

AU/ACSC/076/1998-04

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

MORAL AND ETHICAL RELATIVISM AND THE US ARMED
FORCES A COURSE FOR EFFECTIVENESS?

by

Stephen G. Di Domenico, Major, USAF

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Title Lantz R. Balthazar III

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 1998

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
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 this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. 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 ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 01-04-1998		2. REPORT TYPE Thesis		3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO) xx-xx-1998 to xx-xx-1998	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Moral and Ethical Relativism and the US Armed Forces A Course for Effectiveness? Unclassified				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Di Domenico, Stephen G. ;				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Air Command and Staff College Maxwell AFB, AL36112				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS ,				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT APUBLIC RELEASE ,					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT There are principles that are immutable and transcendent, and if followed will produce effectiveness. These principles are unchanging because they are derived from an immutable source. Our country and military was founded upon these principles. In our post-modern culture, however, these principles and values have come under increasing attack. The State has entrusted the profession of arms with the power of the sword; a unique responsibility. Any abdication on traditional institutional ethics because of changing societal mores can only mean that the military created to defend society can no longer do so effectively because it has become itself corrupt. The author researched statistics pertaining to our society and the military's moral condition. Literature searches were conducted on professional and personal ethics, military ethics and relativism. Finally, the author drew extensively from experts in the etymology of absolutes and the history of our republic. Chapter one chronicles our society's and military's moral decline. Chapter two investigates how the present ethical and moral slide occurred. Chapter three examines how social reformers have sought to change society through mandatory military policy changes. Chapter four explores our society's foundational underpinnings. Chapter five concludes with a call to personal integrity.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Public Release	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 66	19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Fenster, Lynn lfenster@dtic.mil	
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified		19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number 703767-9007 DSN 427-9007	
				Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39.18	

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 or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
DISCLAIMER	ii
PREFACE.....	v
ABSTRACT	vi
MORALLY AND ETHICALLY ADRIFT—WHAT HAS HAPPENED?	1
Introduction	1
Information Suggesting a Moral and Ethical Crisis.....	2
Crime	3
Broken Families	3
Education	4
Military Conduct and Discipline.....	4
TRUTH, THE FIRST CASUALTY OF WAR—WHY HAS THIS HAPPENED?.....	7
What are Institutional Ethics and why is the Military Unique?.....	7
An Ethic Gone Awry.....	8
The Attack on Absolutes	9
The Philosophers.....	10
The Educators	12
THE CONDITIONERS, THE MILITARY AS A VEHICLE FOR SOCIAL CHANGE.....	15
Removal of Biblical Values from the Public Square	16
Homosexuality in the Armed Forces	17
History of Homosexuality and the Uniform Code of Military Justice.....	18
Reason for the Policy Change.....	19
Women in Combat	20
Proponents of Women in Combat Cite Only Opportunities for Women	22
A Counter Offensive	23
FOUNDATIONAL UNDERPINNINGS—WHERE WERE WE MOORED?	26
Continental Congress Religious Demographics	27
The Founders Education.....	29
Writings of the Founding Fathers	29
Moral Principles Advocated by the Founders	31

ANCHORAGE—A CALL TO INTEGRITY	34
APPENDIX A: HOMOSEXUALS IN THE ARMED FORCES.....	39
Erosion of Unit Morale	39
High Risk of Health Related Problems	40
High Cost of Health Care	42
APPENDIX B: WOMEN IN COMBAT.....	44
Physical Strength and Endurance of Men and Women.....	44
Pregnancy Causes Readiness Problems	45
APPENDIX C: FIVE COURSES OF ACTION.....	48
Reject Social Reformers.....	48
Reaffirm Absolute Values	49
Retain High Standards.....	51
Recruit Moral Character.....	52
Reassert the Mission as Raison d'être	53
GLOSSARY	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY	57

Preface

The pervasive moral and ethical decline in our society and two recent military policy changes compelled me to consider this research. In it, I address a link between moral and ethical relativism and our present moral morass. This is relevant because societal moral decline portends a corresponding diminishing effectiveness in the U.S. profession of arms. It's from society that we draw our constituents.

This is a more normative than descriptive paper regarding military ethics. Descriptive means characterizing something with no intent to assign value, good or bad. Norms connotes a sense of moral imperative. In this paper I will use words like should and ought. These are in essence moral words.

My conclusions therefore describe values that the profession of arms ought to pursue. In so doing, I will present strong evidence and reasons why we should do certain things and not do others. In this regard, I have sought to present my research in the most objective manner that my biases would allow. How successful I have been is left to the reader.

I wish to thank my bride of eleven years for enduring the many hours that this research demanded. I also wish to thank Dr. James Toner of the Air War College for kindly reading my transcript and graciously offering advice. Finally, special thanks to Major Lantz Balthazar for his patience reading a stream of seemingly endless drafts.

Abstract

There are principles that are immutable and transcendent, and if followed will produce effectiveness. These principles are unchanging because they are derived from an immutable source. Our country and military was founded upon these principles. In our post-modern culture, however, these principles and values have come under increasing attack.

The State has entrusted the profession of arms with the power of the sword; a unique responsibility. Any abdication on traditional institutional ethics because of changing societal mores can only mean that the military created to defend society can no longer do so effectively because it has become itself corrupt.

The author researched statistics pertaining to our society and the military's moral condition. Literature searches were conducted on professional and personal ethics, military ethics and relativism. Finally, the author drew extensively from experts in the ontology of absolutes and the history of our republic.

Chapter one chronicles our society's and military's moral decline. Chapter two investigates how the present ethical and moral slide occurred. Chapter three examines how social reformers have sought to change society through mandatory military policy changes. Chapter four explores our society's foundational underpinnings. Chapter five concludes with a call to personal integrity.

Chapter 1

Morally and Ethically Adrift—What has Happened?

Do we have a moral military? We probably have a moral society. Do we have a debauched military? We probably have a debauched society.

—Dr. James H. Toner

Introduction

The consequences of our society's moral decline are so pervasive the debate centers not around whether there is a crisis, but rather the cause. Since the military is a microcosm of society, from which it derives 100 percent of its constituents, societal moral degeneration portends the same in the military profession. This is serious because the U.S. military's purpose is to support and defend the Constitution and thus American society. The stakes are high and failure in its mission, unlike any other profession, could mean the loss of the Republic. For this reason, the military must be held to a higher standard than the society it protects—a standard where unchanging ethics and personal character are paramount.

Increasingly, however, political and military leaders have embraced moral and ethical relativism, a product of post-modernism. This philosophy is best characterized in what it asserts and what it denies. It asserts there is no standard of right and wrong, no one has the right to make moral judgments, truth is unknowable because of cultural and societal diversity, and no one should judge others behavior concerning right and wrong.¹

It denies the existence of an almighty creator to whom we are accountable, and the influence and veracity of Judeo-Christian thought. This is neither the sentiment of our founding fathers nor the tradition of our profession. Using this, social reformers have sought to use the military as a vehicle for societal change. The danger is that they have done so without regard to military effectiveness.

This paper will chronicle our societal moral and ethical decline, offer reasons for this decline, identify reformer policy changes, take a historical look at our forebears sentiments, and finally recommend courses of action to regain and retain lost ground.

Information Suggesting a Moral and Ethical Crisis

Charles W. Colson, Nixon administration Chief of Staff and former Marine officer, said, “The breakdown of character is the number-one crisis in America.”² William J. Bennett, former Secretary of Education and author of *Book of Moral Virtues*, said,

Over the past three decades we have experienced substantial social regression. Today the forces of social decomposition are challenging- and in some instances, overtaking- the forces of social composition ... Unless these exploding social pathologies are reversed, they will lead to the decline and perhaps even to the fall of the American republic.³

This predicament is also apparent to the next generation. Thirty-two percent of outstanding high school students, in a recent survey, identified a “decline of moral and social values” as the number one problem facing their generation. An almost identical percentage identified it as the greatest crisis facing our nation today.⁴

Many abroad have called our situation perilous. Aleksandr Solzenitsyn said in a recent speech, “The West... has been undergoing an erosion and obscuring of high moral and ethical ideas.”⁵ Goh Chok Tong, the Prime Minister of Singapore, identified broken

families, teenage mothers, illegitimate children, juvenile delinquency, vandalism, and violent crime as America's greatest ills.⁶

William J. Bennett, in his book, *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators, facts and figures on the state of American society*, describes what one reviewer called “chilling statistics” and “a kick to the solar plexus.” Following are a select few of these societal woes with regard to crime, families, and education. These particular indexes are chosen because they best reflect our society's moral condition. More importantly, they reflect the condition of the next generation from which the military will derive all its constituents. Statistics regarding military conduct and discipline will follow.

Crime

Crime has skyrocketed. Since 1960, total crimes have increased by more than 300 percent while population increased only 41 percent. Violent crimes have increased by 550 percent in the same period.⁷ Since 1965, juvenile violent crime arrest rate has tripled. Juveniles are the fastest growing crime segment of our population.⁸

Broken Families

It is well documented that children from single-parent families are two to three times more likely to have emotional and behavioral problems. They are also more likely to drop out of high school, become pregnant as teenagers, abuse drugs, and have trouble with the law.⁹ Approximately half of the marriages in the US will end in divorce, the highest rate in the world.¹⁰

The traditional two-parent family is now the exception. Since 1960, the illegitimate birth rate has increased 400 percent. In 1991, almost 30 percent of births were out of wedlock. Some sectors of society are as high as 68 percent.¹¹ During the same period,

the percentage of families headed by one parent has tripled. Approximately 90 percent of these single parent homes are without a father.¹² According to projections, only 6 percent of black children and 30 percent of white children born in 1980, will live with both parents through age 18.¹³

Education

This situation has caused problems in the public school system. In 1940, public school teachers identified talking out of turn, chewing gum, making noise, running in the halls, cutting in line and littering as the top disciplinary problems. In 1990, teachers identified them as drug and alcohol abuse, pregnancy, suicide, rape, robbery and assault.¹⁴ Twenty percent of high school students carry a firearm, knife, club or other form of weapon on a regular basis.¹⁵

About the only statistic to decline during the period from 1960-1990, was SAT scores.¹⁶ Prior to 1960, SAT scores did not see more than two consecutive years of decline, since that time every year has declined except years 1981-1984.

Military Conduct and Discipline

If the military and society are reflections of each other, as asserted by Dr. Toner (see chapter epigraph), then the moral degeneration in our society would foretell the same in the military. Military judicial statistics appears to bear this out.

Categorically, almost all offenses tracked by the USAF¹⁷ Judge Advocate General¹⁸ office increased between 1976 and 1997. Under court marshal punishments, larceny offenses increased 44 percent, assault almost 60 percent, drug incidents 15 percent, and incidents involving violence 77 percent. Total court marshal cases in the same period

increased 26 percent. In the last seven years alone, Absent Without Leave (AWOL) offenses increased by a startling 100 percent.

These statistics seem to indicate a fundamental change in the moral character of recruits entering the service. This has also been observed of the same generation entering college. A professor of philosophy at Clark University stated:

Students come to college today as moral stutterers. They haven't been taught much respect for what I call "plain moral facts," the need for honesty, integrity, responsibility. It doesn't take a blue-ribbon commission to see this. Students don't reason morally. They don't know what it means.¹⁹

In 1990, at the US Air Force Academy, the Superintendent Lieutenant General Bradley Hosmer, circulated a memo stating in essence that the incoming raw product from society had changed significantly. Their ethical maturity was such that we could no longer rely on just teaching them the honor code but must teach them the meaning of lying, stealing and cheating. As a result, he initiated the Center for Character development. Major General (Ret) Jerry E. White, a former Professor of Astronautics at the US Air Force Academy, echoed this concern in an *Air Power Journal* article,

...[W]e do have a problem. Something has changed in our society. We can no longer assume that ethics and integrity are givens for people who solemnly take their oath of office as military personnel.²⁰

The case for societal and military moral degeneration is self-evident, but who or what is most responsible for this decline?

Notes

¹ Character Development Manual, United States Air Force Academy, Center for Character Development, Colorado Springs, CO, July 1994, 10

² Colson, Charles W. "A Question of Ethics". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996, 4

³ Bennett, William J. *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators: Facts and Figures on the State of American Society*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994), 8

⁴ Hunter, Heather. *Character Education Institute*. (San Antonio, TX), <http://www/CharacterEducation.org>

Notes

⁵ Bennett, William J. *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators: Facts and Figures on the State of American Society*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994), 10

⁶ Goh Chok Tong, *Strategic Environment Course Book, ACSC, Social Values*, 105

⁷ Bennett, William J. *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators: Facts and Figures on the State of American Society*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994), 18,22

⁸ Ibid., 29,30

⁹ Ibid., 52

¹⁰ Ibid., 59

¹¹ Ibid., 46

¹² Ibid., 51

¹³ Ibid., 51

¹⁴ Ibid., 83

¹⁵ Ibid., 31

¹⁶ Ibid., 82

¹⁷ The other services do not track this information or it was not available

¹⁸ Military Justice Statistics (Fact Sheet), HQ USAF (AMJAMS)

¹⁹ Cotton, Ray. *The Morality of the West: From Bad to Worse*. n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from: <http://www.probe.org/morality.htm>

²⁰ White, Jerry E. "Personal Ethics versus Professional Ethics", *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996, 30

Chapter 2

Truth, the First Casualty of War—Why has this happened?

*The crisis of American medicine is not tobacco, AIDS, silicone, the Gulf War Syndrome, breast or any other form of cancer, physician assisted suicide, euthanasia ... It is the same crisis that faces our culture in every other area: How do we decide ethics? That is, how do we decide right from wrong? Is there a method, which will stand the test of time, or do ethics change with changing cultures?*¹

—Dr. Edward Payne

*Have the rules changed? And who makes the rules, God or men? The Christian and the theist turn toward the Creator of the Universe. The humanist or atheist turns towards himself. This distinction between theism and humanism is the fundamental division in moral theology.*²

—Ray Cotton

What are Institutional Ethics and why is the Military Unique?

Ethics have been defined as “a body of moral principles or values governing or distinctive of a group”³, principles and/or standards that guide professionals to do what is right, or what ought to be done. For the profession of arms, included among these principles are a sense of duty and honor, loyalty to peers, and authority, a spirit of patriotism, self-sacrifice, integrity and an awareness of tradition and camaraderie with those who share the same values.

The profession of arms is distinctly different from all others. We are called to take lives and, if necessary, offer our own in our nation's defense. Sir John Hackett put it so well at a speech to the cadets at the Air Force Academy,

...[Y]ou guard our country and way of life, and you are prepared to die in our defense. But more— in guarding our country and our way of life, you are also prepared, either directly or indirectly, to kill in our defense. Yours is a contract conceivably involving death— either yours or our country's enemies.⁴

Our contract, as Sir Hackett states, of “unlimited liability”, is the *sin qua non*-ethic of the profession of arms. For this reason, the profession must be held to a higher standard than the society it protects. Society relies upon them to sustain their way of life. General Douglas MacArthur echoed this sentiment.

The soldier, be he friend or foe, is charged with the protection of the weak and unarmed. It is the very essence and reason of his being. When he violates this sacred trust, he not only profanes his entire cult but threatens the fabric of international society.⁵

We have been given the power of the sword. We alone have been endowed by the state to kill and maim in its defense. But this responsibility can be, and often has been used, toward incredibly sinister and evil ends. As C.S. Lewis so aptly stated:

I am very doubtful whether history shows us one example of a man who, having stepped outside traditional morality and attained power, has used that power benevolently.⁶

An Ethic Gone Awry

The medical profession is one example of an institution that has forgotten its calling. For hundreds of years it adhered to the Hippocratic oath. The oath represented an enduring standard by which all members swore, “first do no harm.”

In the 19th century the American Medical Association (AMA) called physician abortionists,

[M]en who cling to a noble profession only to dishonor it—false brethren—educated assassins—modern Herods—the executioners. These men should be marked as Cain. They should be made the outcasts of society.⁷

One cannot help but notice the clear Biblical words, “false brethren”, “Modern Herods”, and “Marked as Cain”. This is undoubtedly due to the strong Biblical influence of the AMA's ethos. But they have since moved. Late in the 20th century the AMA referred to abortionists as “[C]onscientious physicians who should be permitted to perform abortions.” Before the AMA called abortion “the slaughter of countless children—unwarrantable destruction of human life”, now they call it “[T]he induced termination of pregnancy—a medical procedure.”⁸

Clearly, ethics have changed in the AMA. Today, many no longer invoke Hippocrates either by name, oath, or practice. In fact, since 1972, this profession, which purports to heal, has aborted 35 million babies.⁹ Today, one in four pregnancies end in abortion.¹⁰

The moral anchor was weighed, the profession set adrift. Stowing away aboard are other social ills such as physician assisted suicide, a far cry from “First do no harm.” Like the medical profession, any institution, which moves away from a Biblical [absolute] foundation (in this case public service), toward relativism (monetary advancement), is in danger of jeopardizing their effectiveness and reason for existence. This movement from absolute principles often takes time yet inextricably moves forward. Relativism provides the motive force. The same ends can be true for any other profession that leaves its moorings. But why and how does this happen?

The Attack on Absolutes

In 1915, a young physicist named Albert Einstein made a seemingly impossible proposition. He put forth a revolutionary theory called relativity that would recast Newtonian physics. In his strange universe, Einstein envisioned no absolute motion of celestial bodies because there was no absolute reference frame. It all depended upon where the observer was located and his own relative motion. Einstein's was not a universe of straight lines and a master clock, but curvilinear trajectories and relative time. As a true scientist, Einstein refused to accept his proposal until three assertions was tested. This testifies to his deep intellectual honesty, and relentless scientific rigor. In 1923, all three tests had been satisfied. Einstein was a global hero.

With the exciting scientific discovery in hand, a more revolutionary philosophical view also began to take hold with increasing popularity. "There were no longer any absolutes of time and space, good and evil, knowledge and above all value."¹¹ Modernism, which embraced science as absolute truth, became passe. Post-modernism, which said there is no truth was now in vogue. Einstein, who believed fervently in absolute truth and absolute standards for right and wrong perhaps more than any other, was greatly disturbed by this gross misapplication and scientific quackery.¹² There was no science behind this notion, no tests, no empirical proof.

The notion of relativism may have found popularity riding as a stowaway on Einstein's theory, but the seeds of relativism were sown years before.

The Philosophers

Plato, Aristotle, and Socrates all believed in a true moral code, a normative ethical system.¹³ Absolute standards are universal and immutable. They are true for everyone

and do not change with time. They do not change because Judeo-Christian thought, from where our society derived most of its law and conduct, embraces a God who is immutable, the God of the Bible.

The Bible's language is inherently antithetical, that is to say, black and white. Jay Adams in his book, *A Call for Discernment* explains,

People who study the Bible in depth develop antithetical mindsets: they think in terms of contrasts or opposites. From Genesis to Revelation, God's thoughts and ways are set against all.¹⁴

Modern philosophers, however, espoused a belief diametrically opposed to the traditional philosophers and the Bible. Charles Darwin's, *Origin's of the Species*, put forth the notion that God was not necessary in the creation. Frederich Nietzsche sought to highlight the ethical implications of Darwinism.¹⁵ In Nietzsche's universe, man, not God was the measure of all things. God was dead, and if God was dead, then nature is all there is, and what is, is right.

John-Paul Sartre, was one of the fathers of existentialism. Existentialist humanism was the natural progression of Nietzsche's premise. If God was dead, then we have no ultimate purpose or plan to our lives. We can therefore, pick and choose our own values. Nothing is right, nothing is wrong. There is no transcendent truth when God is dead. Stated in the modern vernacular, "If it feels good do it." Jay Adams adeptly summarizes Nietzsche's and Sartre's propositions,

Modern mentality...is a continuum mentality: Truth and values are not absolute but relative. According to continuum thinking...every idea is a shade of gray. There are no right and wrong or true or false, but only shades of right or wrong or true or false spread along a continuum. The poles of this continuum are extended so far out towards the wings that for all practical purposes they are unattainable and therefore worthless. Nothing then is wholly right or wrong. All is relative; most of it is subjective.¹⁶

Prior to Sartre, the belief in the existence of a higher authority than man, set limits and gave guidance. It restrained inappropriate behavior and encouraged virtue. An example of this is the Ten Commandments. Even Sartre admitted that,

[S]ince we ignore the commandments of God, all value prescribed as eternal, nothing remains but what is strictly voluntary.¹⁷

Aldous Huxley, a leading existentialist, honestly admitted,

For myself, no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was ... from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom.¹⁸

Clearly such a system of thought is contrary to “unlimited liability” and does not engender an attitude of selflessness or self-sacrifice but self-preservation; not an enduring quality for military effectiveness.

The Educators

This whole system of thought was passionately embraced and forwarded by America's higher schools of thought. For over a hundred years, Harvard, was a conservative Christian seminary. Not surprisingly, Harvard's entrance requirements declared,

Let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well the main end of his life and studies is to know God and Jesus which is eternal life ... and therefore to lay Christ in the bottom as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning.¹⁹

Others conservative schools like Yale and Princeton had similar confessions.

Harvard and others are now leading proponents of relativism. A recent Harvard graduate student lamented in his graduation oratory:

They tell us that is heresy to suggest the superiority of some value, fantasy to believe in moral argument, slavery to submit to a judgement sounder than your own. The freedom of our day is the freedom to devote ourselves

to any values we please, on the mere condition that we do not believe them to be true.²⁰

Another Harvard undergraduate student that same year said there was one central idea, one sentiment which they all acquired in their four years at Harvard; and that is, in one word —confusion.²¹

This year in Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), a lecturer skillfully summarized the critical thinking process. But after an hour discussing the finer points of critical thinking, the lecturer said nothing regarding the goal of critical thinking. Believing this to be an important but innocent oversight, the author questioned the speaker afterwards. She, however, was unable to explain the purpose but only the process. When suggested that perhaps it was a systematic process to discern truth from error, she admitted she didn't know if she believed in objective or absolute truth and discussing it could be quite controversial. It is becoming increasingly popular in our culture and in the military to see things in shades of gray. Absolute truth is an unpopular idea. Consequently, ours is a society coming dangerously close to becoming unable to discern good from evil and make moral judgements. In the midst of this morass have arisen social reformers who while eschewing absolutes have instituted their own.

Notes

¹ "The Price of Immorality" *World*, November 1, 1997, 5

² Cotton, Ray. *The Morality of the West: From Bad to Worse*. n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from: <http://www.probe.org/morality.htm>

³ Toner, James, H. "Gallant Atavism, The Military Ethic in an Age of Nihilism". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996, 13

⁴ Quoted in Toner, James, H. "Gallant Atavism, The Military Ethic in an Age of Nihilism". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996, 14

⁵ William Manchester, *American Caesar*, Douglas MacArthur, 1880-1964, Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing, New York, NY, 1978, 488

⁶ Lewis, C.S. *The Abolition of Man*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947, 78

Notes

⁷ Quoted by Dr. J.C. Willke, M.D., “AMA and Abortion,” Radio address on WLBF, Montgomery, AL, 4 December, 1997

⁸ Ibid.

⁹, “The Sanctity of human life”, *Focus on the Family Magazine*, January, 1988, n.p.

¹⁰ Bennett, William J. *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators: Facts and Figures on the State of American Society*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994, 68

¹¹ Johnson, Paul. *Modern Times: The World from the Twenties to the Nineties*. Harper Collins, 1991, 4

¹² Ibid., 4

¹³ Lt Col Jeffrey A. Zink, Major Patrick R. Tower, *A Hitch-Hiker's Guide to Ethics Education and Training in The United States Air Force*, Department of Philosophy and Fine Arts, United States Air Force Academy (Unofficial work in progress)

¹⁴ Jay E. Adams, *A Call for Discernment, Distinguishing truth from Error in Today's Church*, Timeless Texts, Woodruff, SC, 1987, 29

¹⁵ Cotton, Ray. *The Morality of the West: From Bad to Worse*. n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from <http://www.probe.org/morality.htm>

¹⁶ Ibid., 29

¹⁷ Cotton, Ray. *Ethics: Pick or Chose?* n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from <http://www.probe.org/ethics.htm>

¹⁸ Cotton, Ray. *Ethics: Pick or Chose?* n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from <http://www.probe.org/ethics.htm>

¹⁹ Barton, David, *Education and the Founding Fathers*, Wallbuilder Press, 1993, 3

²⁰ Cotton, Ray. *Ethics: Pick or Chose?* n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from <http://www.probe.org/ethics.htm>

²¹ Ibid., n.p.

Chapter 3

The Conditioners, The Military as a Vehicle for Social Change

*We have now come full circle. The relativism, which purportedly undergirds the new tolerance, gives way to exactly what it was trying to be rid of, namely, absolutes. That is, the reformers make their own ideals the new guidelines for society. We are all expected to abide by them. These are the new absolutes.*¹

—Rick Wade

Modern social reformers believe absolutes are anathema unless they are redefined by themselves. President Clinton, addressing the Human Rights Campaign dinner for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people, said absolutes and thus morality are evolving, “We’re redefining in practical terms the *immutable* ideas that have guided us [emphasis added].”²

In his classic, *Abolition of Man*, written in 1947, C.S. Lewis decries the role of what he terms “conditioners”. These innovators (we perhaps call them social reformers today) attack traditional values (what he terms the Tao) to effect change on society. This reconstruction flows from arbitrary values; what they see as best for society. In their attack on traditional values, they reject absolutes and establish their own based upon personal preference. This eradication of traditional values, Lewis says,

... put [them] in a position where we can find no ground for any value judgements at all.” Of the conditioners he states, “The rebellion of new ideologies against the Tao is a rebellion of the branches against the tree: if the rebels could succeed they would find that they had destroyed themselves.”³

He continues,

The conditioners, then, are to choose what kind of artificial Tao they will, for their own good reasons, produce in the Human race ... they may look upon themselves as servants and guardians of humanity and conceive that they have a 'duty' to do it 'good'.⁴

It is the “duty” and “good” and the reformers desire to change society through the military that will be addressed in this chapter. Their approach can be seen in several agendas, removing God from the public square, advancement of homosexuality as an compatible lifestyle in the military, and the advancement of women in combat billets.

Removal of Biblical Values from the Public Square

George Washington warned in his presidential farewell address,

Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds ... reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle [Biblical Values].⁵

We, however, live in an age where Biblical principles are attacked as being harmful and its removal from public life encouraged. In the landmark Supreme Court cases of *Abington v. Schempp*, and *Murray v. Curlett* (June 17, 1963), the court not only banned school prayer but banned all Bible reading.⁶ The activist Court wrote,

If portions of the New Testament were read without explanation, they could be and ... had been psychologically harmful to the child.⁷

An earlier Supreme Court ruling, however, in 1892 declared, America was a Christian nation based upon Biblical principles and gave no less than 87 historical precedents for its ruling. The 1963 ruling gave no precedents, just an opinion. In the *Stone v. Graham* case on the Ten Commandments posted in public schools, the Court again redefined the First Amendment without precedent,

If the posted copies of the Ten Commandments are to have any effect at all, it will be to induce the schoolchildren to read, meditate upon, perhaps to venerate and obey, the Commandments.⁸

So there you have it, in one case the court said that Biblical principles were harmful and in another they said that reading it might cause them to obey it. Clearly today's activist Court believes exposure to Biblical principles significantly and negatively effects behavior. But how did the removal of the same eventually effect society?

Rising crime rates, broken families, and educational deterioration, saw their beginnings in the early 1960's, the same year God was banned. Every societal index cited in chapter one, began a precipitous break upwards starting in 1963 except SAT scores which declined. These statistics strongly suggest God's removal, and thus absolutes from the public square by the reformers, drove the moral degeneration in our society. Now that Biblical principles were out of the way, other agendas impacting effectiveness could be pursued.

Homosexuality in the Armed Forces

Within the first months of his presidency President Clinton instituted a new policy regarding homosexuals serving in the armed forces. This new policy essentially allowed "celibate" homosexuals to serve. With the policy change came new language. The words "homosexuality is incompatible with military service" were removed from the regulations even though Congress had carried this principle forward into law.⁹ Criteria for a practicing homosexual were also redefined. According to then Secretary of Defense William Perry, attending gay pride parades, frequenting gay bars, and possessing gay materials were not "credible" evidence to initiate an investigation.¹⁰

Why was a long-standing policy changed? Was there ample evidence to suggest that our past policy was flawed? Was this new policy decision pursued by the armed forces leadership to increase effectiveness? To fully understand what happened here, a historical look at the military policy on homosexuals is warranted.

History of Homosexuality and the Uniform Code of Military Justice

The US military's homosexual policy goes back to the British Articles of War in 1775. Sodomy was an offense for removal and was enforced as early as 1778.¹¹ It was considered both morally reprehensible and detrimental to discipline. At a General Court Martial a Lt. Enslin was tried for attempted sodomy with another soldier and perjury and was found guilty of breaches against the 5th and 18th Articles of War. Washington approved of the sentence and said, “[W]ith Abhorrence and Detestation of such Infamous Crimes orders Lieut. Enslin to be drummed out of Camp tomorrow morning by all the Drummers and Fifers in the Army never to return.”¹²

Prior to WWII, homosexual misconduct was prosecuted under the categories of “conduct unbecoming an officer” or for enlisted members, “conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline.”

After 1900, individuals were punished for committing homosexual acts under the general category of sodomy.¹³ A 1917 WWI War Department circular, signed by the Surgeon General, categorized homosexuality as “psychopathic” and therefore a reason for rejection from military service.¹⁴ Even individuals thought to be homosexual were excluded under 1921 enlistment standards.¹⁵ The War department's policy in 1941 asserted that homosexual “sodomites” would be court-martialed instead of the previous policy of discharge.¹⁶ This stance was again affirmed in May, 1949,

[H]omosexual personnel, irrespective of sex, should not be permitted to serve in any branch of the Armed Forces in any capacity, and prompt separation of known homosexuals from the Armed Forces is mandatory.¹⁷

This policy was later included in the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) in 1951 under “act of sodomy”, Article 125 and “assault”, Article 134.¹⁸

Noteworthy is that even Class III homosexuals (those who were not known to commit homosexual acts while in military service) were also given honorable or dishonorable discharges based upon the character of their service.¹⁹ As late as 1970, the Joint Service Administrative Discharge Study Group, recommended the military retain its 200 year old ban of homosexual service in the military by including the phrase, “homosexuality is incompatible with military service.”²⁰

Reason for the Policy Change

With 200 years of agreement among military and judicial experts on this issue, a disproportionate majority of opponents inside and outside the military, and overwhelming evidence showing homosexuals and the military are incompatible and detrimental to effectiveness (see Appendix A), why the sudden policy change?

The preponderance of evidence shows the decision to lift the ban was not made on the basis of an electoral mandate or military needs²¹, but a deliberate decision to effect change within the military for the furtherance of a strategic societal agenda. The change was born out of a radical agenda to strike down any discrimination of homosexuals thereby validating their lifestyle within society. This was accomplished with no regard for its negative impact on morale and effectiveness of the US military.

The Conditioners identified the military's doctrine as unacceptable and attacked both law and policy without regard to good science, research, or effectiveness. The same is true for a second agenda.

Women in Combat

When the author speaks of women in combat, he is not talking about women serving in the military, or women in combat support positions but specifically women in combat billets. As General Krulak, Commandant of the Marine Corps, said,

Let me state at the outset that I am not an advocate of women serving in the infantry or as tank or LAV crewmen [combat billets], etc.—What I am here to tell you is that it is time we realize the tremendous capability that our women in the service represent.²²

Women in the military are a tremendous enabler but placing women in traditionally male combat billets, in close quarters and remote locations is not conducive to good order and discipline or effectiveness. Such a policy is an unabashed effort aimed at achieving a feminists agenda. Unfortunately it has also achieved a perhaps unintended but dangerous effect— undermining military readiness. The new policy is a significant departure from traditional time-honored and battle tested doctrine.

In 1976 only two percent of those serving in the military were women.²³ At this same time women were first admitted into military academies. The true purpose of this action, however, was betrayed when it was hailed as not an increase in effectiveness but the first step to achieving equality for women. Three years earlier the Department of Defense (DOD) went to an all-volunteer force recruiting only those who met stringent mental, physical and moral standards. Presumably, for physical reasons, women were

restricted from any combat positions.²⁴ Eighteen years later, Defense Secretary William Perry said,

Our over-arching goal is to maintain a high-quality, ready and effective force. By increasing the numbers of units and positions to which women can be assigned [combat billets], the military services gain *greater flexibility in the development and use of human resources* [emphasis added].²⁵

Secretary Perry set a course for the feminization of the military without offering any proof of combat effectiveness. Six months later the defense department promised to raise the percentage of female service members up to 25 percent of the total force²⁶ (today our force stands at 13.5 percent).²⁷ In 1991, the law prohibiting women from flying combat aircraft was repealed. Following this, in 1993, Congress repealed all remaining restrictions in law prohibiting women from combatant ships. Today there are no laws barring women from any assignments in the military. By policy alone, ground combat positions, special operations assignments, submarine duty, and a handful of other assignments remain closed to women.²⁸ As a result, 99 percent of Air Force positions, 94 percent of the Navy, 67 percent of the Army, and 62 percent of the Marines are open to women.²⁹

The office of the secretary of defense appears to be keeping its promise but to what effect? Are these actions really as the SECDEF says, “to maintain a high-quality, ready and effective force?” or to fulfill a radical feminist agenda without regard for military effectiveness? The author believes the latter because little real research was conducted prior to the removal of the previous law, but political posturing and special interest participation was rampant.³⁰

Proponents of Women in Combat Cite Only Opportunities for Women

If women in combat increase effectiveness then where are the statistics supporting the policy? One would think to make a significant policy change on such a heady issue would require much study and subsequent proof of virtue. Such is not the case but evidence of the contrary is abundant.

Commanders today are vexed with improper gender relations, consensual and non-consensual sex, sexual harassment during training and even rape.

The proponents of women in combat misunderstand or choose to ignore basic human drives. A former commander of a Air Expeditionary Force recently said, “When you place men and women together, hormones flow, when you place them together TDY (Temporary Duty, i.e. Deployed), hormones flow faster.”³¹ Pregnancies aboard the USS Eisenhower, the first test case for women aboard a combat vessel, went from 5 to 39 in just a few months. Ultimately, thirteen percent of the women aboard the Eisenhower became pregnant. These statistics should warn us of the inherent risks associated with placing men and women in close quarters, on a ship or afield.

A recent task force on gender integrated training after six months of study, admitted there are problems but purposely avoided looking at consensual sex.³² They then blindly asserted³³ that once initial training was accomplished men and women could successfully integrate without impacting discipline or moral. One writer commented, “this conclusion was about as predictable that combustible materials in a hot place are likely to ignite.”³⁴ Indeed it was, in an earlier DOD news briefing discussing the panel's formation, Secretary Cohen stated, “We are not going to turn back the clock, we don't intend to.”³⁵ When asked later about his comment he stated,

... [T]here are people, obviously, on the Hill and off the Hill who feel that any attempt to change the current process [separate gender training] would be turning back the clock ... We are not going to restrict the opportunities for women³⁶

Much evidence suggests gender integrated training undermines effectiveness. These include lower physical strength and endurance, and readiness due to pregnancy. See Appendix B for these statistics.

The question must again be asked, Is it opportunities for women or mission effectiveness that is most important?

A Counter Offensive

If the social reformers have been successful using the military to change society toward their ends can we not do the same for noble purposes? Dr. James H. Toner, a professor of leadership and military ethics at The Air War College, advocates the need for high moral character. The military ethic can and must serve as a source of moral refreshment to a society that often ridicules these values. They must do so in a nihilistic environment, one that rejects all absolutes and established beliefs.³⁷ He advocates “Gallant Atavism.” Gallant suggests something noble, valiant, brave, and heroic. Atavism is a biological term meaning the reappearance of characteristics in a plant or animal of some remote ancestor that have been absent in intervening generations. Can we reintroduce characteristics of our former, ethic such as integrity, that have been absent to increase effectiveness? To do so would require knowledge of our ancestors beliefs and sentiments.

Notes

¹ Wade, Rick. *The New Absolutes: As Review by Rick Wade*. n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from: <http://www.probe.org/new-abso.htm>

Notes

² Thomas, Cal, "Clinton Loses Moral Standing", Montgomery Advertiser, Nov 17, 1997

³ Lewis, C.S. *The Abolition of Man*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947, 56-58

⁴ Ibid., 56

⁵ Barton, David. *Keys to Good Government*, WallBuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1994, 20

⁶ Barton, David. *America's Godly Heritage*, WallBuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1993, 17

⁷ Ibid., 17

⁸ Ibid., 18

⁹ Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense News Release, "Secretary Aspin Releases New Regulations on Homosexual Conduct in the Armed Forces," December 22, 1993, ed., Robert L. Maginnis, "The APA sustains Homosexual Agenda", *Insight*, n.p.; on-line, internet, 25 October, 1997, available from <http://www.frc.org/frc/insight/1s95a7hs.html>

¹⁰ Department of Defense Directive 1332.30, "Separation of Regular Commissioned Officers" and Department of Defense Directive 1332.14, "Enlisted Administrative Separations, February 28, 1994, Ed, *ibid*.

¹¹ see General Orders, 14 March 1778, "The Writings of George Washington...1745-1799", Fitzpatrick, John C, Ed, *Ibid*.

¹² Heimbach R. Daniel, "The Bible in the Moral War over the Rejection of Homosexuality by the Military Services: A View from Inside the Pentagon", *Premise* Volume II, Number 7, August 27, 1995, 10, on-line, internet, 18 February, 1998, available from: <http://capo.org/premise/95/august/p950710.html>

¹³ Maginnis, Robert L, "The APA sustains Homosexual Agenda", *Insight*, n.p.; on-line, internet, 25 October, 1997, available from: <http://www.frc.org/frc/insight/1s95a7hs.html>

¹⁴ WD OTSG Circa. 22, 1 August 1917, "Examinations in Nervous and Mental Disease," printed in "The Medical Department of the United States Army in the World War, Vol. X, "Neuropsychiatry in the United States (Washington: GPO, 1929), 66-69, ed, *Ibid*.

¹⁵ Army Regulation 40-105, 20 June, 1921, ed, *Ibid*.

¹⁶ War Department Directive, "Sodomites," 15 July, 1941, ed, *Ibid*.

¹⁷ Quoted in *Ibid*.

¹⁸ *Ibid*., n.p.

¹⁹ Colin J. Williams, "Homosexuals and the Military", New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 29, ed, *Ibid*.

²⁰ William P. Snyder and Kenneth L. Nyberg, Policy Paper, "Gays and the Military: An Emerging Policy Issue," *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Spring 1980, 74, ed, *Ibid*.

²¹ For a pragmatic discussion on why should the military retain the old policy, see Appendix A.

Notes

²²General Charles C. Krulak, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Speech to the Women's Officer Professional Organization, 15 Sept 1995, on-line, internet, available from: <http://www.usmc.mil/cmcspeeches.nsf>

²³Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense News Briefing, "Gender Integrated Training", June 3, 1997

²⁴Ibid., n.p.

²⁵Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense News Release, 29 July, 1994, "Secretary of Defense Approves Plans to Open New Jobs for Women in the Military.", ed, Ibid.

²⁶Department of the Navy, Secretary of the Navy, SECNAVINST 1000, 6 February, 1995, ed, Ibid.

²⁷Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense News Briefing, "Gender Integrated Training", June 3, 1997

²⁸Ibid., n.p.

²⁹Ibid., n.p.

³⁰See Appendix B for a more detailed analysis of impacts to effectiveness

³¹Speech at Air Command and Staff College, 10 March, 1998

³²Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense Background Briefing, 3 June, 1997

³³This same panel was criticized by the GAO for its "haphazard" research

³⁴Ibid., n.p.

³⁵Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense News Briefing, 27 June, 1997

³⁶Ibid., n.p.

³⁷Toner, James, H. "Gallant Atavism, The Military Ethic in an Age of Nihilism". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996, 13

Chapter 4

Foundational underpinnings—Where were we moored?

If I were called upon to identify the principal trait of the entire 20th century, I would be unable to find anything more precise and pithy than this statement: Men have forgotten God.

—Aleksandr Solzenitsyn

We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount. The world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants.

—General of the Army Omar Bradley

We are the world's most affluent, influential and powerful country today. For the past two centuries, we've been a source of great blessing to many countries around the world. We've promoted peace and democracy, reproved rogue regimes, and through our potent instruments of power, provided humanitarian and economic assistance to those less fortunate. We have welcomed countless millions into our borders seeking freedom from oppression or poverty. Ours is a history rich in success and benevolence. This history has caused some to study our society to determine the source of this greatness. Alexis de Tocqueville was one such individual. After studying the US, which was then an emerging power, he said,

I sought for the key to the greatness and genius of America in her harbors...; in her fertile fields and boundless forests; in her rich mines and vast world commerce; in her public school system and institutions of learning. I sought for it in her democratic Congress and in her matchless Constitution. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her

pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.¹

Why has America succeeded where so many other nations have failed? According to de Tocqueville, it was the foundation upon which the republic was laid.

Unfortunately, much confusion and disagreement surrounds this question and of those who laid the foundation. Who were the founding fathers? What was their beliefs and religious sentiment?

Some have portrayed the founders as atheists, agnostics and deists. John Adams, the first vice president under Washington and the nation's second president wholly contradicts this notion,

The general principles on which the fathers achieved independence were ...the general principles of Christianity...I will avow that I then believed, and now believe, that those general principles of Christianity are as eternal and immutable as the existence of attributes of God.²

The preponderance of evidence proves incontrovertibly every one of our founding fathers shared a Christian worldview. The republic's foundation was based upon Biblical principles. The overwhelming evidences from church memberships, education, writings, and personal accounts all but waylay any argument to the contrary.

Continental Congress Religious Demographics

Who qualifies as a founding father? The word “founding” denotes those whom originated or established, and provided the foundation for our form of government, in particular, our constitution. Founding fathers are therefore those who intellectually contributed to and were present at the constitutional convention. This definition narrows the list to 55 men.

If we want to determine the religious beliefs of these forebears we need only look at their individual religious convictions. Church membership provides the best indication of these convictions. Membership, in their time required more than filling a pew each Sunday. It entailed a sworn public confession of Biblical faith, an adherence and acknowledgment of the doctrines of that particular denomination.³

Demographically, of the 55 men, twenty-eight were Episcopalians, eight were Presbyterians, seven were Congregationalists, two were Lutheran, two were Dutch Reformed, two were Methodist, two were Roman Catholics, one is unknown, and three were possibly deists (Williamson, Wilson, and Franklin).⁴ Fifty-one out of fifty-five were known members of orthodox Christian denominations. Forty-five of these were Calvinists, the most doctrinally orthodox Christians around.⁵ Alexis de Tocqueville said “Puritans [Calvinists] ... founded the American republics.”⁶ George Bancroft, probably the leading American historian in the 19th century, called John Calvin, the “Father of America”. Bancroft, who himself was not Calvinist, went on to say, “He who will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows little of the origin of American Liberty.”⁷

It is clear that of the 55 delegates, almost all of them were deeply committed Christians. Even Benjamin Franklin's deism is questionable because it was he who called the Continental Congress to prayer when they seemed so hopelessly stalled. In his prayer, he used no less than four Biblical references.⁸ If he was a strict deist, he was not ignorant of the Bible, unwilling to neither petition the God of the Bible nor unable to employ its wisdom though-out his eloquent oratory.

The Founders Education

Most of the founders attended Harvard, Yale or Princeton. Entrance requirements for these colleges were both academically and spiritually rigorous. For example, the primary purpose for attending Harvard was to know God and the Bible. Harvard, attended by three founders⁹ and notables John Adams, John Hancock, Samuel Adams, required,

Everyone shall so exercise himself in reading the Scriptures twice a day that he shall be ready to give such an account of his proficiency therein.¹⁰

The same was true at Yale where seven constitutional signers¹¹, including Samuel Johnson and William Livingston and notable Noah Webster graduated. It was also true at Princeton, which produced the largest number of early fathers.

The beliefs in the tenants of Christianity and moral education was so pervasive that out of the first 126 colleges formed in America, 123 were formed on Christian principles.¹² In 1900, it was extremely rare to find a university president who was not an ordained clergyman. Christianity was clearly at the very core of education and it was under this system that the founders were educated.

Writings of the Founding Fathers

One of the most effective ways to determine individuals deepest and personally held convictions (apart from viewing their behavior) is to review their writings. What did they advocate? What sources did they most often draw upon when supporting their views? These questions were asked by political science professors at the University of Houston.¹³ They reasoned if they could compile all the known writings of the founders and determine the sources that they drew upon most often, then they would determine

their political and religious sentiments. The researchers assembled 15,000 writings from the founding era.¹⁴ After ten years of analysis, they isolated 3,154 direct quotes made by the founders and their source. Three men were quoted most often, Baron Charles de Montesquieu (8.3%), Sir William Blackstone (7.9%), and John Locke (2.9%).¹⁵ More than any individual source, however, the researchers found that the founders quoted from the Bible four times more than Montesquieu and Blackstone and twelve times more than Locke.¹⁶

This heritage was clearly understood by Congress. In 1853 the House and Senate Judiciary Committees investigated for over a year a petition to separate Christianity from the principles of Government. The House report said (the Senate report was very similar),

Had the people during the revolution, had a suspicion of any attempt to war against Christianity, that revolution would have been strangled in its cradle. At the time of the of the Constitution and the amendments, the universal sentiment was that Christianity should be encouraged, but not any one sect [denomination]...In this age, there is no substitute for Christianity...That was the religion of the founders and the republic, and they expected it to remain the religion of their descendants.¹⁷

The U.S. Supreme Court also understood this Biblical foundation laid by the founders. In an 1892 case the Court ruled according to the founders intent,

No purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, state, or national, because this is a religious people ... This is a Christian nation.¹⁸

Important in its ruling the Court provided eighty-seven different historical precedents to support its conclusions.¹⁹ The founders were unquestionably Christian in their world-view, that cannot be denied, but what did they advocate as the basis for morality?

Moral Principles Advocated by the Founders

George Washington, a soldier, a general, and our President and Commander in Chief said in his farewell address,

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, which should labor to subvert these great pillars.²⁰

Let's be careful to understand exactly what Washington was saying. He believed that in order for our country to see political and economic (prosperity) success, religion (Christianity and Biblical principles) and morality (derived from Biblical principles) were indispensable. He called them pillars of support. Pillars are load bearing members that if removed or subverted, will result in the structure it supports to collapse. Washington believed that one could not claim to be an American who would work to subvert these pillars.

The 1892 Supreme Court case mentioned earlier suggested how morality could best be inculcated,

Why may not the Bible, and especially the New Testament...be read and taught as a divine revelation in the [school]—its general precepts expounded...and its glorious principles of morality inculcated?...Where can the purest principles of morality be learned so clearly or so perfectly as from the New Testament?²¹

Why did the founders believe Biblical principles were the most effective means to morality and governance? Biblical principles assert moral problems are matters of the heart. Only by reaching the heart first could one stop crime before it started. Thomas Jefferson probably said it most clearly,

The precepts of philosophy ... laid hold of actions only ... [But Jesus] pushed his scrutinies into the heart of man, erected his tribunal in the region of the thoughts, and purified the waters at the fountain head.²²

John Adams explained,

We have no government armed with the power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion ... Our constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.²³

Clearly the founders believed that our constitution was erected for a people who possessed a moral consensus, who were trained in Biblical principles. It would be ineffective to any other people.

Our society, however, is a post-Christian culture. We, and thus the military, have seen the pinnacle and are now on the downward slope. We are running on the fumes of a former Judeo-Christian ethic. We are #1 in the world in violent crime, #1 in divorce, #1 in illegal drug use, and as the richest nation in the history of the world, #1 in the western world in illiteracy.²⁴ Although the majority would still identify themselves as Christian, seventy-five percent do not believe in objective truth or moral absolutes²⁵, a notion antithetical to a Christian world view. John Adams words have become painfully true.

Why should we then appeal to Biblical principles? Why should we adhere to absolutes? Why advocate high moral standards against which everyone is measured? The argument, “our founders did therefore so should we” rings hollow. We are in no way obligated to following our founders example. We are not obliged that is unless we seek preservation, order and effectiveness. It was Biblical principles and thus moral absolutes that made us distinct from all other societies. This was the “greatness” identified by de Tocqueville, this was the source of our country's, and our military's effectiveness. But this effectiveness was not possible without a personal commitment by our founders and citizens to personally integrate Biblical truths into their beliefs and behavior.

Notes

¹ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, edited by J.P. Mayer and Max Lerner, a new translation by George Lawrence (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 205

² Barton, David, *America's Godly Heritage*, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1993, 5

³ Koukl, Gregory, *America's Unchristian Beginnings?*, *Stand to Reason Commentary*, n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from: http://str.org/free/commentaries/social_issues/america.htm

⁴ Ibid., n.p.

⁵ Ibid., n.p.

⁶ Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy In America, Volume II*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1946, 83

⁷ Eidsmoe, John, *Christianity and the Constitution, The Faith of our Founding Fathers*, Baker Book House Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1995

⁸ Ibid., n.p.

⁹ Bradford, M.E., *Founding Fathers*, University Press of Kansas, 2nd Edition, 1994

¹⁰ Barton, David, *Education and the Founding Fathers*, WallBuilder Press, Aledo, Texas, 1993, 3

¹¹ Bradford, M.E., *Founding Fathers*, University Press of Kansas, 2nd Edition, 1994

¹² Ibid., 7

¹³ Barton, David, *America's Godly Heritage*, WallBuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1993, 9

¹⁴ Ibid., 9

¹⁵ Ibid., 9

¹⁶ Ibid., 9

¹⁷ Ibid., 14

¹⁸ Ibid., 10

¹⁹ Ibid., 10

²⁰ Garity, Patrick, J., *A Sacred Union of Citizens, George Washington's Farewell Address and the American Character*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, NY, 1996, 183

²¹ Barton, David, *America's Godly Heritage*, WallBuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1993, 11

²² Ibid., 23

²³ Ibid., 24

²⁴ Ibid., 24

²⁵ Sproul, RC Jr., *Table Talk Magazine*, January 1998, n.p.

Chapter 5

Anchorage—A Call to Integrity

O Lord, who may abide in thy tent? Who may dwell on thy holy hill? He who walks with integrity and works righteousness and speaks truth in his heart. He does not slander with his tongue nor does evil to his neighbor, nor take up reproof against his friend. In whose eyes a reprobate is despised but who honors those who fear the Lord. He swears to his own hurt and does not change. He does not put out his money in interest nor does he take a bribe against the innocent. He who does these things will never be shaken.¹

—Psalm 15:1-5

The singular distinguishing, defining value of our military profession [is] a priceless quality called integrity. Integrity—here is the touchstone upon which everything depends.

—General Lee Butler

This paper asserts the rift in the moral fabric of our society and the subsequent decline in military effectiveness were brought about by moral and ethical relativism, social reformers capitalizing upon this destructive philosophy, and a departure from our traditional moorings. But what can be done? The author suggests five courses of action required to recover (See Appendix C). The majority of people reading this paper, however, are unlikely to possess the ability to enact the sweeping changes these require. We are faced with the question, “what can I do?” A high ranking Naval Admiral recently said, “If you are worried about someone else's ethics [and not your own], you better be close to crucifixion.”² The Admiral's point was simply this, those vexed by our current

ethical environment may be faced with an uncomfortable question, “what am I going to do about me so that the ethical climate of my particular service can get better”? A good ethical climate begins the individual.

Former Air Force Chief of Staff General Ronald R. Fogleman called integrity the *sin qua non* of a leader.³ It is no coincidence that integrity is the first core value coming prior to “service before self” and “excellence in all we do”. The later core values are not possible without the former.

The English word integrity comes from the Latin word “*integritas*.” It denotes a sense of wholeness or integration, completeness, soundness, undivided.⁴ In our vernacular, we might say of one with integrity, “They have it all “together.” Integrity is the trait that includes other essential character traits: courage, honesty, responsibility, accountability, justice, openness, and selflessness. General Fogleman said integrity is what holds these traits together.⁵

On the personal level integrity means taking every aspect of your thinking and behavior *Coram Deo* (before the face of God) comparing it to an absolute standard and asking questions like, “did I just present information to my superior, (or my spouse) in the most scrupulous manner possible or have I shaded the truth (for my advantage)?” “Am I literally or figuratively stealing time or money from my country?” “Have I accomplished my tasks to the best of my ability with the time allotted?” “Am I considering other people and my country more important than myself?” These are questions of intent, dedication, commitment and selflessness and they all stem from personal integrity.

To be sure, however, we will fail. G.K. Chesterton once said that the doctrine of original sin was the only philosophy empirically validated by all the years of recorded human history.⁶ Paul made this clear in the third chapter of Romans, “All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God.”⁷ We will all fail to meet the absolute standard for integrity, this is part of our nature, our humanity. It is not so much a question of failure, however, as what we do with the failure that defines a person of integrity. Do we admit our failings to both our subordinates and or do we seek to hide them. If we hide them, we have no commitment to integrity. Integrity includes the courage to take responsibility for your actions and those of your subordinates. This is the difference between one who has integrity and one who does not.

Air Force General George Lee Butler, from his vantage point of over three decades in service, identified four reasons he has seen individuals fail in personal integrity. 1. Power—forgetting who you are. “Great men seek power to do, not to be.” 2. Fear of failure—to avoid embarrassment, we fail to take responsibility for our mistakes or we lie to cover up. 3. Lack of competence, people who are inadequate for their tasks and duties. 4. Poor moral climates where people fail to keep a personal code alive.⁸

A character outcome of the Center for Character Development at the US Air Force Academy is officers with forthright integrity. They define it as those whom,

Voluntarily decide the right thing to do and do it in both their professional and private lives. They do not chose the right thing because of a calculation of what is most advantageous to themselves but because of a consistent and spontaneous inclination to do the right thing...In other words, persons of integrity walk their talk.⁹

Persons of integrity do not stray from acting in accordance with strong moral principle even when it is expedient or personally advantageous to do so. The author knows an individual who upon entering the Academy swore that he had not taken illegal

drugs nor would ever do so while in the military. As a sophomore at the Academy, however, he took drugs. Undetected, he finished his last two years and went on to undergraduate pilot training (UPT). Upon graduation from UPT, he was required to fill out a government form for a top secret security clearance. A question on the form confronted him with this question, “have you ever taken illegal drugs?” Instantly he knew he was at an impasse. If he responded “no” he would be lying. If he responded “yes” then he was admitting culpability. He took counsel and was told that admitting would probably end his career before it started. He chose, however, to completely disclose his violation on the form knowing full well the probable outcome. He was later discharged from the service with a less than honorable discharge and required to pay a large sum for his education at the Academy. This is what Psalm 15 (see epigraph) means when it says a man of integrity “swears to his own hurt.”

Many reading this account may be thinking this man was a fool. No, not a fool, but one with whom the military desperately needs to fill its leadership positions. This is the test of integrity, what you do when no one else is looking, and what you do afterward if you have failed.

Our military today earnestly needs men and women of integrity, who have it all together. Who are willing to sacrificially serve in our nation's defense to fulfill their duty without regard to self, parochial, or larger agendas. Who seek to support and defend the constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic and who will fight tirelessly so against any attempt to undermine its effectiveness.

Only through personal integrity can we hope to infect those around us as Gallant Activists. Only through a personal commitment to character can we impart something of

virtue to others and our institution; for you cannot impart what you do not possess. Only by embracing an unchanging standard can we hope to stem the tide of relativism and all the destructive policies to our effectiveness that inevitably follow. Only by reaching back to our forebears sentiments can we lean forward to the future postured to face the next challenge to our life and liberty.

Our times require military members with the integrity to buck the current dearth of public virtue, while the current spirit of public service flat-lines.¹⁰ As Walter Lippmann wrote, “That, is why young men die in battle for their country's sake and why old men plant trees they will never sit under.”¹¹

Notes

¹ New American Standard Bible, Broadman and Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN, Psalm 15:1-5

² Speech to Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, AL, 4 March 1998

³ CSAF at Generals Officers Call, Nov 1996 on United States Air Force Core Values, lesson plan

⁴ *Webster's II, New Riverside University Dictionary*, The Riverside Publishing Company, Boston, MA, 1984

⁵ Chief of Staff of the Air Force, *Core Values Lesson Plan*, 1 January 1997

⁶ Colson, Charles, “A Question of Ethics”, *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996, 6

⁷ *New American Standard Bible*, Broadman and Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN, Romans 3:23

⁸ General George Lee Butler, Personal Reflections on Integrity from an Old Grad, Speech to Air Force Academy cadet wing

⁹ Dr. Edgar Puryear, *19 Stars, A Study in Military Character and Leadership*, Presidio Press, Novato, CA, 1994

¹⁰ Toner, James H. “Gallant Atavism, The Military Ethic in an Age of Nihilism”. *Air Power Journal*, Summer, 1996, 12

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 12

Appendix A

Homosexuals in the Armed Forces

The author offers three reasons why homosexuals should not serve in the armed forces, the erosion of unit morale, the high risk of health related problems impacting readiness, and the high cost that will be ultimately borne by the military for long term care.

Erosion of Unit Morale

Homosexuality in the ranks will negatively impact troop morale and thereby readiness. This is categorically the position of those who ought to know, the war fighters. A survey of active duty officers, conducted for the American Security Council Foundation, found that 99 percent believed that homosexuals would undermine the cohesiveness and readiness of combat units.¹

The Defense Readiness Council surveyed 2,800 retired flag and general officers and found almost 90 percent believed homosexuals in the ranks would undermine morale.²

Just prior to President Clinton enacting the new “Don't ask, don't tell” military policy regarding homosexuals, an overwhelming majority of members in the armed forces opposed any change. Forty percent said that they disapproved on moral grounds of lifting the ban. Another forty six percent said lifting the ban would enter into their

reenlistment decisions. Finally 11 percent felt so strongly that said they would not reenlist if it was removed.³

The general public were also opposed to lifting the ban. At the time of the decision, 57 percent of Americans were opposed.⁴ Finally, a February 1993 CNN/Gallup Poll showed that an overwhelming 74 percent of men who had not attended college opposed lifting the ban. This was particularly important because this group is the prime population from which the military draws its recruits. But what does all this have to do with morale?

Morale can be defined as a strong sense of enthusiasm and dedication to a commonly shared goal that unifies a group. Can heterosexual soldiers be forced to live and work in close quarters with avowed homosexuals and be expected to do so with “a strong sense of enthusiasm.” What is the goal? To increase tolerance in the military or make it a cohesive group of well trained soldiers, sailors, and airmen willing to take lives and give lives in their country's defense? But if unit cohesion were not a good enough reason, there is more.

High Risk of Health Related Problems

There is a significant and heavily documented health risk to members of the homosexual community, which is incompatible with military service. The author was not allowed to enter into active duty until a benign cyst was removed at personal expense. This policy was enforced because someone determined that individuals with this particular diagnosis were at risk for further complications that may impact their future ability to serve. This was a small risk the military was unwilling to assume. Furthermore, it was an unlikely healthcare cost they were unwilling to bear.

Under the new policy, the highest-risk group for Human Immune Deficiency Virus (HIV), hepatitis B and some of the most serious sexually transmitted diseases today are no longer even screened in the recruiting process. From a purely utilitarian standpoint, the US military has assumed an enormous risk. According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), homosexuals, because of their lifestyle, are extremely vulnerable to contracting HIV and Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STD's.). This well documented lifestyle includes, recreational drug use, homosexual sex, malnutrition, prior incidents of STD's, and most significantly, sexual promiscuity.⁵

The Advocate, a leading homosexual magazine, reported that 72 percent of homosexual respondents engage in oral intercourse, 46 percent anal intercourse, 48 percent in three-way sex, and 24 percent in group sex (4 or more). Most of the survey respondents admitted to having more than 30 sex partners over their lifetime, and 35 percent report more than 100 partners.⁶

The Army's Surgeon General, Lieutenant General Alcide Lanoue spoke of the health risks associated with homosexuals:

The military setting provides unique requirements for safety in executing the Army blood transfusion program and for preventing the transmission of blood-borne pathogens in the field setting. Homosexual males would comprise a pool of ineligible blood donors and as a group are at high risk of infection by HIV and hepatitis B, both significant blood-borne pathogens which can infect other soldiers through exposure to blood in peace and war.⁷

This group is at risk from any number of perils, AIDS not withstanding.

Readiness, from an availability standpoint, will suffer. A soldier who is infected with HIV will be permanently non-deployable. Some of these STD's will also render a soldier non-deployable such as gonorrhea, syphilis, and hepatitis B.

Readiness from a medical standpoint will also suffer. By 1993, the military had dealt with 8,832 HIV-positive service members. The majority of these have been separated from the service. The remaining 1,580 at that time were still on active duty and their status precluded them from deploying.⁸

High Cost of Health Care

Health care liability to the military is enormous. This comes in an era of decreased budgets and declining medical benefits. A homosexual recruit, who contracted HIV while in the service, would be afforded full medical benefits for the remainder of his life.

According to Dr. Edmund Tramont, Associate Director for retroviral research at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, this would be approximately \$386,000 in year 2000 dollars and rise to \$639,000 per person by the year 2008. Additionally, he estimated that the 10-year health care costs for HIV infected military members would be between 1.7 and 5 billion dollars.⁹

It's clearly in military's and the US tax payers best interest to screen homosexuals out in the recruiting process and discharge those currently serving in the military. It is also clear that the previous policy was an enlightened one.

Notes

¹ American Security Council Foundation, "Confidential Survey of 1,040 Active Duty U.S. Flag and General Officers," 7-21 June, 1993, ed, Ibid.

² Defense Readiness Council, "Survey of Retired Flag Officers, 15 June, 1993, ed, Ibid.

³ Los Angeles Times Poll Study #307 – United States Military Survey, Los Angeles Times, February, 1993, ed, Ibid.

⁴ Fabrizio, McLaughlin and Associates Poll, March 1993, ed, Ibid.

⁵ H.W. Jaffe and C. Keewhan, et al., "National Case-Control of Kaposi's Sarcoma and Pneumocystis Carinii Pneumonia in Homosexual Men; Part 1 Epidemiological Results, "Annals of Internal Medicine, Vol. 99 (2), 1983, 145-157; H.H. Hansfield, "Sexually Transmitted Disease in Homosexual Men," American Journal of Public Health,

Notes

Vol. 9, 1981, 989-990; Karla Jay and Allen Young, *The Gay Report*, Summit, New York, 1979; Janet E. Gans, et al., "American Adolescents: How Healthy Are They?," *American Medical Association*, 1990, 31; P. Careron, K. Proctor, and W. Coburn, "Sexual Orientation and Sexually Transmitted Disease," *Nebraska Medical Journal*, Vol. 70, No. 8, August 1985, 292-299, ed, Ibid.

⁶ Janet Lever, "Sexual Revelations: The 1994 Advocate Survey of Sexuality and Relationships: The Men," *The Advocate*, 23 August, 1994, 21-22, ed, Ibid.

⁷ Department of the Army memorandum, "Potential Medical Implications of Homosexuality in the Military," Office of the Surgeon General, 29 April, 1993, ed, Ibid.

⁸ Office of the U.S. Army Surgeon General, 9 April, 1993, "HIV Positive Analysis Report," ed, Ibid.

⁹ Edmund C. Tramont, "AIDS and Its Impact on Medical Readiness," *Land Warfare Paper No. 6*, The Institute of Land Warfare, Association of the United States Army, November 1990, 4, ed. Ibid.

Appendix B

Women in Combat

Physical Strength and Endurance of Men and Women

A recent study conducted by the US Navy (Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, CA)¹ sought to determine the effectiveness of training in the physical performance of five basic damage control tasks. These tasks were carrying litters on level surfaces, carrying litters up and down ladders, moving and starting emergency pumps, turning engine bolts, and directing fire hose streams.

Participating in the study were 350 men and 195 women. What they found is instructive. Almost all of the male subjects were able to complete all of the tasks even before training, while women could only perform one of the tasks to the established standard. Perhaps even more notable was after substantial training the women exhibited no appreciable improvement. The study showed a clear delineation in lifting strength and aerobic capacity between men and women.

Anyone who has served on surface or submarine vessels understands the importance of damage control. This function is essential for all personnel. Even civilian contractors who serve aboard these vessels are expected to participate in damage control. Simply said, lack of physical strength and aerobic capacity will limit the effectiveness of damage

control operations which leads to decreased survivability and will ultimately compromise mission effectiveness.

Civilian fire departments have discovered the injury rates of women to be disproportionate to men when expected to perform like their male counterparts. Women suffered up to three times the back injury rate than men. They found women suffer more injuries because in order to lift the same load as men who are at 50% lifting capacity, they must lift close to their maximum.²

A Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women corroborated what the civilian fire departments were finding. Women were at 2.13 times greater risk for lower extremity injuries and 4.71 times greater risk for stress fractures. Additionally, the same study showed that women's aerobic capacity was substantially lower than men.³

Pregnancy Causes Readiness Problems

Women, are more capable than men in many respects. Unfortunately, the ability to procreate detracts from combat readiness rather than as Defense Secretary William Perry said, adding greater “flexibility in the development of human resources.”

At any given time, up to 18 percent of women in the Navy are pregnant which corresponds to 8,423 women.⁴ During Desert Storm, 1,145 women on ships were reassigned due to pregnancies. This was an average of 95 women per month.⁵ Many of these women held gender specific billets. Consequently, when these women left ship, their billets remained unfilled and the remaining crew was required to take up their duties.

The author deployed aboard a Navy Destroyer for a week. While on board, the ship's executive officer explained that upon return, the destroyer would be in dock for an

extended period. During this time the ships berthing units would be retrofitted to accommodate women costing millions of dollars and months out of commission. Upon entering duty again, the destroyer would carry mandatory gender specific billets to be filled only by women. When asked if this impacted his effectiveness he corroborated much of following.

According to the Navy policy, a women sailor may serve aboard a ship until she is 20 weeks pregnant. During this time, she can never be more than six hours away from OB/GYN care.⁶ This policy is understandable because before it was enacted, five babies were born on ships of which one died. But as understandable as it is, it clearly limits readiness of both the sailor and the ship.

On average, a pregnancy takes a sailor from a ship for six months.⁷ This includes six weeks of convalescent leave and then a four month hiatus from redeployment. This period can be extended by the attending physician. According the Navy records, 43 percent of the women who get pregnant, never return to the ships, 35 percent leave the Navy and the remaining 8 percent stay on shore.⁸

Amazingly, Navy policy prohibits a commander from taking action against a woman who becomes pregnant during a deployment even though sex aboard ship is prohibited.⁹ This can and has become quite an effective escape route for a woman who no longer desires sea duty. Even more damaging is the impact to readiness. An empty gender billet may not be filled for a long period.

Notes

¹ Davis, Paul O, "Physical Demands of Ships, Tasks Are a Factual Matter", Navy Times, 2 July, 1990, 25, ed, Maginnis, Robert L, USAF Ret., "Feminism Sinks Navy Readiness", *Insight*, n.p.; on-line, internet, 25 October, 1997, available from: <http://www.frc.org/frc/insight/1s95wc.html>

² Ibid.

Notes

³ Section II —Alternative Views. “Report to the President.” Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Services, 15 November, 1992, 63, ed, Maginnis, Robert L, USAF Ret., “Feminism Sinks Navy Readiness”, *Insight*, n.p.; online,internet,25October,1997,availablefrom<http://www.frc.org/frc/insight/1s95wc.html>

⁴ CMR Report, Center for Military Readiness Policy Analysis, No. 8, March, 1995, “Navy Policy on Pregnancy”, ed, Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

Appendix C

Five Courses of Action

The author suggest five courses of action to reclaim former ground, maximize mission potency and posture ourselves for future effectiveness.

1. Reject social reformers
2. Reaffirm Absolute values
3. Retain high standards
4. Recruit moral character
5. Reassert the mission as the *raison d'être*

Reject Social Reformers

Chief of staff Harold K. Johnson (1964-1968) lamented in his memoirs that he wished he had gone to President Johnson, along with the other service heads, handed in his four stars, and said in effect, “Either give us the tools to fight in Vietnam or call the war off...”¹

Leaders must resist any policy or decision that would detrimentally affect the effectiveness of the mission exhaust every avenue legally and ethically available. If this fails, perhaps the only honorable thing to do, as a good soldier, is to resign. There have been precious few that possessed personal integrity willing to sacrifice a career, honor, and prestige for what is right. Former USAF Chief of Staff, General Ronald Fogleman is perhaps such a man. Faced early in his tour with the tragic fratricidal shoot-down of two US HH-60 helicopters in Iraq, he was disturbed that after the investigation no one was

found at fault. General Fogleman invited the panel to reconsider its findings with the admonition that 21 people dead and no culpable persons is unlikely. When the panel again failed to find any culpability he commissioned his own investigation and found both AWACS and F-15 aircrews had been derelict in duty. He instituted a new accountability program to ensure that performance reports reflected an individuals poor or wrongful behavior. He said,

We are the USAF and the US taxpayer has the right to hold us to a higher standard, and will be held personally accountable for our actions.

If anyone was willing to assign culpability for failure to perform it was General Fogleman. When the Secretary of Defense, William Cohen decided to cite General Schwailer, commander of the 4404th Wing, for failure to enact proper security procedures over the Khobar towers bombing, General Fogleman decided it was time to step down. He believed that General Schwailer had discharged his duty better than anyone could have in the circumstances and had actively advocated Gen. Schwailer's exoneration in the matter. Consider his farewell address,

Military service is the only life I have ever known. My stock in trade after 34 years of service is my military judgement and advice. After serving as chief of staff for almost three years, my values and sense of loyalty to our soldiers, sailors, Marines, and especially our airmen, led me to the conclusion that I may be out of step with the times and the thinking of some of the establishment.

Reaffirm Absolute Values

Lt General Bradley Hosmer, Superintendent at the Air Force Academy, established the Center for Character Development at the US Air Force Academy and specifically stipulated “Values clarification and moral relativism will not be taught at the USAF Academy.”² Echoing this sentiment, Air Force Chief of Staff Ronald Fogleman said

regarding the Air Force core value curriculum, “This is not a values clarification exercise ...There are correct answers, and those answers are found in the Air Force Core Values.”³

These core values, Integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do are worthy values because they are clearly Biblical mandates. That is, they are derived from traditional Judeo-Christian thought. Existentialism teaches there is no God so everything is permissible. This engenders the “me-first” mentality so often seen in our society today. Biblical ethics, on the other hand, teaches there is a God and each one of us were created in His image—It mandates we conduct ourselves accordingly. With this understanding, we are compelled to consider others more important than ourselves (Phillipians 2:3-4). This is why you cannot inculcate moral principles unless you embrace absolute values. Each individual must understand they are accountable moral agents.

C.S. Lewis says the head rules the belly [the passions] through the chest. The chest he equates with sentiment—traditional value.

These are the indispensable liaison officers between cerebral man and visceral man. It may be said that it is by this middle element that man is man: for by his mere intellect he is mere spirit and by his appetite [stomach] mere animal.⁴

Lewis says that those who attack traditional, absolute values unwittingly produce men without chests.

In a sort of ghastly simplicity we remove the organ and demand the function. We make men without chests and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honor and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful.⁵

We inculcate good values then by first recognizing a sovereign creator and corresponding immutable principles and sentiment. We use words that recognize value

and virtue. We first affirm there is good and there is evil and then we call good, good, and evil, evil.

Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.⁶

Retain High Standards

Major General Jerry E. White, in his article, Personal Ethics versus Professional Ethics, asserted that ethical behavior can be assured only by means of law, fear or personal convictions.⁷ Laws and regulations are required to set guidelines of expected or prohibited behavior. These are required if individuals are not driven by strong moral convictions. Consider the words of Noah Webster,

There are two powers only, which are sufficient to control men and secure the rights of individuals in a peaceable administration. These are the combined force of religion and law, and the force of fear of the bayonet.⁸

Speed limit signs do little to affect a driver's behavior. Consequently, laws are a last line of defense for those who lack moral judgement. Previous chapters have shown this to be a growing number of individuals.

The fear of punishment operates on the prohibitive conscience. It is effective only to the extent that the punishment outweighs the benefits of the bad behavior and the likelihood of getting caught. It is more effective than law alone. A 100-dollar speeding ticket helps to reduce recidivism.

The UCMJ is a good example of this. It was enacted by congress in 1950 to ensure good order and discipline and to govern the conduct of soldiers. It established a system of courts to try those who transgress its articles.⁹ Under its articles, soldiers can be court marshaled for such seemingly innocuous offenses as disrespect to officers (Article 89),

feigning illness (Article 115), using provoking or reproachful words or gestures (Article 117), exhibiting conduct unbecoming (Article 133), or bringing discredit to the armed forces (Article 134). It's not perfect but it represents a worthy standard and thus is attacked by relativists who bristle under any laws that appear moralistic. They call it an anachronism, puritanical and out of step with society.¹⁰ This high standard is not only warranted but capitulation would be to lessen the foundation for the encouragement of military discipline. We cannot afford to capitulate on high standards; failure is too costly.

Recruit Moral Character

Good laws are necessary, but good soldiers are a necessity. William Penn, who created the state government of Pennsylvania believed,

I know some say, 'Let us have good laws, and no matter for the men that execute them.' But let them consider that though good laws do well, good men do better; for good laws may [lack] good men ... but good men will never [lack] good laws, nor [allow bad] ones.¹¹

With the increasing incidence of moral degenerate behavior within society and the military, we more than any institution ought to be recruiting individuals with good personal character as a primary consideration. Recently the US Army has begun running criminal background investigations on all their prospective recruits. The policy is designed to identify a growing number of enlistees who conceal arrests and legal troubles during interviews.¹² It seems prior to the new policy, the Army was discovering recruits with prior criminal records after they arrived at induction stations or training bases. Cases where enlistees lied before entering the service jumped from 142 to 239 between 1995 and 1997.¹³ Additionally, the Army voided 1,028 recruiting contracts that had not

revealed past offenses before entering the Army.¹⁴ Lack of a criminal record, however, does not guarantee an officer or enlisted member possesses good moral character.

A good recruiting process should therefore entail more than ensuring a prospect has a degree, background check, and a physical. Our all voluntary force, in this time of downsizing, ought to be composed of individuals possessing high moral standards and who have demonstrated behavior commensurate with those standards.

An inwardly moral person, one driven by personal convictions, represents the best basis for moral and ethical behavior. Every commander would love to have people driven by a keen sense of right and wrong, making the right decisions based upon love of virtue rather than fear of punishment. These individuals, according to St. Augustine, are the best of citizens and best of soldiers.¹⁵

Reassert the Mission as Raison d'être

Admiral Jay Lynn Johnson, Chief of Naval Operations, stressed Operational Primacy as one of four stars of the US Navy¹⁶, The author believes it should be the load stone. Colonel Charles R. Myers, USAF, while discussing the Air Force core values, stated it well,

As a moral standard, excellence ordinarily means accomplishing the mission well. It means a determined focus on results. On getting the job done right the first time and on time. The military function is so important and so exacting that getting the job done demands more in the military than it does elsewhere. Mission failure in the military endangers national survival, and performing the military role requires capabilities and entails risks not found in other callings...The airman's promise to defend the nation imposes an ethical obligation to use every effort to accomplish the mission.¹⁷

nothing should affect combat capability. The author is a frustrated Seattle Seahawks fan. He has waited patiently for 22 years to see them in the Superbowl. He doesn't know how

many whites, or blacks or Hispanics or Asians are on the team. He doesn't care. All he wants to see is a championship team. To be sure the owners are after the same goal because they are in business to make a profit. The best profit is realized when you win. There are no women on the Seattle Seahawks. This is not because the owners have discriminated against women or believe them to be inferior in value. They have selected the best individuals possible in every position and role regardless of race or gender. Women do not have the physical strength, speed, and stamina to make that team.

According to General Douglas MacArthur, "In War, there is no substitute for victory." The only agenda on a professional football team is victory. The same should hold true in the military. Why do we now take a different view? Why would we ever place less capable individuals in demanding combat billets? Why would we ever lower our standards? Why would we reject absolutes and ethics, advocated by our forebears, that have proven so effective and their removal so costly? In football you can lose ballgames. In the military profession, you can lose lives, the war, or even your country.

Notes

¹ Colson, Charles W. *A Question of Ethics*. Air Power Journal, Summer 1996, 10

² Center for Character Development, *United States Air Force Academy Character Development Manual*, July 1994, pg. 10

³ *Chief of Staff Core Values Lesson Plan*, 1 January, 1997, section 4, pg. 4

⁴ Lewis, C.S. *The Abolition of Man*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947, 34

⁵ Ibid., 35

⁶ New International Version of the Holy Bible, Zondervon Bible Publishers, Grand Rapids, MI, 1978, Isaiah 5:20

⁷ White, Jerry E. "Personal Ethics versus Professional Ethics". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996, 31, on-line, internet, available from: <http://www.cdsar.af.mil/apj/white.html>

⁸ Barton, David, *Education and the Founding Fathers*, WallBuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1993, 14

⁹ Toner, James H. *The American Military Ethic: A Meditation*. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1992, 207

¹⁰ Ibid., 208

Notes

¹¹ Barton, David, *Keys to Good Government*, WallBuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1994. 2

¹² Montgomery Advertiser, "Army running criminal checks on all recruits", 21 Jan, 1998

¹³ Ibid., n.p.

¹⁴ Ibid., n.p.

¹⁵ Aurelius Augustine, *City of God*, The Modern Library, New York, New York, 1993

¹⁶ Admiral Jay Lynn Johnson, Address to the Air Command and Staff College, 20 Jan 98

¹⁷ Myers, Charles R. "The Core Values: Framing and Resolving Ethical Issues for the Air Force". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1997, 48

Glossary

ACLU	American Civil Liberties Union
ACSC	Air Command and Staff
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Disease
AMA	American Medical Association
APA	American Psychiatric Association
AU	Air University
AWACS	Airborne Warning and Control System
AWC	Air War College
CDC	Centers for Disease Control
COG	Center of Gravity
CNN	Cable News Network
DOD	Department of Defense
HIV	Human Immune Deficiency Virus (Virus that causes AIDS)
OB/GYN	Obstetrics and Gynecology
SAT	Scholastic Aptitude Test
SECDEF	Secretary of Defense
STD	Sexually Transmitted Disease
UCMJ	Uniform Code of Military Justice
U.S.	United States of America
USAF	United States Air Force
USAFA	United States Air Force Academy

Bibliography

- “Adult About Adultery: Don't count on the Rules, but don't discard Them, Either”.
World Magazine, June 28/July 5, 1997.
- “Clinton Loses Moral Standing”, *Montgomery Advertiser*, Nov 17, 1997.
- “Scarlet Letters”. *Air Force Times*, August 1997.
- “Searching for Wisdom in Military”, *Montgomery Advertiser*, 20 Dec 1997.
- “The Command of Truth”. *Table Talk magazine*, October 1997.
- “The Sanctity of human life”, *Focus on the Family Magazine*, January, 1988.
- Air University. *Air University Style Guide for Writers and Editors*, 1996, n.p. On-line, Internet, 4 November 1996. Available from <http://www.au.af.mil/au/rco/style/>.
- Augustine, Aurelius. *City of God*. New York, The Modern Library, 1993.
- Barton, David, *America's Godly Heritage*, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1993.
- Barton, David, *Education and the Founding Fathers*, Wallbuilder Press, 1993.
- Barton, David, *Keys to Good Government*, WallBuilder Press, Aledo, TX, 1994.
- Bennett, William J. *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators: Facts and Figures on the State of American Society*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.
- Bork, Robert. *Slouching Toward Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline*. New York, ReganBooks, 1996.
- Bradford, M.E., *Founding Fathers*, University Press of Kansas, 2nd Edition, 1994.
- Butler, General George Lee, “Personal Reflections on Integrity from an Old Grad, Speech to Air Force Academy cadet wing”.
- Character Development Manual*. United States Air Force Academy, Center for Character Development, Colorado Springs, CO, July 1994.
- Chief of Staff of the Air Force, *Core Values Lesson Plan*, 1 January 1997.
- Closson, Don. *How Do You Spell Truth?* On-line, internet, available from <http://www.probe.org/spelltru.htm>
- College of Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education, *AU Press Style Guide for Writers and Editors*. Maxwell, AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, December 1994.
- College of Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education. *AU Press Author Guide*. Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, March 1995.
- Colson, Charles W. *Kingdoms in Conflict*. Grand Rapids, Zondervon Publishing, 1987.
- Colson, Charles W. “A Question of Ethics”. *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996.
- Cotton, Ray. *Ethics: Pick or Chose?* On-line, internet, available from <http://www.probe.org/ethics.htm>
- Cotton, Ray. *The Morality of the West: From Bad to Worse*. On-line, internet, available from: <http://www.probe.org/morality.htm>
- CSAF at Generals Officers Call, Nov 1996 on United States Air Force Core Values, lesson plan.

Eidsmoe, John, *Christianity and the Constitution, The Faith of our Founding Fathers*, Baker Book House Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1995.

Garity, Patrick, J., *A Sacred Union of Citizens, George Washington's Farewell Address and the American Character*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, NY, 1996.

Hall, Brian F. and Wagie, David A. "The US Air Force Academy's Cutting-Edge Character Development Program." *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996.

Heimbach R. Daniel, "The Bible in the Moral War over the Rejection of Homosexuality by the Military Services: A View from Inside the Pentagon", *Premise* Volume II, Number 7, August 27, 1995, 10, on-line, internet, 18 February, 1998, available from <http://capo.org/premise/95/august/p950710.html>

Hunter, Heather. Character Education Institute. San Antonio, TX. on-line, internet, available from <http://www./CharacterEducation.org>

Johnson, Paul. *Modern Times: The World from the Twenties to the Nineties*. Harper Collins, 1991.

Kilpatrick, William. *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right from Wrong: Moral Illiteracy and the Case for Character Education*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992.

Koukl, Gregory, *America's Unchristian Beginnings?*, Stand to Reason Commentary, n.p.; on-line, internet, 16 December, 1997, available from http://str.org/free/commentaries/social_issues/america.htm

Krulak, General Charles C., Commandant of the Marine Corps, Speech to the Women's Officer Professional Organization, 15 Sept 1995, <http://www.usmc.mil/cmcspeeches.nsf>

Lewis, C.S. *The Abolition of Man*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947.

Maginnis, Robert L. The APA Sustains Homosexual Agenda. *Insight Magazine*, Family Research Council, <http://www.frc.org/frc/insight/1s95a.7hs.html>

Military Justice Statistics (Fact Sheet), HQ USAF (AMJAMS), 1976-1997.

Myers, Charles R. "The Core Values: Framing and Resolving Ethical Issues for the Air Force". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1997.

New American Standard Bible, Broadman and Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN, 1983

News Background Briefing, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, 3 June, 1997.

News Briefing, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, "Gender Integrated Training", June 3, 1997.

News Briefing, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, 27 June, 1997.

Puryear Dr. Edgar, *19 Stars, A Study in Military Character and Leadership*, Presidio Press, Navoto, CA, 1994

Solomon, Jerry. World Views. On-line, internet, available from <http://www.probe.org/w-views.htm>

Sproul, R.C. *Lifetimes: Understanding the Ideas that Shape Society Today*. Old Tappan, New Jersey, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1986.

State of American Society. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.

The Chicago Manual of Style. 14th ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.

"The Price of Immorality" *World Magazine*, November 1, 1997.

Tocqueville, Alexis de, *Democracy in America*, edited by J.P. Mayer and Max Lerner, a new translation by George Lawrence (New York: Harper and Row, 1966

Toner, James H. "Gallant Atavism". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996.

Toner, James H. *The American Military Ethic: A Meditation*. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1992.

Toner, James H. *The Sword and the Cross: Reflections on Command and Conscience*. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1992.

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

Tong, Goh Chok, *Social Values, Strategic Environment Course Book, ACSC*.

Wade, Rick. *The New Absolutes: As Review by Rick Wade*. On-line, internet, available from: <http://www.probe.org/new-abso.htm>

Wakin, Malham M. "Professional Integrity". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996.

White, General Jerry E. "Personal Ethics versus Professional Ethics". *Air Power Journal*, Summer 1996.

William Manchester, *American Caesar*, Douglass MacArthur, 1880-1964, Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing, New York, NY, 1978.

Writers & Editors. Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, December 1994.

Zimmerman, Carle C. *Family and Civilization*. New York: Harpers, 1947.

Zink, Lt Col Jeffrey A., Major Patrick R. Tower, "A Hitch-Hiker's Guide to Ethics Education and Training in The United States Air Force", Department of Philosophy and Fine Arts, United States Air Force Academy), research

DISTRIBUTION A:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Air Command and Staff College
Maxwell AFB, Al 36112