

INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND PROFESSION

BY

COLONEL DALE A. HOLLAND
United States Air Force

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2009

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

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) 17-03-2009		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Integration of Faith and Profession				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Colonel Dale A. Holland				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Lee E. DeRemer Senior Service Representative				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT Faith and the human spirit are important elements in the profession of arms and worthy of any strategic leader's attention and study. Spiritual readiness, unlike physical or mental readiness, is often ignored for fear of First Amendment violations. America's founding fathers intended to prevent the government from establishing any single denomination or religion, but never intended the absence of religious activity from individuals who serve in government to include the military. In fact, the government is compelled to provide military members the opportunity to free exercise of their religion. This mandate is facilitated by the chaplain core as upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the 1985 case Katcoff v. Marsh. The ultimate responsibility for spiritual readiness rests with the commander regardless of personal faith. The commander possessing strong personal faith must seamlessly integrate faith and profession in order to be an authentic leader. This essay explores practical ways to integrate faith into professional life from the perspective of a senior leader.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Strategic Leadership, Integrity, Religion, Spiritual Readiness, Separation of Church and State, Authentic Leadership					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 26	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND PROFESSION

by

Colonel Dale A. Holland
United States Air Force

Colonel Lee E. DeRemer
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Colonel Dale A. Holland

TITLE: Integration of Faith and Profession

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 17 March 2008 WORD COUNT: 5,084 PAGES: 26

KEY TERMS: Strategic Leadership, Integrity, Religion, Spiritual Readiness, Separation of Church and State, Authentic Leadership

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Faith and the human spirit are important elements in the profession of arms and worthy of any strategic leader's attention and study. Spiritual readiness, unlike physical or mental readiness, is often ignored for fear of First Amendment violations. America's founding fathers intended to prevent the government from establishing any single denomination or religion, but never intended the absence of religious activity from individuals who serve in government to include the military. In fact, the government is compelled to provide military members the opportunity to free exercise of their religion. This mandate is facilitated by the chaplain core as upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the 1985 case *Katcoff v. Marsh*. The ultimate responsibility for spiritual readiness rests with the commander regardless of personal faith. The commander possessing strong personal faith must seamlessly integrate faith and profession in order to be an authentic leader. This essay explores practical ways to integrate faith into professional life from the perspective of a senior leader.

INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND PROFESSION

Senior leadership in the United States military today is no simple task. Much of the force is under constant pressures from multiple deployments, family separations, post traumatic stress, and a host of other demands. The military is stretched thin in many respects. The force is physically, mentally, and spiritually exhausted as deduced from the U.S. Army 2008 posture statement which says, "Our top priority is to restore balance..."¹

Significant effort goes toward creating physical and mental readiness programs, but my experience shows comparatively little effort goes toward spiritual preparation of the individual or the force. Perhaps the tangible nature of physical and mental training lends itself more easily to formal readiness programs and the intangible nature of the human spirit does not. This does not mean spiritual readiness is any less important. George C. Marshall, General of the Army, once said, "The soldier's heart, the soldier's spirit, the soldier's soul, are everything. Unless the soldier's soul sustains him he cannot be relied on and will fail himself and his commander and his country in the end."² Faith and the human spirit are important elements in the profession of arms and worthy of any strategic leaders study and attention.

This essay will explore the historical foundation for the role of faith or religion in the military by examining the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the roots and meaning of the phrase, "Wall of separation between Church and State" and the significance of the court case *Katcoff v. Marsh*, 1985, for military chaplains. Then a discussion of integrity and what that means to an authentic senior leader of faith follows, given the historical backdrop and today's professional environment. Finally, this

essay discusses practical ways to integrate faith and profession for today's senior military leader who must strive to be an authentic leader in their personal life and in the lives of the professional forces he or she is entrusted to lead.

Constitutional Foundation for Religion in the Military

Careful review of our nation's founding documents helps to illuminate the intentions of our founding fathers. The first ten amendments to the United States Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, were ratified December 15, 1791.³ In particular, the First Amendment states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..."⁴ It seems clear enough that government is not to nationalize any one religion over another and at the same time protect the rights of individuals to worship in a manner of their own choosing.

Early draft versions of the first amendment proposed words like "...nor shall any national religion be established..."⁵ or "...any particular denomination of religion in preference to another..."⁶ Many early Americans experienced life under the yoke of the State Church of England which motivated many of them to come to America in search of freedom to worship as their conscience dictated. Given the context, it seems clear our founding fathers never intended for the government to pass any laws establishing any one single denomination or religion at the exclusion of all others. This has come to be known as the "establishment" clause and tends to overshadow the "exercise" clause, "...or prohibit the free exercise thereof..." that immediately follows.⁷

The latter clause requires government not to make any laws infringing on the individual's right to exercise religion as his conscience or faith tenants dictate. Therefore it seems equally clear our founding fathers intended, or certainly expected, religious

activity present in the lives of individual Americans who held government positions to include the military. The government cannot establish a single state religion but it must protect individual freedom to exercise religion. The difficulty in defining the line between “establishment” and “exercise” seems to be more blurred as of late and can be traced to the Supreme Court’s opinion or interpretation of the church-state relationship.

The origin of the phrase “Wall of separation between Church and State” comes from a letter President Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1802 in reply to the Danbury Baptist Association, Danbury, Connecticut.⁸ The matter concerned a fear of possible religious establishment by the government. Jefferson’s response assured them of no such government establishment of religion by referring to the First Amendment and paraphrasing his conception of what the establishment clause meant by saying, “...thus building a wall of separation between Church & State.”⁹ Over the years various courts reprinted Jefferson’s complete letter in their opinions but gradually the context of his letter was dropped and this single phrase was extracted to support court opinions in religious establishment cases.

Until 1962 various courts generally defined the wall of separation between Church and State as government not nationalizing a particular denomination or religion at the exclusion of others. Since 1962 courts have tended to more narrowly define the wall of separation between Church and State as government not supporting *any* religious activity.¹⁰ *Engle v. Vital* was the 1962 case ending prayer in public school. Since then, more and more perceived religious activity has come under scrutiny. For example, in 2003, an Alabama judge was ordered to remove a display of the Ten Commandments from his Alabama court room.¹¹ Additionally, lower courts in California

initially declared the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America unconstitutional because of the phrase "...Under God."¹² Further, it seems there is continuous controversy each year over the display of nativity scenes in public buildings.¹³ It appears that over time, the meaning of the word "religion" in the first amendment shifted from the government establishment of any single denomination to the support of religious activity of any kind.¹⁴

Where then, is the balance between no government establishment of religion and government guarantee of free exercise of religion to the individual? The essence of this question is central to *Katcoff v. Marsh, 1985*, United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which addresses the constitutionality of the Army chaplaincy under the First Amendment.¹⁵ The case looked at the constitutionality of Congress and the United States Army providing chaplains to enable soldiers to practice religion of their choice. The obvious inference is applied across the other services and becomes a landmark case for the entire military. Ultimately the court decided the Army chaplaincy is constitutional and brings out many significant points worthy of review.¹⁶

Some of the issues cited by the United States Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit, were size of the Army, mobility, deployable nature, combat stressors, and personal lifestyle sacrifices demanded of soldiers. The court saw increased religious or spiritual needs as a result of rapid deployments to austere countries and uncertain environments where combat stressors and the possibility of death confronted them. If chaplains were not readily available to deploy with the troops then the government would fail to provide for the free exercise of religion for its own members. More importantly, the court noted, "unless chaplains were made available in such circumstances the motivation, morale

and willingness of soldiers to face combat would suffer immeasurable harm and our national defense would be weakened accordingly.”¹⁷

In a 2007 legal review article of *Katcoff v. Marsh*, Richard Rosen, director, Texas Tech University Center for Military Law & Policy, concludes the military chaplaincy remains on a firm constitutional foundation twenty-two years later, but is still subject to legal dictates of the establishment clause. Specifically, he points out, military officials must accommodate spiritual rights of service members, must ensure no unwanted proselytizing, must not mandate spiritual participation, and may not discriminate against particular religious sects or denominations.¹⁸

The constitutional foundation for the military chaplaincy is firm. Therefore, it follows that the senior leader concerned about spiritual readiness should leverage chapel programs at his disposal to set the conditions for spiritual readiness of the force. Significant effort goes into building and maintaining readiness programs for physical fitness and mental preparedness, but precious little goes toward spiritual readiness. Most often this area is left completely up to the individual soldier, sailor, airman, marine, or coastguardsman and everyone hopes it all works out for the best in the end. The problem, as any good leader knows, is that hope is not an acceptable method to complete a particular course of action. The astute strategic leader recognizes the critical importance of the human spirit to overall readiness and seeks to maximize the effectiveness of the military chaplaincy directly or indirectly. The senior leader must lay the foundation for successful spiritual readiness, both personally and for the organization.

The commander is ultimately responsible for the spiritual readiness of the force and we are each responsible for our own spiritual readiness.¹⁹ *The Future of the Army Profession* states, "All soldiers have human needs and most have spiritual needs broadly defined, and converting these needs into strengths of will and character is an important part of combat leadership."²⁰ As senior military leaders we must embrace the importance of spiritual readiness if not personally, then certainly for the sake of the soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines and coastguardsmen we lead.

Authentic Leadership

The topic of authentic leadership has recently taken center stage among schools of leadership theory and discussion. Webster's Dictionary defines the word authentic as "Conforming to fact and therefore worthy of trust, reliance, or belief: GENUINE."²¹ One such definition, from a company specializing in helping to develop authentic leadership, defines authenticity and authentic leadership as follows: "Authenticity is the 'State of being committed to the truth'" and "An authentic leader is a person who chooses to live a life of integrity. They are not only honest in relationship with others but most importantly they are honest and true to themselves."²² The military needs authentic leaders of integrity and character with strong moral courage.

Integrity is the pillar on which authentic leadership is based. The word integrity is rooted in a Latin term meaning completeness or wholeness.²³ Other common words are derived from the same root, like the word integer, which refers to a whole number versus a fraction of a number. Similarly, a basic concept of integral calculus is the process of determining the whole by summing together infinitesimal parts. Each part contributes to the character of the whole when properly summed. The physical world

illustrates this concept when mechanical parts are uniquely designed and properly fit together to achieve an overall purpose or function.

For example, we often refer to the structural integrity of a bridge whose purpose is to allow traffic to cross from one side to the other. No single part can stand alone and each plays a specific role. The overall function of the bridge is fulfilled when each individual part is properly fitted together. The bridge loses its integrity when one of the parts fails to be consistent with the overall purpose of its design. When a cable snaps, a beam fails, or a pylon crumbles, the bridge collapses. Additionally, we sometimes refer to the watertight integrity of a seagoing vessel. The boat loses its integrity if a portion of the hull fails, water rushes in, and the overall function of the boat to keep people afloat is lost.²⁴

Similarly, every part of a leader's life must fit together to fulfill the overall function of leadership, otherwise the individual lacks integrity and will cease to function as an effective leader. For the leader of strong personal faith, integrity demands seamless integration of faith and profession. For example, the leader must be the same person at the club on Friday night as he or she is in the church pew on Sunday morning. Integrity means the leader acts in a manner consistent with who they are, no matter the circumstances surrounding them. If a leader acts one way in the work environment and a different way at home, then they lack integrity. Authentic leadership demands you consistently be who you are at all times, not who you think the establishment wants you to be while in the professional workplace. Anything less comes up short of true authentic leadership.

As already noted, the Constitution enables this practice of authentic leadership by guaranteeing free exercise of religion to every citizen of the United States. Commanders and senior leaders are afforded the same rights as those they lead, so long as they are acting in their personal capacity and not the official capacity of the position they occupy.²⁵ Current guidelines on free exercise of religion in the Air Force state, "...superiors enjoy the same free exercise rights as all other airmen."²⁶ The military senior leader is not only free to pursue personal spiritual development but obliged to do so, since leading authentically and personal faith is clearly an important part of who that senior leader is as a person. However, the senior leader's responsibility extends well beyond self to the organization they lead.

According to Department of Defense Directive 1304.19, "Commanders are required to provide comprehensive religious support to all authorized individuals within their areas of responsibility."²⁷ While the commander is ultimately responsible for spiritual readiness, all senior leaders share in this responsibility either as staff support or in policy making positions for the force. So, regardless of a strong personal faith, the senior military leader must embrace the responsibility to provide spiritual support to the individual members of the organization.

In addition to Department of Defense direction, recall the mandate of the Constitution to guarantee the right to free exercise of religion for each individual in the force. Every senior military leader upon assuming his or her rank swears or affirms an oath to "...support or defend the Constitution..."²⁸ Therefore, it follows the senior military leader is constitutionally obligated to address the spiritual needs of the individuals that make up the force. The constitutional mechanism to meet this need is the military

chaplaincy as concluded in our previous review of *Katcoff v. Marsh*. According to a Department of Defense Directive, military chaplains, “Are established to advise and assist commanders in the discharge of their responsibilities to provide for the free exercise of religion in the context of military service...”²⁹ The effective authentic leader does well to leverage tools available through the military chapel programs in order to facilitate spiritual development and readiness of the force.

Practically every unit in the military devotes organizational time and effort to unit physical fitness on a regular basis. Standards are derived and enforced to ensure the unit is ready to perform in combat. Substandard performance receives extra attention and, if not correctable, the member is potentially relieved of duty. The same goes for mental and technical skill readiness. Vast training programs are developed to ensure capability. No commander would ever knowingly commit unready forces to battle. Doing so violates the clear moral imperative to ensure the troops are equipped with everything needed to succeed. The same reasoning should be applied to spiritual readiness. The only difference being, no single standard can be established except to ensure that every individual is free to exercise their personal faith according to the tenants of that faith so long as, “It will not have an adverse impact on mission accomplishment, military readiness, unit cohesion, standards, or discipline.”³⁰

Arguably few spiritual readiness programs exist because senior leaders fear violating the establishment clause of the First Amendment. However, the senior leader must respect or recognize the free exercise clause and seek ways to ensure opportunities for spiritual preparation are made available to the force. The senior leader must cultivate a strong relationship with his or her chaplain and work through them to

avail the force of spiritual readiness programs prior to combat deployment. If you are the commander, then task your chaplain in the same manner as you would other staff members such as your director of operations. Set high expectations and demand strong spiritual readiness programs. Because, like physical and mental readiness, spiritual readiness requires consistent daily discipline and exercise. Do everything possible to make robust spiritual readiness programs available to the troops you lead. If you are not the commander, then make every effort to ensure policy aims support development of robust spiritual readiness programs.

Practical Examples

So what does all this mean for the senior leader? Theory only goes so far then one must face practical application. The following three guidelines are helpful for senior leaders of faith. First, faith must be expressed in one's personal, not official capacity. Second, service in the military and belief in religion are completely voluntary. Draftees do not exist in our military and certainly not in any religion. Third, free exercise of religion is encouraged while endorsement or establishment of religion is not.³¹ A review of each of these guidelines follows supported by actual examples, ripe with learning points for the student of authentic leadership.

In the professional work environment faith is personal not official. Everyone is free to exercise their religion in a personal capacity, including the commander or senior leader. For example, a U.S. Air Force Wing Commander is not paid by the government to spread his personal faith, but he is paid to command forces. However, the person who occupies the Wing Commander billet is free to exercise his or her faith in a personal capacity to include sharing that faith with others who voluntarily want to listen.

Current Air Force guidance to senior leaders stresses the importance of being sensitive to superior-subordinate situations where words or actions can be misperceived as official endorsement of a particular religion or coercion to believe in a particular faith. The key is voluntary discussions of religion, free of coercion and free of endorsement.³²

For example, during WWI, Private Alvin York struggled to reconcile fighting in a war and potentially having to kill, with his personal conviction that killing was forbidden by the Bible. He sent many letters to the Local County Board of Fentress requesting to be labeled a conscientious objector. Each request was denied. He maintained the integrity of his character by continuing to obey his commanding officers, choosing not to speak negatively, which might have lead to dissention in the ranks. Instead he chose to bring his concern to the attention of his company commander, Captain Danforth. Private York explained his opposition to the war and to killing. Captain Danforth believed Private York to be honest and sincere in his concerns and so he brought the matter before his battalion commander, Major George Edward Buxton, who agreed to meet with Private York. Maj Buxton wisely encouraged Captain Danforth to join them and further decided not to discuss the matter as a battalion commander to a private, but as three American citizens interested in a common cause. The battalion commander took steps to remove any perception of coercion and laid the foundation for respecting honest religious convictions, man to man. After several such voluntary and personal, not official, meetings of respectful discussion, Private York changed his personal view toward war and killing. Later his combat actions and gallantry not only saved American lives but propelled then Sergeant York to American hero status. Maj Buxton serves as a

good example of personal spiritual readiness, taking seriously the spiritual wellbeing of the men he led. The results were noteworthy.³³

Every member of the American armed forces is a volunteer, not a draftee. Each member is present by personal choice. A significant strength of our force is the mutual dignity and respect among all service men and women. None should be forced or coerced into believing a certain way against their will. Again, the more senior the leader, the more care must be taken to distinguish between official actions or statements and those that are private and personal. But this does not necessarily mean the senior leader cannot make personal statements of faith in public so long as appropriate steps are taken to avoid the perception of coercion.

Most Christian denominations based on the Bible encourage individual members to share their faith proactively. Sharing of personal faith is a basic tenant or command and comes from Matthew 28:19-20, "Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy spirit, teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age."³⁴ If a senior leader happens to believe in this particular faith, then what does integration of this into professional life look like? There are many different depictions to be sure, but the following is one such description of how a senior leader of faith was authentic in commanding his unit.

Colonel Jim Hougnon, United States Army, retired, relates how he introduced himself as the new training battalion commander to his team of sixty drill sergeants. After telling about his family, he described his own interests and hobbies then included the fact he was Christian. He explained, from a personal perspective, that he prayed

each of them would become a Christian too because he believed it would be in their best interest. Colonel Hougnon was careful to explain his professional expectation and evaluation of their performance rested completely on their individual performance and conduct alone and their personal spiritual interest had no bearing on fitness reports or professional recommendations.³⁵

Colonel Hougnon was an authentic leader and the risk to authentic leadership is public accountability. Your troops want to know if you are genuinely authentic and consistent in your leadership; they may even test you. Colonel Hougnon relates, one of his subordinates later identified himself as a Christian and it was clear he expected preferential treatment as a result. Colonel Hougnon quickly but lovingly expelled that notion, reinforcing his previous statement that his professional expectation was the same for each drill sergeant and that personal spiritual belief was a separate matter. Years later, during a different assignment, Colonel Hougnon was approached by one of the original members of his drill sergeant team. The drill sergeant expressed that he later made a decision to become a Christian because of the authentic and consistent leadership of faith he observed in Colonel Hougnon. Interestingly, Colonel Hougnon never had a conversation about Christianity with this particular sergeant.³⁶

A key element to Colonel Hougnon's effective authentic leadership was that he earned the right to be heard. He was selected for command because of his consistent display of moral courage and character that seamlessly included his faith. He was not expected to change into someone else after taking command, which meant he was not afraid to be himself. Every part of his life, faith and profession already fit together comprehensively to fulfill the function of being the leader. He simply led authentically,

not coercively or by force. The result was superior professionalism on the official side and new spiritual clarity on the personal side for at least two soldiers and probably more.

The effective authentic leader must remember free exercise of religion is encouraged while endorsement or establishment of religion is not. There is natural tension between government not establishing religion and yet guaranteeing free exercise of religion to every American citizen, especially those in the armed forces as confirmed by the court case *Katcoff v. Marsh*.

Several public examples concerning endorsement of religion within the military received national media attention in recent years. Highlighted below are two of these incidents. First, the overall religious climate at the United States Air Force Academy was accused of being overtly discriminatory and second, some senior leaders at the Pentagon were involved in making an endorsement video supporting the Christian Embassy ministry. We can draw several points of learning from each example.

In the case of the Air Force Academy, focused national attention came after former graduate and attorney Mikey Weinstein filed a lawsuit against the Academy claiming evangelical Christian values were being illegally pushed on the cadets by senior leaders. Weinstein represented a small number of other graduates in the lawsuit that was eventually dismissed by a federal judge for several reasons, one of those reasons being that none of the plaintiffs were currently cadets at the Academy.³⁷

The incident prompted the Acting Secretary of the Air Force to appoint Lieutenant General Roger Brady to lead a cross-functional team to review the Academy's religious climate. The team assessed the climate via hundreds of personal interviews, gaining an

overall sense of the ground truth perceptions of cadets and faculty alike. Lieutenant General Brady concluded no overt religious discrimination existed. Instead, there was a failure to fully accommodate every individual's religious needs and a general lack of sensitivity to expressing one's religious beliefs in a manner of mutual respect.³⁸

The report also highlighted one of the primary missions of the Academy: developing authentic leaders of character. For most people, character development and religious belief are inseparable.³⁹ This observation is reflective of what our founding fathers previously recognized and protected under our First Amendment rights. The report continued with several recommendations of which major ones are now brought to your attention. Senior leaders must intentionally plan to accommodate religious preference when planning schedules and operations to encourage free exercise of religion. Senior leaders are also encouraged to create opportunities for cadets, superiors, subordinates, and peers to dialogue about religion and spirituality because of its necessity to the character development desired in Air Force leaders. Finally, the report recommended reemphasizing the need for sensitivity and mutual respect when sharing one's faith or discussing issues of a religious nature.⁴⁰

The previous example contains some practical steps toward free exercise of religion. The next example is more of what not to do concerning endorsement. Several senior leaders, military and civilian, participated in videotape interviews to create a promotional endorsement for the Christian Embassy ministry at the Pentagon. While this sounds harmless enough, it generated a Department of Defense Inspector General investigation in which several senior military leaders were found in violation of Department of Defense regulations.⁴¹

Specifically, the senior military officers appeared in uniform, during the duty day, in front of clearly identifiable Department of Defense symbols with their senior rank clearly displayed. It was very evident their remarks endorsed Christian Embassy and some of the officers implied they spoke on behalf of other groups of senior military leaders. The overt symbols, rank, uniforms and circumstances gave the impression the senior officers were acting in an official capacity and spoke on behalf of the Department of Defense. While unintended by the senior officers, the end product video displayed official endorsement of a particular private religious organization.⁴²

These well-intended authentic leaders made some mistakes. What can we learn from them? To begin with, strongly consider legal consultation prior to any such activity. In this case, the leaders would have been authorized to proceed with the project if in civilian clothes, during off duty time, in a benign environment without overt military symbols clearly distinguishable. However, in this case, a former Pentagon chaplain set up the interviews and each senior officer assumed legal approval had been obtained, but none took the time to ask because all were eager to authentically support the project.⁴³ The additional lesson here is to never assume legal approval has been obtained; always exercise individual diligence when it comes to even the perception of official endorsement of private religious activities or any private organization. This will keep you away from establishment clause violations. Unfortunately, many leaders see the challenges of avoiding First Amendment violations and cease perusing their right to free exercise of religion. These particular general officers had and still have the same right to be involved with Christian Embassy as any other member of the military. But they are not allowed to officially endorse or establish Christian Embassy over any other

private religious organization. Remember, free exercise of religion is encouraged while endorsement or establishment of religion is not.

One final practical example to review is prayer at official military events. Under the protection of the free exercise clause, military chaplains are not restricted from praying according to their particular sending denomination. For example, the current Air Force policy does not overtly state chaplains may pray in “Jesus name” as is the tradition for many protestant denominations, but it does not prohibit them from praying in this manner either.⁴⁴ As a senior leader or commander, remember, you are responsible to exercise a heightened level of sensitivity to situations where your subordinates may perceive unintended coercion by your words or actions. Concerning prayer at official military events, you do well to confer with your chaplain. Military chaplains receive specific training for these sensitive situations and they exist to support the commander in meeting the spiritual needs of the force.⁴⁵

Conclusion

The human spirit is a very important element of combat readiness. For centuries, military leaders have wrestled with understanding how to harness the human capacity to wage war. Though it may be difficult to grasp for some, there is no denying the importance of faith and religion for the vast majority of people as it contributes to human capacity. America’s founding fathers not only recognized the importance of religion; they fought and died for the freedom to exercise individual religion apart from state mandate. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees government shall make no law establishing any single religion at the exclusion of all others and it also guarantees the free exercise of religion to every individual American. This concept has

come to be known as a wall of separation between Church and State, but in reality it is more of a delicate see-saw to be kept in balance as individuals are called to exercise their personal faith while serving in government positions to include the military.

The military chaplaincy exists on this constitutional foundation as verified by the 1985 court case *Katcoff v. Marsh*. The American government owes its military members the right to individual exercise of religion, especially when it sends American sons and daughters into harm's way expecting the ultimate sacrifice when necessary. Senior military leadership has the constitutional and moral obligation to care for the spiritual readiness of the force they lead.

Undeniably, it is the responsibility of leadership to be authentic, especially leaders possessing strong personal faith. Authentic leadership is based on integrity, and integrity demands the senior leader of faith seamlessly integrate faith and profession for maximum effectiveness. Practical guidelines for the authentic leader of faith are to remember one's faith is personal not official, the troops are volunteers not draftees, religious exercise is encouraged but endorsement of a particular religion is not, and finally, the senior leader must be sensitive to subordinates' perception of coercion when sharing their faith.

Endnotes

¹ Pete Geren, Secretary of the Army, and GEN George W. Casey Jr., Army Chief of Staff, "2008 Army Posture Statement," 2008, <http://www.army.mil/aps/08/index.html> (accessed February 19, 2009).

² H. A. DeWeerd, ed., *Selected Speeches and Statements of General of the Army George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff United States Army* (Washington D.C.: The Infantry Journal, 1945), 122.

³ “Bill of Rights and Later Amendments,” linked from *U.S. History.org* at “Historic Documents,” <http://www.ushistory.org/documents/amendments.htm> (accessed February 7, 2009).

⁴ “Bill of Rights,” linked from *The United States National Archives and Records Administration* at “Historical Documents, Bill of Rights,” http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html (accessed February 7, 2009).

⁵ Religious Tolerance, “The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Religious aspects,” http://www.religioustolerance.org/amend_1.htm (accessed February 7, 2009).

⁶ Jim Allison, ed., “Congressional Debates: Religious Amendments, 1789,” <http://candst.tripod.com/1stdebat.htm> (accessed February 16, 2009).

⁷ “Bill of Rights.”

⁸ James Hutson, “A Wall of Separation,” June 1998, linked from *Library of Congress*, <http://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danbury.html> (accessed February 7, 2009).

⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁰ David Barton, dir., *Separation of Church and State*, VHS (Aledo, TX: Wall Builders, Inc., 1992).

¹¹ B.A. Robinson, “The Ten Commandments, The “Justice Moore” conflict,” Linked from *Religious Tolerance.org*, http://www.religioustolerance.org/chr_10cg.htm (accessed February 9, 2009).

¹² Suzanne Herel, “Judge rules Pledge of Allegiance unconstitutional ‘Under God’ reference not appropriate for public schools, he says,” *San Fransisco Chronicle*, September 14, 2005, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2005/09/14/MNpledge14.DTL> (accessed February 9, 2009).

¹³ Paul Strand, “Nativity Scene Goes to U.S. Supreme Court,” *CBN news.com*, November 20, 2008, <http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/486017.aspx> (accessed February 13, 2009).

¹⁴ Barton, *Separation of Church and State*.

¹⁵ *Katcoff v. Marsh*, 755F 2d 223, United States Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit, Argued Oct. 29, 1984, Decided Jan. 22, 1985, <http://bulk.resource.org/courts.gov/c/F2/755/755.F2d.223.84-6184.352.html> (accessed February 13, 09).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 1.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 10.

¹⁸ Richard D. Rosen, “*Katcoff v. marsh* at Twenty-Two: The Military Chaplaincy and the Separation of Church and State,” *The University of Toledo Law Review*, 38, No. 4, (Summer 2007): 26-27.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Defense, *Appointment of Chaplains for the Military Departments*, Department of Defense Directive 1304.19, (Washington DC: U.S. Department of Defense, June 11, 2004, certified current as of April 23, 2007), 2. <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/130419p.pdf> (accessed 16 Feb 2009).

²⁰ John M. Brinsfield and Peter A. Baktis, "The Human, Spiritual, and Ethical Dimensions of Leadership in Preparation for Combat," in *The Future of the Army Profession*, 2d ed., ed. Lloyd Matthews (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2005), 464.

²¹ Anne H. Soukhanov, eds. et al., *Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary* (Boston, MA: The Riverside Publishing Company, 1984), 139.

²² A Higher Self, "Authentic Leadership," http://www.ahigherself.com.au/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=9 (accessed February 16, 2009).

²³ Howard D. Graves and Bruce K. Bell, "Changing Demands, Unchanging Need: Leaders of Integrity and Character for the Twenty-First Century," linked from *The Officers Christain Fellowship Home Page* at "Articles," http://www.ocfusa.org/pubs/bell_graves_leadership_demands.php (accessed February 16, 2009).

²⁴ Tom Hemingway, LTC (ret), USMC, Examples collected over time from personal friendship and mentorship.

²⁵ The National Association of Evangelicals, *Religious Freedom for Soldiers and Military Chaplains*, (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Evangelicals, February 7, 2006), 13. <http://www.nae.net/militarypdf/NAE%20Statement%20on%20Military%20Religious%20Freedom%202-7-06.pdf> (accessed February 16, 2009).

²⁶ U.S. Department of the Air Force, "Revised Interim Guidelines Concerning Free Exercise of Religion in the Air Force," February 9, 2006, <http://www.af.mil/library/guidelines.pdf> (accessed February 16, 2009).

²⁷ U.S. Department of Defense, *Appointment of Chaplains for the Military Departments*, 2.

²⁸ U.S. Federal and Military Officer Oath of Office, 5 USCode Sec. 3331 (01/24/94) Oath of Office (Title 5, Part III, Subpart B, Chapter 33, Subchapter II, Sec. 3331) Sec. 3331. - Oath of office - An individual, except the President, elected or appointed to an office of honor or profit in the civil service or uniformed services, shall take the following oath: **"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States** against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." This section does not affect other oaths required by law.

Enlisted Oath, 10 USCcode Sec. 502 (01/24/94) Enlistment oath, and who may administer (Title 10, Subtitle A, Part II, Chapter 31, Sec. 502) Sec. 502. - Enlistment oath: who may administer Each person enlisting in an armed force shall take the following oath: **"I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States** against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the

officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. So help me God." This oath may be taken before any commissioned officer of any armed force

²⁹ U.S. Department of Defense, *Appointment of Chaplains for the Military Departments*, 2.

³⁰ U.S. Department of Defense, *Accommodation of Religious Practices Within the Military Services*, Department of Defense Instruction 1300.17 (Washington DC: U.S. Department of Defense, February 10, 2009), 2. <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/130017p.pdf> (accessed February 16, 2009).

³¹ Richard Gross, COL, US Army lawyer, "Sharing Your Faith in the Federal Workplace," Lecture to Fellowship Seminar, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks Memorial Chapel, PA, November 12, 2008, cited with permission of COL Gross.

³² U.S. Department of the Air Force, "Revised Interim Guidelines Concerning Free Exercise of Religion in the Air Force."

³³ Tom Skeyill and Richard Wheeler, eds., *Sergeant York and the Great War His Own Life Story and War Diary* (San Antonio, TX: Vision Forum Inc., 1998), 79-82.

³⁴ Holy Bible, New King James Version, Matthew 28:19-20, <http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=matthew%2028:19-20;&version=50> (accessed February 20, 2009).

³⁵ Jim Hougnon, COL (ret), USA, "Leadership without Coercion" linked from *Officers' Christian Fellowship Home Page* at "Articles/Leadership," http://www.ocfusa.org/articles/hougnon_coercion.php (accessed February 19, 2009).

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Lara Jakes Jordan, "Case against Air Force Academy dismissed," October 27, 2006, http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/10/27/case_against_air_force_academy_dismissed/ (accessed February 19, 2009).

³⁸ Roger A. Brady, Lt Gen, USAF, *The Report of the Headquarters Review Group Concerning the Religious Climate at the U. S. Air Force Academy*, (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Air Force, June 22, 2005), i, http://www.af.mil/pdf/HQ_Review_Group_Report.pdf (accessed 16 Feb 2009).

³⁹ Ibid., iv.

⁴⁰ Ibid., ii.

⁴¹ U.S. Department of Defense Inspector General, *Alleged Misconduct by DOD Officials Concerning Christian Embassy*, (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, July 20, 2007), 2, http://www.dodig.mil/fo/Foia/ERR/Xtian_Embassy_072707.pdf (accessed February 19, 2009).

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid., 3.

⁴⁴ U.S. Department of the Air Force, “Revised Interim Guidelines Concerning Free Exercise of Religion in the Air Force.”

⁴⁵ Ibid.