

E Pluribus Unum:

Open Homosexuality and the Culture War within the US Armed Forcesⁱ

L. Michael Allsep, Ph.D., J.D., DAF[†]

Air University, Air Command and Staff College, Department of Leadership and Strategy

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

allsep@mac.com

Lt Col James E. Parco, Ph.D., USAF^{*}

Air University, Air Command and Staff College, Department of Leadership and Strategy

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

james.parco@us.af.mil

David A. Levy, Ph.D., DAF[†]

United States Air Force Academy, Department of Management

USAF Academy, Colorado

david.levy@usafa.edu

Submitted to Air and Space Power Journal (Chinese language edition)

Last revised: 10 February 2011

Word counts

Essay: 4,810

Endnotes: 631

Author bios: 272

Keywords: gays in military, DADT, diversity, discrimination, religion, military, gender

**Corresponding author*

E-mail: james.parco@us.af.mil

Phone: 334.953.1368

[†] The thoughts and opinions expressed in the paper are the authors' alone and do not necessarily reflect those of the US government, the Department of Defense or Department of the Air Force.

On July 19, 1993 at a United States military base near Washington DC, President William Jefferson Clinton announced his administration's new policy pertaining to homosexuals serving in the American armed services. Although he had made a campaign pledge to allow gays to serve openly, Clinton did not foresee the backlash he would get from Congressional leaders who remained steadfast on excluding them from military service. In his "Ft. McNair Speech," Clinton articulated a compromised solution that would later become known as "don't ask, don't tell."ⁱⁱⁱ (DADT) Although the policy mandated the separation of military members for homosexual conduct or clear evidence of the propensity to engage in such conduct, gay men and lesbians would be allowed to serve provided no such evidence existed. Several months later, Congress passed a version of Clinton's proposal and codified it into law by an overwhelming majority (301-134).ⁱⁱⁱ

Those who voted for the policy argued that military life is fundamentally different from civilian life. Due to the extraordinary responsibilities of military service and the critical role played by unit cohesion, the military must exist as a separate society even if it means a more discriminatory one.^{iv} In addition to cohesion, success in combat also requires military units that are characterized by high morale as well as good order and discipline -- concepts supposedly threatened by openly gay service members.^v Those opposed to DADT contended that such an exclusionary policy imposed an unnecessary cost on an all-volunteer force given one's sexual orientation was irrelevant to job performance. Furthermore, opponents pointed to a complete lack of evidence substantiating the purported effects on unit cohesion, morale or combat effectiveness of openly serving homosexuals. Nevertheless, in February 1994, amidst an unresolved debate, "don't ask, don't tell" became the law of the land. For the next seventeen years, gay men and lesbians would be allowed to serve in the US military only as long as they were willing to conceal their identity.

The policy debate on gays in the military neither originated in nor was unique to the United States. In the early 1990s, many Western countries faced the same vexing question as to the

appropriate role of gay soldiers with many arriving at an entirely different conclusion. Both Canada and Australia had repealed their policies excluding homosexuals in 1992, followed by Israel in 1993. Despite the United States' continued ban on open homosexual service, it wasn't alone. The United Kingdom also continued to exclude openly gay soldiers until 2000 when the gay ban was finally rescinded after the British military lost a series of court challenges. Since then, approximately twenty-five countries have allowed homosexuals to serve openly. These countries include all of the European Union member countries and applicants, with the exception of Turkey.^{vi} At the time of implementation, each country faced predictions that removing discrimination based on sexual orientation would lead to erosion of essential social cohesion and unit effectiveness. Despite these warnings, the biggest story turned out to be no story at all, and yet, the United States stood firm for another decade.

Few Americans could have predicted that after several failed Congressional attempts to overturn the law, suddenly on December 15, 2010 by a vote of 250-175 the US House of Representatives would pass a bill to repeal the 17-year old gay ban. Three days later, the bill passed a US Senate vote with a 65-31 majority, and on December 22, President Obama signed the *Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010* into law.^{vii} Although the new law would not go into effect until sixty days after the President, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense certify the military's readiness to implement the repeal, the legal path had been cleared to give equal protection to all service members regardless of sexual orientation.

This is not the first time the US military has faced a monumental integration of a previously banned class of Americans. President Truman integrated blacks into the military with the stroke of a pen in 1948,^{viii} and Congress began nominating women to US service academies in 1976.^{ix} As was the case with race and gender, the further expansion of the military social aperture to accept homosexuals had the predominant impact of making the military more inclusive and giving equal

social status to a previously disadvantaged class of citizens.

Yet, there are reasons for concern in the United States. First, the integration of Blacks and women into the military was not accomplished without difficulty and remains unfinished today. While the military deserves credit for today's relatively healthy racial climate, the full integration of women remains a struggle. Second, the gap between the social and political values of the officer corps and those of the general population has widened to a disturbing extent, a fact aggravated by the belief that the military culture is not only separate but also superior. Finally, the extent to which this gap manifests itself in devoutly held religious beliefs that sometimes contradict emerging law and policy on sexual orientation presents a special problem because of faith's claim to the whole person. This essay addresses the possible impact of these three challenges on a successful transition to a military that respects openly homosexual service members.

The Problem With Women

Throughout history, men have dominated the ranks of warriors, almost to the complete exclusion of women.^x This began to change as the technological nature of war changed. As R. W. Connell observed, "Violence was now combined with rationality, with bureaucratic techniques of organization and constant technological advance in weaponry and transport."^{xi} In military terms, this resulted in what Walter Millis called the "organizational revolution" in warfare.^{xii} In gender terms, it meant a split in hegemonic masculinity between dominance and technical expertise. Dominance behavior had to make room for expertise, which not only was incompatible to traditional notions of dominant masculinity, but also might be wielded by women. The creation of nationalism sharpened the distinctions between "us" and "them" in a way that also empowered women by giving them space within the national community.^{xiii} Inside the military, however, this space was caught in the contest between the competing versions of hegemonic masculinity. As a result, a form of masculinity that privileged direct dominance, excluded women, and felt challenged by claims of

expertise also claimed the mantle of nationalism. From those cultural conflicts emerged a kind of masculinity that is most accurately characterized as “martial masculinity.”

In the post-Vietnam era, some believed there was a new war being waged against traditional military culture that included a “realignment of sexual roles” that would ultimately be destructive to masculinity and national security—two concepts that merged in martial masculinity.^{xiv} As the image of the American soldier fell into disrepute as a result of the defeat in Vietnam, a deep sense of frustration and betrayal took root in the officer corps.^{xv} At the same time, new wave of feminist awareness and grassroots activity that began in the 1960s became politically powerful in Washington during the 1970s. Its success in breaking down historic barriers to equal opportunities for women led some to call the Seventies the “She Decade.” The centerpiece of that political activism was an initiative to amend the US Constitution to establish clear equality before the law for all women, the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). It was in this atmosphere that Congress turned its attention to the question of admitting women to the military service academies. That effort reflected the difficulties American military culture has faced adjusting to social policy changes that directly challenge martial masculinity, especially because of the sacrosanct place institutions like West Point and Annapolis have in the American military psyche.

That debate over women serving equally to men within the military rank and file exposed the fundamental clash between those unalterably opposed to admitting women on an equal basis, and those who were willing to accept at least the possibility based on enforcement of objective standards. Those whose arguments were grounded in martial masculinity already had all the evidence they needed from military history and tradition; never mind that it was a history that treated women as second-class citizens and denied them opportunities to prove their equal worth. As long as some male service members and their supporters understood masculinity as a gender reality ultimately determined by nature and confirmed by historical experience and religious doctrine, there could be

only respect for traditions built on the natural gender order or a perversion of it. Those who believed that individual women might prove themselves equal to the task if given the chance, but who were opposed to special treatment or a separate track for women, were, whether they recognized it or not, admitting that gender was a social construct. Theirs was a masculinity that respected expertise over direct dominance, and the evidence of their eyes rather than the traditions and beliefs of their forebears was their standard of reference.

Despite a sharp division of opinion in the military, in October 1975 President Gerald Ford signed Public Law 94-106, which included a provision requiring equal treatment for women at the military service academies. The services acted quickly to comply with the law, and the Class of 1980 at each of the military academies for the first time in history included female cadets and female midshipmen. In the wave of publicity that followed these women into the ranks, little space was given to the notion that their very presence was destructive of martial masculinity. Instead, reporters generally celebrated their courage while marveling at the obstacles they still faced. Sex was certainly an issue from day one, but the deeper kind of gender issues were still largely hidden from view. To those who opposed equal opportunity for women in the military, such coverage was only symptomatic of a larger problem, a problem caused by dangerous cultural trends and an ever-expanding revolution in civil rights. From the viewpoint of some, thanks to meddling politicians those cultural threats were no longer external to the military, but endemic within military culture itself. As one former Marine officer and future US Senator noted at the time, “Civilian political control over the military is a good principle,” but the military had become “a politician’s toy,” and under the banner of equality, politicians were using the military as “a test tube for social experimentation.”^{xvi}

A Culture Apart

The concept of civilian control of the military that governs the civil-military relationship in

the United States allows for a certain separation between civilian and military society, although the gap has widened since the Vietnam War.^{xvii} Military service confers special honor and distinction, which has come to constitute in the United States a privileged class within a citizenry that has mostly never worn the uniform. This privileged identity derives largely from the genuine appreciation most Americans have for the willingness to sacrifice that military service embodies. At the same time, within the military there is a strong sense of belonging to a superior culture, and increasing numbers of Americans seem willing to accept that premise. Conservative activist Elaine Donnelly argued recently that gays in uniform represent a threat to military culture, which she contends could be “defined most simply as “how things are done.”^{xviii} Like most opponents of repealing DADT, Donnelly accepted that there is a separate military culture that represents the best of America, and argued that the military should be allowed to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation in order to preserve that supposed moral superiority. And she’s not alone. In support of her position, she amassed a list of 1,167 retired flag and general officers who were signatories on a letter to the President and members of Congress urging support of the 1993 gay ban and opposing any actions to repeal or invalidate it.^{xix}

When Donnelly defined military culture as “how things are done,” what she really meant was how things *had always been done in the past*. Just as with blacks and women, previous generations of Americans have used different political language, which conjured different images and meanings, but each generation has faced the same vexing question of what it means to be a “real” American – that which entitles a person to claim the full mantle of citizenship. To deny gay citizens the right to serve openly in the military not only denied them the privileges and opportunities that come with military service, but it also branded them as not sufficiently moral to be entitled to the full rights and privileges of citizenship. Moreover, the military culture that wanted to continue to deny them full citizenship was dominated by a military hierarchy increasingly out-of-touch with majority American

culture. The findings of a Department of Defense study on the possible impact of repealing DADT not only confirmed the gap between the values of the military's leadership and the values of majority American society that interested scholars had long known existed, but it also exposed a generational gap even within the military itself.^{xx}

The truth of the matter is that over the previous two decades, opposition to the repeal of DADT has been less about social cohesion and unit effectiveness and more about latent discrimination against homosexuality. Below the veneer of concern over military effectiveness is the presumed right of the military profession to protect its own culture against what it considers undue and harmful meddling by outsiders. In that way the debate over DADT mirrors the argument the military once made, and in some corners still does, against equal opportunity for women in the military services. The recent debate over the repeal of DADT simply exposed in a harsh light this usually hidden struggle over what it means to be an American, a debate that has been waged since colonial times between those who believe in a separate and special race of Americans, and those who believe that anyone who accepts the creed and obligations of citizenship can be fully American. Echoes of that struggle can be heard in the so-called “birther movement,” which against all the evidence insists that President Obama is not really an American.^{xxi} More concerning echoes can also be heard in the command posts of the country's highest-ranking commanders.

Andrew Bacevich recently called attention to the danger of a growing “culture of contempt” within the professional ranks of the officer corps against those not in uniform, even, and perhaps especially, against those civilians appointed over them.^{xxii} Certainly there has to be some credence given to this warning after the revelations in *Rolling Stone* magazine of the often crude contempt the former US commanding general of US Forces in Afghanistan, General Stanley McChrystal, and his staff expressed for their civilian superiors.^{xxiii} Bacevich warned of the danger of “praetorianism, warriors becoming enamored with their moral superiority and impatient with the failings of those

they are charged to defend,” and continues:

“The smug disdain for high-ranking civilians casually expressed by McChrystal and his chief lieutenants -- along with the conviction that “Team America,” as these officers style themselves, was bravely holding out against a sea of stupidity and corruption -- suggests that the officer corps of the United States is not immune to this affliction.”^{xxiv}

A fuzzy but still powerful cultural definition of America, understood by most social conservatives as emanating from the Founding Fathers, now competes with the legalistic idea of a national creed that accompanies multiculturalism and is embraced by most social progressives. Like the country it serves the military cannot escape the impact of these arguments, or the demographic and cultural changes that accompany them, by walling itself off from society. Cultural change is slow, but changing attitudes rooted in privilege and fear of cultural extinction is even slower. Both are inevitable and neither is pleasant. Such has always been the reality of diversity in America.

The propensity for increased diversity is woven into the American social fabric. Ethnic diversity trends in the US population during the last thirty years remains consistent with the diversity trends of the 1800s. According to US Census Bureau data, the "diversity index" which measures the probability that two people randomly drawn from the US population at-large will be from different ethnic backgrounds reveals a very clear shift since 1980.^{xxv}

1980: 34%
 1990: 40%
 2000: 47%
 2010: 52%

The United States now finds itself at a point in its history where there is no longer a clear majority ethnic group, and while racially exclusive attitudes are still held by many, America continues on a path of more diversity, not less. Although the reported data reflects only racial demographic change, there are many lessons to be gleaned from our experience with racial integration that can inform prudent action to future challenges. More importantly, this evidence makes clear that maintaining a cultural status quo is not an option. The overall empirical message is clear: cultural

change is inevitable no matter how much some constituencies may resist.

A Question of Morality

The post-Civil War fear in the Deep South that racial integration threatened the traditional political power structure is not that different from the fear some heterosexual military members have of homosexual integration. Just as the integration of blacks led to larger societal integration by way of civil rights legislation that also benefited women and other ethnic minorities, many perceive a clear and present danger that integration of open homosexuality will lead to their greater fear -- the “moral depravity” that will emerge from societal sanction of gay marriage and the erosion of family values rooted in religious belief.

There's an elephant in every room these days when the "gays in the military" issue comes up and most people on both sides of the argument are reticent to acknowledge it.^{xxvi} Those opposed to integrating gays in the military cite a variety of reasons for their opposition: military readiness, unit cohesion, logistics, medical issues, future costs, etc. But the primary reason which no one wants to discuss is that many believe it to be immoral. The argument is rather straight-forward:

- (1) Sexual conduct is a matter of choice
- (2) Acts of sexual misconduct are immoral
- (3) Those who chose to commit immoral acts are themselves, immoral
- (4) Immoral individuals aren't fit for military service

Everyone can agree that immoral individuals should not be allowed to serve. There's never any discussion about the rights of thieves, murderers, rapists or pedophiles to serve in the armed forces. Those lines are easy to draw when making discriminating judgments. But when it comes to determining the morality of homosexuality, conversations become far more guarded and delicate. The difficult disagreement emerges in determining what qualifies as moral sexual conduct and what doesn't. It is entirely consistent for those who believe homosexuality is an immoral choice to

advocate for the exclusion of gay men and women from serving in the armed forces. The most prominent example occurred on March 12, 2007 when then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Peter Pace attempted to define the parameters of impermissible sexual conduct in his comments to the press regarding gays in the military. He remarked that: *"My upbringing is such that I believe that there are certain things, certain types of conduct that are immoral...I believe that military members who sleep with other military members' wives are immoral in their conduct...I believe that homosexual acts between individuals are immoral, and that we should not condone immoral acts...[I]f we know about immoral acts, regardless of committed by who, then we have a responsibility...I do not believe that the armed forces are well served by saying through our policies that it's okay to be immoral in any way, not just with regards to homosexual acts...So from that standpoint, saying that gays should serve openly in the military to me says that we, by policy, would be condoning what I believe is immoral activity."*^{xxvii}

His comments immediately invoked a firestorm of criticism, and three months later, the Secretary of Defense announced that he would advise the President not to renominate General Pace for a second term.^{xxviii} Pace stepped down as Chairman on October 1, 2007.

The severe reaction to Pace's comments were instructive to all who watched closely -- keep your personal views to yourself. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates emphasized this point in commenting on General Pace's remarks several days later: *"I think personal opinion really doesn't have a place here. What's important is that we have a law, a statute that governs 'don't ask, don't tell.' That's the policy of this department, and it's my responsibility to execute that policy as effectively as we can. As long as the law is what it is, that's what we'll do."*

Aaron Belkin, a university professor and gay-rights activist later commented, *"I give General Pace a lot of credit for having the courage to publicly state what everyone knows."* Despite the former Chairman of the JCS's opposition to gays in the military, his perspective is shared by many military officers. And given the impact on Gen. Pace's career, nearly everyone has taken notice of bringing up "the

‘M’ word” when discussing gays serving openly in the military.^{xxix}

For most people, the determination of moral conduct comes from two sources: the law and religious doctrine. When it comes to the law, there is little disagreement. The US military’s Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) is the rulebook by which it operates. If the UCMJ permits such conduct, it will be permitted -- and if it doesn't, it won't. Ethical practice is defined purely by following and enforcing the rule of law, regardless of one's personal feelings. However, when it comes to using religion as a basis for moral judgment, the situation becomes far more challenging. With a military that defines itself as 85% Christian, the governing "religious law" is far more contentious and not as easily changed as the will of Congress. Whereas the legal basis of morality can be changed with the stroke of a pen, the religious basis of morality is often regarded as Truth to believers and not subject to debate. The First Amendment within the American Bill of Rights further complicates matters because of its guiding provision that "*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*"^{xxx} Thus, although the government can't force people to act in a matter inconsistent with their legitimate religious beliefs, neither can the military use religious doctrine as a basis for discriminating against those with whom they disagree.

The social policies currently in place allow American citizens to be as inclusive or exclusive as they want to be. For instance, in choosing places of worship, not only must an individual choose a church that theologically aligns with his or her religious beliefs, but also with their personal belief towards homosexuality. For a person who is committed to a belief that homosexuals are sinners and abominations before God, he or she must seek out a church that shares the same desired level of exclusion. Over the past decade, some churches have suffered congregational losses because they were deemed “too inclusive” by congregants who sought a church family that excluded homosexuals. One needs to look no further than to the crisis facing the newly divided Episcopal Church in the US to understand how the issue of homosexuality is fomenting a disagreement over its moral status,

even within Christianity.

For religious fundamentalists who take such scripture literally, homosexual behavior is unquestionably immoral and the biblical view of it is quite clear in their minds, "*Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable.*"^{xxxix} However, for others who view biblical teachings in the context of their metaphorical meaning, the exclusion of gays from military service based on moral grounds is far less clear. Just as slavery had once been a morally-accepted practice and has since been universally repudiated, religious-based views on the morality of homosexuality are at best debatable given that disagreements exist even within major American Christian denominations.

No one was surprised when the 267-page Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated With Repeal of DADT delivered to Secretary Gates on November 30, 2010 co-chaired by commanding general of U.S. Army Europe, General Carter Ham, and DoD's General Counsel, Jeh Johnson, noted the apparent resistance to a policy change on the basis of religious grounds. Specifically, some of the military's 3,000 chaplains voiced fears that they would not be able to preach the truth of a religious belief that "*homosexuality is a sin and an abomination, and that they are required by God to condemn it as such.*"^{xxxii}

Ham and Johnson addressed the moral and religious concerns in their report stating "*the reality is that in today's U.S. military, people of sharply different moral values and religious convictions -- including those who believe that abortion is murder and those who do not, and those who believe Jesus Christ is the Son of God and those who do not -- and those who have no religious convictions at all, already co-exist, work, live, and fight together on a daily basis. The other reality is that policies regarding Service members' individual expression and free exercise of religion already exist, and we believe they are adequate. Service members will not be required to change their personal views and religious beliefs; they must, however, continue to respect and serve with others who hold different views and beliefs.*"^{xxxiii}

The comprehensive report cites three critical elements necessary for effective repeal of the

open homosexual ban: leadership, professionalism and respect, noting that among the three elements, “*leadership matters most.*” Clearly, the leadership demonstrated by the armed services chaplain corps will be critical. According to military regulations, “*chaplains care for all Service members, including those who claim no religious faith, facilitate the religious requirements of personnel of all faiths, provide faith-specific ministries, and advise the command.*” Yet, chaplains will also remain free to preach in accordance with the tenants of their faith as guaranteed by the US Constitution. For those who approach their pastoral duties embracing themes of inclusion, respect and compassion, the policy change should be uneventful. Yet, for those who embrace themes of exclusivity, the untold story remains. Military regulations require all service members, to include chaplains and their congregants to outwardly display respect and tolerance of others. However, once inside their worship centers, chaplains will be free to promote messages that could be considered to be divisive and exclusionary in accordance with the tenants of their faith. Such a dual approach could relegate such chapels as military-sanctioned respect-free zones where military members could come to express their policy opposition. While entirely legal, the effect could further escalate the culture war inside the institutional walls of the military if some chapels transition into centers of political dissent and protest.

Policy change never equates to cultural change. They progress inextricably linked but separate. Nevertheless, change is inevitable, and to prevent potentially unnecessary escalation and unrest, it will be up to leaders at all levels to marshal their subordinates through yet another social integration as demanded by society. To underscore the analysis of Ham and Johnson, “*leadership matters most?*” and the complexity of the policy change should not be understated. Successful implementation will take time, but no amount of delay will make it more palatable for those constituencies who oppose it.

The Destiny of Diversity

The pluralist ideal of *E Pluribus Unum*^{xxxii} rooted in our nation's federal constitution is essentially political pluralism. Cultural pluralism has always had to fight for social space in America.

In the words of Frederick Douglass:

“The whole history of the progress of human liberty shows that ... it must be a struggle. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will.”

The debate over the cultural values of military institutions is a normal and necessary discussion. Disagreement should be expected and in the end, there will always be winners and losers. The challenge for societal, political and military leaders is always to prevent too great an incongruence between cultural change and policy change. Nevertheless, as history has taught us, when we come to those moments as a nation and find ourselves at a crossroads, we have a choice in taking one of two paths: the difficult path of progress or the simple one of obstructionism. The reality of diversity is that regardless of the choice, it is almost inevitable we will eventually arrive at the same place. The only remaining question for the military is how much self-inflicted damage will it have to endure before reaching that point? The path that diversity has followed in the United States over the course of its history has been one of increased diversity. At every step of the way, efforts to increase it have been resisted, and in every case, the efforts have failed. No law, sound-bite or political rhetoric has ever been able to stop its advance. Indeed, diversity is a patient adversary.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

L. MICHAEL ALLSEP is assistant professor of comparative military studies at Air University where he teaches in the Department of Leadership and Strategy at the Air Command and Staff College. He earned a Ph.D. in History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and was previously a visiting assistant professor in the history department of Duke University. He holds a juris doctorate from the University of South Carolina School of Law and practiced law in Charleston, South Carolina.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES E. PARCO is a professor of leadership and strategy at Air Command and Staff College. He holds an MBA from the College of William and Mary and a Ph.D. from the University of Arizona. He previously served on the National Security Council at the White House during the Clinton Administration as well as in a diplomatic capacity overseas with the American Embassy in Tel Aviv. He is widely published in the fields of psychology and economics for his work on game-theoretic models of human decision behavior.

DAVID A. LEVY is a professor of management at the United States Air Force Academy and holds a Ph.D. in organizational behavior from Cornell University. He served on active-duty with the Air Force for ten years and later worked as an organizational change consultant for both KPMG and Grant Thornton. He is a sought after speaker in the field of adaptive leadership.

Parco and Levy are also co-authors of a series of “Thinking Deeply About” books, including:

The 52nd Floor: Thinking Deeply About Leadership
Attitudes Aren't Free: Thinking Deeply About Diversity in the US Armed Services
Echoes of Mind: Thinking Deeply About Humanship

ENDNOTES

ⁱ This essay is derived from a compilation of three papers previously published in English by the same authors:

- (1) Allsep, L.M. (2010). The Odyssey of James Webb: An Adaptive Gender Perspective, in *Attitudes Aren't Free: Thinking Deeply About Diversity in the US Armed Forces*. Eds. James E. Parco and David A. Levy. Maxwell AFB: Air University Press. Accessible online at <http://books.google.com/books?id=-5FmjEclenC&pg=PA320&vq=allsep&pg=PA299#>
- (2) Allsep, L.M., Levy, D.A., and Parco, J.E. (2011). The Culture War Within: Reconciling policy change and military culture after DADT. *Armed Forces Journal*, January/February 2010. Accessible at <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2011/02/5363912/>
- (3) Levy, D.A. and Parco, J.E. (2010). An elephant named Morality: The latent argument over 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'. *Armed Forces Journal*, September 2010. Accessible at <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2010/09/4679369/>

ⁱⁱ Cannon, C.M., Clinton issues gay policy, Military chiefs back directive. *The Baltimore Sun*, 20 July 1993.

ⁱⁱⁱ 10 USC 654

^{iv} *Ibid.* (a)(8)(a)

^v *Ibid.* (a)(6)

^{vi} Palm Center Report. June 2009. Nations Allowing Gays to Serve Openly.

<http://www.palmcenter.org/research/nations%20allowing%20service%20by%20openly%20gay%20people> Last visited: 9 Feb 2011.

^{vii} CNN Staff Wire. Obama signs repeal of 'don't ask, don't tell' policy. 22 December 2010.

Accessible at http://articles.cnn.com/2010-12-22/politics/dadt.repeal_1_repeal-openly-gay-men-president-barack-obama?s=PM:POLITICS

^{viii} Executive Order 9981. <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/9981.htm>

^{ix} Mitchell, B.P. (1998). *Women in the Military: Flirting With Disaster*. Washington: Regnery. 32.

^x Allsep, L.M. (2010). The Odyssey of James Webb: An Adaptive Gender Perspective, in *Attitudes Aren't Free: Thinking Deeply About Diversity in the US Armed Forces*. Eds. James E. Parco and David A. Levy. Maxwell AFB: Air University Press.

^{xi} R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995), 192.

^{xii} Walter Millis, *Arms and Men: A Study in American Military History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1981).

^{xiii} Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989, 1990 and 2000), 61–62.

^{xiv} See for example James Webb's "Women Can't Fight," *Washingtonian*, November 1979.

^{xv} Michael S. Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 174 and 197.

^{xvi} James Webb, "Women Can't Fight," *Washingtonian*, November 1979.

^{xvii} Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2001).

^{xviii} Donnelly, E. (2010). Defending the culture of the military, in *Attitudes Aren't Free: Thinking Deeply About Diversity in the US Armed Forces*. Eds. James E. Parco and David A. Levy. Maxwell AFB: Air University Press.

^{xix} Center for Military Readiness (2010). Flag and General Officers for the Military, *ibid.*

^{xx} Generation Gap Divides Troops on Gays in Military. *The Associated Press*. November 1, 2010. Accessible at <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/11/01/generation-gap-divides-troops-on-gays-in-military>

^{xxi} See The Birther Movement official website at <http://www.birthers.org/>

^{xxii} Bacevich, Andrew. Endless war, a recipe for four-star arrogance. *Washington Post*, June 27, 2010. Accessible at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/25/AR2010062502160.html>

^{xxiii} Hastings, M. (2010). The Runaway General. *Rolling Stone Magazine*. June 22, 2010. Accessible at <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/the-runaway-general-20100622>

^{xxiv} Bacevich, *ibid.*

^{xxv} El Nasser, H. Minority births drive growth in U.S. diversity. *USA Today*, June 22, 2010. Accessible at http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/census/2010-06-10-census-minorities_N.htm

^{xxvi} Levy, D.A. and Parco, J.E. (2010). An Elephant Named Morality: The unspoken argument over 'don't ask, don't tell'. *Armed Forces Journal*, September 2010. Accessible at <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2010/09/4679369/>

^{xxvii} Pace clarifies gay comment as his 'personal moral views.' *The Washington Times*. March 14, 2007. Accessible at <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2007/mar/14/20070314-121537-6699r/>

^{xxviii} Frank, J. “General Pace out as Joint Chiefs Chairman.” Chicago Tribune, June 8, 2007. Accessible at <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2007/mar/14/20070314-121537-6699r/>

^{xxix} Belkin, A. Interview, May 26, 2010. Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama.

^{xxx} Constitution of the United States of America. First Amendment.

^{xxxi} The Holy Bible. Leviticus 18:22.

^{xxxii} Ham, C. and Johnson, J. (2010). Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with Repeal of ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.’ Delivered to the Secretary of Defense Nov 30, 2010, 12. Accessible at [www.defense.gov/.../DADTReport_FINAL_20101130\(secure-hires\).pdf](http://www.defense.gov/.../DADTReport_FINAL_20101130(secure-hires).pdf)

^{xxxiii} *Ibid.*, 12.

^{xxxiv} *E pluribus unum* is Latin for “out of many, one” and appears on all the major seals of the United States’ legislative, judicial and executive branches of government. It was the de facto American motto until 1956 when Congress officially adopted “In God We Trust” as the official motto.