

2009 FALL SYMPOSIUM
Soldiers & Citizens
Military and Civic Culture in America
November 7, 2009
Robsham Theater, Boston College

SESSION 1: Diversity in Uniform: Race, Gender, Class, Sexuality
and Religion in the Armed Forces

Panelists: Col. Charles Allen, United States Army War College
Missy Cummings, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Nathaniel Frank, University of California/Santa Barbara
Michael L. "Mikey" Weinstein, Military Religious Freedom Foundation
Chris Appy, University of Massachusetts/Amherst

QUIGLEY: Good afternoon, I'm David Quigley, Dean of the College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences here at Boston College, and I'm pleased to welcome you, all of our panelists, all of the audience, to Chestnut Hill this afternoon. We look forward to each November's symposium as an opportunity to once again collaborate with David Tebaldi and the team at Mass Humanities and to explore pressing issues before this Commonwealth and our nation. This afternoon, we're thrilled to host a series of conversations about the relationship between the military and contemporary American society. As a prelude to this symposium, a smaller group of us gathered yesterday afternoon to reflect on the fraught relationship between the modern university and the military.



Next week, our campus will dedicate a veterans' memorial, on Wednesday, marking the service of generations of Boston College alumni in the nation's armed services. As we evoke such earlier moments in American military history, we are reminded just how different our present age is. The separation between elite educational institutions and the world of the military strikes many of us as a challenge to our core democratic commitments. I look forward to this afternoon's three panels and the opportunity to reflect on a series of interrelated and insistent questions about our public values and our personal choices, about collective security and individual dignity, about what it means to fight for America in the 21st Century, about how we Americans think about shared sacrifice. I can't think of a set of conversations that is more urgently needed and I thank you for coming this afternoon. Please join me in welcoming the chair of the Mass Humanities board, John Burgess. (applause)

BURGESS: Thank you very much. I'd like to welcome all of you to this annual seminar in a series and symposium that have been sponsored over the years by the Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities. The topic this year is an especially important one – Soldiers and Citizens – that tests and will discuss a series of challenges in the relationship between soldiers and citizens that have defined us over the decades, both as a nation and within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. After all, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was, in many ways, the birthplace of the soldier-



citizen, the Minutemen of Concord and of Lincoln. It was a place that was one of the first states within the Union to challenge the question of diversity within the armed forces when the 54th Massachusetts was raised during the Civil War. And even today, in a world where the relationship between the military and civilian society is perhaps, in some respects, more distant than it has been in previous times, that relationship continues to inform the life of the Commonwealth.

In September, President Obama presented the most recent Congressional Medal of Honor to the parents of Jared Monti, who was born in Abington, Massachusetts and who died in Afghanistan – a reminder that to this day, citizens of this Commonwealth serve and die on behalf of their country around the world, dying in places far remote from where they grew up, where their friends were and where they went to school. And in some respects, we can perhaps dedicate this seminar to the memory of those who have made that level of sacrifice. And with that, I'd like to introduce David Tebaldi, the executive director of the Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities. Thank you.

TEBALDI: I'm your taskmaster. It's my job to kick this off and keep us on schedule. I'm going to take just a minute to tell those of you who may not already know us just a little bit about the foundation. Established in 1974 as the Massachusetts Foundation for Humanities and Public Policy, Mass Humanities is a private educational organization working in partnership with the National Endowment for the Humanities in Washington, D.C. and the Massachusetts Cultural Council.



The foundation gives grants and conducts programs that use the humanities to enhance and improve civic life across the Commonwealth. If you'd like to be involved or just kept informed about grant opportunities and upcoming programs, please visit our website at masshumanities.org where you can sign up for our electronic newsletter, you can subscribe to Mass Moments, our critically acclaimed online almanac of Massachusetts history and become a donor if you like. The animating vision of Mass Humanities derives from Thomas Jefferson. "I know of no safe repository of the ultimate powers of government," Jefferson wrote, "but the people themselves. And if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their power with a wholesome discretion, the cure is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion." By sponsoring projects that bring the perspectives of history, literature, philosophy and the other humanities disciplines to bear on issues of concern to the people of Massachusetts, Mass Humanities fosters the Jeffersonian ideal of an informed and enlightened citizenry.

Our sixth annual fall symposium – *Soldiers and Citizens: Military and Civic Culture in America* – is in keeping with this ideal and we are delighted to see so many of you here today to participate in what I know will be an informative and provocative series of conversations.

In his 1997 book about the Marine Corps, the military journalist and former Pentagon correspondent for the *Wall Street Journal*, Thomas Ricks, tells an anecdote about an interview that he had with Senator John McCain. McCain often appears on talk radio shows when he's back home in Arizona and he told Ricks that whenever he wants to talk about military and defense policy, the phones stop

ringing. The public is just not interested in military issues, according to McCain. That was pre-9/11 of course and now that our country has been attacked and is engaged in two apparently endless wars, the Senator would likely revise that assessment. But it remains true, I think, that civilians – the vast majority of us, that is – are not nearly as interested in or knowledgeable about military matters as we ought to be.

Our first panel, “Diversity in Uniform,” will examine how social issues, issues of race, gender, class, sexuality and religion affect the military and the relationship between the military and society. Our moderator is Christian Appy, Professor of History at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst and the author of two wonderful books, *Patriots: The Vietnam War Remembered from All Sides* and *Working Class War: American Combat Soldiers and Vietnam*, both of which are available for sale in the lobby. And in your conference program, there are fuller biographies of all the panelists. So I’ll now turn it over to Chris and let Chris introduce his panelists. Thank you. (applause)

APPY: Thanks, David. Thank you all for coming out. We hope to include as many of you as possible. I’m sure you, like I, have been thinking, over the last couple of days, about the horrible events at Fort Hood. And that’s not really going to be the focus of our discussion today – it’s a little bit too early to really understand, never mind interpret, what happened there. But one of the things that I was thinking about is simply this question of what must it be like to live in a place like Fort Hood? This enormous military base. And who are they in relationship to us sitting here in this great auditorium in beautiful Newton, Massachusetts? What is the gulf between their life and ours? Are they really a reflection of America or are they really quite different? And do we want them to be different or do we want to create a society where the gulf between the military and civilian life is narrower and more fluid? So those are questions that will be discussed throughout the afternoon.



But one litmus test question that is worth thinking about at the outset is what would it take for us, as individuals, to encourage our own children to go into the military? What would have to change for us to welcome our own children to places like Fort Hood? Let me now introduce the panelists and we’ll start this discussion. First, to my far left is Michael “Mikey” Weinstein. If you’re old, as we are, you may remember a cereal commercial where a little kid says – or they say about the little kid, Mikey likes it. That’s apparently the origin of this nickname, which has stuck. And so we’re allowed – there are a lot of fancy titles on this panel, but they’ve given me permission to call them by their first name, so Mikey Weinstein is founder and president of the Military Religious Freedom Foundation.

He’s a 1977 Honors graduate of the Air Force Academy, became a White House Council for President Ronald Reagan and later general council to two-time presidential candidate and Texas billionaire, Ross Perot. *Harper’s Magazine* has called him the constitutional conscience of the military and his organization was recently nominated for next year’s Nobel Peace Prize, though I understand you actually don’t have to do very much to win one of those prizes, Mikey, so maybe you should slow down a little bit. Just a little peace or something. He’s also the author of a book called *With God on Our Side: One Man’s War Against an*

Evangelical Coup in America's Military. To my immediate left is Mary Louise "Missy" Cummings. She's a professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics at MIT, where she directs the Humans and Automation lab. Sounds like you make bionic people or something, but not quite.

In the early – maybe 1990 – you got your wings as a Naval aviator and became one of this nation's first women fighter pilots in US history. She resigned from the Navy about a decade later and she describes these events and may talk a little bit about it today, in her memoir, *Hornet's Nest*. After leaving the Navy, she went on to get her PhD in systems engineering at the University of Virginia. To my immediate right is Nathaniel Frank.

FRANK: I'm not disclosing my nickname. (laughter)

APPY: No nicknames.

FRANK: I have one, but –

APPY: We're just going to stick with Nathaniel. He's the senior research fellow at the Palm Center, which is a research institute at the University of California Santa Barbara. He received his PhD in history at Brown University and has written articles, many of them on gays in the military, but other topics as well for the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *LA Times*, *Huffington Post*, *Slate Magazine* and other places and he's appeared on television. He has recently written the definitive book on the policy of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, which is called *Unfriendly Fire: How the Gay Ban Undermines the Military and Weakens America*. And then, as David mentioned, Charles Allen was kind enough to fill in for Ike Wilson.

ALLEN: I go by Chuck.

APPY: Chuck. All right, good.

CUMMINGS: See, Nathaniel?

APPY: Colonel Chuck, now retired after 30 – you're not fully retired – retired from the military portion of it – now a professor in the Department of Social Sciences at the – I'm sorry, that's –

ALLEN: That's the other guy.

APPY: I looked down at the wrong part of my notes. I'm sorry – the other guy. You're a professor of cultural science in the Department of Command Leadership and Management at the Army War College, although you've previously taught for some years at West Point, where you graduated in 1978. And Chuck Allen writes frequently on leadership for the *Washington Post*. So let me begin with a very basic question about diversity in the military. Now there are debates about whether or not – to what degree the military is representative of American society as a whole and what groups are either over-represented or under-represented, and we're going to talk about that and discrimination against some groups within the military. But I want to start with just a more basic question, which is, do you think it's a good

thing for the military to be broadly representative of the American people, and if so, why? So could we start with you, Missy?

CUMMINGS: Sure, I think that the broadest that the military could be would be the best thing. More people from more diverse backgrounds would be truly more reflective of America. Unfortunately, I don't think you will ever see a perfect match between the demographics between the two for various reasons that I'm sure that we're going to get into in more detail later.

APPY: Mikey?

WEINSTEIN: You know, I agree with Missy that it would be a wonderful thing to see the military have kind of a – all four corners represent exactly what we see in America but I have three kids – four kids, if you count my daughter-in-law. Both my sons and my daughter-in-law are Air Force Academy graduates. After being at his first base for a couple of months, my eldest son overheard his commander one day talking to his First Sergeant saying, you know, there really is no place for Democrats, blacks and Jews in the Air Force. So that didn't sit too well with him. So I think it's fair to say that yeah, it'd be great if it would be clearly representative, but Chris, it's anything but that. In fact, *Army Times* – just from a religious perspective – about three weeks ago, came out with a story indicating that we have 1.4 million troops in uniform in the US military – Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps – 500,000 are self-proclaimed Evangelical Christians. That's interesting. I mean, our foundation – we have Evangelical donors and clients and supporters, but it's clearly not terribly representative of what you see in society. Not any more, not without the draft.



APPY: Nathaniel, yeah.

FRANK: Well, I think the short answer is yes. But the medium answer – yes, because the military and civil society need one another. Civil society supports and funds the military and makes most of the ultimate decisions or many and so the military needs a civilian culture that supports it and they need to understand one another but it also depends on how you define diverse. I mean, I love my grandmothers, particularly the 101-year-old, but I don't want her driving a car and I don't want her in uniform. So that's part of what diversity is and I think that, as we'll probably discuss further, there are reasons that there's not a perfect match that are correct.



ALLEN: In my 30-year career, I've served with a pretty diverse organization. So I came in at West Point in 1974 as a major drive to bring in young African Americans to be part of the officer corps, which did not represent the population of the serving members of the armed forces. So I think the push to do that is to show people that lead them that they're also part of the society that they serve. So it has to be pretty important. And I think what we know is, over the past few years, we've been at the front edge of diversity in organizations, sometimes forced from the outside by presidential decree and by regulations on laws, but in happenstance we have more African Americans represented in the population, a little bit less in the Hispanics and Asians, so there's a gap there. But those are all the primary methods in measuring



the diversity. So yes, we need one and we've been working toward it for the past few years, but there are some gaps.

APPY: Staying with you for a minute, Chuck, can you talk a little bit about the differences, the changes you've seen over the last 30 years in the military with regard to racial issues and how they've been dealt with? Improvements that have been made but also change that still needs to be made.

ALLEN: I'm retired, so I'm not active duty, so I can tell you what I've observed over time. Again, I joined the Army with West Point, 1978 being commissioned out of my first class in West Point and my company, there were four African Americans that started that first year. By Christmas, there were two left in the category and by the end of the freshman year, there was one. And out of that company, one graduated. So in terms of acceptance, there was a lot of stress on the system on how to fit in and how to be accepted by the other members of the corps cadets. As I graduated and went to assignment in Germany, the preponderance of the soldiers there were African American. Three African American officers, probably 50% or so were African American and that's the personnel. Big difference. Now the composition of the armed forces, I believe, is about 20% African Americans, the officer corps is about 12% African Americans. The gap is closed, but it's pretty substantial.

APPY: And in the Army –

ALLEN: In the Army, yes.

APPY: – not so much in –

ALLEN: – the Army –

APPY: – some of the other branches.

ALLEN: Right. So there has been some transition, some change, but there's still some issues. Now, again, we have under-representation from the Hispanics and Asians in the population.

APPY: Nathaniel, if I could ask you, we've now had this policy of Don't Ask, Don't Tell for almost 17 years. Could you talk a little bit about the cost and consequences of that policy?

FRANK: Well, sure, under the policy, 13,000 servicemembers have been fired and the government has done its own studies that show that about 1,000 have been mission critical, over 300 of them have been linguists, over 60 of them have been Arabic linguists. And one of the notorious stories about the costs of this policy is that on September 10, 2001, the government intercepted a cable that said, tomorrow is zero hour, but it was written in Arabic and then we had a backlog of cables to interpret. We didn't have enough interpreters. So the government has been wringing its hands for years before and particularly subsequent to 9/11, saying we need people to understand what we need to understand in order to fight these wars – intelligence, military, etc. And yet, we're kicking them out because of something that has

nothing to do with military performance. All the research shows that. So there's that. The brain drain.

There is the burden that those who stay in – there's approximately 65,000 of them – have to serve under, which is that they can't be honest. And the military, now, is beginning to see in its own studies that this means forced compromised integrity of its servicemembers. And that directly undercuts the values that the military culture rightly holds dear. So I think those consequences are among the most severe. And the fights that are ongoing between universities and military recruiters and ROTC comes partly out of the history of anti-war sentiment, which is enduring but also comes out of this policy part of it.

APPY: I'd like to turn to Missy, now, for a second and have you say a little bit about what drew you into the military and what drew you out.

CUMMINGS: My father was in the Navy. He was an enlisted man.

Basically, he did maintenance on aircraft. In fact, I didn't know there were ships in the Navy until much later in life. (laughter) So it was a natural draw. I mean, we lived the Navy life and then when I went to college, I wanted to get a scholarship, so I applied to the other academies and Mikey went to the Air Force Academy and I chose to go the other way. I went to the Naval Academy and my father actually told me to go the Air Force Academy. And I went to the Navy primarily because he told me to go to the Air Force Academy. (laughter) There's an important lesson there. Actually, when I went to the Naval Academy, women were just – at that very time – starting to become pilots. And so I did not go to the Naval Academy with the desire to be a pilot, I just thought it sounded fun and romantic and all those other reasons that I think other genders – people go into the Navy.



And then it was while I was in that the combat exclusion law was repealed and I was just perfectly primed to jump into that slot. It was an incredible experience and I am very grateful to the Navy for the experience that I had, but in fact, it was that experience – of being one of the first female fighter pilots – that caused me to leave. I wanted to share this story really with Nathaniel, because I think he'll appreciate this more than anyone. I knew that it was probably time to go when – and you cannot imagine the hostility that the men in my squadron had, who had just come back from Congress to petition Congress not to allow women into the fighter pilot community, which is actually not a legal action by military officers, and they did it anyway, and of course, they suffered no retribution.

But I went into the ready room one day and a bunch of guys were around that – you're getting ready to go fly in the ready room. And one of the guys was talking to another guy very loudly, so he'd make sure that I heard him and he said, you know, I would rather fly with a fag than fly with a woman. So not long after that, I left.

FRANK: Well, that's a great argument for lifting the ban on gays in the military. (laughter)

CUMMINGS: I thought you would like that, right? So I just want to – there's a lot more openness than you might think.

FRANK: Progress.

APPY: One of the things that struck me in reading Missy's book is the incredible double-standards that you were up against. There are these anecdotes of male pilots who would make a mistake and lose a \$35 million aircraft, for example, and just be given a slap on the wrist and you get hauled before an evaluation board for false rumors and allegations and the tiniest of errors. That, obviously, was part of your decision to leave, right?

CUMMINGS: Yes. And I think historically, that's very true of any group of barrier-breakers. When you go into a fishbowl, then you are always held to a much higher standard and scrutiny than the others. And certainly, the Tuskegee Airmen were another example of similar incidents. But I will tell you that now that we're talking about numbers and how do we get to better diversity, there's a academic rubric that actually – not many academic rubrics apply to real life, but I think this one does. And this is this idea of something called critical mass, where if you can get, in an organization, 15% of that organization – of the minority – up to that number of 15%, then they can start to make cultural in-roads to be more successful. And certainly the military – I was appreciative when Chuck said about the 20%.

And certainly, we're well over that and not that there is not racism in the military, but in my entire time in the military, I never saw any overt racism that I was cognizant of. So I think in that respect, that we've made a lot of strides, mostly because the recruiting has been up and we've been able to get the people in. As far as women, particularly in piloting communities, the women who are in the helicopter communities went over 15, 20% about 10 years ago, eight to 10 years ago. And those women have been far more successful. They have been squadron commanders, they're having families, they're having full careers. The female fighter pilot community is still less than 5% and it is not going to go over the 15% magic number. Not in my lifetime.

And I seriously question – and we can come back to this later – culturally, I think this is society's fault. This is not the military's fault that we are probably not going to get women up to that number, at least not for a very, very long time. So I think we're still going to see a lot of problems, until we get there.

ALLEN: If I may, with the Army, again, about 16 to 17% of the population are females or women. And so we realized in the past few years that we cannot do our mission or our job without women in combat support roles and other activities. And so it's a fact of life right now. We know that.

APPY: Mike, you and your foundation argue that Evangelical proselytizing in the military has become so pervasive that it really is a form of coercion. I'm wondering if you could describe for us some of the specific forms it has taken that are most egregious.

WEINSTEIN: Well, let me just correct you for a second. It's really not – we make a difference between an Evangelical Christian and a Fundamentalist Christian. We are at war – I stand before you today with the gun smoke in my face as a civil rights activist. There is no question about it. It's not something that I can talk about

without getting passionate, because it's very serious. It's not a coercive – it's not a coercion issue. It's not an issue or a challenge or a problem, ladies and gentlemen. It's a national security threat. On a Saturday afternoon, I'm sad to tell you that the constitutionally mandated wall separating church and state where all the nukes are and the laser-guided and conventional weapons is gone in our military. Gone. What we fight in our foundation – we represent over 15,000 active duty United States Marines, sailors, soldiers and airmen, midshipmen and cadets. Ninety-six percent of our clients are Christians. Three-fourths are Protestant, one-fourth Roman Catholic. Only four percent of our clients are Jewish, Agnostic, Atheist, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, whatever.

And I can tell you that when we – it comes hour by hour around the clock. A good example would be, where were all of you on Tuesday, July 12, 2005? That was almost four-and-a-half years ago. On the front page of the newspaper most reviled by the Pentagon. Audience, what paper would that be? Yes, that's right – the *New York Times*. I'm from Albuquerque; I guarantee it wasn't the *Albuquerque Journal*. On the front page of the *New York Times*, Tuesday July 12, 2005, your United States Air Force announced a new policy. The policy was that the Air Force was now going to reserve its right to evangelize, quote, “anyone it determined to be un-churched.” Now, forget the separation of church and state, which the people we're fighting – Fundamentalist Christians – view as just a myth like Big Foot and the Loch Ness Monster. We're talking about Clause 3, Article 6 of the body of the Constitution. Does anyone know what that says? Anybody?

M: No religious tests.

WEINSTEIN: Exactly, no religious tests for any position in the federal government, I guess, unless, of course, you're in the US Air Force. The other services do it also, and they will hold a religious Geiger counter up to apparently anybody. A Pakistani, an Afghan, because we're mercilessly proselytizing them also – and the Iraqis. And if it comes back and says you're this thing called un-churched, which of course, is in direct violation of the Constitution, which everyone in the military takes a solemn oath to protect, preserve, support and defend, well, the military will – they reserve the right not to Judaize, Buddhiaize, Hinduize, Atheize, Agnosticize, Catholicize, Protestantize but to Evangelize you. We've had so many of our soldiers and Marines who've been put into harm's way because they refuse to bend to this particular weaponized gospel of Jesus Christ. Please understand, most of our clients are Christians, most of our staff are Christians, most of the organizations that support us are Christians, but it's gone.



And trying to get people to understand how serious it is, unless they're complicit, it's almost impossible to do it. The alchemy – to answer your Question, Chris, that we're faced with is Fundamentalist Christian fanaticism mixed with real weapons of mass destruction. We have them. They don't have them yet, we hope, combined with totally misguided patriotism, a total abrogation of the oath to preserve, protect and support the Constitution, a total dearth of restraint, oversight and supervision and complete, unrestrained access to our weapons pile. Have a nice day.

APPY: Each of you, in your own way, I think, have argued that the military would be stronger and more effective if it gave greater respect to human difference and human rights. But what about this old argument that that's not really the role of the military, that in fact, at the heart of military training from the beginning – basic training – is that you take a group of civilians and you strip away all those civilian identities and affiliations and turn them into a disciplined, loyal, trusting corps of military people. How can you have a really effective, disciplined military if you're acknowledging everyone's individual differences?

WEINSTEIN: Well, I think in the military, you necessarily – when you join it, you necessarily give up many of your Constitutional rights. They're severely truncated. And that's in order to provide good order and discipline, to provide and manufacture the necessary lethality for our military to protect the full panoply of Constitutional rights for the rest of us. So that's going to be something that just happens, as a matter of course.

ALLEN: I'm going to use a very simple metaphor. You have a football team in the area called the New England Patriots? You want to have all linebackers, right?

APPY: I'm sorry?

ALLEN: Do you want to have all linebackers?

APPY: No.

ALLEN: You want a guard, a linebacker, a quarterback, you want a defensive end, a defensive team. You have diversity based upon that. The core mission is to have a game and to win. For our military, the core mission is to have a team that can win. And you get the strongest team probably from the greatest diversity and using the resource of the people that are there.

FRANK: The argument that you gave that was allegedly – and I realize you may be playing devil's advocate, so I'm not picking on you – that was allegedly a reason to put the breaks on inclusion and diversity is actually to the contrary, the argument for why you don't need to exclude people based on identity, because that's what the military does. It takes people from one of the most diverse nations and cultures in the world and it strips down their identity and it remakes them anew. So the idea that they have – I was recently just reading an article by a former assistant Secretary of State, John Hilden, about the civil/military gap in thinking about this panel and he sort of waxed poetic about a former gang member who didn't – on the street, hear, ever the ideals and values of integrity and honor and courage and commitment but went to the Marines and learned all of this. And this was also part of a paper that was arguing against letting gays and women in combat.

And so I thought, how ironic that he's boasting about how they can take a gang member, which, incidentally, is exactly what the military is doing when it can't fill its recruitment shortfalls, in part because it won't allow women in certain positions and it won't allow open gays in certain positions, it lowers its standards and it's let in over the past three years over 100,000 ex-convicts. So it does take people who otherwise don't fit the bill, who its own rules would otherwise deny because it's

good at doing this. And so it's not about acknowledging these identities, which, I think, is what some people use in exaggerated form to say we're going to have people prancing around in pink boas and we're going to have gay pride floats drifting onto military bases if you have openly gay service. It's not about that. There's practical acknowledgements, like making sure that you have uniforms that fit the female body. But apart from that, it's not about celebrating, it's about letting people in and then remaking the identity anew, as a cohesive force.

CUMMINGS: I think this debate over individual differences is really just a way to cloak saying, I want to exclude people based on some other group differences. For example, the female uniform issue is why can't we have females in certain aspects of the military. If you really do the math and you think it through logically, women are better at fine motor control, meaning women are better at in-flight refueling. And this is very true in the service. They're better at landing on aircraft carriers, they breathe less oxygen, they can pull more Gs. Only women – if you really go by that logic, then why – if we're going to for a cost/benefit analysis based on traits and characteristics, then – but obviously, that's silly. But I find this idea about – when you ask a homosexual, is he a homosexual, is he a man – what is the percentage most, right? And what is it that you need out of that person?

Is it that you need a man? Is it that you need somebody that can lift a certain amount of weights? Does it need somebody who has fine motor control skills? So I think if we really took a gender, race, sexual preference, religious – if we just were completely agnostic about matching people's characteristics, their abilities to the job, then we probably would find that we have a much different service than we have now.

APPY: I'm curious to know how we can make change in the military. Does it come from the top down or the bottom up or some combination of the two? I'm reminded that in the last 1960s and early 1970s, there really was a quite prominent and powerful GI movement within the military that was dissenting over the way but also against other kinds of military regulations and with some success, actually. Part of that GI movement led to a tripling of military pay between 1970 and '74, the end of some minor regulations, like hair length and the Army even, I think, ended Reveille in 1970, at least for a time, because of this movement. More significantly, I think that GI movement led to the end of the draft and may actually have had some impact on speeding up the gradual withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. So I'm curious to know if any of you sense that there is a growing movement from the grassroots within the military that's pushing for some of the reforms that you've been arguing for and as well, is there movement from people higher up in the hierarchy to make change.

ALLEN: I'd say that bureaucracy lives. Our culture's very, very strong. So what we see with major changes in the Army, it has happened from the outside. I was at West Point in 1976 when the first women came to the academy. It was not by our own choosing and I think the Army pushed back on those changes. I was in an ROTC program at John Carrol University in Cleveland, Ohio when the ROTC opened up to women. Those two things were directed from the outside. So I think, again, it has to be some civilian policy decision or change to the law that says, do this. When told to do this, we will do our best. You talked about the change in the pay

structure and other things within the military, that was all driven by the need to transition from a draft force, conscription force, to a volunteer force. How do you do that? And that direction came from President Nixon – an external force that changed our culture and it changed bureaucracy that we found to pretty efficient and very comfortable.

FRANK: And it strikes me that it's both internal and external, top-down and bottom-up. At least 25 nations now let gays serve openly. Not a single one of them did it voluntarily. Very few military people, even over in wine swilling Western Europe wake up one morning and say, I'm going to be the guy under whom gays start coming into our force. So it's done by external pressure. And then that's what I'm trying to do and those of us who are fighting for what I'm fighting for is exerting pressure, I guess from the bottom up – I'm certainly not the top – to those who do have the power, particularly the civilian politicians just as President Truman was responsible for racial integration. I think Mikey and to some extent, Missy, what they're fighting for, though, is also change from within, in a sense. I mean, Mikey's trying to enforce rules that the military already has and ought to be enforcing. So that's a somewhat different vantage point for change.



APPY: Where do we stand right now on the policy? I noticed that the Secretary of the Army seems to be inclined to get rid of it, though the commandant of the Marine Corps, I guess, just recently has expressed reservations.

FRANK: Right, and both of those comments were somewhat exaggerated by activists. I may be one of them. They expressed their sense of whether it would be easy or not easy, respectively, both saying we will do what we are told, which is the bottom line. And that's why the political sector needs to recognize that, I think particularly for Democrats who have too often thought that in order to earn the respect of the military, which has been one of their problems, they have to sort of get down on their knees and plead for it rather than command. And that was part of Clinton's problem. And if Obama doesn't get his act together, it will be part of his problem. I think the window we have is definitely historic, with the political stars aligning. That said, it's fast-closing. And as we see healthcare being dragged on and as we see a reversal for marriage equality in Maine, that may give the chills to some of the lawmakers, particularly in the Senate, conservative Democrats, to get this done.

The president could issue an executive order to halt the discharges but is not inclined to spend the political capital. And as we look towards 2010 elections, the risk aversion in politics that's always there gets worse. So I'm less optimistic than I was a few months back, which is one of the reasons that so many of us are pushing hard to get it on the agenda.

WEINSTEIN: Well, Chris, I'll tell you, I think the Romans had it right. If you cut off somebody's head and stick it on a pole, it really changes behavior. This really isn't that hard. This isn't frickin' rocket science. I'm a Republican who voted for Clinton twice, Kerry and that other guy, Gore. I voted for Obama, I was – before I came on stage here today, I did an interview with *USA Today*, where I told the reporter – this is on the Fort Hood thing, where is our president? Why can't he make an announcement, saying that he will have a zero-tolerance policy against harassment,

retaliation and retribution against the several thousand honorable sailors, soldiers, Marines and airmen who happen to be Muslims in our military, because let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, they've gone through hell the last 72 hours.

The phone calls and e-mails that are coming in to – because nature abhors a vacuum, so they come to the Military Religious Freedom Foundation. I was telling Nathaniel last night, I understand the economy is complex and I understand that healthcare is complex, but I spent three-and-a-half years in the West Wing of a White House, I know the power of an executive order and Don't Ask, Don't Tell should be gone. It isn't that hard. It should be gone. Sign the executive order, Obama. And I don't understand why – and I can tell you, I got a number of phone calls two weeks ago when an extremely senior Pentagon official was speaking to the cadet wing at the Air Force Academy and he told them, you better get ready, Don't Ask, Don't Tell is going to leave. And he wasn't saying it in a terribly happy way, but I think it's coming, but I don't understand why it's taking this long.

When it comes to our fight – when you tell somebody that they lack integrity, character, courage, intelligence and honorability because they have the wrong religious faith, that's like telling somebody that they're stupid because of the color of their skin. It's unacceptable. When I get asked by the press all the time, well, Mikey, what do you want, we're not looking for it from bottom-up, no. We want 400 court marshals, I want people to lose their liberty and to go into confinement, because that's what it's going to take. And we are very, very close to the Don't Ask, Don't Tell thing. The people that we fight, that are known as Dominionist Fundamentalist Christians, about 12.6% of the American public are – they have four particularly heinous, malodorous stench about them. It's like walking into a trench in my native New Mexico on a hot August day and smelling – having your nostrils assaulted by the smell of 10,000 rotting pig corpses or something.

The first is incredible misogyny, the belief that women should be confined to basically buying food, preparing meals, cleaning up, spreading their legs, raising kids. Virulent Islamaphobia, virulent anti-Semitism and virulent homophobia. So I don't – it's great to try to push – we've given up. We're trying to push from the top down. We're suing the Pentagon in Federal Court, we're in State Court. But I like that idea of the severed head on the pole. (laughter) (applause)

CUMMINGS: So I'm going to change the tone a little (laughter) and I'm actually going to support the military in the sense of when we're talking about integrating women, I would say the major work has been done – the military was really resistant, the system worked, though, as it should have, the civilian counterparts, women would not be flying combat aircraft today had it not been for Bill Clinton, so the history is what it is. So I think that not every single gate has been opened to women, but I think we've had phenomenal progress in ways that I never thought I would see in my lifetime. So I think that for integrating women into the military, it is neither a bottoms-up or top-down approach, because the system, actually, is functioning pretty well as it was intended to right now.

I personally have a real issue with society. So I actually say, the real issue is coming at this from the side. The reason that the military cannot get enough women into the fighter cockpits or into the more testosterone-laden roles – however, I will tell

you that I'm a mother of a two-year-old, I have never been meaner, I have never been able to drop more bombs on more people. I definitely think you do not know the capability of a woman to be lethal. (laughter) But that's exactly it. Our society stereotypes women far worse than people inside the military do. We look at our role models, the Britney Spears, whoever the latest icon is and we, as a society still value the thin, pretty, not-too-bright woman as role models. And certainly when you get – both the research and real life will show you this.

As soon as a woman starts to exert herself and push back and argue, she becomes a bitch, as opposed to a man, who's just in command, right? So I think the problem of women going into these more non-traditional roles and getting the numbers has to change fundamentally at a society level, which I'm not – I'm not encouraged by what I see today, although, I think the best thing that has come out the Fort Hood – this whole terrible incident – has been the fact that that female police officer was the one who pumped him full of four bullets. And she is being held up as a role model and a person that – and I think that – she's actually not a military person, but that's the kind of woman that we need to hold up in society as a role model, a woman who was doing her job and supporting her people and not because she was a woman, but because she was there to do her job. And so we'll see. (applause)

ALLEN: I need to add a point here, too. As we look at what happened in the past eight years in combat, we know that we judge people upon competencies and performance. And without a question, our soldiers, our sailors, airmen are performing very, very well and they're very mixed in their diversity between the different ethnic groups and also in gender. And again, if you get beyond what they look like and how they act and figure out what they do, what they add to the organization, to the enterprise, I think we can have a very wide tent – open tent – to bring in people and make sure they do the job that we need them to do for security.

APPY: I want to piggy-back on what Missy said, sort of hold an olive branch out to the military. I mean, my respect for the military has grown somewhat as I've fought against them. They put up a good fight, first of all. But I also think the military's pretty good at following orders from the top. And largely what's happening now, and the issue with gays in the military, as with women in combat, is a kind of culture war. I don't really love the term, but it is a kind of culture war where the far religious right is trying to use the military and social conservatives to do what they accuse liberals of doing in the past, which is that they have a vision of society that, in a lot of our minds is rearguard – having a place for women and other minorities, that's not what I agree with – and they're using the military, not because they care about what's good for the military or for national security, but as a stage to have this drama.



And so a lot of it is about morality and they see women's place in the home and that's the moral structure and homosexuals' place is pretty much nowhere and so I get that the military – you asked at the beginning, is there some purpose or function to this civil-military gap. Do we want it to be the same, exactly, or do we want a gap? There are people who want the gap, partly because the military needs to be a more moral place. First of all, the stakes are higher when you're talking about life and death and second of all, it's a killing machine, and so psychologically, people need to feel moral and they need to feel that there's a just war if they're going to be

part of it. And you need to make sure that if a patrol force out of Baghdad Airport sees an IED that's about to explode, only their moral compass is going to cause them to go and dismantle it and not leave it for the next batch of troops. I mean, that and the rules, but if no one sees it – so it has to be more moral.

The question is, in the 21st Century, what does that mean to be more moral? A lot of people want a different morality. They want to criminalize adultery even though that's not really what society does anymore. So I don't begrudge the military for wanting a strong sense of morality but – so my question is, in the 21st Century, does being moral mean criminalizing the consensual sexual behavior of soldiers in their bedrooms?

WEINSTEIN: Chris, let me just say that actually in the military, adultery is a felony.

FRANK: Right, that's right.

WEINSTEIN: I've tried and defended those cases, which is astonishing –

FRANK: Exactly.

WEINSTEIN: – because it destroys – I don't know if you know that or not – but it destroys good order and discipline. So it's a felony.

FRANK: Well, and sodomy is against the rules, which includes not just homosexual sex, but what, according to polls, 80% of people in the military do – oral sex and other kinds of things that aren't the kinds of positions that the religious right wants us to do it in.

APPY: If I could just chime in –

FRANK: Change the tone again? (laughter)

APPY: No, no – I was just thinking that even if we could reform the military to make it a kind of ideal community and do all the things that we've talked about, there's still another problem. That is, we have civilian leaders that command the military in ways that may disturb us. And to answer my own question that I posed at the very beginning, I have five sons, ranging in age from 10 to 26 and in all honesty, I haven't encouraged any of them to go into the military. And some of that has to do with the culture of the military itself and the forms of discrimination and harassment and other things that we've talked about, but mostly it has to do with – I don't want to see them have to go kill and maybe die for some cause that isn't clearly necessary or clearly just or openly and honestly debated and declared by Congress.

So I think any discussion of the military obviously has to go beyond what's going on in the military itself and how it's being used by politicians. Does that mean I get the last word? We do – I think it would be great to open it up for questions now for people who are willing to – yeah, if you would please go up to the microphone up there, that would be great.

Q: Hi, I think my question is for Mikey, and it's about the Air Force Academy. And I recall the publicity about the academy and the Evangelical influence there, which was pervasive, as I understand it. But what – I don't know really what's happened. There was supposed to be an investigation and I noticed in your comments that you said something about people who had never had their careers interrupted or in any way penalized because of what they did. So I'd like – if you could just comment for a second on what is the status, now, at the Air Force Academy, given the background of, let's say, very energetic Evangelical activity there.

WEINSTEIN: Sir, are you familiar with the flying donkey theory?

Q: No.

WEINSTEIN: Anybody? When a donkey flies, you don't expect it to stay up very long. The Air Force Academy, quote "religion scandal" started right after the sex scandal. Our family is the one that started the religion scandal and it started – I have to thank Mel Gibson for my entire change of my life, because when his movie came out in February of 2004 – I forget the name, I think it was the *Jesus Chainsaw Massacre* or *Freddy Versus Jesus*. In any event, I could not believe the pressure that was being put on the cadets to go there – and the staff – and I had three kids there at the time. The Air Force Academy, now, is actually being – I'll say this – I believe, ably commanded by a new three-star general, himself an Evangelical Christian, who came out to my house in Albuquerque, we sat down and had a long heart-to-heart in February.

He took over in June or July and I think he gets it, I'm encouraged about what I'm seeing. We still have about 19 or 20 active cases there. Look, you've got a situation where you have Campus Crusade for Christ Military Ministries at the academy as you do at all 1,000, close to 1,000 military installations scattered around the world as we garrison the globe in 132 countries. And their motto is – and we have it right on film – is they want to make sure every cadet that graduates from the Air Force Academy or comes out of Paris Island or West Point or Annapolis is, quote, "a government-paid missionary for Jesus Christ." So right now, it's a flying donkey, we'll wait and see. I think that General Gould is doing a good job, we watch very closely, but 17 hours before this disaster, this horrible thing at Fort Hood, we were reached out to by 40 cadets and staff at West Point.

Do you want to know why they reached out? The student body at the Air Force Academy is called the Cadet Wing, it's the Brigade of Midshipmen at Annapolis, it's the Corps of Cadets at West Point. The Corps is made up of companies and in fact, one of the other panel members today was from this very company. It's Company C-1. They all have nicknames and logos and they have mascots. Well, C-1 is called the Crusaders. And when you watch on national TV, you watch the Army football team or at Basketball games, they have someone dressed up as an 11th Century Crusader with a cross and a shield running up and down the sidelines. You have to wonder how that's going to be playing in the Islamic world when you see this being at the United States Military Academy. The number of Evangelical Colleges in this country that got rid of their sports teams being called the Crusaders, like Wheaton College and many others, happened a long time ago.

And these cadets and staff reached out because they were so sick of the Fundamentalist influence at West Point, they're terrified to come forward. We placed a phone call to Lieutenant General Franklin L. Hagenbeck late Thursday. For some reason, he hasn't called me back yet. I'll get on that on Monday.

Q: Probably my question is also for Mikey. Our program points out that currently, of the services, about 39% are Evangelicals and yet of the – more than two-thirds of the military's active duty chaplains are affiliated with Evangelical or Pentecostal churches. So the obvious question is, how did this massive disproportion come about and what attempts are the authorities making, I assume, to change it?

WEINSTEIN: I'll answer the second question first. No attempts. Right now, the military chaplaincy is probably 84% fundamentalist Christian. The days of Father Mulcahy in MASH are dead. Father Mulcahy is dead. There is no universal blood donor, a (inaudible) or great chaplain that's there. That isn't the way it is. The rabbis in the US military all have the same last name. They are called Rabbi Speed Bump, because that's about what they do for the Evangelical juggernaut that's out there. And I don't mean to be talking in such bombastic terms, but I'm sorry, this is a fight and that's the way it is. The Air Force, it got that way, we think, because when I was in the White House, Reagan changed some of the terms that it took to be endorsed by an ecclesiastical entity to go into the military as a chaplain. It used to be you actually had to be from a religion, like Methodist, Presbyterianism, Catholicism, Judaism.

Now if you – thanks to our good friends at Liberty University and a bunch of other places, you can sit in your pajamas on a terminal miles away and as soon as you get 90 hours done, you can be an endorsed military chaplain. The flood gates opened up and everything changed really in the early '80s and we're faced with the situation we're faced with today. At least the chaplains are just staff officers, they're not commanders. But then, we have the Officers' Christian Fellowship out there and their goal is they want to see Christian officers exercising Biblical leadership to raise up a Godly army. They're everywhere. Their three goals are, they want to see a spiritually transformed US military, with Ambassadors for Christ in uniform, empowered by the Holy Spirit. Look it up, it's right there. They're up and down the chain of command everywhere. Next question.

Q: Chris, Chris, Chris?

APPY: Yeah?

Q: Can I just speak to that?

APPY: Sure.

Q: Some of you might have heard this as well, it was just a few months ago, on public radio, I heard a report about the military's effort to recruit priests because there are very few priests in the chaplaincy and the great difficulty that they're having finding them. And of course, this IS especially interesting being here at Boston College, but there aren't enough priests for the churches, much less for the military. So at least in

that case, there's an effort to diversify the chaplaincy as it were. There aren't enough people out there to satisfy the demand.

APPY: Yeah.

Q: Thank you. My question is a diversity question of a little different ilk. I served during the Vietnam era. I served with thousands of officers who graduated from schools all over this country. They got their commission through ROTC. And I guess I have been very concerned since the early '70s, when ROTC was diminished dramatically in this country. And I wonder, where are the officer leaders coming from now? Where are they graduating from? What are the percentages of Academy graduates to non-Academy graduates?

ALLEN: I don't have the exact number, but I believe about 20% of the lieutenants that come out of the academies are West Point graduates for the overall officer corps. We also have an ROTC program which has been a very strong program for a number of years, but because of the demand of growing the Army for the current campaign, we've turned more to the Officer Candidate School, OCS. So that number has jumped dramatically in the past year or so. So you have a professional education at the military academies, you've got a very strong program of ROTCs across the United States, but we're taking folks, again, from civilian disciplines with degrees and allowing them to come in and join the Army because we have a shortfall across the board. So does that answer your question?



Q: Yes, it does. In part. How does that compare to what it was 40 years ago? Do you happen to have that information? Because in the units that I commanded, I probably had, I don't know, 70 or 80 officers of the three different units and of those, maybe 10% or less were academy graduates.

ALLEN: I don't know the numbers from back then, but I can tell you we did – back in that timeframe, we were short officers again, so we went through a process of doing – the OCS graduates, right, again?

Q: Yes.

ALLEN: Taking NCOs and other people and putting them into position of leadership. And there's something called Meli (sp?) that happened in very quick succession to that. So (inaudible) the foundation in values, understanding professional ethics and being held to certain standards, there's some gaps. There was a discussion about whether West Point should stay around for a while. In fact, we were in a panel yesterday with Professor Vasovich (sp?) and the question came up, what value does it have? It's really for the American people to decide.

Q: Sure, thank you.

ALLEN: It's a question of priorities, assigning funds, etc. But there might be a need for it in the long-term.

Q: Hi, my name is Ojen Verma (sp?), I'm an undergraduate student at Tufts University. So the panel seemed to agree that Don't Ask, Don't Tell should be repealed from the top down. But my question really concerns, what happens next, in terms of the transition process. I don't know the history of President Truman reintegrating African Americans or process with women, but my question is, you repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell, but there are going to be consequences for that. So my question is, how does the military respond to it and how do they execute this top-down policy?

FRANK: Well, it's a good question and that's kind of where the game is now. The fact that it looks inevitable that it will be repealed – although, perhaps not in the next year or two, after all – means that people who are interested in preparedness are looking toward how implementation goes. So at the Palm Center, we've done a lot of research on how this has gone down in foreign militaries, including looking at what aspects of those processes are relevant to our own and what are different, because the cultures are different, the militaries are different. So you can look at some of our studies, if you Google Palm Center, but I also think it's important to say that first of all, with regard to the question about racial integration, it really took years and years and years – you could say decades – before it was smooth.

As late as the '70s, there were race riots on US Navy ships and there still are problems. In fact, although gays in the military is more of a political firestorm, the situation with women in combat, operationally, is tougher, I think. So you have a lot of noise around this issue. But remember, gays are already in the military. They're already integrated, they're already dispersed throughout the barracks and the showers and so forth. So it's really – I minimize this, partly tongue in cheek, because look, all we have to do is stop kicking out gays. This is just about having the rhetoric of the policy catch up to reality, which is that gays are there. They're also serving openly, incidentally, notwithstanding the strictures of the policy. Two-thirds of servicemembers say they know or suspect gays in their units already.

So the very assumptions of the policy are false. They're more about wanting to keep the blemish of homosexuality away from the military in peoples' minds. But there isn't as much, operationally, that needs to be done, as with racial integration or women in combat. That said, there are certain lessons from other countries and from the social science literature about making sure there is zero tolerance for harassment, making sure people understand what the rules are and about allaying peoples' concerns that openly gay – as I said – means something like we're going to have the pink military, because it's not going to be like that.

Q: Thank you.

Q: My question's directed to really anybody on the panel, but Missy may be interested in it. It's really an interesting fact. I was in the military, but what I'm going to talk about – I wasn't in the military. I was a civilian on a Navy ship and I taught. And we went from Virginia and ended up in Jerusalem. And when the trip was over, my stay was over and I was going to head back to the US. And I was looking for another ship that I could go on and there happened to be a tender on the way there, and I went aboard and I asked, anybody like to have courses offered in math or philosophy and so on and so forth. And there was interest and the skipper of the ship happened to be a woman. And she was very helpful and so on. And she said,

well, there's only one problem. There's only one – I'm just looking for a term – there's only one place you can bunk, and there's two people there, and there's a woman there. And so we shrugged our shoulders and I walked away.

So that's an interesting fact that really happened. And I ended up in Jerusalem and I had to take the plane back. But it brings out a point that you do have segregation in quarters and that lends itself, it seems, to a certain inefficiency. It would seem the ideal is, you would have common quarters, especially when you're near a combat zone. And ideally, also, if you have common quarters, you should be able to interact freely. I remember when we went, we didn't have the – when I was in the military, we didn't have the cubicles that you have now where you get privacy. You had a common room and double bunks and so on. So dress was free and so on and so forth. So I'm just bringing out the point that it limits interaction and lends itself to certain inefficiencies in terms of common quarters and so on and so forth. Any comment would be all right.

CUMMINGS: I can speak to that. In fact, the integration of women on ships was actually very easy because of the way that ships are structured, that even – they have all different sizes of spaces and it's really not very difficult if you need to take a large, let's say, 30-man bunkroom and build a wall down the middle and have one side female and one side male. I will tell you that on ships – so the compartmentalizing of people and showers and bathrooms – I mean, this is a non-issue. This has been solved ages ago. But I think the one legitimate issue that still remains, it's – the Navy is more susceptible to it than the other services because of the close quarters, and that's pregnancy. In my last squadron, I was the person who got to counsel women who became pregnant. Every single one was a single mother, junior enlisted. And there was in fact – there were a lot of women getting pregnant to get out of going to sea. When you became pregnant, you were not deployable. And I'm sure the Army suffers from a few of these problems as well.



Now it does happen. Now when you actually look at those numbers, there are still – percentage-wise, it is not crippling women. Men get in accidents, men have other medical issues – about on average of those issues. But I think it's a tricky issue. And I have been critical of the military for not taking a harder stance on this. They make birth control on both sides plentiful and you don't see this problem in the female officer ranks. It rarely happens that a female gets pregnant without her chain of command knowing in advance. And it does happen, but the enlisted women have a completely different – what we call objective function. They see it as a way, maybe, to get out of duty or to get out of something. And they do, believe me. And I'm not trying to say women are any more moral or less lazy or whatever, but there are virtually no consequences for them and they get an easy ride out of the military if that's – and that's, right now, because the military doesn't want to fight that battle.

So I think that the military should take a harder line and make sure that both parties are named and if – you know, you can't always force that issue, but they should be both held responsible and they should both incur additional service or some kind of financial payback if, in fact, they take part in this. Men and women are going to couple up on ships. They do it in the Army, they do it in the Air Force. You're not going to stop this from happening. I think you need to speak to professionalism,

education and then making sure that you have administrative policies in place to discourage at least unprotected sex.

Q: Hi, my question is for Mikey. Generally, the topic is religion in the military. I was in the Marine Corps for a number of years. I grew up around here and enlisted in '89 and later became an officer and I just want to share a little quick story with you. I was on the phone with a friend of mine, he was going to be selected – he was on the board to be selected for command of a squadron. And my friend is a very talented guy and he's a very personable guy and pretty much has gone as far as he's wanted to go. And I said, so Mike, what do you think your chances are? And he said, they're pretty good, but I got this one report from my present commander and it's not so good. And I said, well, that doesn't sound like you, why would you get a bad report? And he said, well, I didn't go to the same church as him. And I was – I didn't understand what he was saying.

I thought it was an expression for, we didn't understand each other or we weren't on the same page, and he said no, literally, I didn't go to his church. He was this Evangelical-type of guy. And as it turned out, he got command anyway, so that's good for him. But the reason I was shocked by this story is because in all of the years that I spent in the Marine Corps, for 13 years of active service, I never heard a single word about this. I never heard a commander say anything, I never heard a troop say anything, I never heard a single word about, you should do this or that to do with religion. In fact, if anything it was a burden to our mission of training. It was always in the infantry and it was always like, oh yeah, religion, right. Guys, go to church and get back so we can do more training.

And that was the most that I ever heard. So I guess my questions is, you know, I saw you in the documentary *Constantine's Sword* and once again, I was completely taken aback and I'm wondering, why the disparity there? Why the two stories? Is it reaching into some communities and not others? Is it in some services and not others? What's the deal there? Thanks.

WEINSTEIN: That's a great question and very well articulated. I get it all the time. Generally, I ask people if – are they white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant males who make the statement. And meaning no offense – you may very well be, and I appreciate what you're saying. Remember, fish in an aquarium never see the water. I live in Albuquerque. We have a lot of – it's a metropolitan area, it's the 44th largest city in America, we're very proud of that. (laughter) We don't let COPS come anymore from the Fox network and shoot there. They've shot there 14 times and the mayor didn't like that. But we have rapes there, we have murders. I've never seen one, but it goes on and it's there. And the fact that I haven't seen a rape or haven't seen a murder doesn't mean that it doesn't happen. I can also tell you that in my career – I had 14 years, counting my four years at the Academy – I never saw it. I never saw it either.

But when I finally got to the White House is when I – under Reagan – I started seeing it. And I saw the – I guess it was – we have some brilliant scholars here. I think it was Kirkegaard (sp?) that said that we live our lives forward, but we understand them backwards. That was actually in the documentary, *Constantine's Sword*, that you talked about. I look back now and I can see this coming. I was

asked by a four-star general recently, how bad is it, Mikey? He knew it was bad and I asked him to pick his pencil up at his desk – we were in the Pentagon – and hold it six-and-a-half inches over his desk, which he did, somewhat quizzically. And I said, now drop it. And he dropped it. And I said, why did it drop, General? And he said, what? And I said, why did it drop? He said, gravity. I said, that's right. That is how ubiquitous and systemic it is. It's beyond the scope of answering this question, I want to make sure others have a chance to ask their questions, but I'll talk to you afterwards if that's all right.

FRANK: If I could just add to that, there has been a process of Evangelical colonization of the military over the past 60 years. There's some great books about it, one by Anne Loveland (sp?), which I drew on – and I discuss this in my book, *Unfriendly Fire*, where the Evangelicals in the military got together with some of the military brass and other social conservatives to discuss the argument about gays in the military. And they said, we don't want this because for us, it's a moral issue. And homosexuality is a sin and we don't want our government sanctioning it. But we don't think that's necessarily going to fly with the public because of this annoying church and state thing that a lot of people believe in, so instead, we're going to cast this as unit cohesion and we're going to make it a national security argument. And I document this in the book. I've spoken to some of the people who were at the table in those discussions.

So it gets back to what I was gesturing at earlier, that I think the military is a place that social conservatives and Evangelicals are increasingly drawn to as a refuge from the society and the cultural norms that they don't like outside the military. And so it becomes a self-intensifying process. And if Evangelicals don't feel that they have a place in society or in the churches, then they're going to continue to try to do this in the military and more will be drawn to it and it will continue to self-intensify, and that's sort of the problem we have.

APPY: Yes, please.

Q: Hi, my name is Lola Highler (sp?) and I wanted to thank you all for being here. Saturday's not an easy day for a lot of people, but it's a good crowd. I have a little bit of a different perspective, I think, on what's being discussed. And it's primarily from personal experience. I am not a military person, I'm a grassroots activist social worker who tries to bring together as many resources in any kind of effort to help people who need help. And I was a student – I'm a late bloomer – I went to social work school in my '50s in Tucson, Arizona. And I was tasked, probably because no one else would take it on, to be the project manager for a program called Operation Deep Freeze. And essentially, it was to house homeless people during the winter, because Tucson, people think oh, how would people suffer outside in Tucson? But actually, in the winter, it is very cold and if you get nasty, rainy weather, people can actually die.

So I worked with the Tucson Council of the Homeless and I happened to stumble on a plan that was actually produced by the military at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. And I can use this because it was a public document. And I had wondered why, in fact, we were not using military facilities if they had a plan to house homeless people in an overflow situation. So I start investigating and I actually did get an

appointment with the commander at Davis-Monthan. Now remember, this was 10 years ago, and we weren't at – it was before Iraq, before Afghanistan and there was a lot more access to military people. At any rate, he asked the same question, well, why is it that I've never seen this plan? Why is it that we aren't helping homeless people?

And we worked for about four or five months, believe it or not, in trying to figure out how Davis-Monthan could be part of the community effort to help. And we came up with a really pretty good plan. It was through the chaplain. The chaplain got involved. We were going nowhere until the chaplain got involved. Now I'm a Roman Catholic and I subscribe to corporal works of mercy. And on that basis, I think I was able to work with the people definitely under the radar and we got this thing up and running with volunteers from the chaplain corps in the church there.

APPY: Question please? I'm sorry, your question?

Q: I just wanted to present a perspective, because I'm hearing just black and white stuff and I think people have to understand, the military – they're human beings, and I just – again, it's a comment, because I'm feeling very uncomfortable with some of the rhetoric here. And I'm a person who can be big on rhetoric. Believe me or not, I've been community organizing a long, long, long time.

APPY: OK, thank you very much.

Q: So the question is, can we bring people together to talk in human ways about how the military can be involved in helping people in the community. I guess that's the question.

FRANK: I'll just say briefly, I appreciate that sentiment and would sort of like to clarify that in my last comment, for instance, certainly nothing against Evangelicals or chaplains in the military, it's this colonization and I think Mikey puts it best. In terms of what's going on, you really have to recognize how some people on the extremes are trying to take over and remake the military in the image of their kingdom on earth. And that's kind of what we're talking about. But you're absolutely right, it's an important sentiment and one that I also expressed earlier when I said, my respect for the military has grown as I've worked – fought against it and worked with it and the people inside there are often doing what they think is best, so that needs to be appreciated.

APPY: Thank you. Maybe one more?

Q: I also thank you for bringing us together. I really appreciate it very much. This is sort of in response – it's not a question, it's a response to what the gentleman in the center, I forgot your name.

APPY: Chris.

Q: Oh, what you said. I think it's really important that we need to examine why we're so quick to go to war time and time again. I think that's a really crucial issue now, as we see people losing their lives all over the world in the name of war. I happen to

practice Buddhism, it's differentiated by the chanting of (speaks in foreign language) and the reason that's important that I bring this up is because I was a much more confrontational person even a year ago. But I really focused on changing myself and becoming less hostile.

APPY: OK, so do you have a question, please?

Q: The question is, can we include in this debate or this dialogue or within the military, the idea of dialogue, of coexistence, of not being so quick to go to war?

ALLEN: I think that's in the third panel today, so –

APPY: Yeah, OK. Maybe take one more? Yeah.

Q: Thank you. My name is Don MacGillis. This question is mainly for Missy. You talked eloquently about the harassment you faced in the Navy. Recently in the *Globe*, there have been quite a few articles and Doonesbury has addressed this too, about not just harassment, but actual sexual assaults of women in the military, I guess mainly among enlisted personnel. Is the military doing much about this? It sounds like an absolutely horrifying situation and the women come out very traumatized from this. Thank you.

CUMMINGS: That's a very good question and it has many disturbing aspects. I think that in most units, when sexual assault is brought in a formal manner to the attention of a senior officer, the military in general is very good about prosecuting these things. I'll tell you where the real problem is. Every woman I know at the Naval Academy, when I was there and still today, has been sexually assaulted, myself included. But we never, ever reported it. And it was just not something that you did, because if you reported the sexual assault, then you yourself would – they would come after you in many other ways. You would just make your life miserable within your own unit. And so I think that the real problem, when we start to talk about those issues, are making it a culture where people can feel free to come forward – and this is not just going to be a female/male issue in the future, as well, as Don't Ask, Don't Tell comes – what kind of a culture can we have to protect the individual around us from these kinds of events? So I think it's going to get worse probably before it gets better.

ALLEN: In the past number of years, there's been a series of training programs, reporting criteria that has been established to one, try and identify that there has been an assault committed and then also to prosecute. The challenge becomes is not making the victim the victim again. That's the major problem. So the reporting doesn't happen and then these things continue over and over again. As a commander over in Germany, I had a very bright, energetic and highly rated young major that was the golden boy of the community. What we found out over time is that he consistently had been harassing and assaulting women in the community. And people thought he was that great and no one decided to challenge him. He is now mister – based upon my time in the Army.

CUMMINGS: Yeah, and I just want to point, it is a very difficult issue because it is at the very lowest level that you have to get that person who has been assaulted to come

forward and the military idea of cohesion – women, men, whatever, it is one that it's very tricky to break that. And few women – I think the statistics of the sexual assaults that are reported to what is actually happening is – the differential is huge.

APPY: Well, thank you all and thanks to you. (applause)

END OF SESSION 1

Sponsored by Mass Humanities
www.masshumanities.org



Images credit: George Abbott White