage to racial desegregation to normalization of homosexuality, social activists through lobbying by special interest groups have endeavored to shape and accelerate the transformation of the social contract through the coercive force of government rather than through consensus as envisaged by the founding fathers. As a national institution borne of the society it serves, the military has not been insulated from the social evolution of the nation. Just as society and the values, mores, and taboos it espouses are not static, neither too is the military that society employs to serve and protect it. The case examples of racial desegregation, gender and sexual orientation equality, and environmental activism this study offers are but a few social issues in which the military has been or is being used as a sounding board to drive sweeping national paternalistic agendas. The purpose of contextually identifying these cases is neither to champion nor admonish their effects as prognostications for national social reforms. Rather, the purpose is to examine the impact social activism places on the civil-military relationship and test former Secretary of the Navy Richard Danzig's thesis that "...the military itself shouldn't be a driver...but a follower of the consensus of society." Notwithstanding perils imposed on the military's functional imperative, transformation of American military culture is not an end but rather a means by which progressives, through piecemeal social engineering, hope to recast American social psychology writ large. By virtue of military subordination to policy makers, the military demographic, and the people's iron clad trust in its military, coercive transformation of the military produces an army of passive and silenced ambassadors through which social contagion accelerates the implantation of new normative social standards. The cases of military piecemeal social engineering this study outlines were and are naturally evolving social issues that if left to mature through consensus, would strengthen social harmony and not engender a civil-military gap.

**Conclusion:** The coercive use of the nation's most trusted institution as a vehicle to impose normative social change is a breach in trust amongst the actors within civil-military relationship and a breach of the American social contract. Herein lies the problem; paternalist interventions undermine the social contract that the Constitution codifies by law and that the military is oath-bound to protect and defend; consequentially, national security is put at risk.

## DISCLAIMER

THE OPINIONS AND CONCLUSIONS EXPRESSED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF EITHER THE MARINE CORPS COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE OR ANY OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY. REFERENCES TO THIS STUDY SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOREGOING STATEMENT.

QUOTATION FROM, ABSTRACTION FROM, OR REPRODUCTION OF ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DOCUMENT IS PERMITTED PROVIDED PROPER ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IS MADE.

*Table of Contents*

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMERY.....	ii
DISCLAIMER .....	iii
PREFACE.....	v
INTRODUCTION .....	1
AGENTS OF TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE.....	2
SENTINALS OR PRAETORIANS.....	9
PERILS OF PATERNALISM .....	13
CONCLUSION.....	22
NOTES.....	23
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	31

## *Preface*

My interest in the discussion of civil-military relations as it relates to the American social contract stems from my chosen profession as a Marine Corps officer, my love of history, and my deep loyalty to the Constitution and our nation's founding principles. As our country drifts further and further away from our founding principles and towards European-style socialism, the freedoms and liberties codified by the Constitution can and will be lost. As a Marine I am supremely confident we can withstand an attack from any foreign power. As an American, husband, and father, I am anxious about our nation's future by threats from within as echoed by Abraham Lincoln who stated "America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroyed ourselves."

I would like to acknowledge and thank my best friend and wife, April, for her keeping me honest and true to the principles we share and for her keeping me on task. I also want to acknowledge Dr. Paul Gelpi for the intellectual license he granted me to pursue this topic in a way of my own choosing, and Dr. Bradford Wineman for his informative instruction on civil-military relations.

*Of all tyrannies, a tyranny exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end, for they do so with the approval of their consciences.*

-- C. S. Lewis

The purpose of government is to provide for the common defense, or as President Ronald Reagan famously put it, "Government's first duty is to protect the people, not run their lives."<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding a panoply of alphabet soup government agencies that share in the collective effort toward performing that first duty, the United States military, comprised of the armed services, serves the principle task of protecting America's vital interests.<sup>2</sup> The linkage that binds the triad of actors, the people, the government, and the military in achieving the common defense is the civil-military relationship.<sup>3</sup> Not unlike most relationships, the indispensable element of this tripartite civil-military relationship is trust. When one actor within the civil-military relationship violates that sacred trust, the nation as a whole is put at risk.

Through social paternalism, progressives within the Federal government have sought to transform U.S. military culture to reform American culture writ large. The ends of this agenda are control, which equates to autocratic dominion over all aspects of American society. The ways are progressivism, essentially, the transformation of American society to reflect the progressive world view through regulation and legislation. The means are paternalism, or otherwise, enacting policy that slowly erodes traditional American norms, values, and institutions to shape and create a malleable society indifferent to the implantation of a new progressive social identity.

By using case examples, this study will illustrate that first, social activism within the Department of Defense (DOD) has and does occur. Second, the DOD is, and has been, used as an agent for social change to transform American society beyond the extant social consensus to achieve paternalist agendas. Lastly, in doing so, the American liberal republic is being transformed into a neo-feudal state in which the will and self-determination of the people is dictated rather than derived. The case examples of racial desegregation, gender and sexual orientation equality, and environmental activism are but a few social issues in which the military has been or is being used as a sounding board to drive sweeping national paternalistic agendas. The purpose of contextually identifying these cases is neither to champion nor admonish their effects as prognostications for national social reforms. Rather, the purpose is to examine the impact social activism places on the civil-military relationship and test former Secretary of the Navy Richard Danzig's thesis that "...the military itself shouldn't be a driver...but a follower of the consensus of society."<sup>4</sup> Examined in isolation, one could argue each case is the result of a natural evolving social anathema. However, taken as a whole, it is equally reasonable to conclude powerful forces outside of the military are engaged in piecemeal social engineering, nudging peripheral reforms to recast society.

### **Agents of transformative change**

Over the course of the twentieth century and into this new century the unremitting social issue in American society has been civil rights. From women's suffrage to racial desegregation to normalization of homosexuality, social activists through lobbying by special interest groups have endeavored to shape and accelerate the transformation of the social contract through the coercive force of government rather than through consensus as envisaged by the founding

fathers. As a national institution borne of the society it serves, the military has not been insulated from the social evolution of the nation. Just as society and the values, mores, and taboos it espouses are not static, neither too is the military that society employs to serve and protect it. Equally, as the demographic of the nation evolves, so too should the military demographic.

This section's intent is to highlight that either social reforms in the military preceded national reforms or the military was and is being used as the social change vanguard in concert with concurrent non-military paternalist reforms. Before making the case, a description of terminology is required. Broadly stated, *social activism* "is an intentional action with the goal of bringing about social change."<sup>5</sup> *Paternalism* is policy enacted by a person or entity of authority that restricts freedom of choice or action on a person or people subordinate to them in the subordinates' supposed best interest.<sup>6</sup> The term *Progressivism* is a misnomer. There are two forms of American Progressivism. The first, Classical Progressivism, was born at the turn of the twentieth century as a social and political movement to institute reforms to the labor and work environment at the height of American industrialization; the second, contemporary or "New Progressivism," is the co-opting of government to coerce incentive-based change to "social norms and social meanings in leading human behavior in welfare-promoting directions."<sup>7</sup> This study refers to the later form of progressivism, New Progressivism. The *Social Contract*, as envisaged by the founding fathers, is the agreement amongst society that the state exists to serve the will of the people, that the people are the source of all political power enjoyed by the state, and that the people can choose to give or withhold that power.<sup>8</sup> *Piecemeal Social Engineering*, a term coined by Karl Popper, refers to deliberate actions or reforms on the margins of a broad issue that collectively lead to a desired social outcome that if holistically acted on would likely

fail or lead to harm.<sup>9</sup> Popper argues that piecemeal social engineering is the gateway to social reforms.<sup>10</sup>

Following a chronology of social activism in the military, the first case deals with racial segregation. In 1913, President Woodrow Wilson mandated racial segregation for all federal agencies including the military.<sup>11</sup> On the eve of American entry into World War II the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940 barred discrimination of selectees for enlistment on the basis of race or color but left final enlistment authority with the services.<sup>12</sup> Because much of the nation was segregated under the Jim Crow laws, the Army maintained segregation to avoid being a laboratory for social engineering.<sup>13</sup> Despite 1.2 million African Americans having served in every theater of World War II, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt did not end the practice.<sup>14</sup> Stephen Ambrose succinctly captures the irony of American military segregation during World War II, writing, “The world’s greatest democracy fought the world’s greatest racist with a segregated army.”<sup>15</sup> Not until 1948, after FDR’s death and the war over, was segregation in the armed services abolished with President Harry S. Truman’s Executive Order 9981.<sup>16</sup> In it, the Order mandated “equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.”<sup>17</sup>

Desegregation of the military was not immediate despite Truman’s Order. Even as blacks accounted for 25 percent of all new recruits during the Korean War, all black units were not abolished until 1954.<sup>18</sup> Preceding and throughout World War II and the Korean War, considerable pressure was brought to bear by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to lift segregation in the military and society writ large through marches, protests, sit-ins, and law suits.<sup>19</sup> Sixteen years later, following a movement that

witnessed great social and political turmoil, the 1964 Civil Rights Act did by law for the nation what Truman decreed through executive order for the military.<sup>20</sup>

Even as the racial barrier was removed, full integration of women in the armed services remains. For injuries sustained while defending Fort Mifflin in 1776, during the American Revolution, Margaret Cochran Corbin became the first woman among thousands yet unborn to receive a military pension for service to her nation.<sup>21</sup> Fast-forward to the present, in December 2015, Secretary of Defense Ashton B. Carter ordered all military services to open all combat occupations to women.<sup>22</sup> Throughout the intervening 239 years, women have served in varying capacities in every major military conflict and lost their lives alongside their brethren in arms. Before the creation of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901, women served as civil servants undertaking primarily clerical and medical duties. Although The Army Reorganization Act of 1901 did not authorize nurses to be commissioned as officers, it did make nurses a permanent corps in the regular army in which over 20,000 Registered Nurses were recruited to serve during World War I.<sup>23</sup> Despite broad public and military establishment opposition to female enlistment outside of the Army Nurse Corps, the immense manpower demands of World War II that transformed the national character in all labor sectors had equal effect on the military. In 1942, women were permitted to join the Naval Reserve, and the Women's Army Auxiliary was formed.<sup>24</sup> In 1943, Congress enacted the Marine Corps Women's Reserve and established the Women's Army Corps.<sup>25</sup>

After the war in 1948, Congress made permanent female military service through the Women's Armed Services Integration Act with the following prohibitions: women in service could not exceed two percent of the enlisted force or ten percent of the Officer Corps and women

were prohibited from duty aboard aircraft or vessels likely to engage in combat.<sup>26</sup> In the decades since, Congress has passed a series of legislation expanding the role women in the military. In the mid-70's, pilot training for women was opened.<sup>27</sup> In 1988, under the "Risk Rule" all non-combat related specialty occupations were opened to women.<sup>28</sup> In 1991, prohibitions of women serving aboard combat vessels was lifted excluding submarines.<sup>29</sup> The submarine exception was lifted in 2011.<sup>30</sup>

How Congress reacts to Secretary Carter's order to open all military occupations to women, including the infantry, remains unclear. However, for the many lobbying organizations that pressured the military and Congress over the decades, Secretary Carter's order is a huge symbolic victory even if women do not overwhelmingly choose to serve in combat arms. Among these are the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), established in 1951, the Nation Organization of Women (NOW), established in 1966, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and the Service Women's Action Network (SWAN) whose stated mission is to "transform military culture."<sup>31</sup> This last prohibition on women in service now seemingly removed is a huge victory for supporters of the pan-gender movement whose goal is to strip all vestiges of gender identity from the American psyche. Indeed, on January 1<sup>st</sup> 2016, Secretary of the Navy Raymond E. Mabus, Jr. ordered the Marine Corps to implement gender integration of Marine Corps enlisted recruit training and officer candidate training as well as ensure all military occupation titles such as "infantryman" or "rifleman" incorporate what is known as "preferred gender pronouns" as part of this gender integration initiative.<sup>32</sup>

Inclusive to both genders and all races is the issue of homosexuality in the military. Longstanding military tradition and the Uniform Code of Military Justice forbade homosexual conduct to which such acts served as grounds for military discharge. In 1992, as a campaign promise, then presidential candidate Bill Clinton promised to lift the ban on homosexuality in the military.<sup>33</sup> Once elected and as a compromise with Congress, President Clinton announced his “don’t ask don’t tell” (DADT) policy in 1993.<sup>34</sup> The new policy did not lift the ban on homosexuality but rather banned questioning a service member’s sexual orientation and lifted the requirement for a service member to self-identify or incriminate oneself.<sup>35</sup> While DADT mandated the military to institutionally turn a blind eye, it made no provision for same-sex marriage or same-sex partner military related benefits. In 1996, Congress passed and President Clinton signed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA).<sup>36</sup> Title 10, United States Code required separation of same-sex partners and DOMA prohibited federal recognition of same-sex marriage and forbade extending military/federal benefits to same-sex partners.<sup>37</sup>

In September 2011, President Obama announced the repeal of DADT and lifting the prohibition of homosexuality in the Armed Services.<sup>38</sup> In a 5-4 ruling, the Supreme Court legalized same-sex marriage in June 2015, in spite of the DOMA law and fourteen States with constitution prohibitions on same-sex marriage.<sup>39</sup> A coordinated and sustained lobbying effort from groups like the Human Rights Campaign, Allegiance Strategies, American Unity Fund, Log Cabin Republicans, and Project Right Side pressured state and federal lawmakers on both sides of the isle.<sup>40</sup> The current item on the military social docket is transgender service. In July 2015, the Secretary of Defense announced a DOD working group to study the implications of openly transgender persons serving in the military with a starting presumption that “transgender persons can serve openly without adverse impact on military effectiveness and readiness.”<sup>41</sup>

Unrelated to “who serves” in the military but of equal significance in terms of social activism in the military is the environmental or green initiative. Despite massive defense spending cuts imposed by the Budget Control Act of 2011, consisting of a \$1 trillion reduction over a 10-year period and substantial troop end-strength reductions, a costly alternative fuels agenda is under way in the Defense Department.<sup>42</sup> At a cost of \$149 per gallon, algal oil biofuel purchased by the DOD from Solazyme is forty-four times as expensive as regular petroleum that from 2007 to 2014 averaged \$3.35 per gallon or 32 million gallons purchased by the DOD for \$107.2 billion.<sup>43</sup> Although Rand Corporation, commissioned by the Pentagon in 2011, concluded that alternatives fuels would provide no direct benefit to the DOD, and support from Congress stalled, the military has continued to pursue an alternative energy agenda “with encouragement from the White House.”<sup>44</sup> One could conclude the DOD has adopted this green agenda regardless of its immense cost and lack of benefit in order to curry favor with industry and political elites. By pushing a green agenda to artificially inflate alternate fuel consumption, political elites garner favor amongst political donors and lobby groups. In exchange, the DOD retains or gains appropriations for large defense programs.

By 2016, the Navy plans to deploy a “Great Green Fleet” Strike Group using only alternative fuel blends and has a stated goal of 50 percent total energy consumption from alternative fuels by 2020.<sup>45</sup> The Army’s stated alternative fuel goal is 25 percent for tactical consumption and 50 percent for training consumption by 2028, compared with the Air Force’s alternative fuel goal of 50 percent of domestic aviation fuel by 2016.<sup>46</sup> Put into context, experts expect that not until 2035, through an aggressive program, will biofuels contribute to more than a meager 1.6 million barrels, less than 20 percent, of the 20 million barrels Americans consume daily.<sup>47</sup> The alternative energy market holds tremendous sway with over 170 alternative energy

lobby groups and is just one arm of the larger climate change lobby which according to the Center for Public Integrity numbers 1,160 businesses and lobby groups weighing in on climate legislation.<sup>48</sup>

### **Sentinels or Praetorians**

If one accepts that social activism has and does occur within the military, then it begs the question why the military? The answer is simple, paternalist interventions in the military serve a broader progressive social agenda in American society and because those in power who wish to coerce the military can; “traditional paternalism is coercive.”<sup>49</sup> Reshaping military culture is not the “ends” but rather a “means” for the following reasons: First, the DOD is the largest federal agency and by virtue of its institutional structure, is the most susceptible to coercive political influences.<sup>50</sup> Second, from Private to General, enlisted or commissioned, heralding from backwater town to thriving metropolis, the men and woman of the armed services are the purest cross-section of American society under which federal authority enjoys a monopoly of power.<sup>51</sup> Third, the U.S. military is the most trusted American institution.<sup>52</sup> Lastly, in one form or another, the military touches nearly every American. Through the transformation of the military, the state advances the formation, implantation and acceptance of new normative social, moral, and behavioral standards.<sup>53</sup>

In order to understand the motif for coercive use of the military as an agent of social change, the nature of the civil-military relationship and a profile of “who serves in the military” must be understood. Although ambiguously inferred by the U.S. Constitution, the military is subordinate to civil authority.<sup>54</sup> That civil authority enjoys autocratic dominion over the military in the form of the President as Commander-in-Chief and the Congress who are charged with

maintaining the armed forces. In this relationship, the military implements national policy in accordance with the law; it does not formulate national policy.<sup>55</sup> The third dimension to this civil-military relationship is the people, who elect the government that makes the policy and from whom fill the ranks of the military.

Over the course of three centuries, since the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, this triad of subordination – the military to the government, the government to the people, and the people to the law - has produced the wealthiest, strongest, and most stable societies.<sup>56</sup> In western societies generally, and in the United States specifically, large standing militaries have been viewed as perilous to liberty, not merely due to cost but due to the threat a large standing military can impose on a government or a government against the people through military force.<sup>57</sup> From her founding until post World War II, the United States maintained a paltry peacetime military interrupted by episodes of mobilization and demobilization.<sup>58</sup> Presently, comprised of over 1.3 million on active duty, 826,000 in the National Guard and Reserve, and over 742,000 civilians, the Defense Department is the nation's largest employer.<sup>59</sup> Put into context, the DOD employs more men and women than the combined populations of Rhode Island, New Hampshire and Vermont.<sup>60</sup> By familial relations, an additional 3 million spouses, children and adult dependents of service members contribute to a large and irresistible population pool over which the federal government enjoys enormous sway.<sup>61</sup>

In a broad sense, the military is a microcosm of American society. The men and women of the armed services herald from all 50 states and territories. They are a plurality of all races, religions, and ethnic backgrounds that form the dynamism of the United States. However, the nature of military service produces a divergent population among the armed services from that of

a truly representative American demographic. Per an exhaustive 2013 demographic profile of the military community, men constitute 84 percent of the total force, while women have steadily constituted 16 percent of the total force since 2000 at varying ratios among the military branches.<sup>62</sup> While the majority who serve are white men and women, constituting 70 percent of the total force, white Americans are underrepresented in the military compared to the national population average of 78 percent.<sup>63</sup> Black or African American service members are the largest minority group constituting 16.8 percent of the total force and are an over representation of the national population average of 13.2 percent.<sup>64</sup> The “Millennials” generation, Americans aged 18-24, constitute 48.8 percent of the total force and vastly over represent the national population average of 9.9 percent.<sup>65</sup> Although a bit nebulous because the military maintains minimum educational entry requirements, nearly the whole of the total force has a high school diploma or GED equivalent with 20 percent of enlisted and 80 percent of officers having earned a bachelors or advanced degrees compared to the national population average of 86 percent with high school diploma or GED equivalent and 28.8 percent with a bachelor’s degree of higher.<sup>66</sup> Finally, in drawing a holistic comparison, “only 3 out of every 10 young Americans (17-24 years old) meet the medical, educational, and moral standards of the U.S. military.”<sup>67</sup>

If the aim is to nudge American society toward achieving a progressive agenda then it makes strategic sense to use a trusted agent as a vanguard to advance paternalist schemes. According to Gallop polling, the U.S. military ranks first among all American institutions in terms of the public trust since the mid-1980s.<sup>68</sup> By comparison, the Congress ranks last with only 8 percent of respondents stating that they have a “great deal” or “a lot of” trust in Congress.<sup>69</sup> This delta in trust among the people for their military as opposed to policy makers lends credence to Popper’s piecemeal social engineering theory and explains why practitioners of

paternalism seek transformative social change on the margins – use the military - rather than pursuing a direct approach – passing sweeping laws. Variables to this hypothesis are the appetite to expend political capital, political audacity, and the time-horizon of strategic patience or lack thereof.

Either by immediate or distant family relation, at present or from generations past, the American people have personal ties to the military. Among the baby boomer generation, 3 out of 4 have had immediate family members serve in uniform.<sup>70</sup> For millennials, those born after 1980, 1 in 3 is closely related to a service member.<sup>71</sup> Indeed, there are over 21 million veterans among the U.S. population today.<sup>72</sup> While it has not always been so, American admiration for its service members today is unequalled by any other segment of the population.<sup>73</sup> It is for precisely that reason that dictating cultural transformations in the military can have a far reaching “social contagion effect” or transmission of new social norms toward nudging American society in step with the progressive’s social agenda.<sup>74</sup>

The danger of paternalist interventions in the military is that they exacerbate the tension between the military’s functional imperative – success on the battlefield – and civilian elite’s cultural imperative – a belief that the military should look like American society as a whole.<sup>75</sup> Some theorists proffer a zero sum game, that “failure to maintain a representative military threatens the legitimacy and credibility of a democratic political system.”<sup>76</sup> Others like Thomas Owens suggest that any gap that exists between the military and society is not one of divergent social values but one of functional imperatives; the military cannot govern itself in conformity with the principles of a liberal society.<sup>77</sup> Owens cites Army General “Dutch” Kerwin to buttress that argument when he states, “The values necessary to defend [liberal] society are often at odds

with the values of the society itself. To be an effective servant of the people the [military] must concentrate not on the values of liberal society, but on the hard values of the battlefield.”<sup>78</sup>

Notwithstanding perils imposed on the military’s functional imperative, transformation of American military culture is not an end but rather a means by which progressives, through piecemeal social engineering, hope to recast American social psychology writ large. By virtue of military subordination to policy makers, the military demographic, and the people’s iron clad trust in its military, coercive transformation of the military produces an army of passive and silenced ambassadors through which social contagion accelerates the implantation of new normative social standards.

### **Perils of paternalism**

This study recognizes that not all paternalist schemes are equal; paternalism can be instituted to elicit positive effects such as levying higher taxes on products like cigarettes and alcohol to make their consumption and abuse prohibitive. However, this study is focused on subversive paternalism enacted to promote unstated agendas. While the preponderance of literature on the civil-military relationship in the U.S. centers on military subordination to civil authority and safeguards to prevent undue military influence on the nation, is it within the government’s preview to use the military as a proxy to engineer national social change?<sup>79</sup> This section argues that the paternalist tactics being employed on the military to shape the American psyche will transform American social liberal democracy into a form of what demographer Joel Kotkin coined as “neo-feudalism.” For Kotkin, America is becoming an oligarchy in which the new Oligarchs are the social and wealthy elites; the new Clerisy are government regulators and technocrats; the new Yeomanry is the shrinking middle class and entrepreneurs; and the new

Serfs are the day laborers, working poor, and government dependents.<sup>80</sup> When the military and the working-class American people, the new yeomanry and serfs, become conscious of the paternalists' design, that awareness will fundamentally alter the civil-military relationship in the United States and put in jeopardy government's first duty.

When Thomas Jefferson penned *The Declaration of Independence* he framed the universal role of government as being instituted by the people and deriving its just powers from the consent of the people in order to secure the people's unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.<sup>81</sup> Even while government's first duty is to protect the people, as President Ronald Reagan put it, as a liberal republic codified in law, the role of the United States government is to protect the people from the coercive nature of government itself. George Washington understood that coercive nature when he stated "Government is not reason; it is not eloquent; it is force. Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."<sup>82</sup> John Locke, in his *Letter Concerning Toleration*, rebuked the coercive nature of government and that it should never be used to shape beliefs.<sup>83</sup> If these truths are indeed "self-evident," then paternalism on its face is a destructive form of government and an anathema to a free society. Paternalism is an affront to the principle of self-determination, a fundamental principle of human rights law in which a peoples is free to pursue their own social and cultural norms.<sup>84</sup> Subversive use of an all-volunteer military to enact piecemeal social engineering on a free people is a violation of existentialism's core principle of human choice and is a practice of a government more akin to neo-feudalism than a liberal republic.<sup>85</sup>

If paternalism is inconsistent with the fundamental underpinnings of self-governance and a liberal republic, what then are the motifs of its practitioners? Perhaps the most well-known

contemporary advocate of paternalism is Cass Sunstein, co-author of *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*, and the Obama administration's "Information Czar," appointed to run the White House's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.<sup>86</sup> In *Nudge*, Sunstein and behavioral economist Richard H. Thaler reject the principle tenant of the rational actor model, that people make rational decisions, and instead argue that people make biased and irrational decisions that are predictable and that can be swayed by changing social environments.<sup>87</sup> Sunstein advocates using "libertarian paternalism" to shape social consciousness in order to "cognitively infiltrate" penchants of choice.<sup>88</sup> Sunstein and Thaler do not argue for the removal of individual choice but rather, through social framing, offer only one choice that varies only by degree of efficacy.<sup>89</sup> Social acceptance from a plurality of choices to unitary choice is achieved by Popper's piecemeal social engineering, or through what UCLA's School of Law Eugene Volokh observes as small change-tolerance; people tolerate what is perceived as relatively small changes to the status quo.<sup>90</sup> The desired effect is that people alter their behavior or accept new norms through "a gradual expansion of paternalistic interventions that started small."<sup>91</sup>

As liberal democracies increasingly become welfare states, the burden of the human condition is placing unsustainable fiscal strain on local and federal budgets. As such, governments are increasingly adopting paternalist policies to alter or shape the behavior of it's citizenry by restricting choice for their "own good."<sup>92</sup> With a global economy in the midst of the information age, paternalists see government intervention in the domain of human choice as a *fait accompli* and have "framed the debate as being not whether there should be paternalism, but how much."<sup>93</sup> Political philosopher, Robert Goodin, argues that government should only intervene in private choice when it is convinced that a person is acting on preferences that are not

“relevant preferences” or “preferred preferences.”<sup>94</sup> Professor of Social Policy, Julian Le Grand argues that because people are myopic or short-sighted and people’s preferences can change over time, paternalist choice intervention is justifiable.<sup>95</sup> Indeed, from the perspective of its advocates, paternalism is not rooted in the abolition of choice, but rather the arbitration of whom chooses, policy makers or the people.<sup>96</sup> In the cases of paternalist interventions in the military identified earlier, those were enacted by executive fiat through regulation because the executive enjoys a near-monopoly of power over the military. In doing so, the paternalist is able advance social framing of “preferred preferences” on the broader society, where the paternalist does not enjoy a monopoly of power, though change-tolerance and social contagion affect.

If paternalists know what is best for society, why then must they employ piecemeal social engineering, as Popper suggests, to achieve the social reforms they seek? For social liberal democracies generally, and a liberal republic, such as the United States, especially, paternalism is an affront to the notion of self-determination, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of association, and freedom of choice generally. Paternalism or “government as by a father over his children,” fundamentally reverses the role of subordination between the governed and the governing; an askew from Abraham Lincoln’s *Gettysburg Address*, “government of the people, by the people, and for the people.”<sup>97</sup> Paternalism is problematic because it supposes benevolence on the part of government and ignorance or willful indifference on the part of the people.<sup>98</sup>

Prophetic of Volokh’s small change tolerance theory, Alexander de Tocqueville in describing the form of tyranny and despotism that would befall the United States in his four-volume *Democracy in America* writes:

After having thus taken each individual one by one into its powerful hands, and having molded him as it pleases, the sovereign power extends its arms over the entire society; it

covers the surface of society with a network of small, complicated, minute, and uniform rules, which the most original minds and the most vigorous souls cannot break through to go beyond the crowd; it does not break wills, but it softens them, bends them and directs them; it rarely forces action, but it constantly opposes your acting; it does not destroy, it prevents birth; it does not tyrannize, it hinders, it represses, it enervates, it extinguishes, it stupefies, and finally it reduces each nation to being nothing more than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd.

I have always believed that this sort of servitude, regulated, mild and peaceful, of which I have just done the portrait, could be combined better than we imagine with some of the external forms of liberty, and that it would not be impossible for it to be established in the very shadow of the sovereignty of the people.<sup>99</sup>

Notwithstanding an assault on personal autonomy, State paternalism is offensive because it is a blunt object; it assumes a universal pretext in a pluralistic society.<sup>100</sup> Political scientist, James Scott makes the case that paternalism and lesser forms of state intervention fail because they apply mandated social solutions to imagined social problems.<sup>101</sup> In the case of racial segregation, women's equality and the acceptance of open homosexuality, the paternalist falsely assumes a static society whereby only through intervention can social change occur. Paternalism fails because it is subversive, and by its very nature it seeks to do in the shadows of obfuscation what it could never achieve in the light of public discourse and therefore lacks legitimacy.<sup>102</sup> Because culture is the evolution of consensus, State sponsored piecemeal social engineering to advance a progressive agenda is a deontological anathema to the notion of the rule of law. Law is debated; law is legislated; law is funded; law is not immutable.<sup>103</sup> In two of the cases presented, gender and sexual orientation equality, social change in the military was achieved by *de jure* requirements but only after *de facto* acceptance. In the case of racial desegregation, social change in the military was an *ipso facto* requirement pursuant to the fourteen Amendment of the Constitution. Like much of the federal green initiative, acceptance will be promulgated through *de jure* requirement.

If paternalism is an affront to the “American way,” is it compatible within the civil-military paradigm? Over the course of the past half century, numerous scholars, from Samuel Huntington and Morris Janowitz to Peter Feaver and Russel Weigley have described an emerging rift or gap in the civil-military relationship, most notably between the military and its civilian overlords. Weigley argues, that except in times of national peril, where civil-military harmony is most acute, the military has increasingly adopted an “Uptonian contempt...for civilian’s judgements on military affairs.”<sup>104</sup> The Uptonian school of thought, named after military reformer Emory Upton, was that “all the defects of the American military system rested upon a fundamental, underlying flaw, excessive civilian control of the military.”<sup>105</sup> Weigley charges that the military has increasingly adopted an institutional attitude of ethical superiority compared to the civilian sector and a penchant for entering the public debate, which undermines “the constitutional principle of civilian control.”<sup>106</sup> If Weigley’s assertions are correct, what then could portend by paternalist interventions that thrust the military into the public debate of social normative formation? If on the one hand an assertive military in the social public sphere poses a grave threat to civilian control, would not the coercive use of the military as a catalyst for social contagion pose an equal threat to the tripartite civil-military relationship?

In Samuel Huntington’s seminal work, *The Soldier and the State*, he argues “objective civilian control” of the military ensures both military subordination to civil authority and a military capable of protecting the nation.<sup>107</sup> For Huntington, the key to “objective civilian control” is military professionalism buttressed by institutional autonomy.<sup>108</sup> Huntington argues that military autonomy leads to military professionalism which neutralizes the military politically. As such, meddling in military affairs undermines professionalism which in turn undermines civilian control.<sup>109</sup> In interpreting Clausewitz, Huntington observes “The fact that

war has its own grammar requires that the military professionals be permitted to develop their own expertise at this grammar without extraneous influence...The inherent quality of a military body can only be evaluated in terms of independent military standards.”<sup>110</sup> Because paternalism shackles autonomy for a person’s or institution’s supposed best interest, paternalism is an anathema to Huntington’s “objective civilian control” theorem. As the military loses its autonomy, it will increasingly become less professional, and in turn less subordinate to civil authority.

In contrast, Morris Janowitz proffers the increasing politicization of the military is because of the military’s evolving role as the dominating visible arm of American national power and because of the changing character of the use of force: “the military establishment becomes a constabulary force when it is continuously prepared to act, committed to the minimum use of force, and seeks viable international relations, rather than victory...”<sup>111</sup> While Janowitz contends that politicization of the military poses inherent risk to subordination generally, the uniformed military subordinates itself “because of law, tradition, and professionalism, and because of his integration with civil values and institutions.”<sup>112</sup> In this sense, the military is the perfect vessel for imposing normative social change on the body politic. The paternalist calculates that while using the military to nudge society to accept a new social agenda may strain the civil military relationship, it will not tip the scales of subordination nor threaten national security.

Having contrasted the views of the leading scholars in the field of civil-military relations, what then can be deduced as the root cause of this supposed gap or rift in the civil-military paradigm? Is it due to Uptonian contempt on the part of the military as Weigley argues? Is it a consequence of restrained military autonomy by civilian policy makers as Huntington theorized

or increasing military politicization as Janowitz charges? This study argues that the “gap” Weigley and Janowitz describe are merely symptoms of the Huntington theorem, that his theorem applies not just to the military but to the third sphere of the civil-military relationship, the people, and that the true nature of the civil-military gap is eroding trust.

In citing Don Snider, Thomas Owens, author of *US Civil-Military Relations Post 9/11: Renegotiating the Civil-Military Bargain*, outlines three trust relationships that operate on a continuum of trust ranging from “fully trusted” to “not trustworthy.” The first trust relationship is between the military and the people; second, the military and the people’s elected representatives, both legislative and executive; third, between the military elites and their subordinates.<sup>113</sup> Despite good intentions and even the justness of their designs, paternalists use of the military as a agent to implant or accelerate new normative values on society erodes the trust between the people and the military, between the military and the civilian elites and by extension the people whom elected them, and finally between military subordinates and their superiors. Succinctly put, “Undermining the confidence of the military as an institution in their own uniformed leadership gives rise to “toxic” civil-military relations.”<sup>114</sup>

While the military is a servant, it must be given the autonomy to master its directed domain. Even if following Clausewitz’s central dictum “that the military is an instrument of policy,” the military institution should not be a form of policy.<sup>115</sup> If political meddling, as Huntington describes, is allowed to erode the military’s autonomy, then military professionalism will likewise erode and engender a fissure or gap in civil-military relations as both Weigley and Janowitz described.<sup>116</sup>

Because piecemeal social engineering amongst the military is merely the paternalist's means and not the paternalist's ends, that fissure will transcend the military domain into the people's domain. By using the military to ripen the public sphere for radical social change, the paternalist is poisoning the civil-military tripartite well of trust.<sup>117</sup> Once the paternalist's deeds and intent are revealed, it produces a moral hazard.<sup>118</sup> If the military and the people become self-aware that their beliefs and values are chosen for them, that social norms and mores are decreed and not decided, then the very essence of a free society, public consent to be governed and willful military subordination could be jeopardized.

Utilitarian philosopher, John Stuart Mill captures the moral hazard of paternalism in his seminal treatise, *On Liberty*. Mill recognizes that individuals' best know their own interests and how to achieve them and that state intervention in choice autonomy undermines people's ability to learn from their mistakes and develop as morally responsible citizens.<sup>119</sup> In *On Liberty*, Mill writes:

The only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it. Each is the proper guardian of his own health, whether bodily, or mental or spiritual. Mankind are greater gainers by suffering each other to live as seems good to themselves, than by compelling each to live as seems good to the rest.<sup>120</sup>

Paternalist interventions in military culture are dangerous because they are myopic; they seek to impose social norms without accounting for the long term affects; and they mandate social solutions to imagined social problems as James Scott noted.<sup>121</sup> The cases of military piecemeal social engineering this study outlined were and are naturally evolving social issues that if left to mature through consensus, as Mill suggested, would strengthen social harmony and not engender a civil-military gap as Huntington theorized.<sup>122</sup>

## **Conclusion**

For progressives who believe their political ideology is the way, and that the ends of amassing autocratic power justify the means of enacting paternalist interventions to shape and create a malleable society, it is done so at the peril of the nation. As a state institution, the military establishment should reflect the values of the people and society it is oath-bound to protect. Deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed, the policies espoused by the state should be reflective of the society it governs. American social culture, the “American way,” is decided not decreed. The coercive use of the nation’s most trusted institution as a vehicle to impose normative social change is a breach in trust amongst the actors within civil-military relationship and a breach of the American social contract. Paternalist interventions fundamentally transform the social structure of a free society into neo-feudalism and a free people into political serfs. Herein lies the problem; paternalist interventions undermine the social contract that the Constitution codifies by law and that the military is oath-bound to protect and defend; consequentially, national security is put at risk.

## Notes

1. James Jay Carafano, Baker Spring, and Mackenzie Eaglen, "Providing for the Common Defense: What 10 Years of Progress Would Look Like." Backgrounder, iss. 2108 (Heritage Foundation, 2008); Ronald Reagan, 1981. Speech, "National Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department, ALF-CIO.
2. Carafano, 2008.
3. n.d. "American Civil-Military Relations." U.S. Army Combined Arms Center Information Paper. <https://www.us.army.mil/suite/pate/611545>.
4. Aaron Belkin. "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell: Does the Gay Ban Undermine the Military's Reputation,'" *Armed Forces and Society*, January 2008, 277.
5. n.d. Accessed December 2015. [http://www.amherst.edu/campuslife/...social\\_activism](http://www.amherst.edu/campuslife/...social_activism).
6. n.d. Accessed December 2015. [http://oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american\\_english/paternalism](http://oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/paternalism).
7. Paul Glastris. "Why a Second Progressive Era Is Emerging – and How Not to Blow it." *Washington Monthly*, Editor's Note, January/February 2015; Cass R. Sunstein, "A New Progressivism," *Stanford Law And Policy Review*, Vol. 17:197, 5 March 2006.
8. n.d. Accessed March 2016. [http://americanhistory/about.com/od/usconstitution/g/social\\_contract.htm](http://americanhistory/about.com/od/usconstitution/g/social_contract.htm).
9. Thomas Avery. n.d. "Popper on 'Social Engineering': A Classical Liberal View." *Reason Papers* (St. John's University) 26: 29 - 38.
10. Karl Popper. n.d. "Piecemeal Social Engineering or Technology: The Truth, The Fiction." Columba Mgbokwer Department of Philosophy, University of Gent. <http://www2.ac.uk/fac/soc/philosophy/people/associates/miller/phpar/abstracts/contributed/mgbokwere.pdf>
11. n.d. "Civil Rights Act of 1964." <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/civil-rights-act/segregation-era.html>.
12. David J. Armor and Curtis L. Gilroy. "Changing Minority Representation in the U.S. Military." *Armed Forces and Society*, January 2010, 226.
13. Ibid.
14. n.d. African Americans in World War II: Fighting for a Double Victory. The National WWII Museum. Accessed December 27, 2015.

- <http://www.nationalww2museum.org/assets/pdfs/african-americans-in-world.pdf>.
15. Ibid.
  16. U.S. National Archives & Records Administration. "Executive Order 9981: Desegregation of the Armed Forces." [www.ourdocuments.gov](http://www.ourdocuments.gov), 1948.
  17. *Armor*, 226.
  18. Ibid.
  19. Civil Rights Act of 1964.
  20. Ibid.
  21. Kristy N. Kamarck. "Women in Combat: Issues for Congress." Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, December 2015, 2.
  22. Ibid, 2.
  23. n.d. University Alliance. "Nursing History: The First Army Nurse Corps." [www.jacksonvilleu.com](http://www.jacksonvilleu.com).
  24. Kamarck, 3.
  25. Ibid, 3.
  26. Ibid, 3.
  27. Ibid, 4.
  28. Ibid, 5.
  29. Ibid, 6.
  30. Ibid, 10.
  31. <http://dacowits.defense.gov/> (accessed December 2015).;  
<http://now.org/about/history/highlights/> (accessed December 2015).;  
<http://servicewomen.org/mission/> (accessed December 2015).;  
<https://www.aclu.org/cases/service-womens-action-network-v-us-department-defense> (accessed December 2015).
  32. Julie Scelfo, "A University Recognizes a Third Gender: Neutral." *The New York Times*, February 3, 2015; Jonah Bennett, "Navy Sec Orders Marine Corps To Remove 'Man' From Job Titles, Integrate Women Into Boot Camp." *The Daily*

- Caller, <http://dailycaller.com/2016/01/06/navy-sec-orders-marine-corps-to-remove-man-from-job-titles-integrate-women-into-boot-camp/?print=1>, January 6, 2016.
33. David F. Burrelli and Jody Feder. "Homosexuals and the U.S. Military: Current Issues." Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, July 22, 2009, 1.
  34. Ibid, 1.
  35. Ibid, 1.
  36. Listed, Author Not. "How Legal Tide Turned on Same-sex Marriage in the U.S." BBC.com, June 2015.
  37. Burrelli, 31
  38. n.d. Accessed December 2015.  
[http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610\\_dadt/](http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/).
  39. Nora Kelly and Brian Resnick. "What Are States with Same-Sex Marriage Bans Doing Now?" NationalJournal.com, June 2015.
  40. Megan R. Wilson, "Lobbyists Quietly Advise GOP on Gay Marriage Shift." Thehill.com. <http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/business-a-lobbying/213747-lobbyists-quietly-advise-gop-on-gay-marriage-shift>, 2014.
  41. Kristy N. Kamarck, "What Are the Department of Defense (DOD) Policies on Transgender Service?" Congressional Research Service Insights, 2015.
  42. John McCain and Mac Thornberry, "America's Dangerous Defense Cuts." The Wall Street Journal. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/john-mccain-and-mac-thornberry-americas-dangerous-defense-cuts-1425943297>, 2015.
  43. Ali Meyer, "Obama, Clinton Foundation Donors Sold 'Green' Fuel to Military for \$149 per Gallon." The Washington Free Beacon. <http://freebeacon.com/issues/obama-clinton-foundation-donors-sold-green-fuel-to-military-for-149-per-gallon>, 2015.
  44. Evan Halper, "As Pentagon Invests in Green Fuel, Critics Focus on the Cost." LA Times. <http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-green-military-20131118-story.html>, 2013.
  45. Katherine Blakeley, "DOD Alternative Fuels: Policy, Initiatives and Legislative Activity." Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, 3-4, 2012.
  46. Ibid, 3.

47. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://needtoknow.nas.edu/energy/energy-sources/emerging-technologies/biofuels/>.
48. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.icij.org/project/global-climate-change-lobby/climate-lobby-soup-nuts>.
49. Thomas C. Leonard. "Richard H. Thaler, Cass R. Sunstein, Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness." Book Review (Yale University Press). <https://www.princeton.edu/~tleonard/reviews/nudge.pdf>.
50. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.defense.gov/About-DoD>, 2008.
51. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/limits-to-civilian-authority/>
52. n.d. Accessed December 28, 2015. <http://www.kpbs.org/news/2011/jun/23/us-military-most-trusted-all-american-institutions/>.
53. N Bagautdinova, A Sarkin, G Khadiullina, B Averyanov, and N Arzhantseva, "Development of Paternalistic Strategy of Industrial Growth with Regard to Institutional Traps (Qwerty-Effects)." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5, no. 12 (2014): 49 – 53.
54. U.S. Constitution, Article I, S 8.
55. [www.ArmedForcesJournal.com](http://www.ArmedForcesJournal.com)
56. U.S. Army Combined Arms Center Information Paper.
57. [www.ArmedForcesJournal.com](http://www.ArmedForcesJournal.com)
58. Sarkesion, Sam, and Robert Connor, *The U.S. Military Profession into the 21st Century: War, Peace, and Politics*. Routledge. [https://books.google.com/books?id=\\_bl-AgAAQBAJ&pg=PR1&lpg=PR1&dq=the+us+military+profession+into+the+21st+century&source=bl&ots=Zm227Tb2A4&sig=aPnX5gwEmoi1gX9yeqpHuLjRDmw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjx986t1ZXKAhWD1h4KHWokBz8Q6AEIKTAC#v=onepage&q=the%20us%20mili](https://books.google.com/books?id=_bl-AgAAQBAJ&pg=PR1&lpg=PR1&dq=the+us+military+profession+into+the+21st+century&source=bl&ots=Zm227Tb2A4&sig=aPnX5gwEmoi1gX9yeqpHuLjRDmw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjx986t1ZXKAhWD1h4KHWokBz8Q6AEIKTAC#v=onepage&q=the%20us%20mili), 60, 2001.
59. [www.defense.gov](http://www.defense.gov)
60. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.ipl.org/div/stateknow/popchart.html#statesbypop>.
61. n.d. Military One Source. Accessed December 2015. <http://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/2013-Demographics->

- Report.pdf.
62. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.businessinsider.com/us-military-demographics-2014-8#>.
  63. [www.businessinsider.com](http://www.businessinsider.com)
  64. Ibid; 2015. US Census. US Government. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>.
  65. [www.businessinsider.com](http://www.businessinsider.com); n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.marketingcharts.com/traditional/so-how-many-millennials-are-there-in-the-us-anyway-30401/>.
  66. [www.businessinsider.com](http://www.businessinsider.com); US Census
  67. Kevin Stringer and Katie M. Sizemore, "The Future of U.S. Land Power: Special Operations Versatility." *Joint Force Quarterly* 69: 86, 2013.
  68. n.d. Gallup.com. Accessed December 27, 2015. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1597/confidence-institutions.aspx>.
  69. Ibid.
  70. James Fallows, "The Tragedy of the American Military." *The Atlantic*. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/01/the-tragedy-of-the-american-military/383516/>, 2015.
  71. Ibid.
  72. US Census.
  73. Fallows
  74. Paul Marsden, "Memetics & Social Contagion: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" *Journal of Memetics: Evolutionary Models of Information Transmission* 2. [http://web.stanford.edu/~kcarmel/CC\\_BehavChange\\_Course/readings/Additional%20Resources/social%20contagion/Social%20Contagion.htm](http://web.stanford.edu/~kcarmel/CC_BehavChange_Course/readings/Additional%20Resources/social%20contagion/Social%20Contagion.htm), 1998.
  75. Mackubin Thomas Owens. *US Civil-Military Relations after 9/11: Renegotiating the Civil-Military Bargain* (New York: Continuum, 2011), 138
  76. *Armor*, 224.
  77. Owens, 139.

78. Ibid, 138 - 139
79. Sarkesion, 18.
80. Joel Kotkin. "Raising the Drawbridge: California's New Feudalism Benefits A Few At The Expense Of The Multitude," *The Daily Beast*, October 2005.
81. July 4, 1776. "The Declaration of Independence."  
<http://www.UShistory.org/declaration/document>.
82. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://blog.gaiam.com/quotes/authors/george-washington/60312>.
83. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke-political/>.
84. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.guidetoaction.org/parker/selfdet.html>.
85. n.d. Accessed December 2015.  
[http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch\\_existentialism.html](http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_existentialism.html).
86. Benjamin Wallace-Wells, "Cass Sunstein Wants to Nudge Us." *The New York Times Magazine*, [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/16/magazine/16Sunstein-t.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/16/magazine/16Sunstein-t.html?_r=0), May 13, 2010.
87. Ibid; Branislav L. Slantchev, "Introduction to International Relations Lecture 3: The Rational Actor Model." Department of Political Science, University of California – San Diego. <http://slantchev.ucsd.edu/courses/ps12/03-rational-decision-making.pdf>, April 19, 2005.
88. Wallace-Wells.
89. Glen Whitman, "The Rise of the New Paternalism." Lead Essay, The Cato Institute. <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2010/04/05glen-whitman/rise-new-paternalism>, April 5, 2010.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid.
92. Matthew Thomas and Luke Buckmaster, "Paternalism in Social Policy: When is it Justifiable?" Social Policy Section, Parliament of Australia.  
[http://www.aph.gov.au/About\\_Parliament/Parliamentary\\_Departments/Parliamentary\\_Library/pubs/rp/rp1011/11rp08?print=1](http://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp1011/11rp08?print=1), 2, December 10, 2010.
93. Whitman.

94. Thomas, 10.
95. Ibid, 11
96. Whitman.
97. n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://dictionary.references.com/browse/paternalism>.
98. Christian Coons and Michael Weber, "Introduction: Paternalism – Issues and Trends." *Paternalism: Theory and Practice*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013).  
[http://www.cambridgeblog.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Into\\_the\\_Intro\\_Paternalism.pdf](http://www.cambridgeblog.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Into_the_Intro_Paternalism.pdf), 4.
99. Ibid, 7.
100. Thomas, 16.
101. Ibid, 20.
102. Coons, 9.
103. Russell F. Weigley, *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security* (Boston: MIT Press, 2001) 238.
104. Robert M. Cassidy, 2003. "Prophets or Praetorians? The Uptonian Paradox and the Powell Corollary," *Parameters*, 133.
105. Weigley, 243 – 244.
106. Peter D. Feaver, 1996. "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces and Society* 23, no. 2, 160.
107. Ibid, 160.
108. Ibid, 160.
109. Owens, 106 – 107.
110. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (1840),  
[http://oll/libertyfund.org/quote/281](http://oll.libertyfund.org/quote/281).
111. Feaver, 164.
112. Ibid, 166.

113. Cassidy, 141.
114. Feaver, 160.
115. Weigley, 231.
116. Thomas, 7.
117. Ibid, 7.
118. Owens, 65.
119. Ibid, 48.
120. Mill, John Stuart. n.d. Accessed January 2016.  
[https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/57651.John\\_Stuart\\_Mill](https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/57651.John_Stuart_Mill).
121. Whitman.
122. Feaver.

## Bibliography

- n.d. Accessed December 2015. [http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch\\_existentialism.html](http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_existentialism.html).
- n.d. Accessed December 2015.  
[https://repository.unm.edu/bitstream/handle/1928/13704/Nunn\\_What\\_is\\_Postnationalism.pdf?sequence=3](https://repository.unm.edu/bitstream/handle/1928/13704/Nunn_What_is_Postnationalism.pdf?sequence=3).
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.guidetoaction.org/parker/selfdet.html>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://blog.gaiam.com/quotes/authors/george-washington/60312>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke-political/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.people-press.org/2015/11/23/beyond-distrust-how-americans-view-their-government/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-w-whitehead/the-age-of-neofeudalism\\_b\\_2566546.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-w-whitehead/the-age-of-neofeudalism_b_2566546.html).
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/382266/new-feudalism-fred-bauer>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <https://www.h-net.org/reviews/showpdf.php?id=11156>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015.  
[https://books.google.com/books?id=yPxxRivuE7kC&pg=PA74&lpg=PA74&dq=instances+when+civil-military+relationship+failed&source=bl&ots=viKjixU53P&sig=AY24svJgs4rcsc\\_nWcH5a6WQI9c&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi61JWz\\_5XKAhVMJx4KHRP\\_B1gQ6AEIRzAH#v=onepage&q=instances%20](https://books.google.com/books?id=yPxxRivuE7kC&pg=PA74&lpg=PA74&dq=instances+when+civil-military+relationship+failed&source=bl&ots=viKjixU53P&sig=AY24svJgs4rcsc_nWcH5a6WQI9c&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi61JWz_5XKAhVMJx4KHRP_B1gQ6AEIRzAH#v=onepage&q=instances%20).
- n.d. Accessed December 2015.  
[http://web.stanford.edu/~kcarmel/CC\\_BehavChange\\_Course/readings/Additional%20Resources/social%20contagion/Social%20Contagion.htm](http://web.stanford.edu/~kcarmel/CC_BehavChange_Course/readings/Additional%20Resources/social%20contagion/Social%20Contagion.htm).
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/01/the-tragedy-of-the-american-military/383516/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.businessinsider.com/us-military-demographics-2014-8#>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.marketingcharts.com/traditional/so-how-many-millennials-are-there-in-the-us-anyway-30401/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.ipl.org/div/stateknow/popchart.html#statesbypop>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.defense.gov/About-DoD>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/limits-to-civilian-authority/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://needtoknow.nas.edu/energy/energy-sources/emerging-technologies/biofuels/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://www.icij.org/project/global-climate-change-lobby/climate-lobby-soup-nuts>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://dacowits.defense.gov/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://now.org/about/history/highlights/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <http://servicewomen.org/mission/>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. <https://www.aclu.org/cases/service-womens-action-network-v-us-department-defense>.
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. [http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610\\_dadt/](http://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/).
- n.d. Accessed December 2015. [http://www.amherst.edu/campuslife/...social\\_activism](http://www.amherst.edu/campuslife/...social_activism).

n.d. Accessed December 2015.  
[http://oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american\\_english/paternalism](http://oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/paternalism).

n.d. Accessed March 2016.  
[http://americanhistory/about.com/od/usconstitution/g/social\\_contract.htm](http://americanhistory/about.com/od/usconstitution/g/social_contract.htm).

n.d. *African Americans in World War II: Fighting for a Double Victory*. The National WWII Museum. Accessed December 27, 2015.  
<http://www.nationalww2museum.org/assets/pdfs/african-americans-in-world.pdf>.

Alexander, David, and Phil Stewart. December 3, 2015. "U.S. Military Opens All Combat Roles to Women." *Reuters*.

n.d. "American Civil-Military Relations." *U.S. Army Combined Arms Center Information Paper*.  
<https://www.us.army.mil/suite/pate/611545>.

Armor, David J. and Gilroy, Curtis L. January 2010. "Changing Minority Representation in the U.S. Military." *Armed Forces and Society*, 36 (19): 223 - 242.

Avery, Thomas. n.d. "Popper on 'Social Engineering': A Classical Liberal View." *Reason Papers* (St. John's University) 26: 29 - 38.

Bagautdinova, N, A Sarkin, G Khadiullina, B Averyanov, and N Arzhantseva. 2014. "Development of Paternalistic Strategy of Industrial Growth with Regard to Institutional Traps (Qwerty-Effects)." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, (MCSER Publishing) 5 (12): 49 - 53.

Bauer, Fred. 2014. "The New Feudalism." *National Review*.

Belkin, Aaron. January 2008. "Don't Ask, Don't Tell: Does the Gay Ban Undermine the Military's Reputation." *Armed Forces and Society*, 34 (12): 276 - 288.

Bennett, Jonah. 2016. "Navy Sec Orders Marine Corps To Remove 'Man' From Job Titles, Integrate Women Into Boot Camp." *The Daily Caller*. <http://dailycaller.com/2016/01/06/navy-sec-orders-marine-corps-to-remove-man-from-job-titles-integrate-women-into-boot-camp/?print=1>.

November 23, 2015. *Beyond Distrust: How Americans View Their Government*. Pew Research Center.

Blakeley, Katherine. 2012. "DOD Alternative Fuels: Policy, Initiatives and Legislative Activity." *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*.

Brydum, Sunnive. 2015. "Ted Cruz Still Wants a Federal Marriage Amendment." *Advocate.com*. <http://www.advocate.com/politics/pliticians/2015/01/22/ted-cruz-still-wants-federal-marriage-amendment>.

Burrelli, David F., and Jody Feder. July 22, 2009. "Homosexuals and the U.S. Military: Current Issues." *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*.

Carafano, James Jay, Baker Spring, and Mackenzie Eaglen. 2008. "Providing for the Common Defense: What 10 Years of Progress Would Look Like." *Backgrounder* (Heritage Foundation) (2108).

Carter, Donald A. 2015. "The U.S. Army Before Vietnam, 1953 - 1965." *Center of Military History* 7 - 50.

Cassidy, Robert M. Autumn 2003. "Prophets or Praetorians? The Uptonian Paradox and the Powell Corollary." *Parameters* 130 - 143. Accessed January 2016.  
<http://strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Articles/03autumn/cassidy.pdf>.

n.d. "Civil Rights Act of 1964." <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/civil-rights-act/segregation-era.html>.

- Coons, Christian, and Michael Weber. 2013. "Introduction: Paternalism - Issues and Trends." *Paternalism: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge University Press). Accessed December 2015. [http://www.cambridgeblog.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Into\\_the\\_Intro\\_Paternalism.pdf](http://www.cambridgeblog.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Into_the_Intro_Paternalism.pdf).
- Fallows, James. 2015. "The Tragedy of the American Military." *The Atlantic*. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/01/the-tragedy-of-the-american-military/383516/>.
- Feaver, Peter D. Winter 1996. "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control." *Armed Forces & Society* 23 (2): 149 - 178.
- Foster, Gregory D. 1997. "Failed Expectations: The Crisis of Civil-Military Relations in America." *Brookings*.
- n.d. *Gallup.com*. Accessed December 27, 2015. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1597/confidence-institutions.aspx>.
- Glastris, Paul. "Why a Second Progressive Era Is Emerging – and How Not to Blow it." *Washington Monthly*, Editor's Note, January/February 2015, Retrieved on April 16, 2016 from [http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/januaryfebruary\\_2015/editors\\_note/why\\_a\\_second\\_progressive\\_era\\_i053469.php?page=all](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/januaryfebruary_2015/editors_note/why_a_second_progressive_era_i053469.php?page=all)
- Halper, Evan. 2013. "As Pentagon Invests in Green Fuel, Critics Focus on the Cost." *LA Times*. <http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-green-military-20131118-story.html>.
- Halpin, John. 2013. "What It Means To Be A Progressive: A Manifesto." Thinkprogress.org, Retrieved on March 30, 2016, from <http://thinkprogress.org/politics/2013/03/22/11761431/what-it-means-to-be-a-progressive-a-manifesto/>.
- Huggins, Barry, and Michael E. O'Hanlon. 2015. "New Marine Corps Study Inflames the 'Women in Combat' Controversy." *Brookings*.
- Kamarck, Elaine. 2015. "The U.S. Military's Integration of Transgender Troops: Another Milestone in Social Change." *Brookings*.
- Kamarck, Kristy N. 2015. "What Are the Department of Defense (DOD) Policies on Transgender Service?" *Congressional Research Service Insights*.
- Kamarck, Kristy N. 2015. "Women in Combat: Issues for Congress." *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*.
- Kelly, Nora, and Brian Resnick. 2015. "What Are States with Same-Sex Marriage Bans Doing Now?" *NationalJournal.com*. <http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/2015/06/26/what-are-states-with-same-sex-marriage-bans-doing-now>.
- Kotkin, Joel. "Raising the Drawbridge: California's New Feudalism Benefits A Few At The Expense Of The Multitude." *The Daily Beast*, October 2005, Retrieved on April 16, 2016 from <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/10/05/california-s-new-feudalism-benefits-a-few-at-the-expense-of-the-multitude.html>
- Leonard, Thomas C. 2008. "Richard H. Thaler, Cass R. Sunstein, Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness." *Book Review* (Yale University Press). <https://www.princeton.edu/~tleonard/reviews/nudge.pdf>.
- Listed, Author Not. 2015. "How Legal Tide Turned on Same-sex Marriage in the U.S." *BBC.com*. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-21943292>.
- Marsden, Paul. 1998. "Memetics & Social Contagion: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" *Journal of Memetics: Evolutionary Models of Information Transmission* 2.

[http://web.stanford.edu/~kcarmel/CC\\_BehavChange\\_Course/readings/Additional%20Resources/social%20contagion/Social%20Contagion.htm](http://web.stanford.edu/~kcarmel/CC_BehavChange_Course/readings/Additional%20Resources/social%20contagion/Social%20Contagion.htm) .

McCain, John, and Mac Thornberry. 2015. "America's Dangerous Defense Cuts." *The Wall Street Journal*. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/john-mccain-and-mac-thornberry-americas-dangerous-defense-cuts-1425943297>.

Meyer, Ali. 2015. "Obama, Clinton Foundation Donors Sold 'Green' Fuel to Military for \$149 per Gallon." *The Washington Free Beacon*. <http://freebeacon.com/issues/obama-clinton-foundation-donors-sold-green-fuel-to-military-for-149-per-gallon/>.

n.d. *Military One Source*. Accessed December 2015.  
<http://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/2013-Demographics-Report.pdf>.

Mill, John Stuart. n.d. Accessed January 2016.  
[https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/57651.John\\_Stuart\\_Mill](https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/57651.John_Stuart_Mill).

Owens, Mackubin Thomas. 2011. *US Civil-Military Relations after 9/11: Renegotiating the Civil-Military Bargain*. New York: Continuum.

Paterson, Pat, CMDR USMC Ret. 2009. "Limits to Civilian Authority?" *Armed Forces Journal*. <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/limits-to-civilian-authority/>.

Popper, Karl. n.d. "Piecemeal Social Engineering or Technology: The Truth, The Fiction." Columba Mgbokwer Department of Philosophy, University of Gent.  
<http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/philosophy/people/associates/miller/phpar/abstracts/contributed/mgbokwere.pdf>.

Popper, Karl R. 1961. *The Poverty of Historicism*. Paul, London: Routledge & Kegan, 43.

Reagan, Ronald. "Address Before the National Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO." Speech, Washington D.C. March 30, 1981, Retrieved on March 30, 2016, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=43616>.

Roth, Beth Ford. 2011. *U.S. Military Most Trusted of All American Institutions*. June 23. Accessed December 28, 2015. <http://www.kpbs.org/news/2011/jun/23/us-military-most-trusted-all-american-institutions/>.

Sarkesion, Sam, and Robert Connor. 2001. *The U.S. Military Profession into the 21st Century: War, Peace, and Politics*. Routledge. [https://books.google.com/books?id=\\_bl-AgAAQBAJ&pg=PR1&lpg=PR1&dq=the+us+military+profession+into+the+21st+century&source=bl&ots=Zm227Tb2A4&sig=aPnX5gwEmo1gX9yepqHuLjRDmw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjx986t1ZXXAhWD1h4KHWokBz8Q6AEIKTAC#v=onepage&q=the%20us%20mili](https://books.google.com/books?id=_bl-AgAAQBAJ&pg=PR1&lpg=PR1&dq=the+us+military+profession+into+the+21st+century&source=bl&ots=Zm227Tb2A4&sig=aPnX5gwEmo1gX9yepqHuLjRDmw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjx986t1ZXXAhWD1h4KHWokBz8Q6AEIKTAC#v=onepage&q=the%20us%20mili).

Scelfo, Julie. 2015. "A University Recognizes a Third Gender: Neutral." *The New York Times*.

Scheurman, William E. 2012. "Good-Bye to Radical Reformism?" *Political Theory* 40 (6): 830 - 838.

Singer, Peter W. 2009. "The Damning Paradox of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'." *Brookings*.

Singer, Peter W. 2010. "The End of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell: A Long Time Coming, But No More Time to Waste." *Brookings*.

Slantchev, Branislav L. April 19, 2005. "Introduction to International Relations Lecture 3: The Rational Actor Model." Department of Political Science, University of California - San Diego. <http://slantchev.ucsd.edu/courses/ps12/03-rational-decision-making.pdf>.

Spencer, Jack. 2001. "A Kinder, Gentler . . . Less-Fit Military." *Heritage.com*. <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2001/08/a-kinder-gentler-less-fit-military>.

Stringer, Kevin, and Katie M. Sizemore. 2013. "The Future of U.S. Land Power: Special Operations Versatility." *Joint Force Quarterly* 69: 86.

Sunstein, Cass R. "A New Progressivism," *Stanford Law And Policy Review*, Vol. 17:197, 5 March 2006, Retrieved on April 16, 2016, from

[https://journals.law.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/stanford-law-policy-review/print/2006/01/sunstein\\_17\\_stan.1\\_poly\\_rev.197.pdf](https://journals.law.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/stanford-law-policy-review/print/2006/01/sunstein_17_stan.1_poly_rev.197.pdf)

July 4, 1776. "The Declaration of Independence."

<http://www.UShistory.org/declaration/document>.

Thomas, Matthew, and Luke Buckmaster. December 10, 2010. "Paternalism in Social Policy: When is it Justifiable?" Social Policy Section, Parliament of Australia.

[http://www.aph.gov.au/About\\_Parliament/Parliamentary\\_Departments/Parliamentary\\_Library/pubs/rp/rp1011/11rp08?print=1](http://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp1011/11rp08?print=1).

de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1840. *Democracy in America: Historical-Critical*.

<http://oll.libertyfund.org/quote/281>, accessed February 15, 2016.

U.S. National Archives & Records Administration. 1948. "Executive Order 9981: Desegregation of the Armed Forces." *www.ourdocuments.gov*. Accessed December 27, 2015.

[http://www.ourdocuments.gov/print\\_friendly.php?flash=true&page=&doc=84&title=Executive+Order+9981%3A+Desegregation+of+the+Armed+Forces+%281948%29](http://www.ourdocuments.gov/print_friendly.php?flash=true&page=&doc=84&title=Executive+Order+9981%3A+Desegregation+of+the+Armed+Forces+%281948%29) .

2015. *US Census*. US Government. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>.

University Alliance. *Nursing History: The First Army Nurse Corps*. Retrieved March 30, 2016, from [http://www.jacksonvilleu.com/resources/history-of-nursing/army-nurse-corps/#.Vv\\_dGoc#2w](http://www.jacksonvilleu.com/resources/history-of-nursing/army-nurse-corps/#.Vv_dGoc#2w).

U.S. Const. art. I, S 8

U.S. Const. art. II, S 2

Von Spakovsky, Hans A. 2010. "Don't Ask, I'll Just Tell You What the Law Should Be: Log Cabin Republicans v. United States." *WebMemo* (Heritage Foundation) (3011).

Wallace-Wells, Benjamin. 2010. "Cass Sunstein Wants to Nudge Us." *The New York Times Magazine*. Accessed January 2016. [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/16/magazine/16Sunstein-t.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/16/magazine/16Sunstein-t.html?_r=0).

Webb, James. 1997. "The War on Military Culture." *The Weekly Standard*.

Weigley, Russell F. 2001. *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security*. Edited by Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn. Boston: MIT Press.

Whitman, Glen. April 5, 2010. "The Rise of the New Paternalism." Lead Essay, The Cato Institute. <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2010/04/05glen-whitman/rise-new-paternalism>.

Wilson, Megan R. 2014. "Lobbyists Quietly Advise GOP on Gay Marriage Shift." *Thehill.com*. <http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/business-a-lobbying/213747-lobbyists-quietly-advise-gop-on-gay-marriage-shift>.