

MOVING FORWARD VICE "STRAIGHT AHEAD"

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL LORIANNE M. CAMPANELLA
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2010

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



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

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

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 25-03-2010		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Moving Forward Vice "Straight" Ahead				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel Lorianne M. Campanella				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Kenneth Lassus Department of National Security and Strategy				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT President Barack Obama, the Commander-in-Chief, has committed to work with Congress to bring about the modification of the existing law which excludes openly gay and lesbian persons from serving in the United States military. When this change occurs, the United States military must have a comprehensive strategy ready to address the probable issues that may arise as the result of such a change. This paper examines a way for our military institutions to move forward towards a functional implementation of a new policy based on a greater understanding and acceptance of one another, while keeping in mind the fundamental purpose for which our military institution exists – to fight and win our nations wars.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Minorities, Discrimination, Values, Equal Protection, Bias, Don't Ask, Don't Tell					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)
			UNLIMITED	36	

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

MOVING FORWARD VICE “STRAIGHT” AHEAD

by

Lieutenant Colonel Lorianne M. Campanella

Colonel Kenneth Lassus
Project Adviser

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

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

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

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Lorianne M. Campanella
TITLE: Moving Forward Vice —“Straight” Ahead
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 25 March 2010 WORD COUNT: 6,303 PAGES: 36
KEY TERMS: Minorities, Discrimination, Values, Equal Protection, Bias, Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell
CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

President Barack Obama, the Commander-in-Chief, has committed to work with Congress to bring about the modification of the existing law which excludes openly gay and lesbian persons from serving in the United States military. When this change occurs, the United States military must have a comprehensive strategy ready to address the probable issues that may arise as the result of such a change. This paper examines a way for our military institutions to move forward towards a functional implementation of a new policy based on a greater understanding and acceptance of one another, while keeping in mind the fundamental purpose for which our military institution exists – to fight and win our nations wars.

MOVING FORWARD VICE —“STRAIGHT” AHEAD

Change has a considerable psychological impact on the human mind. To the fearful it is threatening because it means that things may get worse. To the hopeful it is encouraging because things may get better. To the confident it is inspiring because the challenge exists to make things better.

—King Whitney Jr.

Today the military profession is frequently described as one of the most noble and respected institutions in the United States.¹ In part, this is based on the institutional and individual willingness of military members to surrender comfort, individual freedoms and frequently lives to pay for the cost for the greater good. They do this in defense of the U.S. Constitution and in the name of freedom and liberty.² There is little debate that the strength and domination of the U.S. military is derived in large measure from its greatest commodity – its members.³

Military service can change the fabric of a person's being. It can weave into its members' hearts and minds the clear and palpable appreciation for that which is worth living – and that which is worth dying. Service members have in common a familial sharing of pain, purpose and resolve - the bonds of which are unshakable and unmistakable. The collective body of the U.S. military is proud of what it does, who it is, and that for which it stands. Its way of life is based on military tradition, shared pain, and shared values. It selflessly epitomizes and embodies the ideals that are America. This is what America respects.

To this strong and proud U.S. institution, cultural change often does not come easily or comfortably. History has shown that it may also not come willingly.⁴ Change, however, is inevitable. It is the nature of effective organizations to adapt and progress with the shifting social and political environments and altering demands. Technology,

globalization, and changing social norms have dramatically changed life in the United States. Today, the military is on the brink of a transformational cultural change which will test the military's resiliency, tolerance, strength, and most importantly, leadership.

President Barack Obama, the Commander-in-Chief, has committed to bring about the modification of the existing law which excludes openly gay and lesbian persons from serving in the United States military.⁵ He views the exclusionary law as outdated and tantamount to discrimination by discounting the value and potential contribution of able-bodied, intelligent, loyal Americans.⁶ Amidst the vitriol and staunch opposition to a change in existing law, he has spoken to America and the world in an unwavering tone of tolerance and acceptance of the differences that make us uniquely America, conveying that differences in sexual orientation should not equate to inferior or disfavored status. He has spoken soberly of the continuing sacrifices of all Americans who don a military uniform – not any one color or gender or ideology, but all Service members. Many Members of the 111th Congress and their constituents have voiced many of the same strong sentiments calling the discrimination un-American and inappropriate – even homophobic.⁷ Despite some military leaders stated wishes to maintain the status quo because of the fear of possible negative consequences that could arise in the military ranks, it appears that change is inevitable.⁸ Whether driven by politics, conviction, or philosophy, the military will be faced with implementing the change and this will be a remarkable opportunity to once again demonstrate its extraordinary resilience, adaptability, tolerance, and strength.

If the institution is to maintain its organizational effectiveness and continue to grow, it must develop a comprehensive strategy to implement this policy change. The

military will need to address the challenges that could undermine the institution. This paper examines the challenges of implementing organizational change and applies those principles to inevitable challenges facing the acceptance of openly gay and lesbian Service members within its ranks. This paper will define a strategic message to guide the change effort, examine the historical and legal framework of the change, propose a change strategy, and finish with some observations about the prospects for change, keeping in mind the fundamental purpose for which our military institution exists – to fight and win our nation’s wars.

In deliberating the way ahead, one set of ideas should not be understated. In light of such a significant personnel policy change, the United States leadership’s message to the people of the United States and its military should be clear, consistent, and unremitting. When implementing this policy change, we should emphasize that we are one Nation – and one unified military – forged from the American masses. Our united collective tolerance of our individual differences has the potential to make us stronger. As a nation, we are wiser as a result of the lessons left to us by our ancestors who bore the scars of prejudice, hatred and sexism so that we may live more freely – leveraging the capabilities of all and hoping to be judged by the quality and content of our character and not our heritage.⁹ With faith in our country and our democratic government, the Nation and our military are united in purpose and resolve, and we are responsible to carry forward the associated principles of freedom for all future generations. Though there may be challenges, the U.S. military has faced such challenges before and emerged stronger. We will do so again.

Underpinnings of the Law – Then and Now

Every truth passes through three stages before it is recognized. In the first, it is ridiculed, in the second it is opposed, in the third it is regarded as self-evident.¹⁰

In 1993, President Bill Clinton attempted to make good on his campaign promise to abolish the policy which excluded homosexuals from serving in the military. The President's efforts produced a national debate, replete with prejudices and emotional rhetoric over what the military would look like and what military members would be forced to endure if such a mandate were imposed. As a result of the fierce Congressional debate and substantial military institutional resistance, a "compromised" exclusionary law banning gays and lesbians from openly serving in the military was codified.¹¹

The exclusionary law was premised on the reasoning that if openly homosexual or bisexual persons were allowed to serve, "it would create an unacceptable risk to the high standards of morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion that are the essence of military capability."¹² Despite conflicting evidence to many of the arguments on both sides of the issue, the law was passed in relative short order.¹³ The message was simple. The known or open presence of gays in the military would cause unsettling discomfort for heterosexuals, manifesting itself in disruption to good order and discipline and negatively affecting morale and esprit within military units. The aggregate of political, social and cultural conditions that influenced the United States and military way of life at that time was thought to be unready for what was perceived to be a dramatic change in thinking. Based largely on the subjective professional judgment of selected senior military leaders, when the final cost-benefit analysis was conducted, Congress

determined there was too much risk to modify something that the Congressional majority and the military did not perceive as broken.

During the seventeen years since the law was passed, much has changed in the United States and around the world. Political, economic, social and informational advances have stimulated momentous societal changes and tempered perceptions about sexual orientation. Raised “social intelligence” has increased exposure, understanding and acceptance of different lifestyles.¹⁴ A more tolerant and open-minded attitude about sexuality has fueled societal changes where same sex unions as well as gay and lesbian legal entitlements and benefits are commonplace.¹⁵ Twenty two states now have laws on the books protecting against discrimination based on sexual orientation.¹⁶ Public schools recognize their duty to educate and protect gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender students.¹⁷ It is no longer uncommon to see gay characters or themes on television or in movies. Over the last ten years, Fortune 500 companies that ban discrimination against workers because of their sexual orientation have grown from 51 percent to 88 percent.¹⁸ The truth is that despite a sector of the populace who still harbor distaste and sincerely held religious convictions against homosexuality, gay is simply no longer unordinary or even hidden. As the unfamiliar becomes passé, the contempt that was previously bred from unfamiliarity is, in many circles, turning into ambivalence, indifference, and even acceptance.

While this may not be welcome news for some old-school traditionalists and conservatives among us, from a pragmatist viewpoint it should be good news for the U.S. military. The military is a nonpartisan, secular, apolitical government institution, objectively concerned with filling its ranks with the most qualified candidates the United

States has to offer. Though many forecast a negative impact to unit cohesiveness and morale, recent changes in demographics and societal attitudes seems to indicate a more favorable environment when the law is repealed. The potential negative impact to unit cohesiveness and morale is aggravated by a degree of acculturation. Where acculturation no longer supports fear, the adverse impact is lessened. In fact, one could posit that the U.S. military recognizing, embracing, and leveraging the full dimension of ideas which flows from the mixture of human conditions, to include sexual orientation, moves towards achieving a stated military goal of enhanced diversity.¹⁹

The military's leadership is understandably apprehensive about being required to be a social model or the test bed for America's continuing democratic experiment – especially during a time of war on two fronts. Notwithstanding, trust, respect, and effectiveness are nonnegotiable instruments of our profession. The military leadership of our nation realizes that when the debates have concluded and the dust has settled, the defense of our nation and its policy interests are still paramount. Our military must continue to function effectively and forcefully, without interruption. For this reason, it is imperative for the military, with all its institutional trepidation, to meet this challenge with courage, understanding and strength just as it has met similar challenges of the past. As a reflection of our society and in response to our civilian leadership, the military should set aside its reservations and set about implementing this reform. It is a policy whose time has come.

The Strategy of Change

Transformation is hard work.²⁰ It involves sacrifice, discomfort, and often unpleasantness. It means moving from a known way of doing something or thinking about something to a place of unfamiliarity, uncertainty and angst. Any major

institutional policy change requires buy-in by the leadership and the organization. It is very difficult to drive people from their comfort zones in the status quo.²¹ If an organization is to change, a compelling case must be made for why change is needed. In the course of giving up one thing, one hopes to gain something better.

This is the hope of those supporting the repeal of the law that prohibits openly gay and lesbian persons from serving in the military. To achieve something purportedly better, a more inclusive manifestation of America's freedoms and equality, many believe that the military institution must liberalize its policies to better reflect society. The military will need to suspend prejudices and judgments in exchange for another step towards a more open society with equal opportunities, as well as responsibilities, based on merit and not popularity. It should strive to set aside the collective distastes, biases and prejudicial moral judgments of a portion of our military, for higher order egalitarian principles. Indeed, this change effort will be hard work. That said, by applying a multi-faceted strategy that allows for effective cultural adaptation, the military institution can create the conditions to facilitate a more positive reception of the change. What follows is a comprehensive strategy to help ease opposition to change and make acceptance of a new policy more achievable.

Changing Culture

Prejudices, of course, don't exist in the abstract; they all come with distinctive and distinguishing historical peculiarities. In short, they have content as well as form. Underplaying the differences blinds us to the signature traits of other forms of social hatred. Indeed, in judging other prejudices by the one you know best you may fail to recognize those other prejudices as prejudices.²²

Successful cultural transformation is not effortless.²³ Modifying the refractive lens of our cultural biases is complicated and uncomfortable. It requires creating a different

interpretation of the personal realities we may have known or believed all our lives. Because of its tradition of discriminatory treatment towards gays and lesbians, this is the serious challenge that the military will face. It is not, however, an insurmountable challenge.

The writings of John Kotter offer an analytical framework to help guide strategic leaders in developing a systematic approach to bringing about institutional change.²⁴ Kotter describes the forces that drive organizational change and outlines an eight stage process for successfully bringing about major institutional change.²⁵ These eight steps are: establishing a sense of urgency; creating the guiding coalition; developing a vision and strategy; communicating the vision; empowering a broad base of people to take action; generating short-term wins; consolidating gains and producing even more change; and institutionalizing new approaches in the organizational culture.²⁶ Using these eight steps as a framework, an analysis follows proposing a systematic strategy to achieve successful implementation of the change.

1. Establishing a Sense of Urgency. Establishing a sense of urgency is imperative if cultural change is to be effective and accepted within an institution. If an institution is generally content with the status quo of a given issue or its performance, there is no incentive to change. Institutions are driven by their own inertia and as they grow, they develop their own agendas.²⁷ If members of the institution see no utility in changing, it will be difficult to bring about group buy-in for the change. In fact, a successful organization may resist changing altogether, and if pressed to change, may try to delay any movement towards an unwanted change. In fact, with regards to the case at hand, the Department of Defense has opted for a 9-12 month study on the

impact of repealing the law, thus delaying any immediate change.²⁸ The reasons for this are explicable. Change is risky and change could mean that things could possibly get worse. With no apparent personnel crisis looming for the military, there is no sense of urgency to change the status quo.²⁹

When the gay ban is actually lifted, however, a sense of urgency should be carefully styled by the policy makers and military leaders so as to appeal to what the military knows best. The first underlying motive for prompt adaptation is that it is the right thing to do. This assertion must be framed in such a way as to appeal to the normative rules that constrain or oblige Service member behavior and the display of their outward attitudes. Military members have a certain penchant for upholding freedoms and liberties that are fundamental to emancipated open societies that value individuality and self-determination. They also have a penchant for following orders. Equal treatment within government institutions based on unprejudiced substantive criteria related to job performance, ability and merit is a basic precept that most military members will see as invariably appealing and valuable. In fact, these are critical tenets of the military way of life. The strong and capable are generally rewarded and empowered with more responsibility. We stand on our individual merit, but are also significantly judged on how we operated within a team framework. As individual military members, brought together from all parts of society for a singular purpose, we believe in defending those principles of individual self-determination for those who have earned the bona fides to fully participate in the future of our country. In the military, individuals sublimate their individual preferences into organizationally accepted behavior.³⁰ This is

a step towards healing the divisiveness of the political and cultural landscape of America. Building on that premise, if it's the right thing to do, it should be done quickly.

Secondly, the United States likes winning. There seems no more common sense way to build a winning team than to find and garner talent. Historian Nathan Frank outlines in detail in his book, —Unfriendly Fire,” the national security impact of purging the military of gay service members who possess specialty skills which are in great demand and short supply.³¹ He asserts that prejudice against gays in the military context is generally self-defeating rather than productive and has unexpected consequences such as weaknesses related to gathering and leveraging intelligence information because of significant personnel shortages in critical fields (e.g., translators).³² The U.S. military continues to face concerns over falling personnel retention rates and lowered recruitment standards.³³ Changing the existing law will give the U.S. government access to an additional pool of talent needed to help this nation combat the enemies we face. The urgency in making the change quickly is that it provides the military with more available talent and skill.³⁴

2. Creating the Guiding Coalition. Next, the military should look to creating a guiding coalition to transmit a vision to the American people as well as the military that underscores the reciprocal rights and responsibilities associated with U.S. citizenship. This message must be carried forward on multiple fronts from credible sources for it to be heard, legitimized and accepted. Leaders from the top down will be expected to consistently and outwardly indicate support for the new guidance.

The Administration should seek the support of a credible coalition of champions such as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), GEN Shalikasvilli, or former war

decorated veterans who have previously spoken out against the military ban on open gays and lesbians serving in the military.³⁵ The existing CJCS, Admiral Michael Mullen, is also a strong advocate of eliminating diversity barriers and discrimination in the military. Given his progressive thinking on changing the Navy's policy regarding women on submarines, he stands out as a pioneer for military equality and opportunity based on merit verses the status quo military mindset.³⁶ At a Senate Armed Service Committee hearing held February 2, 2010, Admiral Mullen, testified that he believes gays and lesbians should be allowed to reveal their sexual orientation without the risk of being discharged.³⁷ He added his personal belief that —~~n~~matter how I look at this issue I cannot escape being troubled by the fact that we have in place a policy that forces men and women to lie about who they are in order to defend their fellow citizens." Likewise, GEN (ret) Colin Powell, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Secretary of State, who opposed allowing gays and lesbians serving openly in the early 1990s, has also changed his mind. He stated he now believes that —~~att~~itudes and circumstances have changed" which leads him to believe it is time for a change in the law.³⁸

The Administration might also consider somehow showcasing the military talents and contributions of those Service members who have been honorably discharged because of their sexual orientation or have disclosed their orientation under other circumstances and performed with no negative impact to their unit. 1LT Dan Choi, a West Point graduate, infantry officer, and Arabic speaking war veteran, is being considered for discharge from the service for being gay after disclosing his sexual orientation.³⁹ Reportedly, his orientation did not negatively impact his unit or his

performance in combat.⁴⁰ Likewise, Staff Sergeant Eric Alva served admirably for thirteen years in the Marine Corps before becoming the first US service member to be injured during Operation Iraqi Freedom when he lost his leg to a landmine in Iraq.⁴¹ He was eventually medically discharged and has since declared his sexuality. Countless service members such as these illustrate a different kind of story that debunks many of the stereotypical myths related to gays and lesbians, including that their known presence negatively affects a military unit.⁴² The military may also look to the pool of retired veterans who have similar agonizing stories to share. Gay and lesbian Alumni groups from West Point and the U.S. Naval Academy also serve to provide a wealth of background educational information to help build and fuel a Coalition with substantial experiential evidence.

To help build a coalition when the law is repealed, the military could bring into play the influence of the bipartisan members of Congress who helped bring about the change, including those who are current or former members of the Armed Forces. For example, the leading Congressional proponent for repealing the current law is Representative Patrick J. Murphy (Democrat-Pennsylvania, 8th District). He is currently a member of the House of Representative Armed Services Committee and the House Intelligence and Oversight Committee. Congressman Murphy is an Iraq war veteran, a lawyer, a former United States Military Academy professor and criminal prosecutor, a father and husband, who strongly believes that the existing law is discriminatory.⁴³ He believes the ban has compounded negative effects on the military's readiness and does not well serve the Nation or its people.⁴⁴ Similarly, Representative Joe Sestak (Democrat-PA, 7th District), a retired Navy rear admiral who also serves on the House

Armed Service Committee, supports the repeal of the law and sees it as discriminatory.⁴⁵ Representative Murphy talks about how the effectiveness of operations is not impeded by the presence of gays while Congressman Sestak speaks to equal rights. Interestingly, these two members come at the issue with different points of view and reasoning while arriving at the same conclusion. Pulling in Republicans who supported the repeal will add balance to a coalition movement. A powerful and convincing coalition will set the stage for accepted change.

3. *Developing a Vision and Strategy.* To implement the policy successfully, military leaders must create a vision of the future which directs, inspires and aligns actions with ideals.⁴⁶ To this end, military leaders will be required to combine their words with deeds to credibly communicate their message, reaching hearts and minds, and helping Service members accept, if not embrace the change.⁴⁷ An effective vision should be imaginative, appealing, flexible, feasible, focused, and understandably communicated so as to express those benefits to all the stakeholders.⁴⁸ Today's leaders possess the mental acuity to adapt to changing circumstances and lead. In creating an effective vision, the nation is asking nothing new of our military leaders.⁴⁹

Perhaps a page from our own American history can help us shape a message for the future as well as illustrate the misgivings of our past. As history has slowly revealed itself about the details of the American Civil War, we have gradually learned from various sources about the women who disguised themselves as men and enlisted in both the Confederate and Union armies.⁵⁰ During the Civil War, stringent legal, social and economic barriers existed for women, in much the same way that gays and lesbians face legal, social and economic impediments today.⁵¹ Despite society's

oppression, these women saw fit to disguise themselves as men and marched off to fight during the Civil War.⁵² In much the same way, gays and lesbians shroud their true identities today so that they may serve. The timeless motivations of these heroic Civil War women included patriotism, honor, heritage, love of country, or simply a desire for excitement.⁵³ They fought ~~like~~ “demons,” they were wounded and killed, and ~~with~~ the exception of their sex, female Soldiers did not differ in any fundamental way from male Soldiers.⁵⁴ Today women are not only embraced as members of the U.S. military, they are a critical to its success. Social notions of gender propriety and roles are restricting gays and lesbians today in much the same way as women were being kept in check two hundred and fifty years ago.

A new refined vision can be developed through many methods. Three simple methods are outlined herein: expanding the value of the change for all the parties affected, demonstrating the inherent benefit of diversity, and using a more pragmatic logical approach to conceptualizing the change.

Expand the Value. Strategic leaders must ~~expand~~ “expand the value” of the change to all stakeholders after the exclusionary law is repealed. To that end, changing the law will provide many benefits across the military from underscoring the true meaning of citizenship through burden sharing and upholding responsibilities of our free society to leveraging the skills of our most talented citizenry.

Expanding the value also means increasing the mutual respect and confidence of all the stakeholders. To avoid dissention and friction, strategic leaders must find reasons for all stakeholders to feel like champions of the change. For this reason, the leadership’s message should target the multiple stakeholders involved. First and

foremost, the most critical stakeholders are the American people for whom the Military serves and from which the military is drawn. Next, the military itself needs the leadership to provide it with a clear and unequivocal vision, keeping in mind both the anti-repeal and pro-repeal populations. The international community, though an indirect stakeholder, should also take notice as the change speaks to U.S. equal treatment of its citizenry and support for human rights and tolerance.

The message must shape a more sophisticated awareness of the environment. It must ease the concern of those opposing a change and help them realize a full understanding of the benefits in opening up the ranks. The current law, which excludes open gays and lesbians from military service, places the entire burden for defense of the nation on heterosexuals. The policy actually ends up shielding gays and lesbians from military service. Being a U.S. citizen carries with it both rights and responsibilities. Thus, while gays and lesbians reap many of the benefits and liberties guaranteed to Americans, if they outwardly acknowledge their sexuality they bear no responsibility in defending those rights on the field of battle.

From an international perspective, a change in policy sends a message to the international community that the United States is tolerant and the U.S. military is adaptable and continues to be able to assimilate with the changing times. Twenty-nine countries have allowed gays and lesbians to openly serve in their militaries with little, if any, reported negative repercussion.⁵⁵ Some, such as Italy, view it as a violation of their Constitution to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.⁵⁶ The U.S. modification would evidence America's interest in human rights, basic equality and eliminate institutional discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Diversity.

If we are to achieve a richer culture, rich in contrasting values, we must recognize the whole gamut of human potentialities, and so weave a less arbitrary social fabric, one in which each diverse human gift will find a fitting place.⁵⁷

Diversity can increase strength if brought together skillfully. It can also cause create problems if allowed to become a catalyst for intolerance, bias, or dissonance. The challenge for the military in this regard will be to continue the diversity movement that the military has already begun focusing on true integration and reward based on performance, achievement and potential.

Everyone wants to be a part of a winning team. A winning team leverages the winning qualities of all its members by finding strength and power in each individual's skills and attributes. Bravery, intelligence, skill, and muscle are not the exclusive domain of any one group.⁵⁸ Diversity in the ranks has the potential to produce imagination and strength of thought by simply coming at problems from different points of reference and creating appropriately aligned strategies to problem solving. To that end, diversity has potential value, and it is imperative that strategic leaders embrace and convey to military members the message that the military institution embraces people from all walks of life and in doing so strives to build the strength of the Nation.⁵⁹

Pragmatist Approach. Economists study how individuals make choices about the use of resources in order to satisfy needs. In using the economists approach, the logical application of dispassionate analysis should focus on acceptable and unacceptable behavior and conduct verses professed ethical or moral dogma. There is no good and evil associated with pragmatic decision-making when dealing with efficiencies. A scarcity of resources requires finding a means to otherwise meet a

need. The repeal will not only save taxpayer costs associated with investigating, adjudicating, and processing the discharges of gays and lesbians from the military, but will also help the military better fill its ranks with talented patriotic Americans. According to the Government Accounting Office, since 1993 when the law was enacted, upwards of 13,000 service members have been discharged under the law with costs running upwards of \$95.4 million in recruiting and \$95.1 million in training replacements.⁶⁰

Additionally, of those gays and lesbians discharged, many were self-identified as gay or lesbian. Repealing the law will eliminate the possibility that service members could declare, truthfully or not, their homosexuality to obviate of their service obligation.

4. Communicating the Change Vision. To effect the change in policy successfully, military leaders must not only create a vision that aligns actions with ideals, they must also credibly and consistently communicate their message to stakeholders and facilitate the change.⁶¹ The message should be straight-forward and elegantly simple.⁶² It should focus on mutual respect for one another and actions that will not be tolerated across the board by anyone regardless of their gender or orientation. It should be communicated through words, as well as example, in multiple forums with consistency.⁶³ The coalition of former Service members, Congressmen, and military leaders can be used as an instrument from which to impart the message. Military leaders at all levels, however, will have the duty of conveying commitment to supporting the change.

Any inconsistencies or disparities between the old way of doing business and the new way should be explained.⁶⁴ For example, strategic leaders will have to align the new changed policy with the old paradigm that not only excluded gays and lesbians but

also in some cases punished them.⁶⁵ The military must emphasize that once a different policy is implemented, all members of the military will only be disciplined for misconduct, not homosexual orientation. There is the eventuality that gays and lesbians within the ranks will choose to reveal their sexuality at some point during their service. This eventuality should be planned for not only in the message the leadership sends but also actions it takes to ensure no negative repercussions flow from a homosexual member's revelation. Leaders must communicate that a manifestation of a lack of respect for any Service member will not be tolerated. The new policy will require a new cultural alignment with the new contemporary operating environment.

5. Empowering for Broad-Based Action. One of the most critical mistakes an institution can make is to believe that change can be implemented simply by announcing a change in policy. In fact, cultural change takes team work and empowerment to remove barriers and obstacles to change.⁶⁶ To that end, it is critical for the Department of Defense to examine what processes and systems undermine the new cultural vision and impinge on the change effort. They must then determine what action, if any, should be taken so as to re-align existing systems with the new vision.⁶⁷ Empowerment means removing barriers, providing appropriate training, and providing leaders with the power to enforce the policy.⁶⁸

This area may present the greatest challenge for the military. It requires examining the legal, social and infrastructure issues that may serve as barriers. Some systems may not need any tinkering such as recruitment, promotions, and evaluation appraisals.⁶⁹ These should continue to be based on identifiable qualifications such as intelligence, performance and potential. Even administrative actions and criminal

actions can be properly lined up with the new guiding principles without great difficulty, though the some may want to hand-wring over the details.

The greater incongruity will exist if there is an expectation that sexual orientation be treated as irrelevant but then to not provide the same benefits to homosexuals and heterosexual couples. Some states recognize legal contractual unions between same sex couples. That number may or may not grow in the coming years, as court cases shape the future of the gay-rights movement. Additionally, in June 2009, President Obama signed an executive order granting some benefits to same sex partners of federal employees.⁷⁰ Practically speaking however, the military at this point may legitimately justify treating gay couples disparately by applying the “Defense of Marriage Act” which arguably provides that same sex unions will not be federally recognized.⁷¹

That said the military must recognize the issues connected to benefits and allowances related to sexuality. The stakes include housing, increased pay allowances for “family-members,” medical care, educational benefits and alike. If the Defense of Marriage Act is amended or overturned, the military will be forced to revisit some of the issues related to partner benefits. The President has indicated that he believes the Act should be repealed, which may portend its future demise.⁷² For the purpose of changing the institutional culture, the disparity in treatment will send mixed signals to the institution and potentially serve to undercut some of the thrust of the policy change.

Once the disparities are reconciled and the newly aligned policies are in place, there should be training and discussion to make sure that the policy and supporting procedures are consistent for both heterosexual and homosexual Service members.⁷³

Again, inconsistencies should be justifiable in order to maintain the legitimacy of the policy.

There will always be those who simply cannot stomach change or try to undercut the change.⁷⁴ They must be dealt with carefully but consistently and on a case by case basis by the leadership. Because institutional cultural change doesn't happen quickly, best efforts must be made to at least gain the buy-in of individuals. If winning them over does not work, appropriate tailored actions should be considered to ensure the policy is not undercut. This could mean anything from counseling to removal depending on the actions of the Service member and the individual circumstances of the case. This will be the cost of gaining buy-in and legitimacy.

6. Generating Short-Term Wins. Short term wins must be visible, unambiguous, and clearly relate to the change effort.⁷⁵ Identifying short term wins serves multiple purposes including: providing evidence that the efforts being made are worth the change; rewarding agents of change; fine-tuning vision and strategy; undermining cynics and self-serving resisters; keeping leadership on board; and finally building momentum for support.⁷⁶

One immediate visible short term gain may be demonstrated through the retention and addition of valuable skill sets, such as linguists, being added to the force. The promotion of openly gay high ranking officers and NCOs may also serve to produce legitimacy for the change.

7. Consolidating Gains and Producing More Change. Celebrating short-term wins not only persuades those who are politically or emotionally resisting change, but it can also build momentum for further change and greater acceptance of the change.⁷⁷ In an

organization made up of interdependent parts, building capacity through additional incremental change is important.⁷⁸ Once the immediate change has been accepted, the military may move to then consider providing similar benefits to legally recognized homosexual relationships, such as receiving dependent medical care or the increased housing allowances rates (with dependent) for those legally sanctioned same sex unions. Placing deserving openly gay service members in key positions may also demonstrate dedication and support for the new policy and also consolidates gains. The passage of time and the initial reception of the policy change may or may not allow these gains to be recognized in the shortterm. Regardless, the strategic leaders should be thinking long-term about how to produce more beneficial long term change.

8. *Anchoring new Approaches in Culture.* Kotter notes that culture is powerful for three primary reasons: individuals are selected and indoctrinated into the culture, culture exerts itself through the actions of hundreds or thousands, and all of this happens without much conscious intent and is thus not easy to change.⁷⁹ For these reasons, replacing the old culture can be a challenge. Norms come at the conclusion of transformation and depend on whether the new policy works and is accepted.⁸⁰ Seeing the value of this change in policy will require frequent exchanges of information and the eventual elimination of the “old timers” who “remember when” things were different.⁸¹ Attention must be paid to not allow the old culture to reassert itself in attempts to undercut the new policy.⁸² This may take time but military leaders must maintain a consistent and sustained level of effort by continuously monitoring the organization much the same way they currently do with sexual harassment and racial discrimination.

Conclusion

In the end, with the right leadership, there is little doubt that when directed to do so, the military will faithfully execute the orders it has been given and uphold the law dictated by Congress and approved by its Commander in Chief. The military must also be realistic and sober about the prospects of effectively moving forward. If a comprehensive change strategy is in place when the change comes, Service members will be ready to implement whatever challenges they face. The Force will not be broken, their cohesion will not be torn, and unit effectiveness will not be degraded.

America's adversaries want nothing more than for the nation and its military to be turned against itself, whether by race, religion, gender or just plain fear of one another or lack of understanding. America's enemies benefit when we exclude intelligent, capable and strong Americans from our military talent pool and when we foment divisiveness in our country through laws that unfairly disfavor certain groups. Internal prejudices and discrimination against gays and lesbians have the potential to divide us, not just as a military but as a Nation. By fostering an environment of mutual respect for one another based on performance and ability, the organization benefits. As a result of understanding the full dimension of human relationships we move our military closer towards achieving a better standard of freedom and equality for America and the world.

Endnotes

¹ Jim Garamore, *–The US Military Still the Most Trusted Institution,*” Harris Poll, March 8, 2006. Also see speech by Dr. Francis Harvey, Secretary of the Army, 2005. *–The Nation has entrusted the Army with preserving its peace and freedom, defending its democracy, and providing opportunities for its Soldiers to serve the country and personally develop their skills and citizenship. Consequently, we are and will continuously strive to remain among the most respected institutions in the United States. To fulfill our solemn obligation to the Nation, we must*

remain the preeminent land power on earth-the ultimate instrument of national resolve; strategically dominant on the ground where our Soldiers' engagements are decisive.”

² 2007 *Army Posture Statement*. –The Army Vision: Relevant and Ready Land Power In Service To The Nation: The challenges posed by the 21st Century security environment drive our vision of the force we must become to continue to accomplish our mission, to preserve peace and freedom for the Nation. Maintaining our focus on Soldiers – who are well led and organized into flexible, adaptive formations in our Operating Force, and properly supported by our Generating Force – we will ensure that our Army continues to be relevant, in terms of its design, and ready, in terms of its capabilities, for whatever the Nation demands. America has entrusted us to preserve peace, maintain freedom, and defend democracy – a role we have performed for over 230 years. Today, because of our Soldiers and our record of accomplishment, the American people regard the Army as one of the Nation’s most respected institutions. We will maintain this trust.”

³ Pete Geren, Secretary of the Army, General George Casey, Army Chief of Staff and Sergeant Major Kenneth Preston, Sergeant Major of the Army, *Policy on Diversity*, dated April 1, 2009.

⁴ Morris MacGregor, *Integration of the Armed Forces 1940-1965*, The Center for Military History, United States Army, Washington, DC, April 1979. Also see <http://www.womensmemorial.org/Education/BBH1998.html>, 14 Oct 09. Also see: http://www.google.com/search?q=history+of+discrimination+in+the+military&hl=en&rls=com.microsoft:*:IE-searchBox&tbs=tl:1&tbo=u&ei=NvvWSr66KoHh8QbqsvzsCA&sa=X&oi=timeline_result&ct=title&resnum=11&ved=0CCEQ5wIwCg, 14 October 2009 (accessed February 20, 2010).

⁵ President Barack Obama, The State of the Union Address, 28 January 10, stated that in 2010 he would work with Congress to repeal –Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.” Also see, Sheryl Gay Stolberg, –Obama Pledges Again To End ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,’ New York Times, 11 October 2009, pg. 24. –will end don’t ask, don’t tell,” Mr. Obama told an audience of nearly 3,000 people at a fund-raising dinner for the Human Rights Campaign, the nation’s largest gay advocacy group: –that is my commitment to you.” Also see http://www.lifesitenews.com/ldn/2009/oct/_09101308.html, quoting President Obama during a speech on 13 October 2009 wherein he criticizes people with –old attitudes” about homosexuality and promises to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act” (accessed January 3, 2010)

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ See HR 1283, 111th Congress, introduced 3 March 2009. To amend Title 10, USC, to enhance the readiness of the Armed Forces by replacing the current policy concerning homosexuality in the Armed Forces with a policy of nondiscrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Sponsor Representative Ellen Tauscher (California-Democrat), 177 co-sponsors. See <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d111:HR01283:@@@P>. Also see Patrick Murphy at:http://www.patrickmurphy.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=478&Itemid=93, (accessed 5 December 2009).

⁸ Rowna Scarborough, *Marine Leads Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Fight - Resists Efforts to lift the Ban*, Washington Times, November 2, 2009. Quoting: –Marine Corps Commandant Gen. James T. Conway has emerged in internal Pentagon deliberations as the most outspoken opponent of

permitting gay men and women to serve openly in the U.S. military, according to a former senior Pentagon official. Most of the senior brass hold deep reservations about President Obama's pledge to end the ban on gays in the military, especially in the middle of two wars that have put extra stress on the military, down to the platoon level, where soldiers and Marines would be expected to bond with openly gay colleagues. But Gen. Conway has gone further than others in stating his opposition to a change in policy, according to the former official, who has been privy to private conversations on the matter. "He feels very strongly that [removing the ban] would be disruptive, and he opposes it," said the former official. Currently, Gen. Conway's reservations are in contrast to public sentiment from other service chiefs - all of whom have said if Congress introduces a bill to repeal the ban, they will discuss it with the chain of command and if Congress changes the law, they will follow suit."

⁹ Martin Luther King, Jr, "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character," excerpt from the "I Have a Dream" speech in which Martin Luther King called for racial equality and an end to discrimination, delivered August 28, 1963.

¹⁰ Arthur Schopenhauer, http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Arthur_Schopenhauer (accessed January 3, 2010).

¹¹ See: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1568/is_n4_v25/ai_14171972/, BNET, October 14, 2009 (accessed November 1, 2009).

¹² See, "*Policy Concerning Homosexuality in the Armed Forces*," Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, 103d Congress, 2d Sess. (1993) (Mar. 29, 31; Apr. 29; May 7, 10, 11, July 20, 21, 22 1993 hearings). Senate Debate regarding Homosexuals in the Military, 139 Congressional Record S7603; daily edition, June 22, 1993; House debate regarding the National Defense Authorization Act Fiscal Year 1994, 139 Congressional Record, H7065; daily edition, September 28, 1993; Public Law 103-160 (10 USC 654), prohibiting anyone who "demonstrate(s) a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts" from serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, unless one of the exceptions from 10 USC 654(b) applies.

¹³ Senator Ted Kennedy, *Senate Debate regarding the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994*. 139 Congressional Record, S11194; daily ed, September 9, 1993.

¹⁴ Goleman, Daniel, *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationships*, (Bantam Books, 2006). "Social intelligence is made up of social awareness including empathy, attunement, empathic accuracy, and social cognition and social facility, (including synchrony, self-presentation, influence, and concern)."

¹⁵ In the United States, five states currently allow same-sex marriage Connecticut, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Iowa. Washington, DC, recently approved a bill legalizing gay marriage. New Jersey and Maryland recognize civil unions. See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Same-sex_marriage, (accessed December 15, 2009). See <http://www.lifesitenews.com/ldn/2009/oct/09101308.html>, quoting President Obama speech on October 13, 2009 stated: "Do not doubt the direction we are headed and the destination we will reach," speaking about the expansion of basic equal rights for all Americans. Also see, John M. Shalikashvili, at http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/02/opinion/02shalikashvili.html?_r=2, January 2, 2007, quoting "As was the case in 1993 — the last time the American people thoroughly debated the question

of whether openly gay men and lesbians should serve in the military — the issue will give rise to passionate feelings on both sides. The debate must be conducted with sensitivity, but it must also consider the evidence that has emerged over the last 14 years. When I was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I supported the current policy because I believed that implementing a change in the rules at that time would have been too burdensome for our troops and commanders. I still believe that to have been true. The concern among many in the military was that given the longstanding view that homosexuality was incompatible with service, letting people who were openly gay serve would lower morale, harm recruitment and undermine unit cohesion. In the early 1990s, large numbers of military personnel were opposed to letting openly gay men and lesbians serve. President Bill Clinton, who promised to lift the ban during his campaign, was overwhelmed by the strength of the opposition, which threatened to overturn any executive action he might take. The compromise that came to be known as “don’t ask, don’t tell” was thus a useful speed bump that allowed temperatures to cool for a period of time while the culture continued to evolve. The question before us now is whether enough time has gone by to give this policy serious reconsideration. Much evidence suggests that it has,” (accessed February 20, 2010).

¹⁶ See: http://usmilitary.about.com/gi/o.htm?zi=1/XJ/Ya&zTi=1&sdn=usmilitary&cdn=careers&tm=4&gps=249_1048_1003_598&f=00&tt=14&bt=1&bts=0&zu=http%3A//www.sldn.org/index.html (accessed December 15, 2009). Service Members Legal Defense Network is a policy organization dedicated to ending discrimination against and harassment of military personnel affected by "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT).

¹⁷ National School Boards Association, *Dealing with Legal Matters Surrounding Students' Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity*, www.nsba.org/cosa/sexualorientation (accessed February 5, 2010). Also see: 20 U.S.C. Section 1681-1688 (2004). Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits gender-based discrimination in educational programs that receive federal funds. Although Title IX does not specifically state protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation generally, students may be able to sue under Title IX for a school district's failure to protect them from harassment. Additionally, some states have enacted statutes prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. See, e.g., al. Educ. Code § 220 (West 2004); Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 10-15c (West 2004); Minn. Stat. Ann. § 363A.13 (West 2004).

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Pete Geren, Secretary of the Army, GEN George Casey, Army Chief of Staff and SGM Kenneth Preston, Sergeant Major of the Army, *Policy on Diversity*, dated April 1, 2009. Enhanced diversity is a stated goal of the Army.

²⁰ Spencer Johnson, MD, *Who Moved My Cheese?: An Amazing Way to Deal with Change in Your Work and in Your Life*, (1998, G.P. Putnam Sons). This is a story of four characters living in a maze who face unexpected change when they discover their "Cheese" has disappeared. Sniff and Scurry, who are mice, and Hem and Haw, little people the size of mice, each adapt to change in their "maze" differently. In fact, one doesn't adapt at all.

²¹ John Kotter, *Leading Change*, (Harvard Business School Press, 1996), 5.

²² Henry Louis Gates Jr., *New Yorker Magazine*, May 17, 1992, Jr., examines the comparison of gay rights versus black civil rights.

²³ John Kotter, *Leading Change*, (Harvard Business School Press, 1996), 20.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid., 21-22.

²⁷ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, 1920, Book I, Chapter 8. Rousseau posits that progress has been adverse to the security of humanity, that is, unless it is counteracted by the cultivation of civic morality and duty:

—Only in civil society can man be ennobled—through the use of reason: The passage from the state of nature to the civil state produces a very remarkable change in man, by substituting justice for instinct in his conduct, and giving his actions the morality they had formerly lacked. Then only, when the voice of duty takes the place of physical impulses and right of appetite, does man, who so far had considered only himself, find that he is forced to act on different principles, and to consult his reason before listening to his inclinations. Although, in this state, he deprives himself of some advantages which he got from nature, he gains in return others so great, his faculties are so stimulated and developed, his ideas so extended, his feelings so ennobled, and his whole soul so uplifted, that, did not the abuses of this new condition often degrade him below that which he left, he would be bound to bless continually the happy moment which took him from it forever, and, instead of a stupid and unimaginative animal, made him an intelligent being and a man.”

²⁸ Anne Gearan —*Lawyers Advise Wait to Lift Gay Ban*,” The Washington Post, January 14, 2010. —Lawyers for the nation's senior military officer are recommending a delay of at least a year in beginning the process to repeal the ban on openly gay military service, which could push a decision by Congress to the middle of the next presidential election. Other advisers at the Pentagon, however, argue that lifting the ban would not cause unmanageable problems or divisions among the uniformed military, according to two U.S. officials. They discussed internal conversations about the ban on condition of anonymity. "Now is not the time," the in-house legal counsel for Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote recently in a memorandum obtained by The Associated Press. "The importance of winning the wars we are in, along with the stress on the force, our body of knowledge and the number of unknowns, demand that we act with deliberation." Mullen received the conflicting advice this month about whether to move quickly to lift the 1993 ban, and it is not clear what he will recommend to President Barack Obama. Although allowing gays to serve openly in the military was one of Obama's campaign promises, the issue was put on a back burner during his first year in office. Some liberal supporters and several congressional Democrats are pushing for action. Mullen and other Pentagon leaders have quietly begun a new push to build consensus for the timing of a repeal that Mullen and others assume will come eventually. Strong opposition to swift repeal remains among top uniformed military leaders...”

²⁹ Ibid., 29.

³⁰ This process begins at basic training as the military's initial vehicle for change.

³¹ Nathaniel Frank, *Unfriendly Fire - How the Gay Ban Undermines the Military and Weakens America*, (Thomas Dunne Books, 2009).

³² Nathaniel Frank, *Revolving Door for Troops*, The Washington Post, July 12, 2004. The article states that the Pentagon had to recall 5600 troops for deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan. It also says –The Pentagon's recalls are targeting specialists with needed skills in intelligence, engineering, medicine, administration, transportation, security, and other key support and logistical areas. Under the gay ban, the military has expelled thousands of just such troops: 268 in intelligence, 57 in combat engineering, 331 in medical treatment, 255 in administration, 292 in transportation, 232 in military police and security, and 420 in supply and logistics since 1998. It also booted 88 language specialists (many of them Arabic-language translators and interrogators); 49 nuclear, biological and chemical warfare experts; 52 missile guidance and control operators; and 150 rocket, missile and other artillery specialists. In certain badly needed specialties, the military could have avoided involuntary recalls altogether if it had not expelled competent gay troops in those fields: It is recalling 72 soldiers in communication and navigation but expelled 115 gay troops in that category; 33 in operational intelligence but expelled 50 gays; 33 in combat operations control but expelled 106. In total, while the Army is set to recall 5,674 troops from the Individual Ready Reserve, 6,273 troops have been discharged for being gay, lesbian or bisexual since 1998. The discharges continue, at the rate of two to three per day, despite alarming reports that the military is stretched dangerously thin and is overtaxing its current forces.”

³³ Christian Davenport and Emma Brown, *Military Recruiting Woes Loom*,” <http://www.thenewstribune.com/news/nationworld/story/943895.html>, The Washington Post, November 6, 2009.

³⁴ An example of this is the recent documented loss of translators.

³⁵ John M. Shalikashvili, *Gays in the Military: Let the Evidence Speak*, The Washington Post, June 9, 2009. –News that the president would change the policy had inspired a group of retired flag officers to argue on this page this spring that service by openly gay individuals would harm morale, discipline, cohesion, recruitment and retention in the U.S. military [“Gays and the Military: A Bad Fit,” op-ed, April 15]. They wrote as part of a larger effort by more than 1,000 retired officers to keep the ban in place. According to the generals and admirals, allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly would make parents less willing to allow their sons and daughters to enlist. The argument assumes that anti-gay sentiment is so fierce and widespread that moving to a policy of equal treatment would drive away thousands and could ultimately “break the All-Volunteer Force.” Not only is there no evidence to support these conclusions, but research shows conclusively that openly gay service members would not undermine military readiness. Tradition is a critical military value, and the armed forces have a long-standing tradition of banning gay men and lesbians. Equally important military traditions, however, are learning and adapting -- and my colleagues made claims as if no new knowledge has been acquired over past decades, during which time Israel and Britain joined more than 20 other nations to allow openly gay individuals to serve without overall problems...” GEN (ret) Shalikashvili goes on to posit in the article that time ban has outlived its usefulness and should be changed.

³⁶ Julian E. Barnes, *Navy moves to let women serve aboard Submarines*,” <http://hamptonroads.com/2010/02/navy-moves-let-women-serve-aboard-submarines-0>, 24 February 2010 (accessed March 1, 2010). The change has been pushed by Admiral Mike

Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a former Navy Chief of Operations. As the Navy Chief, Admiral Mullen oversaw research on whether women could be accommodated on submarines. During his second term as Chairman, Mullen told Congress he supported the change.

³⁷ Bryan Bender, *–Admiral Mullen: Allowing Gays and Lesbians to Serve Openly Would Be the Right Thing To Do,* Political Intelligence, February 2, 2010.

³⁸ *–Adm. Mullen Formed Stand on Gays in the Military Over Years of Consideration,* The New York Times, February 3, 2010. Author unknown.

³⁹ *West Point grads form gay support group*. Army Times. http://www.armytimes.com/news/2009/03/military_westpoint_knightsout_031609w/, (accessed January 25, 2010).

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Mark Thompson, *"Reexamining 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'". Time magazine,* <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1598653,00.html> (accessed January 25, 2010). Also see Jose Antonio Vargas *"Defending His Country, but Not Its 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Policy"*. *Washington Post*, February 27, 2007.

⁴² See http://www.hrc.org/sites/voicesofhonor/about_vets.asp, outlining the lives and honorable military service of a range of men and women both enlisted and officer (accessed January 24, 2010).

⁴³ See http://www.patrickmurphy.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=28 (accessed January 30, 2010).

⁴⁴ See http://www.patrickmurphy.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=28. Patrick Murphy served as a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney in New York, a prosecutor in North Carolina, and an associate professor of Constitutional Law at West Point, deployed to Bosnia in 2002 and to Iraq from 2003-2004. While in Baghdad, REP Murphy served as a Captain in the Army's elite 82nd Airborne Division, and was later awarded the Bronze Star for Service. Also see, http://www.patrickmurphy.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=484&Itemid=40, (accessed January 22, 2010). Congressman Murphy notes: *–Our military is the best-trained, best-performing force in the world, and to say that our troops cannot handle serving alongside openly-gay colleagues implies that they are not as professional as service members in other nations' armed forces who do. Over 20 countries, including our strongest allies- Great Britain and Israel- as well as most of our NATO allies, allow gays and lesbians to serve openly in their militaries; studies of the militaries of Great Britain, Israel, Australia, and Canada – all of which permit the service of openly gay troops – have shown no detrimental impact on recruitment, unit cohesion, or morale. U.S. service members are already serving alongside troops from many of these nations in Iraq and Afghanistan. In the U.S., federal agencies such as the FBI, CIA, and NSA do not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation; only the U.S. military does*” (accessed January 22, 2010).

⁴⁵ Craig Whitlock and Ed O'Keefe, *–On Issue of Gays in the Military, Pentagon will make Recommendations to Congress,* The Washington Post, January 29, 2010. The Post article quoting Congressman Sestak as saying: *–always thought the policy was discriminatory, and*

we were obviously losing some good sailors... I believe that having gone to war with these guys, how can you come home and not give them equal rights?"

⁴⁶ John P. Kotter, *Leading Change*, Harvard Business School Press (1996), 7.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁴⁹ America was built on the spirit of noble and inspirational military leaders who directed their men to face certain death throughout this country's history. Gays and lesbians should be treated fairly because it is a military leader's responsibility to get the best from everyone of his or her Soldiers. Every service member deserves a leader who will provide him/her with the opportunity to be the best they can be.

⁵⁰ DeAnne Blanton and Lauren M. Cook, *Women Soldiers in the American Civil War – They Fought Like Demons*, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 2002, 1-2. Using military records, pictures, letters, memoirs, newspapers, medical records, diaries and other government records, Blanton and Cook pieced together the stories of these women – over 240 such women in uniform.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 3-5.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 1-6.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁵⁵ Twenty nine countries currently allow homosexuals to serve openly. Those countries include Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bermuda, Canada, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Romania, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and Uruguay. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_orientation_and_military_service, (accessed October 14, 2009).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ Margaret Mead, http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/m/margaret_mead.html (accessed January 30, 2010).

⁵⁸ See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_orientation_and_military_service Consul. "The Israel Defense Forces policies allow gay men and lesbians to serve openly and without discrimination or harassment due to actual or perceived sexual orientation." At the Israeli Consulate, David Saranga was interviewed by the St. Petersburg Times, said, "It's a non-issue. You can be a very good officer, a creative one, a brave one, and be gay at the same time" (accessed January 20, 2010). Snider, Don M, *The Future of the Army Profession*, ed. Lloyd J. Matthews. Don M. Snider, Project Director, (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2005). chapter 2, 12-16. As one scholar put it, it is essential "to the security of national interests in a world of shrinking resources and ideologically competitive states" to have a professional military force that is

knowledgeable, skilled, insightful, and possesses such professional standards as duty, loyalty, integrity, patriotism, and public service.

⁵⁹ Pete Geren, Secretary of the Army, GEN George Casey, Army Chief of Staff and SGM Kenneth Preston, Sergeant Major of the Army, *Policy on Diversity*, dated April 1, 2009. "Men and women who serve our great Army come from all walks of life. While each thinks differently and brings attributes and characteristics, together they make up the best Army in the world. Army diversity is defined as different attributes, experiences and backgrounds of our Soldiers, Civilians, and family members that further enhance our global capabilities and contribute to adaptive, culturally astute Army. Diversity is a major strength of our Army. Our Army is the strength of this Nation. Our reflection of the Nation's diverse talent and our commitment to Army values empowers us to achieve the Army's Diversity Mission: The national leader embracing the strengths of diverse people in an inclusive environment. We will achieve this vision by investing in and managing that talent, valuing individuals, and developing culturally astute Soldiers, Civilians, and Family members who support our communities, and who embrace the human dimension of leadership. Leaders must promote a common understanding of this vision and make it a reality; doing so strengthens our Army and continues our legacy of sustaining a high quality All Volunteer Force. Leaders must lead the Army's diversity efforts. As we continue to strengthen our knowledge and understanding of diversity within our ranks, not only will our strength, versatility, and understanding of diversity be amplified, but we will be more effective at understanding the cultures and environments where we serve. We expect all leaders to develop and maintain an inclusive environment that will sustain the Army as a relevant and ready Force. We share this commitment as a team." Also see, Craig W. Duehring, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, memorandum on *Air Force Approach to Diversity*, dated October 15, 2007; Thad Allen, Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, *Diversity Policy Statement*, undated; James T. Conway, General, Commandant of the Marine Corps, *Commandant of the Marine Corps Diversity Policy*, undated.

⁶⁰ Correspondents in Washington, AFP, "*Call to End U.S. Military Gay Ban*," <http://www.google.com/url?sa=X&q=http://www.news.com.au/breaking-news/call-to-end-us-military-gay-ban/story-e6frku0-1225824530381&ct=ga&cd=2jTF6T1UIDw&usg=AFQjCNEdp6qYvNYcsn0Cgd6-n-ASs1p8pg>, (accessed January 29, 2010).

⁶¹ John P. Kotter, *Leading Change*, Harvard Business School Press (1996), 7, 9.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 90.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Kleinbaum, Rob, "*GM needs a Culture Change Now*." *Automotive News*, March 9, 2009; Also see, Nagl, John A. "*Organizational culture and learning institutions, Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife, Counterinsurgency lessons from Malay and Vietnam*" (The University of Chicago Press, 2002).

⁶⁶ John P. Kotter, *Leading Change*, Harvard Business School Press (1996), 102.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 104-106.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 110-111.

⁷⁰ CNN Politics.com, June 17, 2009, *Obama OKs some benefits for same employees same sex partners.* <http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/06/16/obama.same.sex.benefits/index.html>, (accessed February 2, 2010).

⁷¹ *“The Defense of Marriage Act”* is a short title for Public Law No. 104-199, 110 Stat. 2419, codified at 1 USC section 7 and 28 USC 1738C, September 21, 1996. The law has two effects. It states that no state or other political subdivision of the US must legally treat a relationship between persons of the same sex as a marriage, even if recognized in another state. It also defines marriage for federal law purposes as a union between persons of the opposite sex.

⁷² CNN Politics.com, , *Obama OKs some benefits for same employees same sex partners.* <http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/06/16/obama.same.sex.benefits/index.html>. June 17, 2009, (accessed February 2, 2010).

⁷³ Ibid., 115.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 112-114.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 121-122.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 123

⁷⁷ Ibid., 132-133, 136.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 151.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid., 157.

