

Homosexuality, Manliness, and The United States Army

**A Monograph
by
MAJ James C. Dayhoff
U.S. Army**



**School of Advanced Military Studies
United States Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas**

AY 2010

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				<i>Form Approved</i> 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) 25-03-2010		2. REPORT TYPE SAMS Monograph		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) JUL 2009 – MAY 2010	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Homosexuality, Manliness, and the United States Army				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) MAJ James C. Dayhoff, U.S. Army				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301				8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT This monograph investigates the nature of the resistance within the United States Army to the inclusion of homosexuals into the wider force and the preparation necessary at the macro level for potential social change should Congress repeal US Code Title 10, Subtitle G, §654 (also known as, "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"). Understanding the historical nature of masculinity, manliness, and the ideals of the citizen-soldier coupled with keen observation of the actions taken by the armed forces of the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia during their respective transitions to the acceptance of homosexuals in their armed forces, enables the United States Army to develop effective courses of action in order to prepare for the social challenges it will face. Effective leadership, implementation of <i>guiding principles</i> for transition and an adapted <i>Code of Social Conduct</i> are paramount to ensuring fair and equitable management of social change for both heterosexual and homosexual soldiers alike.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Homosexuality, manliness, masculinity, gender, citizen-soldier, armed forces, code of conduct.					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Stefan A. Banach, U.S. Army
(U)	(U)	(U)	(U)	44	19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code) 913-758-3302

SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES

MONOGRAPH APPROVAL

MAJ James Christopher Dayhoff

HOMOSEXUALITY, MANLINESS, AND THE UNITED STATES ARMY

This monograph was defended by the degree candidate on March 25, 2010 and approved by the monograph director and reader named below.

Approved by:

Thomas Bruscano, Ph.D. Monograph Director

Michael Hutchens, CDR, USN Seminar Leader,
School of Advanced
Military Studies

Stefan Banach, COL, IN Director,
School of Advanced
Military Studies

Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D. Director,
Graduate Degree
Programs

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

Abstract

HOMOSEXUALITY, MANLINESS, AND THE UNITED STATES ARMY by MAJ James C. Dayhoff, U.S. Army, 44 pages.

This monograph investigates the nature of the resistance within the United States Army to the inclusion of homosexuals into the wider force and the preparation necessary at the macro level for potential social change should Congress repeal US Code Title 10, Subtitle G, §654 (also known as, “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”). Understanding the historical nature of masculinity, manliness, and the ideals of the citizen-soldier coupled with keen observation of the actions taken by the armed forces of the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia during their respective transitions to the acceptance of homosexuals in their armed forces, enables the United States Army to develop effective courses of action in order to prepare for the social challenges it will face. Effective leadership, implementation of *guiding principles* for transition and an adapted *Code of Social Conduct* are paramount to ensuring fair and equitable management of social change for both heterosexual and homosexual soldiers alike.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Section 1 – Resistance to Social Change.....	5
Gender Norms and Manliness	5
Morality and Religious Conviction	11
Unit Cohesion.....	13
Looking in the Mirror.....	16
Section 2 – The Allied Experience.....	17
Canada.....	18
Australia	21
United Kingdom	25
Section 3 – Conclusion.....	29
Analysis	29
Recommendations	30
Implications	31
APPENDIX A	34
Traditional Military History	34
Feminist Theory on Military History.....	35
Advocacy	37
Government Sponsored Resources	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY	42

Introduction

Inherent in the fabric of the United States is the propensity of the nation to rise above the constructs of social strife, in order to create balanced resolution. Today, the nation is faced with a renewed social challenge placing the military squarely at the center of debate. The question of homosexual service in the military is a complex debate spanning multiple cultures and social norms.¹ The United States Army has long held strong resistance to the admittance of openly homosexual servicemembers into service for reasons ranging from strong religious convictions based on morality and manliness, to questions of legality and jurisdiction in the court system. Current national public debate on this socially volatile subject emphasizes the need to continue the discourse on homosexuality within the military. During the 2008 Presidential Campaign, then Senator Barack Obama made clear his desire for social change in the military as he called “for us [America] to repeal Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” (DADT) and lift the ban on homosexual service in the military.² While speaking to the nation at the State of the Union Address, President Obama reasserted his commitment to end discrimination in the military, unequivocally stating, “This year, I will work with Congress and our military to finally repeal the law that denies gay Americans the right to serve.”³

In 1993, Congress passed the DADT policy that President Bill Clinton signed into law that November. Officially known as US Code Title 10, Subtitle G, §654, the law prohibits homosexuals from openly admitting their sexual preference or attempting to, engaging in, or

¹ The contemporary definition for *homosexuality* is the sexual desire or behavior directed toward a person or persons of one's own sex. For the purposes of this monograph, the words *homosexual* and *homosexuality* are gender neutral and refer to Lesbians, Gays, Bi-sexual, and Transgender (LGBT).

² Senator Barack Obama, quoted during the 2008 Presidential campaign, <http://my.barackobama.com/page/community/post/alexokrent/gGggJS> (accessed September 29, 2009). For the purposes of this monograph, DADT refers to “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”.

³ President Barack Obama, quoted on January 27, 2010 during the State of the Union Address, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-state-union-address> (accessed March 14, 2010).

soliciting homosexual acts from other servicemembers.⁴ DADT is prohibitive in nature; however, it maintains provisions that protect homosexuals from discrimination, as long as they abide by the aforementioned rules. The law also mandates that commanders cannot question or seek acknowledgement from soldiers on their sexual preferences.⁵ The DADT law came into being as a compromise between conservatives; backed by strong military support, and the Clinton Administration, and subsequently led to the expulsion of an estimated 13,500 homosexual servicemembers since 1994.⁶ According to a 2008 *ABC/Washington Post* poll, “On the 15th anniversary of “don’t ask, don’t tell,” three-quarters of Americans support allowing gays to serve in their military, whether they “tell” or not – much broader support than existed when the compromise policy was put in place.”⁷ Once again, the U.S. military, and more importantly to this monograph, the United States Army, finds itself at the center of the debate concerning homosexuality and armed service to the nation; effectively forcing it face potential social change.

In light of the Commander-In-Chief’s intentions, it is incumbent upon the military to consider and prepare for such a dramatic shift in military social construct which inevitably raises its own challenges and obstacles. These challenges and obstacles are not limited to the simple inclusion, and subsequent acceptance, of homosexuals by the wider heterosexual force, but must also consider ramifications including retention, billeting, sexual harassment policy changes, servicemember benefits, and much more. As with any social challenge, there are issues and concerns that reside on both sides of the fence. Many servicemembers currently in the military harbor strong convictions against homosexual activity and some of these convictions transcend

⁴ US Code Title 10, Subtitle G, §654.

⁵ US Code Title 10, Subtitle G, §654.

⁶ Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN), <http://www.sldn.org/pages/about-dadt> (accessed on October 14, 2009). SLDN is a non-partisan, non-profit, legal services, watchdog, and policy organization dedicated to ending discrimination against and harassment of military personnel affected by "Don't Ask, Don't Tell".

⁷ ABC News/Washington Post poll taken in July 2008, <http://abcnews.go.com/images/PollingUnit/1066a5GaysinMilitary.pdf> (accessed October 14, 2009).

their passion to serve their country. Therefore, in anticipation that Congress may lift the DADT policy, the Army must develop courses of action for the inclusion of openly homosexual servicemembers into the force that considers all facets of the issue – a holistic approach that is fair to both heterosexuals and homosexuals alike.

The purpose of this monograph is to investigate the nature of the resistance in the United States Army to the acceptance of openly homosexual servicemembers into the force; and then, contrast those observations with the experiences of the British, Canadian, and Australian armies that have made the transition to inclusion of homosexuals across their armed forces, in order to develop greater understanding of how the United States Army can effectively incorporate homosexuals should Congress lift the DADT ban. Although there are many arguments for and against lifting the ban on homosexual servicemembers in the military, those arguments are outside the scope of this monograph. Rather, this monograph is written on the pretext that Congress will pass (at some time in the future) legislation repealing the DADT policy, therefore justifying the need to answer the more pertinent question – how should the Army prepare itself? This monograph argues that the United States Army can develop effective courses of action to mitigate the challenge of integrating homosexuals into the active force by understanding the nature of its [soldiers] aversion to openly homosexual service and by utilizing the experience of Allied nations in the subsequent adaptation of policies, regulations, and social norms to meet these challenges. In recent years, the British, Canadian and Australian armies made the transition to a policy that allows gays and lesbians to serve freely and openly if desired. Keen observation of the successful social change of these allied countries and their militaries will aid the United States Army as it attempts to solve this complex social problem.

Understanding the nature of the Army's resistance to homosexuals is the essential place to start when defining the complex problem of homosexual acceptance in the military. The theme of gender roles and norms is consistent throughout the majority of the resources used in this

monograph. Although arguments are made by gay and lesbian advocates of the United States military's ability to racially integrate in the face of severe social turmoil in the 1940s, those arguments largely ignore gender as an issue, and assume that racial and gender integration are the same. The notion of male soldiers (of any race) sharing living accommodations and communal showering facilities does not correlate easily with mixed-gendered military organizations doing the same; or a military organization that is open to homosexual servicemembers for that matter. This is why the notion of gender roles and norms and their relationship to masculinity is important to this argument. The resistance to homosexuals in the military is linked directly to gender roles, norms, and the historical construct of manliness. It is important to look at historical references to manliness and masculinity in order to gain a greater appreciation for what motivates men to serve in the military. In addition to gender and masculinity, there are sub-themes that link the two together in these works, including unit cohesion, camaraderie, religion, and morality.

The resources for this monograph came from four major areas; traditional military history, feminist theory on military history, homosexual and heterosexual advocacy, and governmental sponsored records; however, there are some resources referenced that do not fit neatly into these categories. The primary themes extracted from military history highlight the powerful attraction to the ideal of manliness in relation to military service through the ages, the intense emotional bonds and camaraderie created in the heat of battle, and subsequently the level of unit cohesion developed over time as units fight on combat. Intrinsicly tied to military history are the feminist theories that highlight the challenges faced by women as they attempt to integrate into armed service through the ages. Of significance to feminist theory arguments is the idea of the *Manly Warrior* developed through social and cultural constructs that subjugate women in all aspects of warfare. Gay rights and other advocacy authors, whether for or against the DADT policy, tend to focus arguments on conservatism, religion, and unit cohesion as the primary means of resistance in the United States military to the inclusion of homosexuals.

Finally, Government sponsored resources consider the question of homosexuality from multiple aspects ranging from clinical definitions of homosexuality to recommended options or solutions to resolving this challenging social problem. However, much of the documentation highlights the United States military's and its allies resistance to the acceptance of homosexuals into their respective forces. A detailed literature review is located in Appendix A.

Section 1 – Resistance to Social Change

The primary argument from the Department of Defense during the 1993 congressional debate on the issue of homosexual service was simply that homosexual behavior was not congruent with traditional military life.

Homosexuality is totally incompatible with military service. The oath, history and traditions of the American soldier rest upon fidelity rather than promiscuity, self-sacrifice rather than self-gratification, and military necessity rather than personal interest, career, and promotional opportunity. There is no right to serve in the military. Service is an obligation and a burden extended to those Americans who are best suited to fight and win our wars.⁸

This very statement provides a clear articulation of the resounding and poignant threat that the military felt as it grappled with the potential that it would have to include homosexuals into its ranks. It is a shining light into the soul of the United States Army and underscores how it sees itself.

Gender Norms and Manliness

The debate over homosexuality and the military delves deeply into American history. However, the debate is not just about homosexuality; it also encompasses sexuality and the differences between the genders in general. This monograph does not assume that manliness is a fundamental trait of good soldiering, but rather that manliness is a component trait of how citizen-

⁸ Ronald D. Ray (COL), *Gays: In or Out? The U.S. Military and Homosexuals – A Sourcebook* (New York: Brassey's, 1993), 123. In this quote, COL (R) Ray summarizes his argument citing Federal Court cases in which the court decided that no one has any right to serve in the military and that no citizen has any legal right to avoid service in the armed forces if called upon.

soldiers see themselves. The mirror of manliness reflects multiple images throughout military history; they are still prevalent in today's fighting force. Gender norms such as; men do the fighting, a women's place is in the home, fear and cowardice have no place in combat, and *Duty, Honor, Country* are all embraced by American fighting men today.⁹ It is through this lens that the Army must view itself if it is to effectively address its concerns about homosexuality.

For example, in *Citizen-Soldier's and Manly Warriors*, R. Claire Snyder explores the foundations of the Ancient's ideal of the republican-citizen as it pertains to the development of the citizen-soldier – a soldier sworn to protect and serve his nation. Her arguments are somewhat Machiavellian in that the “heroic ethic” that binds the citizen-soldier to his cause is masculine in its origin and subjugates women for fear that their “erotic power threatens to infect him with feminine softness.”¹⁰ She further asserts that women temper the *heroic ethic* with the ability to “threaten a man's self control,” the temptation for a man to lust after another man's wife, and view that women weaken the man's control over the citizenship he protects.¹¹ At the heart of this argument is the assertion that men have an overwhelming desire to protect their property (including women), their rights, and freedoms.

As time progressed, the construct of masculinity and the citizen-soldier became more defined. Kristin Hoganson suggests, “The political prominence of veterans and the military metaphors that pervaded politics highlighted the idea of politics as a manly endeavor – one that called for the same discipline, strength, courage, and fraternal loyalty required in battle.”¹² Near the turn of the 20th Century, Americans held their war veterans in high esteem, placing great value

⁹ Linda Grant DePauw, *Battle Cries and Lullabies* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998), 18-25. In this section, De Pauw outlines traditional and historical military roles held by women; victims, instigators, camp followers, leaders, rear guard, among others.

¹⁰ R. Claire Snyder, *Citizen Soldiers and Manly Warriors* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999), 25.

¹¹ Snyder, 25.

¹² Kristin L. Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 25. Here Hoganson equates American masculinity to jingoism.

on their leadership quality and potential for continued service to the nation in civil capacities.¹³ This capacity as a citizen-soldier continued to propagate ensuring that political figures carried the manly status so “embodied by soldiers.”¹⁴ Manliness is a trait that is entrenched in the military mindset and deeply rooted in the past. The idea that men must be the protectorate, the civil leader, and the provider are all constructs that find their evolution in military history. The citizen-soldier ideal is fostered by a sense of fraternity where a common identity replaces that of the individual.

Both Snyder’s and Hoganson’s arguments tie together themes that Richard Holmes explores in his written accounts of soldiers at war; specifically, masculinity. In his book, *Acts of War*, Holmes summarizes an article written by Major R.L. Nabors in 1982:

Major R.L. Nabors goes to the heart of the matter by suggesting that much male opposition to the increase of women's military role stems from the fact that such an increase threatens the single-gender uniqueness from which men derive their self-identification and feelings of masculinity. While admitting that men do possess greater physical strength and stamina than women, Nabors argues that opposition to women in the army is culturally conditioned, and relies on sex stereotyping, paternalism and gender identification. After all, women are able to prove their femininity by bearing children, but for the man, 'the most observable, unique and honored role ... has traditionally been that of warrior'.¹⁵

For Holmes, the “cult of virility” in the military continuously casted doubt in the mind of the military man leading him to denigrate women and any other male who fails to emphasize manliness.¹⁶

Further introspection into the minds of fighting men reveals that “two versions of manhood competed... the hard-drinking, gambling, whoring two-fisted man among men, and the sober, responsible, dutiful son or husband. Some soldiers found that the army transformed them

¹³ Hoganson, 26.

¹⁴ Hoganson, 26.

¹⁵ Richard Holmes, *Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle* (New York: The Free Press, 1985), 101. Article referenced by Holmes: “Women in the Army: Do They Measure Up?” by I.L. Nabors, published in *Military Review*, October 1982.

¹⁶ Holmes, 46.

from one kind of man to the other, better kind.”¹⁷ For example, during the Civil War, American men found themselves compelled to serve their nation for duty and honor. On the one hand, there is this ideal that the greatest test of manhood is war, and the security and safety of a man’s livelihood is linked to his ability to fight. On the other, and especially for men in the South, the ideal of honor and chivalry forced men to continue fighting against horrific odds, simply to avoid accusations of cowardice.¹⁸

By World War I, the idea of manliness was synonymous with ideas of independence, freedom, honor, decisiveness, masculine toughness, and especially; chivalry.¹⁹ These social constructs were ingrained into the consciousness that became a soldier at the turn of the 20th century. As society grappled with the potential for world war prior to 1914, chivalry became the preeminent form of masculinity as men attempted to reflect the overt ideal of the ‘good soldier’ or the ‘dutiful citizen’ in their everyday life.²⁰ “As if in response to the threats to masculinity that man were facing [just prior to World War I], the society intensified its celebration of all things male even to the point of embracing the ultimate test of manliness: war.”²¹ This trend would continue through World War I and beyond with what Richard Holmes calls, “mustache manliness” in which men desired the greatest appearance on manhood in order to break clean from the bonds of youth.²²

As World War II saw greater inclusion of women into military roles, it questioned the manliness ideal that was so engendered throughout history. Capable women were assuming roles traditionally held by men and further questioning the traditional views of masculinity and

¹⁷James M. McPherson, *For Cause and Comrade* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 26.

¹⁸ McPherson, 36.

¹⁹ Mark H. Moss, *Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War* (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2001), 29.

²⁰ Moss, 30.

²¹ Moss, 143.

²² Richard Holmes, *Tommy* (Bury St. Edmunds, UK: Harper-Collins Publishers, 2004), 365.

manliness. Women's military historian, D'Ann Campbell argues that, for men in the military to cope with this change, "underground slander campaigns" were adopted by senior military leaders accusing women of promiscuity and unreliability.²³ Campbell further argues that, "Maleness was synonymous with the military. Some joked about orders from women generals; others feared women would have a softening influence on their soldiers and weaken their fighting abilities."²⁴ This underscores the fear that men harbored of losing their power and privilege in the 1940s as women's rights movements began to question the ideal that the 'citizen-soldier' was reserved for men.

Snyder asserts, "This fraternity entails a strong degree of bonding among its members, a bonding that is constituted through the rejection of previous identities and the acquisition of a new, common identity: the Manly Warrior."²⁵ Subsequently, this new identity laid the foundation for the masculine mindset and the values that coincided with the virtues associated with the citizen-soldier.²⁶ These 'values' are the foundation of today's Army: *Loyalty, Duty, Respect, Selfless-service, Honor, Integrity, and Personal Courage*. The first letter of each value spells the acronym, LDRSHIP or *leadership*; the very trait of past and present veterans held in such high esteem and the trait expected of the civic leaders of the nation. Not only is manliness an inherent trait of citizen-soldiers, it is a quality that its nation expects its soldiers to carry.

It is in the bonds of unit cohesion that the U.S. military seats its strongest argument against the inclusion of homosexuals into the force. The argument that homosexuality is incompatible with the military lifestyle, and undermines cohesion within the military organization, draws considerable fire from civil-rights activists and politicians alike. One of the great opponents of lifting the ban during the 1993 congressional debate was sociologist Charles

²³ D'Ann Campbell, *Women at War with America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 37.

²⁴ Campbell, 37.

²⁵ Snyder, 147.

²⁶ Snyder, 147.

Moskos.²⁷ Moskos was a key player in the development of the Department of Defense's position against homosexuals and the majority of his argument centered on the idea that allowing gays to serve alongside heterosexual males would detract from the masculinity of a unit, creating an effeminate quality. The following quotation taken from the Ronald D. Ray's sourcebook, *Gays: In or Out?*, typifies the Department of Defense position during the 1993 congressional debate over the inclusion of gays in the military.

We are asking men in combat to do an essentially irrational thing – put themselves in a position where they are likely to get killed... One of the few ways to persuade men to do that is to appeal to their masculinity... You cannot have an androgynous military... The idea that fighting is a masculine trait runs deep.²⁸

Moskos' assertion links together the over-arching ideal of the *Manly Warrior*; that men desire to serve in the defense of their nation to gain or maintain their masculinity, to provide protection for their property and to protect their freedom. This is the core construct of the *Manly Warrior*. The inclusion of homosexual servicemembers brings into question not only sexuality, but also questions of gender norms. Snyder argues, these gender norms are “performatively constructed, rather than rooted in nature,” meaning that society implements these ideals culturally and that gender roles are more flexible than simple physical traits.²⁹ Although the argument encompassing the clinical definition of *gender* is not germane to this monograph; the simple fact that culture and society play a role in the acceptance and implementation of gender roles and norms is. To the *Manly Warrior*, the built-in cultural ideal that men do the fighting contradicts the acceptance of homosexuals in to the fighting force and is seen as an attempt to take away the masculinity of the citizen-soldier and replace it with feminine virtues. For years after the 1993

²⁷ Charles Moskos was a renowned military sociologist and participated heavily in the military's defense against lifting the ban on homosexual service. Nathaniel Frank gives an excellent overview of Moskos' work in the prologue of his book, *Unfriendly Fire*. Moskos is credited with coining the phrase “don't ask, don't tell”.

²⁸ Ray, 63, quoted in William Matthews, “Male-dominated Culture,” *The Air Forces Times*, July 20, 1992.

²⁹ Snyder, 138. Performative Theory suggests that *gender* roles are culturally established rather than founded in nature.

homosexuality debate, Moskos continued his assertions using terms, such as, “natural law” and “moral right” to argue for the continuance of the ban.³⁰ Moskos’ influence still prevails with the military even after his death in 2008.³¹

Morality and Religious Conviction

According to a Gallup poll released in early 2009, near 77% of American’s “identify with some form of a Christian religion.”³² The sixty-year continuous poll indicates a slow downward trend, which started at 91% in 1948.³³ However, the statistics in this poll highlight the simple fact that the vast majority of Americans still share in some form of Christian values. These Christian values and conservativeness were the strongest opposition to President Clinton’s attempts to lift the ban on homosexuals serving in the military in 1993. When talk of lifting the ban began to make headlines in the early 1990s, religious leaders like Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and James Dobson injected conservative values and views into the dialogue.³⁴ Nathaniel Franks suggests that, “encompassing a range of socially conservative religious groups, from traditional Catholics to fundamentalist Protestants, in the 1980’s the religious right turned its attention to politics... ultimately spreading their message of God, family, and country to tens of millions of American homes.”³⁵ The power and presence that religion, especially Christianity, plays in American society, and more specifically in the microcosm of American society that is the United States Army is important in understanding the question of morality in the debate over homosexual service.

³⁰ Nathaniel Frank, *Unfriendly Fire: How the Gay Ban Undermines the Military and Weakens America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2009), 27.

³¹ Frank, xvi. “Moskos had the ears of the highest military and civilian makers in part because he had spent his career analyzing a problem that many considered similar: racial integration of the armed forces.”

³² Gallup, compiled data taken between 1948 and 2008 on Christian identity, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/117409/easter-smaller-percentage-americans-christian.aspx> (accessed November 18, 2009).

³³ Gallup, *Christianity Poll*.

³⁴ Frank, 30.

³⁵ Frank, 30.

The ideal of morality in Christianity is directly linked to the ideal of manliness. Generally, Judeo-Christian beliefs place the man at the center of the household. He is the bread winner, he makes the family decisions, and he is responsible for the protection and honor of his family. There is little difference in the Army, where soldiers are expected to provide for their family, protect them, and serve with honor and loyalty. Most Christians view homosexuality as contrary to their moral compass. This is not to say that all Christian faiths are homophobic, but generally speaking, the majority of Christians view homosexuality as immoral. This particular view poses a challenge for an army that may have to adapt its cultural norms if the ban on homosexuals is lifted, and the religious fallout lands squarely on the laps of the Army's Chaplaincy Corps.

Chaplains are responsible for the spiritual health of the Army. Their mission statement, "The US Army Chaplaincy provides religious support to America's Army while assisting commanders in ensuring the right of free exercise of religion for all Soldiers..." implies that all soldiers of any faith, social background or personal belief will receive impartial support of any army chaplain.³⁶ In concept, it is flawless and generally works effectively in today's army. The question is; how differently do Chaplains see their responsibilities today, amidst persistent military conflict as opposed to 1993 when the army was in relative calm? As the debate raged over homosexuals in the military in 1993, the Chaplains Corps was heavily outspoken. Several documents written by military chaplains circulated the Department of Defense in protest to the potential that homosexuals would be allowed to serve openly.³⁷ Concerns about AIDS/HIV, predation, and forced acceptance were the themes that carried the most weight.³⁸ However, the foundation for the resistance of most chaplains was simply that they were morally opposed to

³⁶ United States Chaplains Corps, "Mission Statement," <http://www.army.mil/info/organization/chaplaincy/> (accessed November 18, 2009).

³⁷ Frank, 50.

³⁸ Frank, 50.

homosexual conduct and were concerned that the admittance of homosexuals would place them in a position that questioned their religious beliefs. At the time, the religious right encapsulated many of these concerns as most of the commissioning sources for chaplains were members of the same organizations that pressed to exclude homosexuals in the military.³⁹ The Chaplains Corps position on homosexuality and military service has remained constant over the last two decades. In a statement made in June 2009, former Chaplain Major General Charles Baldwin (Ret) said, “This is a moral issue, and one of my strong contentions is that to repeal the law [DADT] would be to show great disrespect for the religious convictions of the great majority of the people in the military...”⁴⁰

Unit Cohesion

War binds men more tightly together than almost any other branch of human activity. To share your last crumb of bread with another, to warm your enfeebled body against another's in the bleak and barren mystery of the night, to undergo shame, fear and death with scores of others of your age and mental colouring - who, indeed, would trade these comrades of the battlefield for friends made in time of peace?⁴¹

The idea of camaraderie or comradeship is deeply woven in the fabric of the military. In combat, nothing drives a soldier to perform better in the face of fear than the knowledge that his ‘brothers’ are in danger and require his help.⁴² The mantra, “leave no man behind,” is instilled in every soldier who passes through basic training on their way to service in the military. It is in basic training where “the process of military training is designed as much to inculcate the group

³⁹ Frank, 51.

⁴⁰ Chaplain Charles Baldwin, Major General (Retired), quoted in an interview with Jim Lehrer, Public Broadcast Service, <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/video/module.html?mod=1&pkg=0629military&seg=1> (accessed on November 18, 2009).

⁴¹ John Ellis, *On The Front Lines: The Experience of War through the Eyes of the Allied Soldiers in World War II* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1990), 315. Quote from J. Belden who served on several fronts during World War II.

⁴² Gerald F. Linderman, *The World Within War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 263.

cohesion and solidarity upon which fighting spirit depends as it is to produce an adequate level of technical or tactical expertise.”⁴³

The “essence” of the unit cohesion argument is that “military service is [a] subordination of the desires and interests of the individual to the *needs of the service*.”⁴⁴ When a servicemember enlists in the military, they effectively give away some of their rights in order to become part of the unit. This is especially exigent for young men and women entering the unfamiliar environment of basic training where personal privacy is scarce; soldiers live in open barracks, share open showers and latrines and eat in communal dining facilities. As recent as the early 1990s this was the military life that most servicemembers knew. In today’s Army, it is unfair to say that these living conditions continue when servicemembers reach their assigned units upon completion of basic and advanced training. Nowadays, most servicemembers live in apartment style quarters, where they may share accommodations with one to four other servicemembers of the same sex. They have access to private bathrooms and have far more privacy than in previous years. Combat, however, is a different story.

There is an inherent intimacy in combat. Soldiers fight in pitched battles, live and survive under austere conditions, and share life-threatening experiences that many may never talk about. Soldiers fighting in combat share experiences “ranging from bitter enmity to intense affection, from paralyzing terror to serene heroism, and from stultifying boredom to frenetic activity.”⁴⁵ Much of this ideal is shaped by the model of the masculine citizen-soldiers toughness and ability to cope with the stark realities of combat. Soldiers must cope with stress and tragedy of combat while maintaining their honor and integrity, and those who cannot are seen as weak. “The isolation of the combat soldier manifested itself in a loneliness he seldom discussed. Such

⁴³ John Keegan and Richard Holmes, *Soldiers* (New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1986), 42.

⁴⁴ Melissa Wells-Petry, *Exclusion: Homosexuals and the Right to Serve* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Gateway, 1993), 30.

⁴⁵ Keegan and Holmes, 259.

feelings were at odds with the masculine ethic. To write of them risked exposing a weakness that those at home might find disappointing or even disgusting.”⁴⁶ In this passage, Gerald Linderman alludes the fact that soldiers had only themselves and their comrades for solace. In his memoir, *The Warriors*, J. Glenn Gray best illustrates the characteristics of camaraderie and the bonds of brotherhood while reflecting on his experiences in World War II:

"That a man lay down his life for his friends" is indeed a hard saying and testifies to a supreme act of fortitude. Friends live for each other and possess no desire whatsoever for self sacrifice. When a man dies for his friend, he does it deliberately and not in an ecstasy of emotion. Dying for one's comrades, on the other hand, is a phenomenon occurring in every war, which can hardly be thought of as an act of superhuman courage. The impulse to self-sacrifice is an intrinsic element in the association of organized men in pursuit of a dangerous and difficult goal.⁴⁷

In contrast to Gray's expressive view of camaraderie, Paul Fussell's work, *Wartime*, takes a pragmatic approach in uncovering the dark side of the psychological and emotional turmoil experienced by American and British soldiers during World War II. He describes inescapable rumors, extreme pressure of fighting, pettiness of leaders, fear of weakness, "high-mindedness", and the general frustration at all levels with deprivation that could only be dealt with collectively in a small cohesive group.⁴⁸ Inherent in the complexity of combat is a soldier's internal and external need for companionship, friendship, trust, and assurance that someone is watching out for them.

During World War II, the Army was concerned enough that homosexuals could not cope with this level of emotional intensity that it implemented a policy of directly questioning incoming men and women on their sexual orientation.⁴⁹ The military's sole purpose was to fight the nation's wars, and homosexuals were deemed unfit for combat. Subsequently, the military

⁴⁶ Linderman, 353.

⁴⁷ J. Glenn Gray, *The Warriors* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1959), 91.

⁴⁸ Paul Fussell, *Wartime* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 164-180. High-mindedness refers to cultural beliefs that one society is better than the one being fought.

⁴⁹ Allan Berube, *Coming Out Under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War II* (New York: The Free Press, 1990), 13.

instituted a discharge policy aimed at preserving combat effectiveness and discharging those deemed as unfit for fighting.⁵⁰ In the years leading up to DADT, the vehement resistance continued as highly decorated combat veteran Colonel (Retired) David Hackworth famously stated, “Civilian standards of fairness and equality don’t apply down where the body bags are filled.”⁵¹ It is clear that the Army passionately protects the image of *Manly Warrior* to the extent that anything that tarnishes that image is unacceptable.

Looking in the Mirror

It is sometimes difficult to accept the reflection observed in the mirror. The simple fact is that the United States Army’s self-image and esteem is inextricably linked to the *Manly Warrior*. Many young soldiers enlist in the Army to fulfill the desire to protect the nation; this is most commonly attributed to a sense of duty. Many of these soldiers come from conservative backgrounds and share conservative views. These views are not necessarily congruent with popular culture. They often desire to be part of something that is greater than the sum of their own character. Throughout history, professional militaries around the world effectively harnessed the innate and intrinsic desire to serve. Service to their nation gives men greater self-pride, it guarantees them the esteem of manliness they desire and the sense of providing security for their families, and it galvanizes their need for camaraderie. They expect hardship and difficulty, but they also expect that their morals and values will remain intact and unquestioned. It is this Army that must adapt to social change if homosexuals are allowed to serve openly.

If Congress lifts the DADT policy, the United States Army will grapple with the same transitional challenges that the armies of its staunchest allies did. Most recently in 2000, the

⁵⁰ Berube, 176.

⁵¹ Ray, 14, quoted in David Hackworth, “The Case for a Military Gay Ban,” *The Washington Post*, 28 June 1992.

British Army allowed homosexuals to serve openly.⁵² Not surprisingly, the British Army struggled with the same challenges and concerns about integration of homosexuals that the United States Army can expect. The following section investigates the experiences of the British, Australian, and Canadian armies as they wrestled with challenges, developed courses of action and institutionalized social change.

Section 2 – The Allied Experience

The obvious reasons for selecting Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom as case studies for this monograph are twofold; first, their military association with the United States, and second, their shared cultural, social, and political similarities (not to mention their common ancestry). Canada was the first of the three countries to open its armed forces to homosexuals in 1992, followed by Australia in 1994, and then the United Kingdom in 2000.⁵³ The comparison of these three countries highlights similarities in the contentious arguments, both for and against a homosexual ban, which arose during their respective debates and subsequent transitions to the allowance of homosexuals into armed service. In each case, the catalyst for transition to inclusion of homosexuals into the military was a result of political and legal action within the respective governments. As momentum for change increased within each country, it gave rise to questions of how the inclusion of homosexuals would affect such things as; recruitment, morale and unit cohesion, and combat effectiveness. Underpinning these concerns, and woven into the resolution of each, were the actions taken by each to ensure effective and fair inclusion of homosexuals into their respective forces through a *social code of conduct*. Without exception, all three allied militaries were forced, through social and political turmoil, to change their policies toward homosexuals.

⁵² Alex Alexandrou, "The Times are a' Changin': Homosexuality and the Armed Forces"; *Human Resource Management in the British Armed Forces: Investing in the Future* (London, UK: Frank Cass, 2001), 140.

⁵³ Alexandrou, 138-139.

Canada

A 1992 Canadian Gallup Poll showed two-thirds of Canadian's believed that homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the Canadian Forces; this was up 60% from a similar poll held in 1988; however, in much the same manner as the American public opinion in 1993, many of the same participants in the poll were strongly against homosexuality in terms of morality.⁵⁴ In contrast, a survey developed by the Canadian Department of National Defence (CDND) in 1986, showed that nearly two-thirds of Canadian men serving in the military stated that 'that they would refuse to share showers, undress or sleep in the same room as gay soldiers.'⁵⁵ As with similar civil rights laws in the United States, Canadian laws transitioned over time. In 1977, Canadian Parliament passed the 'Canadian Human Rights Act' which guaranteed rights based on race, ethnic, religious, age, and sex, but failed to address sexual orientation. Subsequent changes occurred through the following two decades, including the 1983 change to the Canadian Constitution guaranteeing equal rights of all Canadian citizens, but once again, this law failed to address sexual orientation. In 1989, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that Section 15 of the Canadian Constitution required a broader definition of discrimination to include discrimination based on sexual orientation. In the intervening years through 1992, several court cases progressed through the Canadian Court of Appeals system further clarified the Canadian government's position of sexual orientation in terms of discrimination, and in 1992, ended with the Federal Courts of Canada ruling that exclusion of Canadian citizens from armed service was

⁵⁴ National Defense Research Institute (RAND), *Sexual Harassment and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Options and Assessment* (Office of the Secretary of Defense, Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1993), 74.

⁵⁵ Aaron Belkin and Jason McNichol, *Effects of the 1992 lifting of Restrictions on Gay and Lesbian Service in the Canadian Forces: Appraising the Evidence* (Santa Barbara: University of California, 2000), White paper, 6.

contrary to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms; effectively abolishing the military's ban on homosexuals.⁵⁶

The CDND enforced its ban on homosexuals in much the same way as the current U.S. policy; known homosexuals were discharged under sexual misconduct regulations. From the inception of the Canadian Human Rights Act, the Canadian Forces experienced increasing pressure to change its policy toward homosexuals. In anticipation of events, the CDND began, in 1988, to loosen its reporting requirements and the enforcement of its homosexual ban policy. Although, this appeared to be an improvement for gays and lesbians, many felt they were given unequal treatment when compared to their heterosexual counterparts.⁵⁷ Subsequently, several court cases by gay servicemembers ensued between 1988 and 1992 in which Canadian courts ruled against the military on grounds that the policy did not conform to the Canadian Human Rights Act.⁵⁸ The CDND argued its case on the grounds that “the presence of homosexuals in the CF [Canadian Forces] would be detrimental to cohesion and morale, discipline, leadership, recruiting, medical fitness, and the rights to privacy of other members.”⁵⁹ However, to gain time in the interim, the CDND entered into a compromise which allowed commanders to ask those servicemembers known to be homosexual to leave the service on the grounds that they affected unit cohesion, but commanders could not discharge them by force; additionally, servicemembers were no longer obligated to report fellow servicemembers whom they were suspicious of being homosexual.⁶⁰ The tension between Canadian Forces and the public continued to grow as the CDND continued to argue against lifting the ban. It was not until late 1992 that senior Canadian

⁵⁶ United States Government Accountability Office, *Report on Homosexuals in the Military: Policies and Practices of Foreign Countries* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Senate, 1993), 29. Section 15 of the Canadian Constitutional change states that, “Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.”

⁵⁷ Frank, 138.

⁵⁸ Frank, 138.

⁵⁹ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays and Lesbians in the Canadian Forces*, 6-7.

⁶⁰ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays and Lesbians in the Canadian Forces*, 7.

Defence officials recognized that they were losing their battle in the courts system to maintain the ban on homosexuals that the talk of policy change really progressed.⁶¹

For Canada, the resistance to the inclusion of homosexuals in the force came to an expected (almost inevitable) end in October 1992, when General John de Chastelain, the Canadian Chief of Defense, announced that Canadian Forces would comply with the ruling of the Federal Court and allow all Canadian citizens to serve regardless of sexual orientation.⁶² The 1993 RAND study took a very close look at the immediate aftermath of the CDNDs change in homosexual policy and its affect on the military. Despite expectations of servicemembers resigning or quitting on moral grounds, the concern of a mass ‘coming out’ parties, fears of violence against homosexuals, and a complete loss of unit cohesion, the transition to a policy that allowed homosexuals to serve was uneventful in the Canadian Forces.⁶³ The RAND study cites three primary reasons for this. First, Canadian leadership recognized early the inevitability that policy would change given the pressure being exerted externally. Second, Canadian military senior commanders decided early to treat the implementation of any policy change as a ‘leadership’ responsibility and that the onus was on the commander to ensure good conduct. Finally, Canadian military officials emphasized that the change in policy affected all servicemembers collectively.⁶⁴ A general policy on sexual misconduct ensured the same expectations for all members of the Canadian military regardless of sexual orientation.⁶⁵ In preparation, the Canadian military developed a question and answer survey which was distributed within the military to address concerns of policy changes from both heterosexual and homosexual aspects. In continuance, the CDND developed a second program called, the *Standards for*

⁶¹ Frank, 138.

⁶² Belkin and McNichol, *Gays and Lesbians in the Canadian Forces*, 8-9.

⁶³ RAND, 79.

⁶⁴ RAND, 78-80.

⁶⁵ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays and Lesbians in the Canadian Forces*, 11.

Harassment and Racism Prevention, or SHARP, which was intended to increase awareness among military members about all forms of harassment, racism and sexual orientation.⁶⁶ This program is not unlike traditional United States Army quarterly sexual harassment training sessions. In all, Canadian officials expected their subordinate leadership to ensure the implementation and effective integration of homosexuals in to the force under a policy that treated everyone equally in terms of sexual orientation.

Australia

Although the change in homosexual policy for the Australian Defence Force (ADF) was nearly concurrent to that of Canada, the two nations had slightly different experiences. Prior to 1986, the ADF had no official policy governing the handling of homosexuals. It was generally left up to unit commanders to handle homosexual ‘misconduct’ on a case-by-case basis. If a servicemember was found or admitted to being homosexual, their situations were discreetly handled through pressured resignation which generally sufficed.⁶⁷

Like Canada, Australia underwent significant civil rights evolution during the 1980s. The ‘liberal’ government at the time pushed for greater international alignment in regards to national, state and local laws governing the treatment of minorities.⁶⁸ Subsequently, the Australian government “actively dismantled existing laws against homosexuality and began to ratify new human rights bills that included protection against arbitrary discrimination.”⁶⁹ Surprisingly, and contrary to the popular social movement, the ADF adopted new policy in 1986 that effectively banned homosexuals from national service and gave commanders explicit

⁶⁶ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays and Lesbians in the Canadian Forces*, 11.

⁶⁷ Frank, 138-139.

⁶⁸ Aaron Belkin and Jason McNichol, *Effects of Including Gays in the Australian Defence Forces: Appraising the Evidence* (Santa Barbara: University of California, 2000), 7-8.

⁶⁹ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays in the Australian Defence Forces*, 7.

direction for their expulsion.⁷⁰ In contrast however, this new policy appeared to be implemented incongruently across the ADF with some commanders exercising ‘discretion’ when implementing the ban.⁷¹ It was this imbalance in the implementation of policy that brought increasing pressure against the ban on homosexuals.

Australia struggled through the 1980s to achieve equilibrium in terms of civil rights. Increasing allegations of discrimination among minorities and especially women in the military aided the argument for lifting the ban on homosexuals.⁷² In 1992 the Australian government found that the ADF was not recruiting sufficiently fair numbers of minorities.⁷³ Consequently, debate surrounding the role of women in combat (or lack thereof) began to disintegrate the ADF position, not only on minorities, but homosexuals as well. The ADF found it increasingly more difficult to defend its position on homosexuals in the face of increasing public pressure to adopt a more mainstream human rights position. Therefore, in late 1992, senior governmental and ADF officials began to consider changing policy to better align itself with national laws.⁷⁴

Similar to Canada, serious divisions began to arise within the ADF and other organization that argued for the continuance of the ban; “The major veterans groups in Australia insisted that tolerating gays would undermine cohesion and break the bonds of trust that were essential to an effective military.”⁷⁵ In addition, these groups incited fears of spreading HIV in combat situations through blood transfusions as posing an even greater threat to the ADF.⁷⁶ Not coincidentally, this argument was also a talking point in the 1993 DADT debate in the United States. The HIV/AIDS argument has largely fallen out of the debate against the inclusion of

⁷⁰ USGAO, *Report on Homosexuals in the Military: Policies and Practices of Foreign Countries*, 19.

⁷¹ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays in the Australian Defence Forces*, 8.

⁷² Belkin and McNichol, *Gays in the Australian Defence Forces*, 8.

⁷³ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays in the Australian Defence Forces*, 8.

⁷⁴ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays in the Australian Defence Forces*, 9.

⁷⁵ Frank, 140. The ‘bonds of trust’ are considered the unspoken bonds of camaraderie that tie the unit together in the heat of battle – brotherly love.

⁷⁶ Frank, 140.

homosexuals into armed service because of a better understanding of the disease since the early 1990s.⁷⁷ Still, senior officials in the Australian Department of Defence pressed hard to maintain the ban, recommending in June 1992 that it remain in place. Public outcry prompted the Australian Government to form a committee to investigate the issue holistically, and in September 1992 the committee recommended the government lift the ban on homosexual service in the ADF.⁷⁸ After a short period of contentious debate, Prime Minister Paul Keating announced the end of the ban in November 1992.⁷⁹

The official change to policy came in 1994 when the ADF officially released a new policy of “unacceptable behavior irrespective of sexual orientation.”⁸⁰ Like the Canadian change to policy, the new ADF policy was leadership centric and revolved around a ‘social code of conduct’ that was expected of its servicemembers regardless of sexual orientation. The new policy treated sexual relations between consenting adults as a private matter. The policy, later updated in 1999, effectively placed harassment based on sexual orientation in the same crime category as sexual harassment, discrimination, and unacceptable behavior.⁸¹ As with Canada, the ADF developed several training programs designed to enable unit leadership to facilitate effective inclusion of homosexuals. These programs coupled with an active leadership role were initially credited with the successful implementation of policy. According to the 1993 United States Government Accountability Office report, “early indications are that the new policy has had little

⁷⁷ RAND, 28. It is important to note the use of HIV/AIDS in the arguments presented in this monograph to highlight the fear that it impressed upon the public at the time.

⁷⁸ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays in the Australian Defence Forces*, 11.

⁷⁹ Belkin and McNichol, *Gays in the Australian Defence Forces*, 11. Prime Minister Keating formed the Caucus Committee to study the ADFs homosexual policy and take recommendation from military leaders and interest groups alike.

⁸⁰ Australian Defence Forces, *PERS 35-3: Defence Instructions: Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Offenses, Fraternisation, and other Unacceptable Behavior in the Australian Defence Force* (Canberra, Australia: Australian Defence Forces, 1999).

⁸¹ Alexandrou, 139.

or no adverse impact.”⁸² However, the GAO report came on the heels of the ADFs transition and during the height of the U.S. debate on DADT and therefore had limited perspective.

In 1996 the British Army conducted a research assessment on homosexual policy which included an assessment of several countries that had already changed their policies toward homosexuals in the military. This particular British document is widely used today by gay rights activists to highlight the successful policy changes in allied nations; it is cited in several resources used in this monograph. The single greatest acknowledgement from the British assessment of the ADF is that, “Service policy staffs state that following an initial outcry, homosexuality had become a non-issue.”⁸³ Although this report does not dispute the ADFs effective change in homosexual policy and relative benign transition to the acceptance among the wider ADF servicemembers, the report continues past a ‘stamp of approval’ and highlights the continued struggle within the ranks of the ADF. The report goes on to state, “Male members of a random volunteer group drawn from the RAAF [Royal Australian Air Force] personnel and members of an Air Mobile Brigade based at RAAF Townsville were very largely against the new policy and believed that, in a combat situation, the presence of openly homosexual servicemembers would have degrading effect on Operational Effectiveness.”⁸⁴ In contrast, the report cites an interview of a logistical unit that supported the new policy because the policy governed personal actions rather than sexual orientation.⁸⁵ This key insight demonstrates the challenge faced by commanders in the ADF as they attempted to reconcile the new policy against competing operational demands. However, in general terms, the ADF proved successful in implementing a new policy of acceptance of homosexuals with relatively little issue.

⁸² USGAO, *Report on Homosexuals in the Military: Policies and Practices of Foreign Countries*, 19.

⁸³ United Kingdom Ministry of Defence, *Report on the Homosexuality Policy Assessment Team* (HPAT), http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/C801AAED-2EFE-4D33-A845-EFD103438BF2/0/HPAT_report_Feb_1996.pdf (accessed February 14, 2010), H1-4.

⁸⁴ HPAT Report, H1-4.

⁸⁵ HPAT Report, H1-4.

United Kingdom

The British experience with homosexual policy is more similar to the challenges that will face United States Army. Like the United States military in 1993, the British Ministry of Defence spent considerable effort in avoiding any change of policy toward homosexuals as highlighted in the 1996 *Report of the Homosexual Policy Assessment Team* (HPAT). The report quickly asserts that, “It is not a moral or religious condemnation of homosexuality,” and goes on to explain the context of the 448 page document:

Homosexuality, whether male or female, is considered incompatible with service in the Armed Forces, not only because of the close physical conditions in which personnel have to work, but also because homosexual behavior can cause offence, polarize relationships, induce ill-discipline, and, as a consequence, damage morale and unit effectiveness.⁸⁶

The constructs of unit cohesion and unit effectiveness were the backbone of the British armed forces argument for maintaining the policy against homosexual inclusion during the mid-1990s. Ironically, the assessment team interviewed military officials from several countries, as stated earlier, of which Canada and Australia were credited with successful implementation of new homosexual policies allowing gays and lesbians to serve in their respective forces. However, the delineation was made between the three nations on the grounds of constitutional and societal differences; in regards to Canada, their military organization was seen to mirror of societal norms which created room for the acceptance of homosexuals, and in the case of Australia, the report suggested that a more ‘relaxed’ approach enabled effective policy change.”⁸⁷ It was on these grounds that the report argued for the continuance of the policy to ban homosexuals from military service in the United Kingdom.

⁸⁶ HPAT Report, 7.

⁸⁷ HPAT Report, H5-4 and H1-7. In terms of Australia, the HPAT report suggests that the ADF had an almost ‘laissez faire’ attitude of indifference toward the implementation of homosexual policy.

The pre-cursor to the inclusion of homosexuals into British armed forces evolved much like those of Canada and Australia. Modest increases in overall acceptance of homosexuality through the 1980s led to “fierce skirmishes between the Conservative and Labor parties, and between religious leaders and gay rights advocates, for more than a decade” as potential change loomed on the horizon.⁸⁸ The fallout starkly divided the nation along religious lines resulting in the passage of Section 28 in 1987, a law restricting public schools from promoting homosexuality as acceptable.⁸⁹ The evolution of the gay rights movement in the early 1990s added to the growing resentment against the government for its perceived unwillingness to broach issues of civil liberties.⁹⁰ Concurrent to the public turmoil surrounding civil rights in the 1990s, the British armed forces continued to discharge servicemembers on the grounds of homosexual misconduct. In a famous court case against the British government, former Royal Naval Lieutenant Commander, Duncan Lustig-Prean, and three others, who were discharged between 1993 and 1995 for homosexual misconduct, sued the British armed forces for civil rights violations and to remove the ban that had forced them out of service. The four ex-servicemembers charged the military with discrimination based on sexual orientation, claiming it a human rights violation.⁹¹ The case was rejected in November 1995, by the British Court of Appeals, prompting the four to take their case to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). In a stunning turn of events, the ECHR over-ruled the British court’s decision on September 27, 1999; effectively ending discrimination based on sexual orientation in the British armed forces.⁹²

Suddenly faced with what many military officials considered an unchangeable policy, an immediate abolishment of homosexual policy; the British armed forces were forced to develop a

⁸⁸ Aaron Belkin and R.L. Evans, *Effects of Including Gays in the British Armed Forces: Appraising the Evidence* (Santa Barbara: University of California, 2000), 6.

⁸⁹ Belkin and Evans, *Gays in the British Armed Forces*, 6.

⁹⁰ Belkin and Evans, *Gays in the British Armed Forces*, 7.

⁹¹ Alexandrou, 141.

⁹² Alexandrou, 142.

course of action for the immediate implementation of new policy and the inclusion of homosexuals into the wider force in early 2000. In short order, the British Ministry of Defence, created a *code of social conduct* based on several ‘guiding principles’ that enabled commanders at the unit level to effectively integrate homosexuals and alleviate the concerns faced by heterosexuals:

Guiding Principles

- Sexual orientation is a private matter for the individual.
- Knowledge of an individual’s sexual orientation is not a basis for discrimination.
- Incidents which involve the possible commission of civil or military offences, or which come to a Commanding Officer’s attention through a formal complaint, should be investigated and dealt with in accordance with Service disciplinary or administrative procedures.
- The Service Test contained in the Code of Social Conduct should be applied when there is any doubt about the impact on operational effectiveness of any particular incident.
- The Armed Forces value the unique contribution which every individual makes to operational effectiveness, regardless of their sexual orientation.
- The Armed Forces respect the right to individual privacy of every Serviceman and woman and will only intervene in the private lives of individuals where it is necessary in the interests of preserving operational effectiveness.
- The new policy makes no moral judgments’ about an individual’s sexual orientation.
- There is no place in the Armed Forces for harassment, bullying or victimization.⁹³

The guiding principles are linked to *Operational Imperatives*, which govern unit cohesion and the trust and loyalty required between commander and their subordinates. The operational imperatives are further linked to the *Service Test*; somewhat of a *common sense* check that is asked by the commander prior to taking action in regards to misconduct; "Have the actions or behaviour of an individual adversely impacted or are they likely to impact on the efficiency or operational effectiveness of the Service?"⁹⁴ This code of social conduct was, and still is, an all encompassing policy that takes into account the merits of the situation in terms of personal conduct and subsequently places the onus on the individual to manage the social perception of

⁹³ Alexandrou, 143-144.

⁹⁴ United Kingdom Ministry of Defence, “The Service Test: Armed Forces Code of Social Conduct,” <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/AboutDefence/WhatWeDo/Personnel/EqualityAndDiversity/ArmedForcesCodeOfSocialConductPolicyStatement.htm> (accessed on February 14, 2010).

others toward them. The service test is central to the code and lays the ground work for social behaviour, both on and off duty.⁹⁵ Much in the same fashion as both the Canadian and Australian militaries, the British armed forces adopted an approach that was commander centric and expected homosexuals and heterosexuals to conduct themselves in a professional military manner.

Ten years after the British armed forces changed its policy on homosexuality; there has been little observed negative impact on the force as a whole. In an interview conducted for this monograph, British Army Colonel Graham Norton, who was commanding a field unit at the time and has since been a policy officer responsible for the *Code of Social Conduct* policy during the transition period, observed that allowing homosexuals to serve in the British Army “became a non-issue.”⁹⁶ Colonel Norton indicated many in his army, himself included, had considerable concerns that heterosexual soldiers would “be physically violent to a young lad who admitted he was homosexual.”⁹⁷ But, that did not happen. Colonel Norton correlates the British Army’s overestimation of the situation to three primary points: First, the youth of the army had grown up in an era where differing sexual orientation was far more acceptable than in previous generations, which subsequently leads to the second point, that his generation “were disconnected from the youth” and greatly underestimated the Army’s ability to cope with social change.⁹⁸ Finally, and contrary to the beliefs of senior military leadership at the time, “there was no great outing by homosexuals within the British Army - only the few evangelists.”⁹⁹ Colonel Norton credits most

⁹⁵ UKMOD, “The Service Test.”

⁹⁶ Graham Norton, Colonel, British Army, interview by author, Fort Leavenworth, KS, November 19, 2009.

⁹⁷ Norton, interview.

⁹⁸ Norton, interview.

⁹⁹ Norton, interview.

of the successful transition during the policy change to how the British Army prepared itself in terms leadership and the development of the *Code of Social Conduct*.¹⁰⁰

Section 3 – Conclusion

Analysis

It is sometimes surprising to observe the ability of a rigid organization to adapt to unprecedented change. For Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom, each was dragged into social change screaming and kicking with fears that allowing homosexuals into the force would undermine the very core of their respective self-identity; invariably the *Manly Warrior* and unit cohesion. But, when change occurred, each military found itself relatively unscathed and fully capable of continuing its primary purpose; the defense of its nation. Three clear themes emerge from the experiences of the Allied nations as they came to grips with social change in their organizations. First, each nation identified the key role that leadership would play in the implementation of new policy. The second theme lies in a sexual harassment policy that was all encompassing and did not delineate or highlight the differences in sexual orientation. And finally, each nation implemented a *code of social conduct* which was universal and not centered on sexual orientation, and yet attempted not to degrade the role of unit cohesion and camaraderie.

There was no obvious ‘silver bullet’ used to quell the concerns of heterosexual soldiers as they face the uncertainty of social change within their respective militaries. In contrast, the same expectations were held of the ‘new’ homosexual soldiers as they announced their sexual orientation and began to integrate, or re-integrate, into their respective forces. The role that religion had in the pre-cursor to each transition was profound, yet had little observed effect upon changing of policy toward homosexuality. It is difficult to estimate the number of heterosexual servicemembers who left military service based on grounds of morality as none of the allied

¹⁰⁰ Norton, interview.

militaries tracked that statistic, but by most accounts, it was negligible for each allied military. In the end, it appears that each allied military relied heavily on good leadership, the expectation of professionalism amongst its soldiers, and that the bonds of unit cohesion would be strong enough to stand the test that social change would impose. For each country, allowing homosexuals to serve openly, although very contentious at the start, turned out to be a non-issue.

Recommendations

As the United States Army prepares to potentially include homosexuals into its ranks, anxiety and doubt among servicemembers will only grow. It is imperative that senior leaders in the military take a leading role in quelling concerns and paving a clear path toward resolution; fortunately, this is already occurring.¹⁰¹ However, it will not just happen because the Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said so; careful thought and planning is important to ensure equitable results for all servicemembers. General George Casey underscores this challenge best during an interview at Scofield Barracks, Hawaii. "The basis for my concerns is, I have gone out over the past several months and talked to different segments of the Army and different groups and gotten their input. There is apprehension. There is uncertainty, and that is why it is so important to study this [the inclusion of homosexuals into the Army]."¹⁰²

In this light, there are three key recommendations offered via this monograph: First, in order to affect effective implementation of policy change toward the inclusion of homosexuals, leadership at all levels must be active and involved in managing both the expectations of their

¹⁰¹ Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, comments while speaking to a U.S. Senate panel on Capitol Hill with Secretary of Defense Robert Gates on February 2, 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/03/us/politics/03military.html> (accessed on March 16, 2010). Adm. Mullen publicly supports President Obama's initiative to repeal DADT stating, "No matter how I look at the issue, I cannot escape being troubled by the fact that we have in place a policy which forces young men and women to lie about who they are in order to defend their fellow citizens."

¹⁰² Army Chief of Staff, GEN George Casey, comments while speaking to reports at Scofield Barracks on February 27, 2010, http://www.starbulletin.com/news/20100227_gen_casey_worries_about_repealing_dont_ask_ban.html (accessed on March 16, 2010).

heterosexual population and the inclusion of newly acknowledged homosexuals. Second, the adaptation of any policy or regulation in regards to sexual harassment must remain gender-neutral; harassment *is* harassment and misconduct *is* misconduct; period. A way of accomplishing this aspect of implementing new Army policy is to adopt an agreed upon translation of the British Armed Forces' 'Guiding Principles', which is utilized by commanders at all levels concurrent to the implementation of a United States Army *Service Test*. Finally, the Army must continue to engender the *Code of Conduct for Fighting Forces* as the foundation of the military way of life.

Your obligations as a U.S. citizen and a member of the armed forces result from the traditional values that underlie the American experience as a nation. These values are best expressed in the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights, which you have sworn to uphold and defend. You would have these obligations — to your country, your service and unit and your fellow Americans — even if the Code of Conduct had never been formulated as a high standard of general behavior.¹⁰³

Implications

Although these recommendations appear evident and uncomplicated, there are several implications that the United States Army must consider upon adopting these or similar courses of action. In no way do these recommendations absolve commanders (at any level) from understanding and mitigating the impacts that lifting DADT will have on the social and cultural organization within the United States Army in terms of manliness, unit cohesion, and religion. Intrinsic to the organization of the United States Army is an almost caste system like separation among unit types that will inevitably cope with the inclusion of homosexuals differently, at different levels, within the construct of manliness.¹⁰⁴ Combat arms units, primarily comprised of males, will likely be more resistant to the inclusion of homosexuals than their counterparts in

¹⁰³ DA Pamphlet 600-512, *Code of the U.S. Fighting Force*, 1-b.

¹⁰⁴ The author refers to the hierarchy of combat arms, combat service support, and service support units and the roles, tensions, and relationships, in terms of males within the United States Army.

gender-integrated units.¹⁰⁵ For this reason, combat arms commanders will likely experience greater resistance while integrating newly acknowledged homosexuals into their units. Based on allied experience it is not likely violent exchanges will occur during transition, but preparation is an imperative. Maintaining good order and discipline will rest on good leadership in tempering the storm; many of these combat units will likely feel that forced acceptance of homosexuality is an affront to their manliness. That being said, this monograph does not assume that manliness is reserved only for the combat arms branches or that this tension is limited to male servicemembers; but simply that, in the greater context of the citizen-soldier, manliness remains a fundamental underpinning of military service. Moreover, in the wake of social change, a greater understanding of homosexual demographics within the United States Army will become more apparent and enable commanders to better assess the overall progress of effective social and cultural transition. Equally important to this narrative is the image projected by homosexuals within the construct of the citizen-soldier and the bonds necessary for unit cohesion. Shared effort for inclusion and acceptance is required by both homosexual and heterosexual servicemembers alike; adherence to a *Code of Social Conduct* will smooth the progress of social change and lay the foundation for renewed unit cohesion.

In terms of religion, the United States is unique among the allies in its Christian heritage; religion is fundamentally woven into the fabric of American national identity. For this reason, acceptance of homosexuals in the United States Army will be more difficult for servicemembers who harbor strong religious-based moral convictions against homosexuality than for servicemembers servicing in allied forces. In this context, should Congress lift the ban on homosexual service in the military, servicemembers in general will align themselves into three groupings during the course of social change; and only time will tell their relative size. The first

¹⁰⁵ HPAT Report, H1-4. The report highlights the resistance of males in combat type units to the inclusion of homosexuals.

grouping comprises servicemembers who believe that homosexuality is immoral, but who take strides to accommodate social change because they are unwilling to sacrifice careers in protest, or who will wait until the end of their obligation to leave their respective services. The second group comprises servicemembers who will cope with social change with relative ease; in observation of allied forces, this is likely the largest group. Finally, there will be those servicemembers who terminate their service to the nation on moral grounds. Some will be in a position to retire, others will leave at the earliest opportunity; observation of the allied experience suggests this to be a small group. However, as stated earlier, making this assumption is dangerous, considering the religious nature of the United States. To this end, the United States Army must consider its religious narrative when designing solutions for this complex problem, and strike a balance that is considerate and appealing to all of its servicemembers.

Taking these implications into context; this monograph leaves many unanswered questions in terms of further research on this complex subject. This monograph does not focus on the intricate details of required policy and regulatory changes should Congress repeal DADT, but rather on the macro level social aspect within the context of homosexuality and military service, and how the Army should *think* as it prepares for potential social change. Greater detailed research is required to figure out how the Army is to implement policies and regulations at the micro level. Considerations must be given in the future to policies such as; affirmative action, retention, recruiting, customs at military functions, family advocacy, military benefits; the list goes on. To imply that social change of this magnitude is complex is an understatement of the greatest order. Therefore, it is incumbent on leadership in the United States Army to anticipate and prepare its force in case DADT is repealed.

APPENDIX A

Traditional Military History

Many military historians identify the social constructs of comradeship and manliness as foundational for the military-mindset. In his book, *The Face of Battle*, Keegan illustrates the intimate nature of combat and the personal reliance on one another that soldiers shared in battle from Agincourt to Waterloo and especially in the trenches of the Somme.¹⁰⁶ Unit cohesion goes far beyond the soldiers love for his brother as Keegan argues, "over and above its *cohesion*, sense of mission, mood of self-sacrifice, local as well as national patriotism, there were other elements in play."¹⁰⁷ British military historian, Richard Holmes, offers *Acts of War*, a piercing look into the nature of manhood in combat and the effects that extended periods of time in the trenches of World War I had on the men who fought there.¹⁰⁸ In a book written as a companion to a mid-1980's BBC documentary both Keegan and Holmes teamed up to write *Soldiers*; a book that describes the bond that develops between men and the love and trusts that becomes unbreakable at every echelon and branch in armed conflict.¹⁰⁹ These three works, as well as others, help define what it is to be a soldier fighting for their country, the strong need for camaraderie, and the intense emotions that bond them together.

The following two authors allude to the conundrum that *love* plays for men in the context camaraderie in battle. In his work, *The World Within War*, Gerald Linderman takes to notion of camaraderie and self-identification and galvanizes them to "the ability of comradely affection to transcend race and personality and education-all those things that would make a difference in

¹⁰⁶ John Keegan, *The Face of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and the Somme* (New York: The Penguin Group, 1976).

¹⁰⁷ Keegan, 277.

¹⁰⁸ Holmes, *Acts of War*.

¹⁰⁹ Holmes and Keegan, *Soldiers*.

peace."¹¹⁰ The importance of this work is that it illustrates the powerful capacity that brotherly love holds for men serving in close combat. This idea of brotherly love is profoundly demonstrated in the epic work of J. Glenn Gray.¹¹¹ Gray's book, *The Warriors*, is heavily cited in several of the previous reviewed works. Both Holmes and Linderman find Gray's work important in describing "man's secret attraction to war" and the importance that love, in many facets, plays in combat.¹¹² Gray's account is a personal record of his time spent fighting in North Africa and in the European theater during World War II and illustrates the immense emotional bond that develops between fighting men in combat; a bond that transcends normal everyday friendship. *Manliness and Militarism*, by Mark Moss, does an excellent job in defining what *manliness* means and how the term has changed over time from pre-Victorian to World War I. Focusing the majority of his research on Canadian youth in Ontario during the build-up to World War I, Moss illustrates a wide range of virtues that manliness implores: honor, forthrightness, vigorous physical activity, chivalry, courage, and sacrifice are just a few. He subsequently links these ideals to the notion of *Christian manliness* and the ideals of the nation of Canada.¹¹³

Feminist Theory on Military History

Many historical works focus on the disparity between men and women and their roles on the battlefield. Often this disparity is attributed to socially constructed norms that men do the fighting. It is important to consider the notion of manliness in the context of gender norms and roles in combat and its impact on women specifically, and then correlate that impact to homosexuality. In her book, *Citizen Soldiers and Manly Warriors*, Claire Snyder asserts that "masculinity is socially constructed rather than rooted in nature," and that this masculine nature is

¹¹⁰ Linderman, 273.

¹¹¹ J. Glenn Gray, *The Warriors: Reflections on Men in Battle* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1959).

¹¹² Linderman, 235.

¹¹³ Moss, 31.

what governs the perception of manliness in the military.¹¹⁴ Although Snyder's work focuses specifically on gender bias in the military, her idea that manliness is at the core of why soldiers (male soldiers) serve in the Army is key in understanding how young men see themselves as warriors. The citizen-soldier ideal dates as far back as the Peloponnesian Wars. Ingrained in the ideology of the citizen-soldier is that men fought for the honor of their nation and the right of citizenship. Service in the Roman Army brought honor to one's family and demonstrated a man's ability to protect his land and prosperity. Still, homosexual behavior was part of society whether condoned at that time or not. In *Fighting for American Manhood*, Kristin Hoganson argues that jingoism and gender identity related to citizenship led the United States to embark on the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars. "The epitome of honor and the model of manly character in the post-Civil War period was the veteran. Even ex-Confederates, who had been humiliated on the battlefield, insisted that they never had surrendered their honor."¹¹⁵ Like Snyder, Hoganson's work is related to the civil-rights of women but, here too, it is the idea that honor and courage are traits of a strong manly character that is quintessentially ingrained in the persona of the soldier archetype.

D'Ann Campbell illustrates in her book, *Women at War with America*, the challenges the military faced in World War II when integrating women into the fighting force.¹¹⁶ She highlights the strong resistance by men to the inclusion of women in the military in such roles as, clerical work and industrial labor, even as it allowed men to transition to more combat focused roles. She challenges the American notion that men were the provider; the physically and mentally capable of the sexes. Concordantly, Linda Grant De Pauw adds to the critical mass by attempting to debunk historical references that disregard the role that women played in combat and substituting their individual accomplishments with generalizations. In *Battle Cries and Lullabies*, De Pauw

¹¹⁴ Snyder, 25.

¹¹⁵ Hoganson, 24.

¹¹⁶ Campbell, *Women at War with America*.

shows that women have served alongside men in war since at least 6500 B.C. and that their roles have not been very different than those of men. She attempts to set straight stereotypical gender norms and social constructs that are prevalent in the historical lexicon of the military vocabulary such as, “whores, dykes, lesbians, and single military mothers” that typified the view of many male servicemembers in the past.¹¹⁷

Advocacy

In traditional military history, and even some feminist theory works, the notion of manliness and gender norms is generally restricted to heterosexuals and often glances over historical evidence of homosexuality in military service. The notion of male dominance in the military and inequality of gender roles was the catalyst for some historical works submitted by gay and lesbian rights advocates wanting to give a greater voice to the homosexual community. Although some written efforts strive to correlate the civil and social rights challenges faced by women and other minorities, such as African Americans, with the struggles of the homosexual community, most identify masculinity and manliness as the primary source of resistance in the military to the inclusion of homosexuals. Conversely, several authors (generally associated with the military) offer works that advocate the separation of homosexuals from the military citing legal and moral issues, as well as links to unit cohesion via masculinity. The challenge here is to distill the two arguments to their primary point; that gender, and primarily masculinity, plays a key role in the military lexicon.

B.R. Burg documents the history of homosexuality in military service in the book, *Gay Warriors*.¹¹⁸ In this collection of personal and public accounts, Burg highlights the transition from acceptance of homosexual behavior in the military during ancient Greek times to one of

¹¹⁷ De Pauw, 4-9.

¹¹⁸ B.R. Burg, *Gay Warriors* (New York: New York University Press, 2002).

non-acceptance starting in the medieval period and continuing through the 1990s. Of particular importance to this monograph is the idea that religion, and more critically, Christianity, plays in the traditional non-acceptance of homosexual behavior in the military. Nathaniel Frank is an author and gay rights activist. His recent work, *Unfriendly Fire*, has drawn strong acclaim in the gay community for its indictment of the United States military and its perceived poor handling of the homosexual issues. Although Frank's arguments strongly support gay rights, his explanation of the nature of the resistance to the acceptance of gays in the United States military and his in-depth research into the efforts of foreign militaries is critical to this monograph. Frank argues that, "Millions of Americans found (and still find) homosexuality either viscerally repugnant or at least vaguely wrong."¹¹⁹ This is important because historically the majority of soldiers serving in the military come from conservative-Christian backgrounds where homosexuality is not readily accepted.¹²⁰

In his book, *Conduct Unbecoming*, Randy Shilts narrows the historical gap of homosexual military service from the Vietnam War to the Persian Gulf. At the time of its release in 1993, the debate over gays in the military raged at its highest in American history.¹²¹ Although his book largely encompasses the accounts of gays who were either harassed or discharged from the military for their behavior, it provides good insight into the mindset of the military during this controversial segment in American history. Conversely, *Exclusion!* by Melissa Well-Petry was released at the height of the debate over gay service in the military as well.¹²² Her book supports the convictions of the military leaders at the time and is an excellent contrast to the political and social writings of the time. Well-Petry, who served as a Major in the Army when she released this book, details the military's strong opposition to the inclusion homosexuals in the force with

¹¹⁹ Frank, 29.

¹²⁰ Frank, 89.

¹²¹ Randy Shilts, *Conduct Unbecoming* (New York: St. Martin's Press 1993), xiv.

¹²² Wells-Petry.

staunch military accuracy, founding every argument in legal or constitutional law. This book demonstrates the military's desire to maintain the status-quo and highlights the iconic image of the professional character idealized in the citizen-soldier.

Government Sponsored Resources

Literature is thin in regard to effective measures and options offered or taken by either the United States or foreign militaries for the inclusion of homosexuals into military service. Not since 1993 has the United States military earnestly taken steps in developing ideas or options for the inclusion of homosexuals in the military. Subsequently, the span of information available is nearly fifteen years old. This trend highlights the need for this discourse. Although not obsolete, the literature available from the United States military, circa 1993, does provide a good foundation for conversation in the current contemporary debate on homosexual service in the military. This literature in conjunction with literature from allied countries and their militaries will accompany the ideas in the monograph for successful preparation of potential social and cultural change should Congress lift the ban on homosexual service in the military.

The argument for homosexual service in the military turned a corner in 1993. In that year, the Department of Defense commissioned the RAND Corporation to conduct a study on the effects and potential options for the inclusion of gays in the military. There are few documents that provide as comprehensive a look at military policy and potential for social change in military culture as the RAND study does.¹²³ However, senior military leaders largely disregarded the RAND study as Congress and President Clinton's Administration opted for a compromise with Department of Defense, which resulted in the DADT policy.¹²⁴ Although the RAND study is more than fifteen years old, it offers many comprehensive and novel ideas that are pertinent to the

¹²³ RAND, *Sexual Harassment and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Options and Assessment*.

¹²⁴ Frank, 117.

discussion of learning from American allies and adapting current policy to enable effective social change in the Army. In addition to the RAND study, the United States Government Accountability Office conducted several surveys in conjunction with Department of Defense to better formulate a coherent argument against the inclusion of gays into the military. The 1992 United States Government Accountability Office report to Congress regarding Department of Defense's policy in homosexuality contains statistical data related to the expulsion of homosexuals from the military.¹²⁵ United States Government Accountability Office sponsored work by, Colonel Ronald D. Ray, followed up with his 1993 'sourcebook' report to Congress highlighting previous data in the 1992 report and is an admonishment of Congress and the Clinton Administration for even considering lifting the ban on homosexual service in the military.¹²⁶ Finally, in June 1993, at the request of Senator John W. Warner, the United States Government Accountability Office produced a report that chronicled the policies and practices of foreign countries that had already transitioned to the inclusion of homosexuals in their militaries.¹²⁷ The latter provides keen insight to the challenges faced by lawmakers as they debated the complexities of changing military culture and national policy.

In 1998, European Union passed the Human Rights Act of 1998 legislation that effectively required all member nations to acknowledge the rights of the homosexual community to serve freely and openly in the work place – including the military.¹²⁸ In reaction to the new measure, United Kingdom's Ministry of Defense commissioned a report from its Human Resource Management department to develop methods of transitioning the British Armed Forces

¹²⁵ United States Government Accountability Office, *Defense Force Management: DOD's Policy on Homosexuality* (Washington, D.C.: USGAO, 1992).

¹²⁶ Ray.

¹²⁷ United States Government Accountability Office, *Report on Homosexuals in the Military: Policies and Practices of Foreign Countries* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Senate, 1993).

¹²⁸ European Union, "Human Rights Act 1998," http://www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts1998/ukpga_19980042_en_1 (accessed on November 17, 2009).

to allow homosexuals to serve.¹²⁹ The British Armed Forces resolved the same challenges that potentially face the U.S. Military.

¹²⁹Alexandrou, *Human Resource Management in the British Armed Forces*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABC News/Washington Post. *ABCnews.com*. accessed on October 14, 2009; available from <http://abcnews.go.com/images/PollingUnit/1066a5GaysinMilitary.pdf>; Internet.
- Alexandrou, Alex. "The Times are a' Changin': Homosexuality and the Armed Forces." In *Human Resource Management in the British Armed Forces: Investing in the Future*, by United Kingdom Ministry of Defence, 137-147. London, UK: Frank Cass, 2001.
- Baldwin, Charles (U.S. Army Chaplain, MG, Retired). *PBS.org*. accessed November 18, 2009; available from <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/video/module.html?mod=1&pkg=0629military&seg=1>; Internet.
- Belkin, Aaron, and Jason McNichol. *Effects of the 1992 Lifting of Restrictions on Gay and Lesbian Service in the Canadian Forces: Appraising the Evidence*. White Paper, Santa Barbara: University of California, 2000.
- Belkin, Aaron, and Jason McNichol. *The Effects of Including Gay and Lesbian Soldiers in the Australian Defence Forces: Appraising the Evidence*. White Paper, Santa Barbara: University of California, 2000.
- Belkin, Aaron, and R. L. Evans. *The Effects of Including Gay and Lesbian Soldiers in the British Armed Forces: Appraising the Evidence*. White paper, Santa Barbara: University of California, 2000.
- Berube, Allan. *Coming Out Under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War II*. New York: The Free Press, 1990.
- Burg, B.R. *Gay Warriors*. New York: New York University Press, 2002.
- Campbell, D'Ann. *Women at War with America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Casey, George (GEN U.S. Army, Army Chief of Staff). *Starbulletin.com*. accessed March 16, 2010; available from http://www.starbulletin.com/news/20100227_gen_casey_worries_about_repealing_dont_ask_ban.html. Internet.
- DePauw, Linda Grant. *Battle Cries and Lullabies*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.
- Ellis, John. *On The Front Lines: The Experience of War Through the Eyes of the Allied Soldiers in World War II*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1990.
- European Union. *European Human Rights Act 1998*. accessed November 17, 2009; available from http://www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts1998/ukpga_19980042_en_1. Internet.
- Frank, Nathaniel. *Unfriendly Fire: How the Gay Ban Undermines the Military and Weakens America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2009.
- Fussell, Paul. *Wartime*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Gallup. *Percentage of American Christians: 1948 to 2008*. accessed November 18, 2009; available from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/117409/easter-smaller-percentage-americans-christian.aspx>. Internet.
- Gray, J. Glenn. *The Warriors: Reflections on Men in Battle*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1959.
- Hoganson, Kristin L. *Fighting for American Manhood*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Holmes, Richard. *Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle*. New York: The Free Press, 1985.

- Holmes, Richard. *Tommy*. Bury St. Edmunds, UK: Harper-Collins Publishers, 2004.
- Keegan, John. *The Face of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and the Somme*. New York: The Penguin Group, 1976.
- Keegan, John, and Richard Holmes. *Soldiers*. New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1986.
- Linderman, Gerald F. *The World Within War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- McPherson, James M. *For Cause and Comrades*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Moss, Mark H. *Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Mullen, Mike (Adm. U.S. Navy, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff). *Nytimes.com*. accessed March 16, 2010; available from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/03/us/politics/03military.html>. Internet.
- National Defense Research Institute. *Sexual Harassment and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Options and Assessment*. Office of the Secretary of Defense; Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1993.
- Norton, Graham (Colonel, British Army), interview by James Dayhoff (November 19, 2009).
- Obama, Barack (President). *Whitehouse.gov*. accessed March 14, 2010; available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-state-union-address>; Internet.
- Obama, Barack (Senator). *BarackObama.com*. accessed September 29, 2009; available from <http://my.barackobama.com/page/community/post/alexokrent/gGggJS>. Internet.
- Ray, Ronald D. *Gays: In or Out? The U.S. Military and Homosexuals – A Sourcebook*. New York, NY: Brassey's (US), 1993.
- United States, Government Accountability Office. *Report on Homosexuals in the Military: Policies and Practices of Foreign Countries*. Senate Report; Washington, D.C., 1993.
- United States, Government Accountability Office. *Report on Defense Force Management: DOD's Policy on Homosexuality*. Congressional Report; Washington, D.C., 1992.
- Servicemembers Legal Defense Network. *SDLN.org*. accessed October 14, 2009; available from <http://www.sldn.org/pages/about-dadt>; Internet.
- Shilts, Randy. *Conduct Unbecoming*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Snyder, R. Claire. *Citizen Soldiers and Manly Warriors*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.
- United Kingdom, Ministry of Defence. *Report on the Homosexuality Policy Assessment Team* (Official Report; London: Ministry of Defence, 1996.); accessed February 14, 2010; available from http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/C801AAED-2EFE-4D33-A845-EFD103438BF2/0/HPAT_report_Feb_1996.pdf; Internet.
- United Kingdom, Ministry of Defence. *Armed Forces Code of Social Conduct*. accessed February 14, 2010; available from <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/AboutDefence/WhatWeDo/Personnel/EqualityAndDiversity/ArmedForcesCodeOfSocialConductPolicyStatement.htm>; Internet.
- United States Army Chaplains Corps. "Mission Statement". accessed November 18, 2009; available from <http://www.army.mil/info/organization/chaplaincy/>; Internet.

Wells-Petry, Melissa. *Exclusion!: Homosexuals and the Right to Serve*. Washington, D.C.:
Regnery Gateway, 1993.