Social Engineering in the Military

Military members come from all tiers of American society and all ethnic backgrounds—and there are many differences. But the nature of the military indoctrinates its members with a cultural overlay designed to develop critical discipline, esprit de corps, self-confidence, and a mindset necessary to perform the primary task of breaking things and hurting the enemy. The result is a culture that's uniquely suited for its role in defending our constitution and nation.

Unfortunately, elected officials have frequently used the military as a laboratory for social experimentation. Politicians with an ideological axe to grind seek to advance their social agenda by requiring all quarters of society to adapt to their paradigm—including the military. This appears to have been done without regard to the effect that such social tinkering will have on the ability of the military to perform its objective.

The US military is naturally a conservative organization. This term is not used in the context of modern political ideological definitions. The military depends on historically vetted protocols and naturally resists change. Change involves new challenges, new dangers and usually unintended consequences. These can be dealt with in most organizations, but in the deadly serious business of national defense, it can unnecessarily cost lives and national treasure. It's for this reason that the military is reluctant to change the tried-and-proven methods of doing its job, and embraces change gradually, on a trial basis.

Any suggestion that the Military change its social policies is normally met with howls of protest, and blanket statements that such change will undermine the morale and effectiveness of the military and inhibit its mission capability. Sometimes these objections are without merit and other times they are fully justified. Each attempt to change the social fabric of the US military risks rending that fabric and doing serious damage. No two cases are alike, and the success or failure of one case of social engineering has no basis for predicting the results of another. With this in mind, it's instructive to look at each charge of social engineering forced on the military and analyze it. This exercise intends to demonstrate the thought process that should be applied to any proposed change imposed on the Military, and highlight the underlying questions that should accompany every such debate.

Racial Integration

The United States fought WWII as a segregated army. With a few notable exceptions, African-American soldiers were not allowed to fight in front-line combat. This policy reflected long-held prejudices that prevailed in nineteenth century America. In the few exceptions, units were typically homogenous, made up entirely of minorities, with no real integration. These units typically distinguished themselves exceptionally well in combat.

On July 26, 1948, President Truman signed Executive Order 9981, requiring the racial integration of all armed forces. The last all-black unit in the American army was abolished in September, 1954. This visionary order showed that racial integration in society was indeed possible, and proved a successful experiment that led the

Promoting effective military culture. ....

MilitaryValues.org

way to social acceptance between the ethnic groups. It did not happen without resistance to the idea from the military. Secretary of the Army Ken Royall was forced to retire for refusing to implement the order.

We can see with the advantage of 20/20 hindsight that the integration order was the right policy implemented at the right time. There was no legitimate reason to assume that a black soldier would perform any differently than a white soldier in combat. One could argue that black recruits would be less educated than white recruits, but the reality is that an uneducated black recruit was little different than a similarly uneducated white recruit from poverty-stricken Appalachia. Commanders had a legitimate concern that white soldiers would reject black soldiers from inclusion in their units based merely on ancient, ignorant prejudice. Such prejudice was commonplace in American culture at the time, and since the military reflects American society, such prejudice risked inhibiting the good order and discipline of the American military. Had such an order been given in the heat of battle in WWII, it could have cost American lives, both black and white, and possibly resulted in wholesale mutinies. While the US is at war, it's risky to test social engineering, however well intended. As it was, the change was difficult, and it took years for the military to slowly accept the reality that blacks could fight and soldier as well as anybody. Truman's order was given at a time of relative peace in American history, and allowed the military culture to adapt to the change without having to suffer the consequences of the impact it had on combat capability.

The idea that minority groups should be proportionally represented in all segments of the military creates a potential for reverse discrimination. Many military specialties have very rigorous selection criteria that very few people can meet. If a member of a minority doesn't meet military standards, the question arises if that person failed objective criteria or if they were rejected because of prejudice. That question cuts both ways and there is no good answer if the issue is raised. Racial integration of the military had its rough spots, but there was a significant enough percentage of ethnic minorities in the military that they were proportionally represented in all specialties, so those who didn't make the cut had very little grounds to claim discrimination. This will become more problematic as the military tries to integrate proportionally smaller minority groups.

Homosexuality in the Military

Acceptance of open homosexuality in American society is a relatively recent phenomenon. Homosexuals have always formed a small percentage of American society and attitudes have varied by time and locality from open hostility to quiet acceptance. The American military tolerated homosexuals insomuch as they stayed in the closet, but discharged them if such behavior was exposed.

The social attitude towards homosexuality made homosexuals the potential target of blackmail for foreign agents. A homosexual's social standing and career could be ruined if their sexual preference was exposed or even speculated upon. Homosexuals were consequently potential security risks. This wasn't a military issue, but a societal one reflected in the military.

Like blacks, there is no reason to think that homosexuals can't perform in combat as well as any other social demographic. Alexander conquered the known world with an army in which homosexuality was an accepted norm. The question is how the presence of homosexuals will affect our modern army, populated with Americans drawn from across the social spectrum of society. Prejudices against homosexuals aren't nearly as prevalent

among today's crop of recruits as they were twenty or forty years ago. Thanks to discrimination laws and court decisions, homosexuality is no longer a security risk, as the blackmail potential no longer exists. Nevertheless, a significant percentage of the American population is still uncomfortable with the idea of open homosexuality, and these attitudes will be reflected in the military culture, leading to lowered combat effectiveness.

The military relies on order and discipline. It requires that its members observe customs and courtesies and present a military bearing. Our culture has traditionally considered homosexuality as effeminate, unmanly, and therefore contemptible. This view contrasts with the idea of a military bearing. Until societal prejudices of how homosexuals are viewed changes, these prejudices will make it nearly impossible for homosexuals to ever be considered fully integrated into military culture. The "Don't-ask-don't-tell" policy of the turn of the century military was a rational and reasonable response to these issues, and reflected the reality that if the establishment is unaware of your orientation, they cannot penalize you for it.

The military supports its service member's religious needs through the chaplain corps. This is a unique organization – attached to combat units at every level, but separate in training and command structure. Acceptance of homosexuals faces barriers that racial integration didn't have to deal with, as many Americans have a religious basis for their aversion to homosexuality. Despite the eventual attitudes of society towards homosexuality, and how those attitudes become reflected in the military, it exceeds the charter of any organization to order religious leaders to perform duties that expressly violate their religious teachings, such as requiring military chaplains to perform homosexual marriages or face professional consequences and even punishment.

The United States is engaged in an international military conflict at the moment. Society and the military may or may not be prepared to integrate homosexuals into the military. Wartime is not an appropriate venue in which to conduct such an experiment. If it goes badly, lives will be at stake.

Women in the Military

The military is a highly structured social organization. The demands of combat and the fact that commanders may have to order subordinates into dangerous or lethal situations requires a rigid hierarchy and discipline among the various ranks. For this reason, there are deep prohibitions against fraternization between the ranks. An intentional gulf is created between officers and enlisted in order to discourage reluctance at carrying out orders, and to prevent officers from becoming emotionally involved with soldiers that they may have to order to their deaths.

The first women military auxiliaries joined the military in WWI. From that time until 1948, women served as an auxiliary corps to the regular military. They were segregated from the regular military, and the normal rules of officer/enlisted fraternization went double for Women Auxiliaries.

In 1948, the Women's Armed Service Integration Act made women a de facto part of the military. The military organization reluctantly opened its doors to female members, who at first mostly took traditionally female jobs such as nurses. By the late 1970's women were finding their way into many noncombat positions, and were making rank. In the 1990's women could fly combat aircraft and serve on naval combat vessels. Women had effectively interleaved themselves into all levels of the military.

This trend was strongly promoted by women's rights and feminist organizations. Rather than allowing women to naturally carve out their positions in the military, feminists and the politicians who catered to them demanded that the military change the way it did business to accommodate female personnel, whether it was ready to or not. This ready-or-not-here-we-come approach forced problematic situations and created a hypertension between the sexes in the service.

> *We aren't no thin red 'eroes, nor we aren't no blackguards too,*
>
> *But single men in barricks, most remarkable like you;*
>
> *An' if sometimes our conduck isn't all your fancy paints,*
>
> *Why, single men in barricks don't grow into plaster saints;*
>
> *While it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Tommy, fall be'ind",*
>
> *But it's "Please to walk in front, sir", when there's trouble in the wind,*
>
> -"Tommy" by Rudyard Kipling

War is a politically incorrect, horrific endeavor. There is simply no nice way to kill someone. The rough men who stand ready to do violence on those who would harm us find ways to cope with the effects that the job can have on them. These stress relief behaviors are frequently not something you'd discuss or admit to in polite company. Young men deal with combat and combat training predictably and naturally. Adrenaline and testosterone flows. Tempers flare. Men fight, they cuss, and they frequently decompress tensions with bawdy humor. The best leaders know how to channel this energy release, when to let it loose, and how to keep it from disrupting unit discipline. Male leaders understand this subculture, they appreciate it for what it is, and know how to manage it.

When women were thrust into this environment, problems naturally arose as they hadn't been prepared for the rough, crude behaviors that men on the bleeding edge engage in to stay sane. Sensibilities were offended, complaints were made. Feminists threw the public spotlight on the sordid details of what had been an exclusively man's world, and proclaimed they were offended. Witch hunts were called and many careers were destroyed because the feminists were offended that the same men called on to kill don't act like Hollywood heroes when a lady is present. No one mentioned the obvious fact that they were warned that it was not an environment in which women would be comfortable.

Because of the potential for legal liability, military commanders ordered mandatory sexual harassment training for all service members. This was done with typical military efficiency, and the results were suboptimal. The training syllabus was designed by and frequently delivered by feminists and their male proponents. The approach seemed to treat all untrained male service members as Neanderthals until the training magically turned them into gentlemen. As a result, most service members who took the training considered it a joke, a waste of time, and mildly insulting. This training had no measurable effect, except that the military was protected from legal action in sexual harassment lawsuits, because it had taken action to "train" its members.

Women demanded to enter this world and be a part of it. In time, some women made rank. The men must moderate their behavior because of the presence of women. Females don't react to stress the way males do, so female leaders don't know how to deal with a unit full of stressed-out men, don't understand when to let steam be blown off and when to apply discipline. The result of this is lowered unit morale and cohesion, and a sense of

paranoia, lest a man make a remark that's taken wrong and be brought up on charges of sexual harassment. This is exacerbated by female service members who may be so hypersensitive that they feel they're being sexually harassed in perfectly innocuous interactions.

Many other issues surround the subject of women in combat, which we will discuss in another MilitaryValues.org topical paper. But the enforced social engineering of the military to blindly accept females in all occupations without regard to the appropriateness of that order has led to compromised standards, higher risk and cost, distrust, lower moral, lower retention and a general loss of combat effectiveness.

Conclusion

The military is a necessarily conservative organization that resists change because the traditional military culture is essential to accomplish the military mission. Changes to reflect social trends don't come easily to the military and our national leaders should be circumspect about forcing such change. How a change will affect a combat unit's fighting ability should be the primary consideration. Leaders must recognize that cultural and social standards among the military members should override a desire to be politically correct. Social experiments in the name of political correctness have never positively contributed to the military culture, which causes a breakdown of military effectiveness.

The military reflects the society from which it drawn. As social changes stabilize, they will naturally be reflected in the military. Forcing a change on the military as a precursor to promote social acceptance is risky. If the military culture resists change too forcefully, then military discipline and order breaks down and impairs our combat capability. Making a change for the sole purpose of promoting a social agenda has no place in an organization tasked for national defense.

MilitaryValues.org Principles and Mission

The content of these topical white papers from MilitaryValues.org is aligned with the organization's principles and mission statement. At the core is the protection of America and the founding principles—mainly summarized by freedom and liberty for citizens and a federal government with limited and enumerated powers. All of this is made abundantly clear in our Constitution and the founder's many writings .The US military's role to protect this is made very clear by the oath that is taken by military officers today:

> *"I, [name], do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter. So help me God."*

For details on the MilitaryValues.org principles and mission statement go to www.MilitaryValues.org.

···

About MilitaryValues.org

The effectiveness of the United States military has been significantly compromised over the last 20 years by social engineering and politically driven decisions. This is especially true and serious with military units that face front line combat duties. In stark terms, this problem has unnecessarily cost the lives of our front line men and women—while many more suffer various combat-related physical and mental traumas. And there are untold tangents of pain and loss suffered by families, fellow soldiers, and others.

Combat units, and those that support them, greatly benefit from a culture in which there is a focus of effectively prosecuting missions and wars—and rejects unnecessary risk to the military personnel. This culture creates trust and increases effectiveness and loyalty—which is truly critical for the best shot at success in the complex and dangerous endeavor called combat. However on the other hand, if a military is constantly beat down by forces that do not care about its well-being—then a culture of distrust, failure, and despair will increasingly result. This second culture is what we have today in America's military.

MilitaryValues.org exists to educate millions of citizens on what has gone wrong and how it can be reversed. We hope you will continue to our website and learn more!