Student Guide

Exploring Chaplaincy Ministry

The **Modular Course of Study** is an outcome-based curriculum designed to implement the educational paradigm defined by the Breckenridge Consultations. Clergy Development is responsible for maintaining and distributing the Modular Course of Study for the Church of the Nazarene.

Members of the development committee for the Modular Course of Study were
Michael W. Vail, Ph.D., Series Curriculum Editor
Daniel R. Copp, D.Min., Director, Clergy Development
Jerry D. Lambert, Commissioner, International Board of Education
Al Truesdale, Ph.D., Nazarene Theological Seminary (retired)
Robert L. Woodruff, Ph.D., World Mission Educational Coordinator
Michael W. Stipp, Clergy Development

Series Foreword written by Al Truesdale
Journaling Essay written by Rick Ryding
Principal contributors for each module are listed in specific Faculty Guides.

Series Foreword

A Vision for Christian Ministry:
Clergy Education in the Church of the Nazarene

The chief purpose of all persons—indeed, all of the creation—is to worship, love, and serve God. God has made himself known in His deeds of creation and redemption. As the Redeemer, God has called into existence a people, the Church, who embody, celebrate, and declare His name and His ways. The life of God with His people and the world constitutes the Story of God. That story is recorded principally in the Old and New Testaments, and continues to be told by the resurrected Christ who lives and reigns as Head of His Church. The Church lives to declare the whole Story of God. This it does in many ways—in the lives of its members who are even now being transformed by Christ, through preaching, the sacraments, in oral testimony, and in mission. All members of the Body of Christ are called to exercise a ministry of witness and service. No one is excluded.

In God's own wisdom He calls some persons to fulfill the ministry of proclaiming the gospel and caring for God's people in a form that is referred to as the ordained ministry. God is the initial actor in this call, not humans. In the Church of the Nazarene we believe that God calls and that persons respond. They do not elect the Christian ministry. All persons whom God calls to the ordained ministry continue to be amazed that He would call them. They should continue to be humbled and amazed by God's call. The *Manual* of the Church of the Nazarene states, "we recognize and hold that the Head of the Church calls some men and women to the more official and public work of the ministry." It adds, "The church, illuminated by the Holy Spirit, will recognize the Lord's call" (*Manual,* Church of the Nazarene, paragraph 400).

An ordained Christian minister has as his or her chief responsibility to declare in many ways the whole Story of God as fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth. His or her charge is to "tend the flock of God . . . not under compulsion, but willingly, not for sordid gain but eagerly. Do not lord it over those in your charge, but be examples to the flock" (1 Pet 5:2-3, NRSV). The minister fulfills this charge under the supervision of Christ, the chief Shepherd (1 Pet 5:4). Such ministry can be fulfilled only after a period of careful preparation. Indeed, given the ever-changing demands placed upon the minister, "preparation" never ceases.

A person who enters the Christian ministry becomes in a distinct sense a steward of the gospel of God (Titus 1:7). A steward is one who is entrusted to care for what belongs to another. A steward may be one who takes care of another person or who manages the property of someone else. All Christians are stewards of the grace of God. But in addition, in a peculiar sense a Christian minister is a steward of the "mystery of God," which is Christ, the Redeemer, the Messiah of God. In all faithfulness, the minister is called to "make known with boldness the mystery of the gospel" (Eph 6:19, NRSV). Like Paul, he or she must faithfully preach "the boundless riches of Christ, and to make everyone see what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things; so that through the church the wisdom of God in its rich variety might now be made known to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly places" (Eph 3:8-10, NRSV).

In fulfilling this commission, there is plenty of room for diligence and alertness, but no room for laziness or privilege (Titus 1:5-9). Good stewards recognize that they are

stewards only, not the owners, and that they will give an account of their stewardship to the master. Faithfulness to one's charge and to the Lord who issued it is the steward's principal passion. When properly understood, the Christian ministry should never be thought of as a "job." It is ministry—uniquely Christian ministry. No higher responsibility or joy can be known than to become a steward of the Story of God in Christ's Church. The person who embraces God's call to the ordained ministry will stand in the company of the apostles, the Early Fathers of the Church, the Reformers of the Middle Ages, the Protestant Reformers, and many persons around the world today who joyfully serve as stewards of the gospel of God.

Obviously, one who does not recognize, or who understands but rejects, just how complete and inclusive a minister's stewardship must be should not start down the path that leads to ordination. In a peculiar sense, a Christian minister must in all respects model the gospel of God. He or she is to "shun" the love of money. Instead, the minister must "pursue righteousness, godliness, faith, love, endurance, gentleness." He or she must "fight the good fight of the faith" and "take hold of the eternal life, to which you were called" (1 Tim 6:11-12, NRSV).

Hence, the Church of the Nazarene believes that "the minister of Christ is to be in all things a pattern to the flock—in punctuality, discretion, diligence, earnestness; 'in purity, understanding, patience and kindness; in the Holy Spirit and in sincere love; in truthful speech and in the power of God; with weapons of righteousness in the right hand and in the left' (2 Cor 6:6-7)" (*Manual*, Church of the Nazarene, paragraph 401.1). The minister of Christ "must be above reproach as God's steward, not self-willed, not quick-tempered, not addicted to wine, not pugnacious, not fond of sordid gain, but hospitable, loving what is good, sensible, just, devout, self-controlled, holding fast the faithful word which is in accordance with the teaching . . . able both to exhort in sound doctrine and to refute those who contradict." (Titus 1:7-9, NASB).

In order to be a good steward of God's Story one must, among other things, give oneself to careful and systematic study, both before and after ordination. This will occur not because he or she is forced to do so, but out of a love for God and His people, the world that He is working to redeem, and out of an inescapable sense of responsibility. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the attitude one brings to preparation for the ministry reveals much about what he or she thinks of God, the gospel, and Christ's Church. The God who became incarnate in Jesus and who made a way of salvation for all gave His very best in the life, death, and resurrection of His Son. In order to be a good steward, a Christian minister must respond in kind. Jesus told numerous parables about stewards who did not recognize the importance of what had been entrusted to them (Mt 21:33-44; 25:14-30; Mk 13:34-37; Lk 12:35-40; 19:11-27; 20:9-18).

Preparation—one's education in all its dimensions—for ministry in Christ's Church should be pursued in full light of the responsibility before God and His people that the ministry involves. This requires that one take advantage of the best educational resources at his or her disposal.

The Church of the Nazarene recognizes how large is the responsibility associated with the ordained Christian ministry and accepts it fully. Part of the way we recognize our responsibility before God is seen in the requirements we make for ordination and the practice of ministry. We believe that the call to and practice of Christian ministry is a gift, not a right or privilege. We believe that God holds a minister to the highest of religious, moral, personal, and professional standards. We are not reluctant to expect

that those standards be observed from the time of one's call until his or her death. We believe that Christian ministry should first be a form of worship. The practice of ministry is both an offering to God and a service to His Church. By the miracle of grace, the work of the ministry can become a means of grace for God's people (Rom 12:1-3). One's education for ministry is also a form of worship.

The modules that comprise the Course of Study that may lead a person to candidacy for ordination have been carefully designed to prepare one for the kind of ministry we have described. Their common purpose is to provide a holistic preparation for entrance into the ordained Christian ministry. They reflect the Church's wisdom, experience, and responsibility before God. The modules show how highly the Church of the Nazarene regards the gospel, the people of God, the world for which Christ gave His life, and Christian ministry. Completing the modules will normally take three or four years. But no one should feel pressured to meet this schedule.

The careful study for which the modules call should show that before God and His Church one accepts the stewardly responsibility associated with ordained ministry.

Acknowledgments

Every module is the accumulation of effort by many people. Someone writes the original manuscript, others offer suggestions to strengthen the content and make the material more easily understood, and finally an editor formats the module for publication. This module is not different. Many people have contributed to this module.

Principal Contributor
The principal writer of this module was Chaplain Chris E. Fosback, Commander, Chaplain Corps, United States Navy (Retired). Chaplain Fosback received the Bachelor of Arts in religion from Mid-America Nazarene College (1976), the Masters of Divinity from Nazarene Theological Seminary (1979), and the Masters of Human Resource Management from Salve Regina University (1993).

Chaplain Fosback pastored a Nazarene church in Missouri prior to ordination as an Elder in the Church of the Nazarene in 1980. He was endorsed to serve as a Nazarene Chaplain in the United States Navy Chaplain Corps in 1981 where he provided ministry in the following settings: Japan; ship's chaplain of U.S.S. JUNEAU; single chaplain for the 5,000 member Surveillance, Reconnaissance and Intelligence Group of First Marine Expeditionary Force, with whom he deployed to the Middle East and participated in both Desert Shield and Desert Storm; Regimental Chaplain 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division; Training Officer/Assistant Division Chaplain based in Camp Pendleton and Twenty Nine Palms, California. After Chaplain Fosback retired from the military he pastored a Nazarene church in Kansas followed by a Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) residency at Research Medical Center, Kansas City, Missouri.

Current ministry for Chaplain Fosback includes serving since 1989 as secretary of the General Church's Chaplain's Advisory Council (CAC); collating data to compile a comprehensive history of Nazarene chaplains; Visiting-Professor for Chaplaincy Training at Nazarene Theological Seminary; providing pulpit supply and holding holiness revivals. Chaplain Fosback is the Regional Chaplain Coordinator of the Mid-America Nazarene University—North Central Region.

Co-Contributor
The principal contributor for this course is Chaplain David Grosse, Colonel, United States Air Force (Retired). Chaplain Grosse received the Bachelor of Arts from Eastern Nazarene College, the Masters of Religious Education from Yale University, the Masters of Divinity from Nazarene Theological Seminary, completed all academic requirements (dissertation pending) for the Doctor of Education degree at Boston University, and is a graduate of the Air War College.

In 1962 Chaplain Grosse was ordained a minister in the Church of the Nazarene. He pastored churches in Connecticut, Kansas, California, and Wyoming and served as District Secretary for the Rocky Mountain District from 1963 through 1966. Chaplain Grosse was a charter member of, and helped conceptualize, organize and inaugurate, the Chaplain Advisory Council, on which he served from 1973 until 2000. In 2001 Eastern Nazarene College honored Chaplain Grosse as its Alumnus of the Year.

Chaplain Grosse's published writings include *Now That You're in the Military*, 1977; *Perspectives: A Guide to Educational Ministry*, U.S. 1977; *CARE: Chapel Adult Religious Education*, 1980; *Job: The Trial and Triumph of Faith*, 1986; and has written articles and reviews in more than 20 journals and magazines.

Commissioned a chaplain in the Air Force in 1964, Chaplain Grosse's military assignments have included: several states in The United States, Japan, and Korea. In 1991 Chaplain Grosse was assigned as Alaska Air Command Chaplain and Senior (Staff) Chaplain, Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska. He was honorably retired from the Air Force in the rank of Colonel in 1993, receiving his second award of the Legion of Merit. His major military awards and decorations include the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, and the Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters.

Upon retirement from the Air Force Chaplain Grosse became a consultant in adult education for Headquarters, Church of the Nazarene, and was appointed Director of Chaplaincy Education at Nazarene Theological Seminary until 1999. Chaplain Grosse developed the curriculum for the two chaplaincy courses currently taught at the Seminary.

Chaplain Grosse, now retired, resides in Colorado Springs, Colorado with his wife, the former Donna Webb of Akron, Ohio. They have four sons—Tim, Jeff, Jay, and Curt; a daughter, Glenda; and twelve grandchildren.

Responder
This material was reviewed by Chaplain Dwight Jennings, Lieutenant Colonel, United States Army, (Retired), currently Director of Chaplaincy Services for the Church of the Nazarene, to ensure that the content did not represent a single, narrow view or opinion and reflected the broad spectrum of chaplaincy ministry available to authorized ministers of the Church of the Nazarene outside the walls of the local church. He provided suggestions the principal writer could integrate into this course.

Chaplain Jennings earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree from Southern Nazarene University, Bethany, Oklahoma, a Master of Divinity Degree from Nazarene Theological Seminary, and pursued additional graduate studies in church history at Kansas University and Boston University. He was ordained to the ministry in 1978 and served a congregation in Massachusetts and taught at Eastern Nazarene College.

Chaplain Jennings began his military service as an Army Chaplain in 1980. He held chaplaincy positions with the 2nd Armored Division, 3rd Infantry Division, and 1st Cavalry Division. He served on the faculty of the Chaplain Center and School, directed the Eighth United States Army Retreat Center, Korea, and held branch director of personnel positions at Eighth Army and the Office of the Chief of Chaplains. He concluded his career on active duty as the Division Chaplain of the 1st Cavalry Division where he directed chaplain SFOR 4 operations in Bosnia. His awards include the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Commendation Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Army Achievement Medal.

As the Director of Chaplaincy Services, Chaplain Jennings continues to provide consummate professional advice to General Church leaders, stellar leadership, and visionary pastoral care to over 850 Nazarene Chaplains worldwide.

Co-Responder
The Responder for this module was Chaplain Rick Williamson. Chaplain Williamson received the Bachelor of Arts in religion from Mid-America Nazarene College (1972), the Master of Divinity from Nazarene Theological Seminary (1975), the Master of Arts in Jewish and Christian Literature from the University of Iowa (1987), and the Doctor of Philosophy from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville (1993).

Williamson was a pastor in the Church of the Nazarene from 1975-1989, having been ordained in 1977. Congregations served on the Iowa District included Iowa Falls, Ottumwa Trinity, and Iowa City. In 1988, he was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the United States Army Reserve. He was chaplain at various times to National Guard units in Iowa, Kentucky, and Indiana, and then as the 5025th Garrison Support Unit chaplain at Fort Carson, Colorado. He continued as chaplain in the grade of Captain in the US Army Reserves until fall of 1999.

Two years after becoming an Army Reserve chaplain, Chaplain Williamson began serving as a healthcare chaplain. He ministered in two healthcare systems, Norton Healthcare in Louisville, Kentucky (1990-1997) and Columbus Regional Hospital in Columbus, Indiana (1999-2001).

Current ministry for Chaplain Williamson is as Professor of Biblical Literature and Chaplain for Adult and Graduate Students at Mount Vernon Nazarene University. He joined the faculty there in 2001. Along with his university duties, he served as District Chaplaincy Director for the North Central Ohio District Church of the Nazarene from 2003-2006.

Contents

Syllabus
Exploring Chaplaincy Ministry

Educational Institution, Setting, or Educational Provider:

Location of the Course:

Course Dates:

Name of the Instructor:

Instructor's Address, Telephone, and E-mail Address:

Module Vision Statement:

This module is designed for people who have received a call from God to Christian ministry and who may wish to explore the possibility of chaplaincy ministry, either as a full-time calling or in conjunction with other forms of ministry. The course directs the student outward to ministry beyond the local church as an extension of the local church ministry where people in need appear in all segments of society, where traditional pastors and church programs are not able to go. For these areas of life God has raised up chaplaincy as a creatively positioned ministry to fulfill the important ministry Jesus Christ illustrated in Matthew 25:34-35: "For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in, I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me."

As the incarnate presence of God, chaplains perform specific caring ministry tasks in more than 60 venues and contexts—in many different healthcare settings, among military personnel, in correctional facilities, and in the workplace—for people marginalized from normal societal interaction by reasons of health limitations, incarceration due to violation of societal norms, or isolation for any number of reasons. One or more of these apply to each major venue of chaplaincy ministry, including the industrial assembly line and the military where its members are often isolated in dangerous locales where it is impossible to receive pastoral care through traditional means. As ministry tasks are performed it is clear that God credits them to intentional ministry rather than casual, random acts of kindness.

Chaplaincy ministry is often under appreciated or misunderstood because it is performed outside the settings normally associated with "the church." More than ninety percent of chaplaincy ministry tasks are accomplished in secular rather than ecclesiastical environs. Many people who have no connection with a church or synagogue have experienced interaction with a chaplain during family crises or during war; have been the recipients of the pastoral care and/or support of a chaplain engaged in bringing the presence of God into the lives of people in a setting not generally associated with sacred items, rites or rituals.

Because so much of a chaplain's pastoral care ministry occurs in non-traditional settings, its context, daily routine and multi-faceted focus is importantly caught by hands-on experience. Moving into specialized ministry contexts by interviewing chaplains, seeing their ministry settings, observing and when possible participating in their ministries, will afford the best introduction to the critical role of the chaplain.

This module will introduce the student to ministry in pluralistic settings outside the walls of the church and aid in understanding the relationship between what a chaplain should "be," "know" and "do." It will provide information to help the student analyze his or her gifts and graces that may lend themselves to effective chaplaincy ministry. And, the course will inform the student how to apply for Ecclesiastical Endorsement to the General Church of the Nazarene, which assesses the potential chaplain's readiness, and has sole authority to authorize a minister to serve as a chaplain when he/she is deemed ready in all respects to represent our Church in the unique ministry of chaplaincy.

Educational Assumptions

1. The work of the Holy Spirit is essential to any process of Christian education at any level. We will consistently request and expect the Spirit's presence within and among us.
2. Christian teaching and learning is best done in the context of community (people being and working together). Community is the gift of the Spirit but may be enhanced or hindered by human effort. Communities have common values, stories, practices, and goals. Explicit effort will be invested to enhance community within the class. Group work will take place in every lesson.
3. Every adult student has knowledge and experiences to contribute to the class. We learn not only from the instructor and the reading assignments but also from each other. Each student is valued not only as a learner but also as a teacher. That is one reason that so many exercises in this course are cooperative and collaborative in nature.
4. Journaling is an ideal way to bring theory and practice together as students synthesize the principles and content of the lessons with their own experiences, preferences, and ideas.

Outcome Statements

This module contributes to the development of the following abilities as defined in the *U.S. Sourcebook for Ministerial Development*.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

CP22—Ability to prepare, organize and deliver biblically sound sermons using appropriate techniques and skills in culturally appropriate ways

CP23—Ability to develop and utilize existing ministry forms such as evangelistic preaching, pastoral care preaching, doctrinal/teaching preaching and preaching Christian seasons/calendar by which individuals, families, and congregations may be formed into Christlikeness

CP24—Ability to assess the strengths and weaknesses of current homiletical models in light of enduring theological (Bible, doctrine, philosophy) and contextual (history, psychology, sociological) perspectives

OUTCOME STATEMENTS

- Incorporate relevant opportunities to expand a pastor's effective ministry and spiritual impact beyond the sphere of a local church

Recommended Reading

Each module within the Modular Course of Study is intended to be textbook independent. Chaplaincy ministry is uniquely outside the walls of the church, often misunderstood by those who have not experienced it personally, and few texts exist that adequately address the broad scope of ministry or the critical issue of institutional duality (the dichotomy of providing ministry in non-compatible institutions—secular and sacred).

The full text of the book written by Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr., *The Churches and the Chaplaincy*, published by the United States Government Printing Office (1997 Revised Ed., no copyright assigned and no longer in print) is provided in its entirety.

While the text primarily addresses chaplaincy in a military venue, the principle writer of this module offers no apology for this decidedly one-sided emphasis of study because there is no other text presently available that addresses the principles, concepts, concerns, issues and applications of chaplaincy ministry within the context of institutional duality. Once the difficult concept of institutional duality is understood, the principles, concepts, concerns and issues addressed in the book are directly applicable to any venue of chaplaincy ministry, and can even be adapted for use by the local church in formulating strategies for ministry outside the walls of the church into the community within which it is providentially and deliberately—usually only after agonizing prayer and supplication for Divine guidance—placed.

If these modules are adapted for use outside of the English-speaking countries of North America, an appropriate textbook may not be available in the language of the students. Therefore, the module does not rely on an external textbook.

Suggested Books for the Student's Library

For those students interested in acquiring books for their personal library, the following—prioritized in order of suggested acquisition—would be recommended as good books for this module topic. Books that address the changing dynamics of ministry as society moves from modernity to post-modernity and ministry in the context of pluralism are especially recommended because this is environment in which chaplaincy ministry is delivered:

Pinnock, Clark H. *A Wideness in God's Mercy: The Finality of Jesus Christ In a World of Religions.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992

McNeal, Reggie. *The Present Future: Six Tough Questions for the Church.* San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Roof, Wade Clark. *Spiritual Marketplace: Baby Boomers and the Remaking of American Religion.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Bellah, Robert N. *Habits Of The Heart: Individualism And Commitment In American Life.* New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

Marty, Martin E. and Frederick E. Greenspahn (eds.). *Pushing The Faith: Proselytism And Civility In A Pluralistic World.* New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1988.

Marty, Martin E. *A Nation Of Behavers.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

D'Costa, Gavin (ed.) *Christian Uniqueness Reconsidered: The Myth Of A Pluralistic Theology Of Religions.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1990.

Course Requirements

1. **Class attendance, attention, and participation** are especially important. Students are responsible for all assignments and in-class work. Much of the work in this course is small-group work. Cooperative, small-group work cannot be made up. That makes attendance imperative. Even if one does extra reading or writing, the values of discussion, dialogue, and learning from each other are thwarted. If **one** lesson is missed, the learning leader will require extra work before completion can be acknowledged. If **two** or more lessons are missed, the student will be required to repeat the whole module.

   Small-Group Work. Nothing is more important in this course than small-group work. The class members will be assigned to groups of two to four students each. The group members will serve as study partners for explorations and discussion.

2. **Assignments**

   Journaling: The only on-going assignment for this module is your journal. It is to be used regularly, if not daily. On at least one occasion during the term, the instructor will check the journals. In each lesson a journal assignment is included.

   Because chaplaincy ministry is unique when compared to pastoral ministry in that the location, environment and manner in which it is delivered often generates feelings of isolation from recognized spiritual influences, each student is invited to use the discipline of journaling during this module as a tool to explore spiritual formation in that foreign context. This will require that the student attempt to visualize him or herself in a secular, isolated ministry setting devoid of the relational influences that normally contribute to spiritual formation. The purpose of journaling in this contrived context will be as a means of exploring the difficulty of maintaining and deepening a personal relationship with God while constantly ministering in that secular environment and for the student to honestly evaluate their suitability for chaplaincy ministry.

   This journal is not a diary, not a catch-all. It is, rather, a guided journal or a focused journal in which the educational experience and its implications are selected for reflection and writing.

The framers of this curriculum are concerned about the way students fall into learning "about" the Bible or "about" the spiritual life rather than learning—that is, coming to know and internalize the Bible and spiritual principles. The journaling experience ensures that the "Be" component of "Be, Know, and Do" is present in the course of study. Be faithful with all journaling assignments.

Daily Work: This module has regular homework assignments. It is called daily work because even though the class may only meet once a week, the student should be working on the module on a "daily" basis. Sometimes the homework assignments are quite heavy. The assignments are important. Even if homework is not discussed in class every session, the work is to be handed in. This gives the instructor regular information about the student's progress in the course. The normal time for homework to be handed in is at the beginning of each class session. **All** assignments are to be completed.

Course Outline and Schedule

The class will meet for 18 hours according to the following schedule:

Session Date	Session Time	
		1. The Legacy of Chaplaincy Ministry
		2. The Chaplain's Relationship to Ministry
		3. The Chaplain's Relationship to God
		4. The Chaplain's Relationship to Self
		5. The Chaplain's Relationship to Family
		5. The Chaplain's Relationship to the Local and District Church
		7. The Chaplain's Relationship to the General Church of the Nazarene
		8. The Chaplain's Relationship to Professional and Credentialing Organizations
		9. The Chaplain's Relationship to the Organization Served
		10. The Chaplain's Relationship to Assets and Resources
		11. The Chaplain's Relationship to Supervisors and Staff
		12. The Continuing Legacy of Chaplaincy Ministry: The Chaplain's Relationship to Colleagues in a Pluralistic Ministry Setting

Course Evaluation

The instructor, the course itself, and the student's progress will be evaluated. These evaluations will be made in several ways.

The progress of students will be evaluated with an eye for enhancing the learning experience by:
1. Carefully observing the small-group work, noting the competence of reports, the balance of discussion, the quality of the relationships, the cooperation level, and the achievement of assigned tasks
2. Careful reading of homework assignments
3. Journal checks

A letter grade is not the measure of completion. Completion of the module is based on attendance, participation, completion of all homework, and showing competence in the ability statements.

The evaluation of the course materials and the teacher will be evaluated by frequently asking and discussing the effectiveness and relevance of a certain method, experience, story, lecture, or other activity.

Some evaluation cannot be made during the class itself. Some objectives will not be measurable for years to come. If students encounter the transforming power of God at deeper levels than ever before, learn devotional skills and practice them with discipline, and incorporate the best of this course into their own ministries, the fruit of this educational endeavor could go on for a long time. In truth, that is what we expect.

Additional Information

A reasonable effort to assist every student will be made. Any student who has handicaps, learning disabilities, or other conditions that make the achievement of the class requirements exceedingly difficult should make an appointment with the instructor as soon as possible to see what special arrangements can be made. Any student who is having trouble understanding the assignments, lectures, or other learning activities should talk to the instructor to see what can be done to help.

Instructor's Availability

Good faith efforts to serve the students both in and beyond the classroom will be made.

Journaling: A Tool for Personal Reflection and Integration

Participating in the course of study is the heart of your preparation for ministry. To complete each course you will be required to listen to lectures, read several books, participate in discussions, write papers, and take exams. Content mastery is the goal.

An equally important part of ministerial preparation is spiritual formation. Some might choose to call spiritual formation devotions, while others might refer to it as growth in grace. Whichever title you place on the process, it is the intentional cultivation of your relationship with God. The course work will be helpful in adding to your knowledge, your skills, and your ability to do ministry. The spiritually formative work will weave all you learn into the fabric of your being, allowing your education to flow freely from your head to your heart to those you serve.

Although there are many spiritual disciplines to help you cultivate your relationship with God, journaling is the critical skill that ties them all together. Journaling simply means keeping a record of your experiences and the insights you have gained along the way. It is a discipline because it does require a good deal of work to faithfully spend time daily in your journal. Many people confess that this is a practice they tend to push aside when pressed by their many other responsibilities. Even five minutes a day spent journaling can make a major difference in your education and your spiritual development. Let me explain.

Consider journaling as time spent with your best friend. Onto the pages of a journal you will pour out your candid responses to the events of the day, the insights you gained from class, a quote gleaned from a book, an ah-ha that came to you as two ideas connected. This is not the same as keeping a diary, since a diary seems to be a chronicle of events without the personal dialogue. The journal is the repository for all of your thoughts, reactions, prayers, insights, visions, and plans. Though some people like to keep complex journals with sections for each type of reflection, others find a simple running commentary more helpful. In either case, record the date and the location at the beginning of every journal entry. It will help you when it comes time to review your thoughts.

It is important to chat briefly about the logistics of journaling. All you will need is a pen and paper to begin. Some folks prefer loose-leaf paper that can be placed in a three-ring binder, others like spiral-bound notebooks, while others enjoy using composition books. Whichever style you choose, it is important to develop a pattern that works for you.

Establishing a time and a place for writing in your journal is essential. If there is no space etched out for journaling, it will not happen with the regularity needed to make it valuable. It seems natural to spend time journaling after the day is over and you can sift through all that has transpired. Yet, family commitments, evening activities, and fatigue militate against this time slot. Morning offers another possibility. Sleep filters much of the previous day's experiences, and processes deep insights, that can be recorded first thing in the morning. In conjunction with devotions, journaling enables you to begin to weave your experiences with the Word, and also with course material that has been steeping on the back burner of your mind. You will probably find that carrying your journal will allow you to jot down ideas that come to you at odd times throughout the day.

It seems that we have been suggesting that journaling is a handwritten exercise. Some may be wondering about doing their work on a computer. Traditionally, there is a special bond between hand, pen, and paper. It is more personal, direct, aesthetic. And it is flexible, portable, and available.

With regular use, your journal is the repository of your journey. As important as it is to make daily entries, it is equally important to review your work. Read over each week's record at the end of the week. Make a summary statement and note movements of the Holy Spirit or your own growth. Do a monthly review of your journal every 30 days. This might best be done on a half-day retreat where you can prayerfully focus on your thoughts in solitude and silence. As you do this, you will begin to see the accumulated value of the Word, your course work, and your experience in ministry all coming together in ways you had not considered possible. This is integration, weaving together faith development with learning. Integration

moves information from your head to your heart so that ministry is a matter of being rather than doing. Journaling will help you answer the central question of education: "Why do I do what I do when I do it?"

Journaling really is the linchpin in ministerial preparation. Your journal is the chronicle of your journey into spiritual maturity as well as content mastery. These volumes will hold the rich insights that will pull your education together. A journal is the tool for integration. May you treasure the journaling process!

Bibliography

Books

Manual, Church of the Nazarene. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 2005, Part V "Ministry and Christian Service" paragraphs 400-435.8

Hutchenson, Richard G. Jr. *The Churches and the Chaplaincy.* Philadelphia, PA: US Government Printing Office, 1997 (Revised Ed).

Pinnock, Clark H. *A Wideness in God's Mercy: The Finality of Jesus Christ In a World of Religions.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992

Journals/Magazines

"Chaplaincy: The Greatest Story Never Told," *Journal of Pastoral Care,* 50:1 (Spring 1996), 1-12.

Internet Sources

http://www.americancatholic.org/Messenger/Oct2001/Wiseman

http://www.answers.com/topic/september-11-attacks September 11, 2001 events

www.easumbandy.com Thomas G. Bandy paper written for the United Methodists

http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/ Harris poll

http://www.icisf.org/ International Critical Incident Stress Foundation

http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0017/_P3I.HTM Roman Catholic Canon Law for the Rite of Anointing of the Sick (Canons 998-1007)

http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0017/_P2S.HTM Roman Catholic Canon Law for exceptions to administration of the sacraments (Canons 844 series)

http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03579b.htm Catholic Encyclopedia article on origin of "chaplain"

http://www.preciousheart.net/chaplaincy/Greatest_Story_Never.htm. "Chaplaincy: The Greatest Story Never Told," *Journal of Pastoral Care,* 50:1 (Spring 1996), 1-12.

Lesson 1: The Legacy of Chaplaincy Ministry

Due This Lesson
>   None

Learner Objectives

>   By the end of this lesson, participants will
>   - be able to define "chaplain" and "chaplaincy ministry"
>   - be able to discuss the Biblical foundation and mandate for chaplaincy ministry
>   - be able to discuss the historical legacy that informs chaplaincy ministry

Homework Assignments

>   Read Resource 1-4: "Preface" to *The Churches and the Chaplaincy* by Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr. Prepare three questions or important ideas this reading presented to you. Bring two copies, one to turn in to the instructor and one to keep for group discussion.

>   Read *Manual,* Church of the Nazarene, Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 2005 (paragraphs 23-25, 403-403.3, 405, 412-421, 423-423.1)

>   Read the article "Chaplaincy: The Greatest Story Never Told," *Journal of Pastoral Care,* 50:1 (Spring 1996), 1-12. It may be accessed on the web at: http://www.preciousheart.net/chaplaincy/Greatest_Story_Never.htm. Prepare three questions or important ideas from each reading that challenged you as you read. Bring two copies, one to turn in to the instructor and one to keep for group discussion.

>   Begin working on Resource 1-5: Identify a full-time endorsed chaplain (does not have to be a Nazarene if there is not one immediately available, but must be ENDORSED!) to interview. Arrange to interview the chaplain in his or her ministry environment. This interview will be the basis for an oral presentation in class during Lessons 8 and 10. During the process the student will assess his or her own suitability to minister as a chaplain in this unique setting.

>   Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus.

"Who am I and Who are You?"

You have 4 to 5 minutes each to interview each other, focusing on the items outlined below.

Name

Family roots

Faith roots

Call to ministry

Life goals

Ministry goals

Worst ministry nightmare

Anticipation of course content and intersection in ministry

Other items of interest

Chaplaincy Defined

"Chaplain" from the Latin "Chaplet" means "Protector" or "keeper of the Holy."

Church of the Nazarene *Manual* Definition (paragraph 405):
  Characteristics of a Chaplain are:

  1.

  2.

  3.

  4.

  5.

  6.

  7.

  8.

  9.

  10.

  11.

  12.

  13.

  14.

  15.

"Chaplaincy Ministry is the delivery of _____ _____ by an authorized (_____) chaplain representing a particular denomination or faith group to the members of a defined, closed, _____ community at the request of the controlling organization which provides _____, _____ _____ to its members, and the _____ to carry out _____ upon functions within its sphere of operations."

Chaplaincy Services Logo

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
USGPO, Philadelphia, PA, 1997 (Revised Ed.)

Preface
[Excerpts]

This book was first published in 1975, in the period following the Vietnamese War. Since then, the last quarter of the twentieth century has brought major changes, both in the armed forces and in the American society they serve.

As the project unfolded . . . it became clear that changes in the American society itself are in some ways presenting the greatest contemporary challenges to the chaplaincy. These changes call into question in various ways the traditional place of religion in American public life. They include such trends as the growing secularization of American life and institutions, the privatization of religion, changing patterns of religious pluralism, developments on legal and constitutional issues having to do with church and state, and a number of fairly dramatic changes within the American religious community itself.

The legitimacy and viability of the military chaplaincy as an institution are well established. It faces no significant foreseeable threat. But as the most conspicuous arena in which the interests of church and state inevitably and necessarily intersect, the chaplaincy must increasingly address itself to these aspects of its cultural and social setting.

An obvious example is contemporary religious pluralism. In the mid-seventies, America was regarded as a Judeo-Christian nation. The Protestant-Catholic-Jew paradigm of American religion, popularized in the 1950s by a book with that name written by the Jewish philosopher Will Herberg, was normative. The nation had from the beginning been religiously pluralistic, particularly within Protestantism. Pluralism was and always had been a major issue for the military chaplaincy, which had to provide opportunities for the free exercise of religion for service people of many denominations.

In the last quarter of the 20th century, however, the nature of American religious pluralism has changed. Increased immigration from Asian nations has brought larger numbers of non-Judeo-Christian Americans. Black Muslim movements, originally distinct from orthodox Islam but gradually moving toward the Islamic mainstream, have shifted some African Americans into the non-Judeo-Christian category. Growing numbers of Islamic mosques and Buddhist or Hindu temples have appeared in major metropolitan areas and in some instances in smaller population centers as well.

Perhaps most important of all has been the changed perception of the nature of American pluralism. The statistical shifts have not been of major scope. Well over 90% of those who identify with a particular religious body call themselves Christians. The population is still overwhelmingly Judeo-Christian in terms of statistics. But with growing numbers who do not identify with any religion at all and who prefer to think of America as a secular nation, and with the small but nevertheless real growth in

numbers of adherents of non-Judeo-Christian religions, the change in perception is real and significant.

In the military chaplaincy itself, the commissioning of Muslim imams as chaplains in the Army and Navy has been a change of massive proportions. Along with this goes the expectation that a Buddhist chaplain will be commissioned in one of the armed services in the foreseeable future. So within the chaplaincies any official language which is exclusively Judeo-Christian is largely gone. For the armed forces, "churches" have become "faith groups." Provision of opportunities for the free exercise of religion by non-Judeo-Christian groups, where present, has become a routine duty of chaplains. Emblems and seals that combined the cross and the tablets of law or Star of David are being re-designed.

In this context the chaplaincy has become a major arena for the development of a new kind of cooperative pluralism, quite different from that of World Wars I and II, the Korean and Vietnamese Wars. Decisions on religion in the armed forces cannot in the future be made solely in terms of Judeo-Christian assumptions. This book recognizes that fact and explores its implications in many ways.

But as an analysis of the down-to-earth dimensions of military ministry, the book must also deal with everyday realities. One of these everyday realities is that with 2500 chaplains on active duty in the three services [Instructor's note: these numbers were downsized drastically in 1998 under former president Clinton in an effort to balance the budget but the following percentages in reference to faith group adherence remain stable], 2498 of them (99.92%) are Christian or Jews, and that almost as large a percentage are Christians of one denomination or another. Further, more than 99% of the soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who state a preference identify with a religion in the Judeo/Christian tradition.

A second reality is that those non-Judeo-Christians who have emigrated to the United States have, in considerable measure, come to this nation in search of the kinds of values that America has inherited from its Judeo-Christian roots. They have found a considerable measure of commonality, have made themselves at home in the American environment, and have become a treasured part of its mix.

A third reality is that comparable percentages of the professional literature and research applicable to and used by chaplains come from Judeo-Christian sources. Current works in religious history, biblical studies, pastoral studies, homiletics, sociology of religion, ethics, resources in spirituality, including many that are useful to non-Judeo-Christian American religious leaders, reflect the religious context of the authors and researchers.

<div align="right">

Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
July, 1997

</div>

Interview and Oral Presentation

To accomplish this assignment you are to <u>interview a full-time endorsed chaplain</u>.

It is not necessary to select a Nazarene chaplain to interview. However, the interview must be with an <u>endorsed</u> chaplain of a recognized denomination or faith group

The <u>endorsed</u> chaplain to be interviewed may be selected from any of the four categories or classifications of chaplaincy ministry that are of interest: corrections, health care, industry, military.

Arrange to interview the <u>endorsed</u> chaplain at his or her workplace in the environment that chaplaincy ministry is performed.

The following items must be explored in the interview with the <u>endorsed</u> chaplain:

1. Qualifications, training, professional certifications, and other requirements needed to be employed as a chaplain in that classification.
2. Challenges unique to this classification.
3. Compensations received for ministry (not limited to monetary).
4. Identity and unique characteristics of each subset (i.e., congregation) target of ministry within the institution.
5. Details of a typical day of ministry.

The interview notes will be used to develop an oral presentation for your fellow students during Lessons 8 and 10. Your instructor will allocate the amount of time you will be given to give your presentation based upon the number of students in the class with each student receiving an equal amount of time for the presentation.

The oral presentation should be taken seriously and prepared as if you are a chaplain briefing your District Superintendent about a chaplaincy position in an institution seeking a chaplain to employ. It should be given in a professional manner from an outline and will include all of the interview items. Students will prepare a lap-chart outline for the person being briefed to follow the presentation. The instructor will play the part of the district superintendent being briefed.

The student will conclude the briefing by informing the District Superintendent why (or why not) the student would be suitable to serve as a chaplain in this position.

Lesson 2: The Chaplain's Relationship to Ministry

Due This Lesson

Questions from Resource 1-4
Reading *Manual* excerpts
Questions from "Chaplaincy: The Greatest Story Never Told"
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- understand and be able to discuss the functions (roles) of a chaplain
- understand and be able to discuss the parameters of chaplaincy

Homework Assignments

Read Resource 2-2. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and your ministry. Bring two copies to class.

Continue working on your interview and oral presentation as defined in the Syllabus.

Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

"We have seen a conflict between withdrawal into purely private spirituality and the biblical impetus to see religion as involved with the whole of life. Parker Palmer suggests that this apparent contradiction can be overcome:

> Perhaps the most important ministry the church can have in the renewal of public life is a "ministry of paradox": not to resist the inward turn of American spirituality on behalf of effective public action, but to deepen and direct and discipline that inwardness in the light of faith until God leads us back to a vision of the public and to faithful action on the public's behalf.

Palmer seems to be asserting with respect to religious individualism . . . that American individualism is not to be rejected but transformed by reconnecting it to the public realm."[1]

"The Hebrews . . . saw . . . character as essentially moral. 'Righteousness' in the Bible is not just a matter of what we do and is certainly not just what we say. Righteousness is a matter of the heart. It is about who we are at the core of our beings—before God. Someone who is well intentioned but who fails to follow through is irresponsible. Someone who behaves well outwardly but who inwardly is resentful, lustful, selfish, or proud is a hypocrite. From such a point of view, character can never simply be inherited. Nor does it just grow like a weed. It has to be formed and cultivated—with help that is higher than human."[2]

The Chaplain's Relationship to Ministry

The Functions of a Chaplain
- Prophet

- Priest

- Wiseman

The Parameters of Chaplaincy Ministry
- Incarnational

- Sacramental

- Supervisional

- Doctrinal

- Developmental

- Philosophical

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 1

The Chaplain's Two Institutions

Writers on the military chaplaincy frequently begin with the story of St. Martin of Tours, a compassionate fourth century soldier who encountered a shivering beggar on a cold winter night. Having no money in his purse, he took off his cloak and slashed it with his sword to give half to the beggar. Later that night he saw a vision in which Christ was wearing the half-cloak. As a result of this experience he was baptized as a Christian. Ultimately he left the army to devote his life to the church. In time he became the patron saint of the French kings of the Middle Ages. St. Martin's cloak (cappella) was carried into battle by the kings as a banner signifying the presence of God. But since the capella was a sacred relic of the church, a priest went along as custodian. This keeper of the cloak, or cappellanus, also tended the king's religious needs, and from his office was derived that of "chaplain." The depository for the cloak became the "chapel," the place of worship.

The story is more than a quaint bit of etymology explaining the origin of the terms "chaplain" and "chapel." It is also a clue which points to the essential nature of the chaplaincy. The cappellanus was a member of one institution—a priest of the church—serving in another institution—the king's army. Definitions of the chaplaincy seldom take sufficient account of this institutional duality. Chaplains are unique in the military as the only group of officers whose primary identification is with a non-military institution. But they are also unique in the church, as the only large group of clergy who are commissioned officers in a military institution. A chaplain has "one foot in heaven" and the other in a combat boot.

Church historian George H. Williams, author of an excellent brief history of the military chaplaincy published as part of a larger if somewhat hostile volume in the 1970's, saw clearly that the ministry of chaplains is "fundamentally different from that of his pastoral colleagues" because of the relationship of chaplains to the non-religious institution in which they serve. But he noted the difference primarily in terms of the procedures by which the chaplains are chosen and installed in their work.[3] The major aspect of the dual relationship on which he focused was his claim that the Army and Navy have historically taken the place of denominations for chaplains. The implications were not developed beyond this.

An appreciation of the significance of institutional duality—the fact that a chaplain is not just affiliated with, but is fully part of, two major social institutions—is a key to understanding both the problems and the opportunities of the chaplaincy. The dual relationship is, of course, obvious to everyone familiar with the chaplaincy, but the implications have not really been taken seriously by most of the American churches until fairly recently. Only the Roman Catholic Church has asserted firm control over its chaplains. Within the armed forces even now there are some—including a few chaplains—who pay little attention to the fact that military clergy have a dual set of obligations.

Historical Development of Institutional Duality

In the early days of the American military chaplaincy, institutional duality was largely unrecognized. At that stage of our history the churches themselves had not, for the most part, assumed the complete institutional form by which they are now characterized. As institutions they had little or nothing to do with the establishment of a chaplaincy. It came about, rather, as a result of the felt need of the citizen-soldiers and sailors of the revolutionary period for the same kind of parochial religious leadership in war to which they were accustomed in peace. The initiative came largely from the militiamen and seamen themselves, and the major institutional loyalty of the early chaplains was to the military congregations they served.

The desirability of a chaplaincy was never really debated in the colonial and revolutionary period when the American armed forces were formed. It was taken for granted. The Continental Army grew out of the local and state militia, and militiamen brought their own parson—usually the town minister—into battle with them as a matter of course. The diary of President Stiles of Yale indicated that on November 17, 1774, eighty–three armed men of East Guilford marched off with Mr. Todd, their pastor; a hundred men of Haddon with their pastor, Mr. May; and a hundred more from Chatham with their pastor, Mr. Boardman.[4] This pattern was not unusual.

The identification of the interests of the new nation with the interests of Christianity was far more commonplace during the Revolution than it has been in later periods. In the middle of the nineteenth century J.T. Headly, in one of the early books on the beginnings of American military chaplaincy, commented on their revolutionary ardor. In addition to being "earnest, self-denying ministers of God," many chaplains, he said,

> *Were bold and active patriots, stirring up rebellion, encouraging the weak and timid by their example as well as by their teachings, and inspiring the brave and true with confidence by their heroism and lofty trust in the righteousness of the cause they vindicated.[5]*

The method of appointing chaplains to the militia units varied from colony to colony. In Virginia regimental chaplains were appointed by the legislature.[6] In most instances, however, the local initiative principle, with the pastor brought from home or selected by the unit served, was the norm. Similarly, earliest Navy chaplains were selected by ship commanders.

As the militia units were incorporated into the Continental Army, so were their chaplains. In July, 1775, the Continental Congress put the Army chaplaincy on a federal basis by providing that their pay be twenty dollars a month. In November of that same year Navy regulations were adopted, including this second article:

> *The Commanders of the ships of the thirteen United Colonies, are to take care that divine service be performed twice a day on board, and a sermon preached on Sunday, unless bad weather or other extraordinary accidents prevent.[7]*

The pay for Navy chaplains was soon thereafter fixed at the same amount paid in the Army, twenty dollars a month.

Within a year after the official authorization of a chaplaincy for the Continental Army, George Washington issued the following order:

> *The honorable Continental Congress having been pleased to allow a Chaplain to each Regiment, the Colonels or commanding officers of each Regiment are directed to procure Chaplains accordingly; persons of good characters and*

exemplary lives—to see that all inferior officers and soldiers pay them a suitable respect and attend carefully upon religious exercises.[8]

Note that the responsibility was placed on regimental commanders to procure their own chaplains. From the beginning, then, the nation provided chaplains in both the Army and the Navy. There was no thought, however, of common standards, policies, or procurement practices. Not even ordination was a universal requirement. Local initiative and local choice on the part of the militia company, regiment, or ship were the rules for the early period of American military history.[9] The central government was only minimally involved, and the American religious denominations, as institutions, were not involved at all.

It should be remembered, however, that in this period American religion generally was decentralized, democratic, and locally-oriented. Sidney Ahlstrom, in his classic *Religious History of the American People,* called it an age of "Democratic Evangelicalism."[10] Alexis de Toqueville, in his famous book about the new nation, *Democracy in America,* commented extensively on the voluntarism of American religion.[11] While denominationalism was clearly the pattern developed in America, it was a ground-up denominationalism of churches coming together to meet their common needs, rather than a top-down denominationalism of hierarchies exercising control. Not until the twentieth century did denominations develop large central bureaucracies. Even those faith groups that in the old world had powerful hierarchies—Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism—developed more decentralized patterns in the new world. Not until 1898 did the Protestant Episcopal Church even suggest to the government that the denomination be consulted before Episcopal ministers were appointed as chaplains.

The American churches showed little interest in establishing standards or exercising control over military chaplains throughout the early years of the chaplaincy's existence. The central government gradually assumed responsibility as needs became apparent. Such public debate and legislative action as took place throughout the nineteenth century centered mainly around such matters as pay, uniform, rank and officer status. The churches as institutions took little or no part in these early debates. The *General Regulations* issued by the Navy Department in 1841 required for the first time that any person appointed a chaplain in the Navy "be a regularly ordained or licensed clergyman,"[12] but a later ruling by the Attorney General determined that the Navy Department did not have the authority to issue such regulations. The first federally established standards for Army chaplains came with the Act of Congress of 17 July 1872. In addition to ordination or its equivalent, that legislation required a recommendation from the ordaining denomination or from five accredited ministers of that denomination. Similar legislation for Navy chaplains, with the additional requirement of a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Divinity degree and at least one year of pastoral experience, failed to pass the Congress of 1878, but was passed in 1880 with the deletion of the educational requirement.

It should be noted that these developments did not originate in institutional pressure from the churches; major impetus for the establishment of professional standards came from the chaplains themselves. Navy chaplain Joseph Stockbridge, in an 1853 letter to the Secretary of the Navy, complained that the exclusive accountability of chaplains to their commanding officers had an adverse effect on their ministry. "Besides these considerations," he added, "there is no ecclesiastical power to which Chaplains are accountable."[13]

As chaplains gradually began to acquire a feeling of identity within their respective services, they sought to establish some measure of control over their professional life. In 1878 six chaplains petitioned the Secretary of the Navy to establish a Board of Chaplains to pass on the credentials and professional qualifications for appointment. In 1906 a group of three chaplains, appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to make a study, presented a similar recommendation, and in 1908 such a board was for the first time established. The Army, in 1899, raised its standards by requiring each chaplaincy applicant to pass an examination "as to his moral, mental and physical qualifications as may be prescribed by the President." The mental examination was the same kind given to candidates for a Regular Army officer's commission. In 1901 this system was further refined with a general description of the examination and the weight to be given each part.[14] A Chief of Chaplains was for the first time appointed in the Navy in 1917, and the Army acquired its first Chief of Chaplains in 1920.

Developments within the Churches

Denominational interest in establishing control over the chaplaincy lagged far behind this development of corps or branch identity and organization within the services. The first evidences of interest came during the Civil War. Several southern denominations took an active role in recruiting chaplains for the Confederate Army, and there was some evidence of similar interest in the North. General awareness of the responsibility of the churches did not become nationally visible, however, until the Spanish-American War. As noted above, the Protestant Episcopal Church recommended in 1898 that the denomination be consulted before the appointment of any Episcopalian as a chaplain. The government, accepting this principle, established a firm requirement for denominational endorsement for chaplains of both services in congressional acts of 1899 and 1901.[15]

This denominational approval, now know as "ecclesiastical endorsement," has been a firm requirement for appointment since that time. The form and source of such endorsement varied widely for many years, but the requirement led denominations to begin establishing agencies and procedures for providing it. The Catholic archbishops of the United States in 1905 designated a representative to deal with the government in the appointment of Catholic chaplains. In 1906 the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North, asked President Theodore Roosevelt to refer all Methodist candidates for appointment to a board headed by Bishop Cranston of Washington, and this procedure was established.[16] At no time did the government resist participation by the denominations in chaplaincy matters when such participation was offered.

It was at the time of the First World War that institutional concern of the churches for the chaplaincy began to take firm form. In 1914 a number of Protestant churches adopted a unified approach in their dealings with the military services. The Federal Council of Churches in that year established a Washington Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains, consisting of two Methodists, two Presbyterians, and two Episcopalians. The impetus behind this action came from a Navy chaplain, George Livingston Bayard, who had appeared before a meeting of the Federal Council in Baltimore in 1913 to urge its establishment. Chaplain Bayard also formulated a bill which was passed by Congress in 1914, providing a chaplain for each 1,250 military personnel.

As the United States entered World War I, Secretary of War Newton D. Baker requested a central accrediting agency to endorse chaplains being recruited for wartime expansion. In response, the Washington Committee was reorganized to

include one member of each of the thirty-two denominations constituting the Federal Council. At that time it was renamed the General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains. The chairman of the reorganized committee negotiated an understanding with both the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War "by which it was agreed that the Federal Council should have authority to investigate and nominate all Protestant candidates for chaplaincy."[17]

The World War I period represented the high water mark of Protestant cooperation in dealing with the chaplaincy. During that period the General Committee took an active role in establishing quotas for various denominations on a percentage basis. By attention to ministerial qualifications and by insisting on evaluation by denominational officials rather than relying on letters from fellow-ministers, it hastened the demise of appointments based on patronage or political considerations. It raised educational standards, insisting on a college degree and giving preference to those with seminary training.[18]

A significant step in the development of institutional duality came from the Roman Catholic Church in 1917, when the Pope appointed Archbishop Patrick Hayes of New York as Military Bishop Ordinary. This had the effect of establishing a military diocese, consisting of Catholics in the armed forces under the religious leadership of their chaplains. For the first time a church assumed clear responsibility not just for standards of selection and endorsement of chaplains but also for their ministry to Catholic personnel within the armed forces. There was no inclination whatever on the part of the armed forces to challenge this assumption of ecclesiastical responsibility.

The Second World War brought the final stage in the evolution of the chaplaincy to the present level of institutional duality. With total mobilization for a war supported almost unanimously by the churches of the nation, thousands of civilian pastors became chaplains for the duration, with no sense of loss of ecclesiastical identification. The General Commission (formerly Committee) on Army and Navy Chaplains, now independent of the Federal Council of Churches, represented an even broader constituency than before. It still spoke for many of the Protestant denominations in dealing with the government, but a number of denominations also formed their own committees or agencies and endorsing procedures for chaplains. These committees no longer limited themselves solely to endorsement. The churches saw their task as that of extending their ministries to a whole nation at war. They provided equipment for chaplains such as portable altar kits, vestments, books, and Bibles. They published pamphlets and devotional books for military use. They sent their officials all over the world to visit and encourage their chaplains.

The pattern established by the Roman Catholic Military Ordinariate was highly influential as the model for institutional duality. As diocesan headquarters for all Catholics in the armed forces, the Ordinariate maintains central files for all ecclesiastical records of Catholic chaplains. Baptisms, confirmations, marriages, and other clerical activities are recorded there, and Catholics throughout the military are fully integrated into the institutional life of the church. Other denominations, within the limits of their own polities, have sought to establish similar operations.

Addressing Institutional Duality at Two Levels

A thorough exploration of what it means to be a member of two major social institutions, of the effect of this dual responsibility on the chaplaincy and its potential for effective ministry, will be one of the tasks of this book. Institutional duality brings

many benefits. The military identity of chaplains gives them unparalleled opportunities to relate, not as outsiders but as comrades in arms, to their parishioners. It brings them into positive ministerial contact not just with members of their own denominations, but with those of many denominations and faith groups. It gives them opportunities to minister not just parochially but to the military organization itself.

At the same time these ministries raise issues that have long been controversial in some church circles: the propriety of clergy wearing military uniforms and holding officer rank; the danger of subordinating religious teachings to military goals; the relationship of religion to patriotism and American ideals. Much of this book will be devoted to an analysis of this unique form of ministry, its special opportunities and challenges, its dangers and pitfalls.

But behind the institutional duality of military ministry itself lies a larger duality: the relationship of church and state, the place of religion in American public life. Through most of our history church and state, while carefully separated by the First Amendment which forbids any establishment of religion, have coexisted in mutually beneficial harmony, since that same First Amendment protects every citizen's right to the free exercise of religion. Inevitable conflicts over particular church-state issues have been faced and resolved, but the national motto, "In God we trust" has reflected the spirit of this "one nation under God." In such a cultural context a military chaplaincy has been a comfortable institution from the perspective of both the public and the churches.

In the final third of the twentieth century, however, massive social and cultural changes have affected the whole place of religion in American public life. These began with the Vietnamese War, which produced one of the most turbulent periods in recent history, with a special impact on the chaplaincy because of heavy religious involvement in the anti-Vietnam War movement. For the first time, within some church circles, there was significant opposition to the chaplaincy.

Spearheaded by an organization called "Clergy and Laity Concerned about Vietnam," the movement was an outgrowth of the resurgent pacifism and anti-military feelings prominent within the churches in that period. A highly critical book called *Military Chaplains,* was published by that organization under the editorship of Harvey Cox.[19] There was much discussion in mainline church journals of the propriety of clergy serving in the armed forces in a war which many in the churches regarded as unjust or indefensible.

Opposition to the chaplaincy during the Vietnamese War was centered in the mainline Protestant denominations: Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, United Church of Christ and some Baptist bodies—the generally liberal denominations which had earlier dominated American Protestantism. Prior to Vietnam they had also dominated the chaplaincies. Since that time, however, there have been decreasing numbers of chaplains from these mainline Protestant groups, with corresponding increases in numbers from the more conservative denominations, many of them relatively small.

In the years since Vietnam a variety of cultural forces have gathered strength and challenged the basic accommodation between religion and the structures of public life that undergirded American faith and values from the founding of the republic. They have affected both of the institutions to which chaplains are accountable, the

American religious bodies and the armed forces, and they may challenge the chaplaincy itself, in ways that impact some of its basic assumptions.

An overview of these cultural shifts will provide a framework against which we will look throughout this book at the ministry of chaplains. They will frequently impact our analysis of the ministry of chaplains in the early chapters. In the later part of the book and particularly the final chapter we will look at them more directly, seeking to assess their impact on the future of the chaplaincy.

These changes are of two categories. Some of them change or radically question the traditional place of religion in American public life. Others are significant shifts in the shape and structure of the American religious community itself. Both categories of change may have a major impact on military chaplaincy.

Changes Affecting the Place of Religion in American Life[20]

1. The Secularization of Intellectual Life and Public Institutions

An exercise in awareness of change comes from examining the words of the once-familiar hymn "God of our Fathers, whose Almighty Hand," the trumpet-heralded tune of which is known as "National Hymn." The last three stanzas are especially revealing:

> *Thy love divine hath led us in the past;*
> *In this free land by Thee our lot is cast;*
> *Be Thou our Ruler, Guardian, Guide and Stay;*
> *Thy word our law, thy paths our chosen way.*
>
> *From war's alarms, from deadly pestilence,*
> *Be Thy strong arm our ever-sure defense;*
> *Thy true religion in our hearts increase,*
> *Thy bounteous goodness nourish us in peace.*
>
> *Refresh Thy people on their toilsome way,*
> *Lead us from night to never-ending day;*
> *Fill all our lives with love and grace divine,*
> *And glory, laud, and praise be ever thine.*[21]

The use of the non-inclusive term "fathers" in the title, together with the overall nationalistic tone, have been enough to keep the hymn out of some contemporary hymnals (or to trigger a change in the title line to "God of the Ages"). But even more striking is the portrait of the relationship between the nation and God which is assumed throughout the hymn. In the late 19th century when the hymn was written, and well into the second half of the 20th century, it was a near-universal assumption that the loving hand of God had led us in the past, and had cast the lot of the American people in this free land; that God was the nation's ruler, guardian, guide and stay; that God's word was the nation's proper law and God's paths the way chosen by the nation at its best; that God's true religion ought to increase in our hearts; and that the nation owed glory, laud and praise to God. Americans of all religions—Protestants, Catholics and Jews—agreed on these national assumptions. Even those who in their personal lives paid little attention to religion recognized a national relationship to God as the proper order of things. And in that kind of context military chaplaincies operated with a high level of comfort, both internally and on the part of the citizenry.

Clearly those assumptions are no longer shared by the dominant cultural and intellectual leadership of the society, which is now highly secularized. Secularization is not, of course, a new phenomenon. Generations of religionists have railed against it. It is not our purpose here to trace its historic development from its Enlightenment roots to the present. What is relatively new, however, is the present <u>alienation</u> of the public culture from religion, and especially from Christianity. Stephen Carter, in his widely-read 1993 book, *The Culture of Disbelief,* described a society in which religious voices and views are rejected in the public debate, simply because they are religious. He analyzes "the many ways in which our culture has come to belittle religious devotion, to humiliate believers, and even if indirectly, to discourage religion as a serious activity."[22] He describes rules for public dialogue based on "fact," which exclude "faith" as a way of knowing. Curiously, in a period when pluralism and diversity are increasingly valued, the religious voice is nevertheless excluded. "It is both tragic and paradoxical," says Carter, "that now, just as the nation is beginning to invite people into the public square for the different points of view that they have to offer, people whose contribution to the nation's diversity comes from their religious traditions are not valued unless their voices are somehow esoteric."[23]

Milton J. Coulter, John M. Mulder and Louis B. Weeks, in their book, *Vital Signs,* offer a useful analysis. They call this secularization of public life the "third disestablishment" of religion (the first having been the separation of church and state initiated by the founders, and the second the end of the de facto "Protestant establishment" of 19th century America with prominent place accorded to Catholicism and Judaism in the early twentieth century).[24] In this third cultural disestablishment, <u>all</u> religion is removed from its previously privileged position.

The impact of secularization on the chaplaincies is starkly demonstrated by statistics. Surveys show that the number of Americans who claim no religion at all is now approaching 10%. Among military personnel, however, the number is much higher: as of June 1995 18.25% listed no religious preference.[25] The experience of chaplains supports the statistical data. Said an Army chaplain interviewed for this study: "I'm seeing more soldiers now who have no Christian background, in terms of Sunday School or general religious knowledge, the kind that even ten years ago the average person would have. Now there's a much larger group that doesn't have that background. They can't relate to religious terms, or religious ways of doing things."

A partial explanation of the high percentage of military personnel listing no religious preference is to be found in the fact that most military people are young adults. This is an age bracket—and military service is an environment—in which numbers of young adults have left religion behind, many to return to it in more mature and family-oriented years. The positive side of the phenomenon is the opportunities chaplains have to present the claims of religious faith to this generation with all the advantages of insider status in the armed forces. But growing secularity is an inescapable reality for the military chaplaincy.

2. Postmodern Relativism

The secularization of society has come in the context of what is frequently called the postmodern era. "Postmodern" has been a contemporary buzzword applied to everything from art and architecture, to philosophy and theology. But the aspect of postmodernism most relevant to religious values is the relativism that dominates academia and the intellectual and media elites who conduct much of the public dialogue in our society today.

Postmodernism defines itself over against "modernity," the period and the spirit that began with the Enlightenment and dominated western culture until the latter half of the 20th century. Modernity was characterized by rationality, by a search for objective truth through human reason. It believed in the human ability to manage life and to shape the future, in science, in technology, in progress. It developed rational organizations as well as bureaucracies (which were designed to bring rationality into institutions). It believed in planning for a better society, in common values, in working toward unity and order. And religiously, for the most part, it placed all this in the context of a creating and ordering God.

The postmodern perspective sees all that as now behind us. It is a loss of faith in bureaucratic institutions, in rational control, in durable solutions to human problems, in common values. Underlying all this, and its intellectual basis in the universities and among opinion-shapers, is a rejection of absolutes of any kind. Postmodernism sees no objective truth, only plural possibilities. And without objective truth or reliable knowledge, one falls back on experience, on feelings.

A key term is deconstruction, which refers to the "uncentering of life." Instead of searching for the center, one lives with the fact that there is no center. And "center" is used here not just in terms of a mid-point between extremes, but a core of central meaning and value, accepted by all. Postmodernism says there is no central core of meaning. There are only various perspectives, and the immediate context is what matters at the moment. But instead of despairing, postmodern relativism celebrates diversity, multiculturalism, pluralistic alternatives among which the individual person makes personal choices and celebrates his or her personal perspective, respecting, or course, the differing perspectives of others. Everything is relative. One belief is as good as another, and the guideline is "whatever works for you." In this context religion has no claim to public status. It is simply one option among many—and in secular academic circles, a disreputable one.

3. Changed Perceptions of Pluralism

Along with secularization goes a significantly changed perception of the nature of American religious pluralism. We have always been and perceived ourselves as being a pluralistic people. But through the first 200 years of our national life we saw this as a denominational pluralism within a Judeo-Christian society. We all shared a value system derived from western Judeo-Christian civilization and almost universally acknowledged a national relationship to a just and righteous sovereign God.

This perception has been replace by that of a far broader kind of religious pluralism, accommodating to the increased numbers of Hindus, Buddhists and Muslims who have immigrated from Asia, and to the Black Muslim movement, originally a racial protest but now increasingly merging with orthodox Islam. The statistical change is quite modest. All American adherents of these non-Judeo-Christian religions comprise less than 1% of the population. But the change in the public perception of religious pluralism is highly significant.

Part of this altered consciousness of religious pluralism is the growing secularization of intellectual life and public institutions noted above. More significant, perhaps, than the 1% of the population identifying with non-Judeo-Christian religions is the percentage— now nearing 10%—who profess no religion at all.

American religious pluralism—its history, the present-day reality and the changed perception—will be addressed in greater detail in chapter 6.

4. Privatization of Religion

A parallel development, in part the result of secularization and the altered perception of pluralism has been the relegation of religion to the private sphere of life. This tends to take it out of the area of public concern. Pannenberg and others speak of the "bracketing" of religion—that is, placing religion in brackets, separated from the ordinary rules of public discourse that govern the rest of life.[26] Within the brackets one is free to believe anything one wants.

Like secularization, privatization of religion is not new. Toqueville in the 1830s commented on the individualist religious attitudes of Americans, though "everything in the moral field is fixed and certain" since "Christianity reigns without obstacles, by universal consent."[27] Once again, however, contemporary America has taken it to new extremes. Sociologist Robert Bellah and his colleagues, in their influential 1985 book, *Habits of the Heart,* focused on the "fierce individualism" of our times that undercuts a sense of community and the common good. "Today religion in America is as private and diverse as New England colonial religion was public and unified, they said."[28] Their now-classic illustration was "Sheilaism," a young woman's religion (she called it her "faith") that was so personal and private she had named it after herself. It was entirely free of any relationship to a church or religious community.

Even those—far more numerous—who are closely related to and active in more conventional churches are still individualistic in their beliefs and involvement. Bellah et al, cited a 1978 Gallup poll in which 80 percent of Americans agreed that "an individual should arrive at his or her own beliefs independent of any churches or synagogues."[29] Even among Roman Catholics, according to a 1988 Gallup Poll, 77% reported that they relied on their own consciences rather than papal teachings in making difficult moral decision.[30]

An extreme form of privatization is identified by Stephen Carter in terms of "God as a hobby." Religion, in the view of secularists who set the terms of public discourse, takes its place in the same category as stamp collecting or clog dancing, as a purely personal idiosyncrasy. "It's perfectly all right to believe that stuff," but it is not to be taken seriously.[31]

The privatization phenomenon affects the military chaplaincy in two ways. The first undermines the legitimacy of a publicly-provided chaplaincy. The position is taken by some that the private nature of religion takes it out of the realm of public concern. The nation, in this view, has no business providing for the practice of religious faith, which is entirely an individual responsibility.

Similarly, those who push privatization to the extreme do not recognize that service men and women have a need for chaplains, since what they do religiously is entirely a matter of private practice. "Sheilaism" is provided by Sheila. The privatization of religion affects the attitudes toward the chaplaincy of some within the military, as well as public support of the institution in the nation at large.

The Constitutionality Question

The most serious contemporary threat to the military chaplaincy, which strikes directly at institutional duality itself, has been the challenge to its constitutionality, which began to assume significant proportions during and following the Vietnamese War.

This was not altogether new. Earlier challenges, however, were usually addressed to Congress rather than the courts. In 1818 the Kehukee Primitive Baptist Association asked Congress to "repeal all laws authorizing the appointments of Chaplains to Congress, the army, navy, and other public stations," a request on which no action was taken. A series of memorials in mid-century, in 1850, 1853, and 1854, once again challenged publicly-funded chaplaincies, on explicitly constitutional grounds. The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives rejected them, affirming the constitutionality of such programs.[32]

The anti-Vietnamese War movement of the sixties and seventies brought a new wave of challenges. The highly critical 1971 book, *Military Chaplains,* mentioned earlier, included a chapter by Randolph L. Jonakait, arguing that the chaplaincy was unconstitutional.[33] In 1973 the American Civil Liberties Union distributed a study on "Abuses of the Military Chaplaincy" by the same author, and, reversing its long-standing support of the chaplaincy, announced its intention of beginning court tests of constitutionality.[34] This second study by Jonakait had been initiated and jointly sponsored by the Board for Homeland Ministries of the United Church of Christ.

In the same year a report of a Chaplaincy Task Force of the United Church of Christ included a chapter questioning the constitutionality of the chaplaincy. When presented to the Ninth General Synod of that church the report elicited a good bit of controversy on the floor. It was approved "in principle," but referred to a special committee for further study and resubmission to the Tenth General Synod. That Synod, meeting in 1975, rejected the report (as had the parent body of the Task Force, the Board for Homeland Ministries) and reaffirmed its faith in the military chaplaincy as a worthwhile institution. A study by a United Presbyterian Task Force in the same period gave considerable attention to the constitutionality issue, but its conclusions affirmed the present pattern.

The debate on constitutionality has hinged on two clauses of the First Amendment. That amendment begins, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Opponents label the chaplaincy an establishment of religion, violating the first clause. Defenders have claimed that failure to provide a chaplaincy would deprive those in the armed forces of their right to the free exercise of religion, violating the second.

Constitutionality can be decided definitively only by the Supreme Court, and no test has yet reached that level of the judicial system. Several Supreme Court justices have given en passant opinions in discussing related cases. The clearest such opinion came from Mr. Justice Brennan, concurring in the majority opinion in the case of Abingdon School District v. Schemp, in 1963:

> There are certain practices, conceivably violative of the Establishment Clause, the striking down of which might seriously interfere with certain religious liberties also protected by the First Amendment. Provisions for churches and chaplains at military establishments for those in the armed services may afford one such example. . . . It is argued that such provisions may be presumed to contravene the Establishment Clause, yet be sustained on constitutional

grounds as necessary to secure to the members of the Armed Forces . . . those rights of worship guaranteed under the Free Exercise Clause. Since government has deprived such persons of the opportunity to practice their faith at places of their choice, the argument runs, government may, in order to avoid infringing the free exercise guaranteed, provide substitutes where it requires such persons to be . . . Hostility, not neutrality would characterize the refusal to provide chaplains and places of worship for soldiers cut off by the State from all civilian opportunities for public communion.[35]

Justice Goldberg, in a separate concurring opinion in the same case, with Justice Harlan joining, agreed that it appears "clear . . . from the opinions in the present and past cases that the court would recognize the propriety of providing military chaplains."[36] Justice Stewart, in a dissenting opinion in the same case, also gave an indication that the chaplaincy is constitutional. The only Supreme Court justice to have gone on record with an opinion that the chaplaincy violates the constitution was Justice Douglas, in the 1963 case of Engel v. Vitale.[37]

In 1979, in the case of Marsh v. Chambers, the constitutionality of paying a chaplain to open sessions of the Nebraska legislature with prayer was challenged. The district court found that compensating the chaplain violated the establishment clause, though the offering of prayer itself did not. Both sides appealed the decision, and the appellate court found the practice unconstitutional. The Supreme Court, however, reversed the appeals court. Chief Justice Warren Burger, in a decision relying primarily on history and noting that sessions of the U.S. Congress had been opened with prayer by chaplains for more than 200 years, said there could be no doubt that the practice of opening legislative sessions with prayer had become part of the fabric of American society.

The appellate court in this case noted that "the plaintiff concedes that tax paid chaplains have been upheld, for example, in the context of military bases, where the nature of the government service would restrict free exercise rights if a chaplain were not provided."[38]

The only challenge to the constitutionality of the military chaplaincy to have been litigated in the court system in recent years was the case of Katcoff v. Marsh, which reached the level of the Second Circuit appellate court, New York, in 1985. The challenge was initiated by two students at Harvard Law School, Joel Katcoff and Allen M. Wieder, in 1979. The two men, then aged 24 and 25, initiated the challenge in November of that year, with a civil suit in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York in Brooklyn. Though it attacked the Army chaplaincy only, the other military chaplaincies were by implication also under the gun.

The Army Chief of Chaplains, then Chaplain (Major General) Kermit D. Johnson (succeeded before the case was settled by Chaplain (MG) Patrick J. Hessian), worked with the Army's Judge Advocate General's office and the Department of Justice. Recognizing the need for legal expertise, Chaplain Johnson invited Army Reserve Chaplain (Colonel and later Brigadier General) Israel Drazin, an attorney and a rabbi, to return to active duty in connection with the handling of the case. Chaplain Drazin accepted the invitation, and reported for active duty in March, 1981. The actual litigation was handled by trial attorneys in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of New York.

After a long series of legal maneuvers, interrogatories and various motions, the government, on 14 April 1982, filed a motion for dismissal and summary judgment. Such a motion would permit resolution of the case through written legal arguments rather than a lengthy trial. The plaintiffs also filed a motion for summary judgment, opposed by the government in a lengthy document. On 1 February 1984 Judge Joseph M. McLaughlin rendered his decision in a 39-page document. The government had argued that the courts must defer to Congress on certain matters, and he recounted a long series of congressional actions in establishing and supporting a chaplaincy. Judge McLaughlin agreed that "judicial inquiry into the constitutionality of the Army Chaplaincy Program must be attended by a greater deference to congressional action than is typically required." Evaluating the reason for which Congress had established the chaplaincy, he concluded that it was necessary to secure the free exercise rights of military personnel. He concluded that "the Army Chaplaincy Program is a constitutionally permissible means to a constitutionally mandated end."[39]

Katcoff and Weider filed an appeal to the Second Circuit appellate court. Extensive documents were filed by both sides, and the appellate court's decision, handed down in January 1985, in the main affirmed the constitutionality of the chaplaincy. "Unless the Army provided a chaplaincy it would deprive the soldier of his right under the Establishment clause not to have religion inhibited and of his right under the Free Exercise clauses to practice his freely chosen religion." The court agreed with the plaintiffs, however, that certain parts of the Army chaplaincy program, such as services in the Pentagon, in areas where civilian facilities are as available to military as to non-military personnel, and services to retired personnel and their families, should be examined further. They therefore remanded these parts of the case.

However, the plaintiffs, having lost the substance of the case, asked to drop it in return for not having to pay several thousand dollars of the government's cost on appeal, for which they would be liable should they lose again. Chaplain Hessian, the Chief of Chaplains, was reluctant to consent, believing that if the case were pursued the Supreme Court would ultimately affirm the constitutionality of the chaplaincy. He was persuaded to concur, however, and the case was dropped short of a final resolution.

It appears unlikely that another significant challenge will be mounted in the near future. The anti-militarism of the Vietnam War era, when some elements in the churches themselves took the lead in challenging the chaplaincy, is long gone. The presumption of constitutionality, based on firmly embedded national tradition, the long history of congressional support, and absence of alternative ways of providing military personnel with opportunities for the free exercise of religion, is strong. Katcoff v. Marsh examined extensively attempts that have been made to provide for the free exercise of religion by means other than a chaplaincy. Though civilian resources are available at stateside bases, all such attempts have failed in the context of deployment or combat. Since it is for these situations that armed forces exist, it seems clear that a chaplaincy is the only available means of providing a constitutionally-mandated right.

Changes Within the American Religious Community

1. Declining Significance of Denominations

Coulter, Mulder and Weeks, in Vital Signs, list the declining significance of denominations as an important change that has affected American church life in the

late twentieth century.[40] In part, this is a natural result of privatization, with people substituting their own inner authority for the kind of authority once accorded to hierarchies or denominational decision-making. It also reflects a growing feeling among religious people that denominational differences and theological traditions are unimportant. Within Protestantism people move freely from denomination to denomination, and increasingly this is true of moves between Protestantism and Catholicism. In today's transient society, church-shopping newcomers in a community are less likely to look for a church of a particular denomination with which they identify than to select a congregation that meets their self-perceived needs, with little regard for denominational affiliation.

For these and other reasons, congregations have become the center of power in every mainstream Protestant denomination. The percentage of giving going beyond local congregations to support denominational activities has been in decline for more than two decades.[41] Central bureaucracies have repeatedly downsized, and their influence has deteriorated sharply. The most rapidly growing segment of Protestantism today is the so-called mega-churches, many of which are independent of any denominational affiliation at all.

It is not surprising that young adults entering the military, having grown up in this context, list themselves simply as having "no preference." An Air Force chaplain, interviewed for this study, spoke of the absence of denominational loyalty in many Air Force personnel he had encountered. "If you talk to them they will deny any denominational affiliation. 'My Mom was this, my Dad was that, and I don't care.' This is the post-denominational era. They don't want any part of the formal church. But time and time again I find them telling me, 'I do my own Bible study. I do my own devotions. I have a one-to-one relationship with God.' And if you press them a little they will come up with a Christian confession . . . Is it good news or bad news? I don't know. But it's real."

It is important to recognize, however, that denominations are not disappearing. Though their significance to individual church members is declining and though the center of attention is now the congregation, denominations remain the pattern that organizes most of American religious life. Central agencies of mainline churches are declining, but those of the rapidly-growing evangelical denominations are not. The central structure of the largest Protestant group, the Southern Baptist Convention, is probably growing both in strength and in control over local churches. Even the proliferating independent churches find ways comparable to denominational networks to meet their need for support structures. The Association of Vineyard Churches, originating with one congregation in southern California and spreading to numerous other locations, has become, in effect, a denomination in its own right. The same is true of southern California's Hope Chapel and Calvary Chapel, each with multiple branches. Denominations remain essential for congregational cooperation, for some measure of overall governance, for control and support of the clergy, and for the expression of the larger dimension of church life. Though service personnel, like civilians back home, pay less attention than was earlier the case, denominations remain important to chaplains, both personally and institutionally.

2. Decline of Conciliar Ecumenism

Along with the declining significance of denominations have come changes in the ecumenical movement. Ecumenism, once regarded as the undergirding of the cooperative ministry of chaplains, has languished. In particular, ecumenical

organizations such as the National Council and World Council of Churches, supported by mainline denominations and conspicuous in American church life in the early and middle parts of the twentieth century, have been in a serious state of decline.

On the local and practical level, however, ecumenism in the form of cooperation between persons of various denominations and faith groups, in service projects such as Habitat for Humanity and in joint worship or study groups, is flourishing. Such current ecumenical ventures frequently include Catholics, which was not true of earlier conciliar ecumenism.

3. Shift of Center of Gravity to Congregational Level

Accompanying these changes is a shift of the center of American church life from the denominational to the congregational level. Central bureaucracies are under suspicion from grassroots members. Their funding (which comes from voluntary contributions from members) has been radically decreased, their staffs have been cut and their continued existence in the present form is in question. Congregations are assuming powers formerly granted to the central structures, including far more control of financial resources.

Those Protestant denominations with traditionally strong central authority have generally been declining. Those with a congregational polity have, for the most part, been growing. Also significant is the increasing importance of large independent "seeker-friendly" congregations, of which the massive Willow Creek Church near Chicago is often considered the prototype. Regarded by some as the most significant development in contemporary church life, these flourishing independent congregations have no denominational relationship at all.

Though these trends are most evident in Protestantism, they are present in varying degrees in other faith groups. The central authority of the Roman Catholic hierarchy has continued to assert itself strongly. Individual Catholics, however, are far more likely than in an earlier period to claim the right of private judgment and to make their own choices. This characteristic of the age has also been apparent among Mormons. Some of these trends are seen in all religions.

4. Religious Polarization: The Culture Wars

One of the most important contemporary religious developments affects those of all denominations as well as independents. The last third of the 20th century has brought deep polarization within religious America. On one side of the divide are those known as liberal, progressive, or mainline. On the other side are those known as conservative, traditionalist, evangelical, or fundamentalist. Princeton University Sociologist Robert Wuthnow, in his 1988 book, *The Restructuring of American Religion,* suggested that the split, which cuts across nearly all American religious bodies, has become a more important structural feature of American religion than the denominational divisions that earlier signified divergences within the religious community. Liberal Presbyterians, Baptists, Roman Catholics, and to some extent Jews, may have more in common with each other than with conservatives in the same denominations. Wuthnow summarized the divided state of contemporary religion: "A serious degree of polarization has begun to emerge that may have sweeping ramifications for the future of American religion . . . At present the two sides seem to be deeply divided, comprising almost separate religious communities whose

differences have become far more important than those associated with denominational traditions."[42]

In a later book, *The Struggle for America's Soul,* Wuthnow pursued the same theme further, using the Presbyterian Church as "a typical case" to illustrate the polarization within a particular denomination and detailing the differences between the two groups that cut across the entire religious spectrum.[43]

University of Virginia Sociologist James Davison Hunter has put this religious split into the context of the wider polarization in the society as a whole, with a book called *Culture War: The Struggle to Define America.* At the heart of the cultural split, however, Hunter finds issues that are basically religious: the divide between the relativism of the postmodern academic world which accepts no absolutes, and the belief of conservatives in the reality of absolute, authoritative ("revealed") truth. The social/political issues over which the battle is fought, primarily abortion and homosexuality, reflect polarized religious perspectives. In a later book, *Before the Shooting Begins: Searching for Democracy in America's Culture War,* Hunter carried the same themes further. The battles fought out in congregations and denominational conventions, over women in the priesthood (for Roman Catholics and some other groups), gender-neutral or inclusive versions of hymns and scripture, ordination of homosexuals, and a variety of other issues, all reflect this new split in religious America which has little to do with denomination. The Religious Right is a political express of this religious polarization.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The most direct and apparent change in the last quarter of the century, from the perspective of the military, has been the end of the cold war, significantly altering the size and mission of the armed forces. This has brought a host of immediate and practical problems for chaplains, which we will be examining in some detail. But the extraordinarily broad and sweeping cultural and social changes, having to do with the place of religion in American society and with the shape of the American religious community itself, are in the long run more important for the chaplaincy. They have changed the entire cultural context in which the chaplaincy exists. Throughout this book we will be examining these changes and their effect on this group of people who are in the fullest sense both clergy of the church and officers of the Army, Navy or Air Force.

Lesson 3: The Chaplain's Relationship to God

Due This Lesson

Response paper to Resource 2-2
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- be able to list the elements of a strong relationship with God
- be able to discuss the need for and the importance of a chaplain's strong relationship with God

Homework Assignments

Read Resource 3-2. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.

Continue working on your interviews as defined in the Syllabus. If your interview is complete, begin work on your oral presentation to the class.

Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

"We must not sell ourselves short. I think this is the most common failure: we expect too little of God and we expect too little of ourselves. We must seek what will really fulfill us as human persons, as Christian men and women. Much of the unhappiness in our world comes from our seeking to find fulfillment and happiness in things that ultimately cannot satisfy us. In fact, only One can truly satisfy, and that is our God: 'We are made for you, O Lord, and our souls will not rest until they rest in you.' To choose as the ultimate goal of our lives anything less than God will leave us frustrated, unsatisfied, despairing of finding any meaning that is worthy of us, anything that can satisfy the limitless hunger of our minds to know, of our hearts to love. If we do not see all the other things we choose in life as in some way opening out to this infinite fullness, they will prove to be dead ends. No matter how good and beautiful they may be, no matter how much of ourselves we invest in them, there will come a time when we will say: 'Is this all there is?' And life will appear as a cruel joke, a project that can only lead to frustration and misery.

"But even as we choose the Infinite, we realize the almost infinite number of options our good Father has left open to us as ways to grow and respond to Infinite Life and Love. As we consult our own gifts, talents, and actual opportunities, our perimeters are narrowed: as human person, as a Christian, as one with a particular chosen vocation, what do I want to do? What do I want to pursue? We want to formulate as clearly and as concisely as we can, just what we want to do, what to have, seeing as clearly as possible how each thing we choose contributes, plays its part in bringing us to our ultimate goal, the fullest and deepest possible union with our God of love."[44]

The Chaplain's Relationship to God
Elements of a Strong Relationship with God

Spiritual Direction

Self Care

Divine Authority

Pastoral Authority

Ethics

Morals

Face of Jesus—incarnation/presence of the Holy

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 2

Ministering in Two Institutions

Chaplain John Jones introduced his denominational supervisor to his commanding officer with the words, "This is the only person who could get me out of the service quicker than you could." The church official was flattered, for this is the way denominational representatives would like to regard their authority. Strictly speaking, however, it was a questionable statement. Denominational endorsement is required by law before a chaplain can be commissioned, and maintenance of valid endorsement is a continuing requirement. However, withdrawal of ecclesiastical endorsement—in itself a difficult process—would not automatically bring dismissal from the service. The chaplain's right as a commissioned officer would also be considered. If he or she were guilty of misconduct or violation of law meriting dismissal through due process, this would be the likely outcome. [Instructor's note: Because a chaplain is commissioned in, for instance, the Navy "Chaplain Corps" (Geneva Convention category of non-combatant by law forbidden from carrying arms, firing a weapon or in command of troops or weapon/instrument of war) to represent a particular denomination and not as a "line officer" (Geneva Convention designator for a serving officer of the line in the chain of command who carries arms, fires weapons and/or is in command of troops or weapons/instruments of war) policy now reflects that when the authority to represent an ecclesiastical organization is removed by withdrawal of ecclesiastical endorsement the chaplain has no continued authorization to remain on active duty and is dismissed from the service or is retired if qualified by length of service.]

If, however, the issue were one of religious beliefs or ecclesiastical matters, unless the chaplain voluntarily resigned, some compromise would probably be reached. In most cases in which a chaplain for ecclesiastical reasons no longer maintains the confidence of his or her denomination, the solution is a change of denominations, amicably worked out, with a receiving denomination granting endorsement as the earlier endorsement is withdrawn. Failing such solution, the chaplain might be offered a commission in another branch or corps of the service [See instructor's note above]. Continuing service as a chaplain, however, requires not just the original endorsement but the continuing support of the religious body as well as the military service.

We began this book with an examination of the concept of institutional duality. The chaplain is not just half-military and half-church, but is fully a member of both institutions. Though the job environment of the church is left behind, full clergy status is retained. The authority of the bishop or the presbytery remains in effect. The chaplain is not only expected but probably required to attend periodically meetings of the annual conference or synod, or retreats provided by the church. The chaplain's basic function in the armed forces is that of clergy.

But at the same time the chaplain is a commissioned officer and fully a part of the military organization. The same uniform is worn, the same regulations are obeyed, the same salary is paid and duty is assigned by the same kind of orders as with any other officer. The chaplain participates fully in both institutions at once.

Under ordinary circumstance, the vocational identity of a minister is almost completely established by his or her church. It is the church that controls professional education, usually in denominational seminaries. In ordination it confers professional credentials. A career unfolds within its institutional structures. Job assignments, salary scales, vocational changes and progression, continuing education opportunities, all are determined by institutional regulation or custom. This is no less true in free churches than in those of an episcopal polity. The professional reward and punishment system, the professional expectations and retirement prospects, even the lifestyle, are to a considerable extent church-established. "I am a Baptist minister," or "I am a Catholic priest," is a far more all-encompassing statement than "I am an accountant." It says it all.

To an even greater extent, the professional life of a military officer is governed by the armed service. Not only are the officer's commissioned status, his or her education and training, job assignments, salary and promotions completely under military control. Even the clothes worn on duty and much of his or her social life are institutionally determined. To say, "I am an Air Force officer," says it all. It is in the tension of both these all-encompassing statements that chaplain ministry takes place.

Role Conflict

One aspect of institutional duality in the chaplaincy has been studied sociologically in terms of role conflict.[45] The first significant research in this field was done by Waldo W. Burchard in the period shortly after World War II.[46] His research instrument consisted of questions designed to "bring that respondent face to face with the proposition that the role of military officer conflicts with that of minister of the gospel."[47] A 1969 book by sociologist Gordon C. Zahn, based on a study of the chaplaincy of the Royal Air Force, focused on "role tension" between the clergy role and that of military officer.[448]

The movement in the American churches toward reexamination of the military chaplaincy, in the period during and following the Vietnamese War, made the role conflict issue one of its major concerns. The military officer role was identified with the policies of the government in waging an unpopular war and with incidents in that war, such as the My Lai massacre, which epitomized American revulsion toward it. This role was considered by a substantial number in the churches to be so incompatible with the clergy role as to lead them to advocate doing away with the chaplaincy.

As the strong feelings about the Vietnamese War have receded into history and the anti-military sentiments in the churches of that period have become less prominent, role conflict has become a less pressing issue. But it remains a concern. A 1984 doctoral dissertation by Army Chaplain (Major) Robert Vickers took a fresh look at this issue. It reviewed the Burchard and Zahn studies, but found no significant studies specifically on this issue in the years since. As part of his research Vickers conducted a survey of the Army Chaplain Branch, concluding that role conflict is a real issue for chaplains, but that chaplains generally consider their clergy role to be more important than the officer role. Chaplains also believed that their commanders consider the clergy role to be more important than the officer role.[49]

During the Persian Gulf War an Air Force chaplain, who had written letters opposing the war to the editor of a newspaper published near his Base, became the center of a controversy. Ultimately he was forced to retire. In 1994, before the case was resolved, the author was interviewed on the military chaplaincy by one of the producers of a TV

program that planned to feature the case. Her questions indicated that many of the role conflict questions were still live issues.

An exchange began with a simple statement by the author that the military chaplain is a minister, a priest or a clergyperson for those who are serving in the armed forces. The interviewer raised a question as to whether it is really that simple. She suggested that chaplains are serving two very demanding masters: their Lord—their original calling—and the military, which is quite demanding in its own right. Follow-up questions continued to press the point. She suggested that it probably doesn't sit well with most commanders for chaplains to say they report to God first.

A similar suggestion followed a statement that "the fact that chaplains are in the military services standing for moral principles, standing for moral values, is something military commanders appreciate and want." Do they want that only up to the point that it falls in with the party line?, she asked in effect. Will commanders allow a chaplain to preach an unpopular position that does not fall into the majority position? And if so, is it just at the commander's sufferance? Can a commander remove a chaplain from the pulpit? She pressed further, as to what a chaplain does if a spiritual truth—as he or she perceives it—clashes with a military goal.

The interviewer at times put the issue in terms of conflicting loyalties to Christ or Caesar. She was reminded that the biblical injunction to "choose this day whom you will serve" did not appear in this context. Rather, Christ's advice was to "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." Though Vietnam is long past, the questions raised so strongly in that era were still clearly alive in the mid-nineties.[50]

In a group of persons who are simultaneously full members of two social institutions as disparate as the church and the military, the existence of role conflict would not be surprising. The surprising thing would be its absence. Chaplains, generally, are aware of such conflict in their own experience. In a series of group and individual interviews with chaplains, conducted in 1995 in preparation for the writing of this book, few chaplains denied its reality. Some downplayed its importance, feeling that there were few problems in this area, but most were strongly conscious of the necessity of dealing with such conflicts. One Air Force chaplain said, "If you didn't feel the tension between officer and clergy roles you would have slipped too far to one side. If any of us were to slip, we'd be better off slipping into the role of clergy than that of officer."

A chaplain serving with marines (sic) spoke of the tension he felt in counseling. He put it in terms of agency: "If I am the agent of the command and they ask me what happened in a counseling interview, I should tell them. But if I am the agent of the marine (sic) and they ask me, 'What did you talk about?' then I shouldn't, because of confidentiality. I see that as a real conflict between officer, responsible to the command, and chaplain, responsible to the marine (sic)." He emphasized the privileged nature of such communication as determinative. We shall look at this aspect of role conflict in more detail in the discussion of counseling in chapter 5.

The existence of role conflict is not in itself necessarily a negative factor in ministry. In a sense the chaplaincy is a profession which deliberately makes role conflict a way of life, and the relevant question is not whether such tension exists, but how useful the results may be. Both Burchard and Zahn claimed that a chaplain, faced with a situation in which there is a conflict between the expectations of the clergy role and the military role, is likely to resolve it in favor [of] the military. Zahn noted, however,

that his assessment was directly contrary to the chaplains' own verbal assessment of the way in which they resolve such issues, as given in their responses to a specific question in the research instrument. Zahn also found that the self-image of the chaplains whose attitudes he studied almost universally put the clergy role first and the military officer role second.[51]

There is some reason to believe that this is not merely a self-perception on the part of chaplains, but a normative way of operating. In 1995 a Navy chaplain was inadvertently caught up in a difficult situation on a commercial airplane. He was on the same flight with several other Navy men and women who had recently been detached from the same ship. A chief petty officer with a long history (known to the chaplain) of alcoholism, who was already intoxicated when he boarded the flight, was served several more drinks, and became loud and disorderly. He made sexual advances to a female sailor seated beside him. She loudly demanded that he stop, several times, and slapped him. He was also verbally abusive to other female sailors on board. The chaplain, who was the senior Naval officer aboard the aircraft, tried to calm him during his outbursts. He also changed seats with another person, and sat between the drunken chief and the female sailor he had assaulted. The incident was widely reported in the press, and led the Chief of Naval Operations to order a Navy-wide stand-down to review standards of conduct.

Several other Navy people on the flight heard the commotion but did nothing, either because they considered it the responsibility of the senior officer present or because they saw that the chaplain had already intervened. Several of them, however, later criticized the chaplain for not taking more forceful action. The admiral who reviewed the investigation of the incident concluded that no one other than the intoxicated chief petty officer was culpable or would be disciplined.

It is not clear what more forceful action, taken in the chaplain's officer role, would have been appropriate under the circumstances. Perhaps something should have been done earlier than it was, or some physical restraining of the drunken chief should have taken place. But entirely apart from judgments about what was done on the airplane, any chaplain in such a situation would to some degree be faced with a decision as to whether (and to what extent) to act pastorally, in the ministerial role, or militarily, in the officer role. Beyond the obvious pastoral responsibility to the woman who had been assaulted and who had to be protected from further indignity, a chaplain might also feel some measure of pastoral responsibility toward a misbehaving person with a known problem of alcoholism. From such a perspective, separating the persons and trying to "keep the lid on" in a public place might have seemed more pastoral than some more forceful action directed against the chief petty officer.

The Chaplain's Environment: Military and Religious

Some light may be cast on the differing perceptions of the primacy of the roles by noting the way in which both institutions are presented in the perceived world of chaplains.

Their immediate institutional environment is military. Their ministry takes place in the armed forces, and the external characteristics of life are militarily determined. They wear uniforms rather than clerical collars. Authority resides in commanding officers rather than bishops, sessions, boards of deacons, or church councils. Their church buildings are military chapels, their parishioners are military people, and they may be out of direct touch with the institutional environment of their own faith bodies for

months or even years at a time. It would be natural to conclude, under these circumstances, that the military influence is dominant, that chaplains have "left the church and entered the military," as their civilian colleagues sometimes put it. A closer examination, however, reveals that the institutional environment of the church or faith group is also immediately present for them.

Ecclesiastical Environment in the Military

Three elements provide this environment. First, the chapel program, or the field or shipboard ministry in which the work-life of chaplains is centered, while military in sponsorship, is thoroughly ecclesiastical in character. Its activities—worship services, personal pastoral contacts, choirs, lay councils, religious education programs, outreach activities—parallel the program of the civilian parish. Most important of all, its goals are religious goals rather than military goals. While the chapel program is a voluntary, off-duty concern of the military lay people who participate, it is the primary, on-duty concern of chaplains. Its goals are collateral goals for their parishioners, but the central work-life goals of chaplains. So even in military surroundings they continue to be vocationally in the church.

A second environmental element is provided by professional colleagues. Chaplains are part of a military system, but they are also part of a Chaplain branch, service or corps subsystem within it.[52] All their colleagues in the chaplaincy subsystem are clergy. To the extent that there is validity in historian George H. Williams' hypothesis (not pressed but repeatedly suggested in his essay) that the Army and Navy have taken the place of denominations for chaplains, it is probable that it is the chaplaincy branch of the military service, rather than the service itself, which has so operated.

The chaplaincy of each armed service does perform some functions analogous to those performed by denominational relationships for civilian clergy. There are chaplaincy-wide administrative structures for facilitation of ministry. Provision is made for continuing education, for spiritual retreats, and for professional development. Their most significant long-term associations are likely to be within their own branch. The community thus provided is an important part of their overall environment. Its norms, like those of the religious program which is the focal point of the work life of chaplains, have their source in the church-world rather than the military world. In a later chapter we will take a closer look at this chaplaincy subsystem within the military system.

A third element which extends the religious institutional environment into the military world is provided by the denominational structures which oversee the chaplaincy. Most religious bodies have officials who visit, counsel with, and provide ecclesiastical supervision for chaplains. Each requires reports from its chaplains. Each either encourages or requires periodic attendance at meetings of church governing bodies or conventions. While these denominational relationships are not so pervasive in the everyday life of chaplains as the chapel program or the chaplaincy subsystem, they do serve to keep them continually reminded of the non-military institutions that establish their vocational goals and to which they owe their primary professional allegiance.

Although it is true, then, that chaplains are church professionals whose ministry takes place in a secular institution outside the church, it is not that they have "left the church and entered the military." In a real sense they take the institutional environment of the church with them into the military. A substantial part of the perceived world in which they live and work is determined by church norms rather than military norms.

It is obviously true that some chaplains allow the military identity to dominate. Some are too conscious of their officer rank, and some allow themselves to become tools of military commanders. But they are exceptions, recognized as such by their fellow-chaplains. For most, the fact that they are clergy first is essential to their identity. It is the attitude of the individual chaplain that makes the difference.

One Army chaplain interviewed for this study recalled an incident during an IG (Inspector General) inspection. "Everybody was running around going crazy over this inspection," he said. "My commander asked me to deliver these—I guess they were maintenance manuals—to various places. And I thought, 'Deliver maintenance manuals! That's ridiculous!' But then I said, 'Ah, come on. He doesn't ask me these favors very often—I shouldn't even count it as a favor. It's only going to take a little time. It's kind of like paying the rent.' So I said, 'Hey, I'll use that as an opportunity. I'm not much part of this IG inspection anyway; they're not going to look at me. I'll use this as an opportunity to talk to the soldiers when I go out and deliver these things. I'll ask them how it's going; I'll find out what their stress points are.' I could have just walked around and done that without delivering the manuals, certainly. And I wouldn't want to do it very often, or all the time. But it worked out well."

Clearly this chaplain could have refused to be "used" in this military task. He would have been backed up by his church officials and by seniors in the Chaplains Branch had he chosen to make an issue of it. But by using it creatively, he turned it into ministry and remained faithful to his calling.

Present Status of Institutional Duality

In a footnote to their 1995 book, *For God and Country*, Israel Drazin and Cecil Curry downplay the importance of ecclesiastical endorsement and the relationship of chaplains to their ordaining bodies:

> *The concept of ecclesiastical endorsement is sometimes misunderstood even by military chaplains, who are required by law to secure approval from their denomination whey they apply for a military commission. Many believe an endorsement means they will "represent" their religious organization while in the military. That is not true. From a legal point of view, a chaplain who officially represented his church or synagogue in the military would create excessive entanglement between church and state. Such entanglement, by Supreme Court definition, would be a violation of the establishment clauses of the First Amendment to the Constitution. To avoid this difficulty, an endorsement, by definition, is nothing more than a statement of affidavit by a recognized religious body that the applicant is a member of the clergy . . . Needless to say, an endorsement or certification that an applicant is a member of the clergy is not in itself a determining factor as to whether or not the person will be accepted into the military . . . While it is true that most chaplains retain a close relationship with their denominational bodies, this is a personal and unofficial choice, and, as such, is not excessive entanglement.*[953]

Drazin, who is a lawyer as well as an Army chaplain, and who for several years in the early nineties was involved fulltime in litigation of a court challenge to the Army chaplaincy, is understandably concerned about maintaining an absence of "excessive entanglement." From a legal standpoint the only official "entanglement" of church bodies in the process of appointing chaplains is the provision of that ecclesiastical endorsement.

But the time when that endorsement meant no more than "an affidavit . . . that the applicant is a member of the clergy" is a century past. There is no such thing as a generic "member of the clergy" available to do whatever military authorities may order. There are only Catholic priests, Baptist ministers, Jewish rabbis or Muslim imams, and their ecclesiastical and liturgical functions are controlled entirely by their religious bodies. To say that a Catholic priest's ability to celebrate mass or a Baptist minister's inability to baptize infants is based on a "personal and unofficial" relationship is, from a chaplain's perspective, absurd.

It is true, as stated elsewhere in this footnote, that "[i]f commanders order chaplains to do something that violates their religious convictions, they have the same free exercise problem faced by other soldiers. They have no special protection under the law simply because they are chaplains."[54] But celebrating mass, for the Catholic, or baptizing believers only, for the Baptist, are not just matters of "religious convictions." They are ecclesiastical acts that can be performed only under the auspices of the religious body as whose clergy they function.

The line between private "religious convictions" (which as related to moral issues might vary among the clergy of a particular denomination) and ecclesiastical ministrations or denominational positions (which the church tightly controls) may not always be easy to draw. But the overall reality goes well beyond the legal "entanglement" of a single document conveying endorsement. It is the product of many years of working together, of clerical realities that are well established and universally recognized, and of official chaplaincy structures long experienced in working out with commanders any areas of uncertainty.

The Role of Ecclesiastical Officials

In the post-World War II period churches have broadened their responsibility for and supervision of their clergy in the military. They have demanded, and have been given, authority to participate in the career choices of chaplains entering the regular forces. Chaplains are commissioned as reservists. When they enter active duty it is generally for a specified term of years, after which those who so desire may return to civilian life and maintain through affiliation with the military reserve forces their readiness to serve in national emergencies. The reserve components are essential parts of the chaplaincies. All three services, however, have provisions for accepting into the regular forces those chaplains who apply to remain on active duty permanently. The churches participate in such career choices by examining the qualifications of those applying for regular status, and re-endorsing prior to permanent appointment in the regular forces.

The possibility of conflict between military and ecclesiastical authorities over the role, rights, or treatment of chaplains is inherent in the institutional duality they embody. In 1993, this conflict surfaced in the case, mentioned earlier in this chapter, of the Air Force chaplain in Texas who opposed US involvement in the 1991 Persian Gulf War. He had written letters to the editor of the local newspaper near his base, expressing this opposition. His military commander, while conceding the chaplain's personal right to oppose the war, took strong exception to his public pronouncements as a violation of military regulations, and initiated disciplinary action. The case eventually went to the Secretary of the Air Force for resolution. (The chaplain in question was forced out of the Air Force, but allowed to retire with full pension.) The Chaplains Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, his endorsing denomination, supported the chaplain's right to follow his conscience on a public moral issue, and made

representations in his behalf to military authorities at each level. However, the case was being treated by the Air Force as a matter of military policy and regulations, under command cognizance. No official denominational position or ecclesiastical practice could be shown to be involved, so the church officials had no basis for intervention except through persuasion. The respective roles of military and church authorities in cases like this are often ambiguous.

Changes in the Church Base

The cultural changes in the closing years of the twentieth century described in chapter 1, having to do with the place of religion in American public life, have significantly affected central church organizations. On the whole, these organizations are weaker than in the immediate post-World War II period when the present parameters of institutional duality were established. This is particularly true of the mainline Protestant denominations which in that period dominated both publicly perceived American religious life and the military chaplaincy.

Conflicts between denominational authorities and rank and file church members have led to a redirection of financial resources, with much less fiscal support going to central bureaucracies. Proliferating parachurch mission agencies have undercut mission causes officially sponsored by denominations. The polarization noted earlier, cutting across all denominations, has frequently pitted central authorities against the people in the pews. The center of church life has shifted to congregations rather than denominational structures. Denominational staffs have been cut repeatedly. The conciliar ecumenical agencies through which these denominations have traditionally worked together have been weakened even more than the denominations themselves.

While these trends have been affecting mainline Protestant denominations, the strength of the evangelical wing of Protestantism has been growing. Moreover, there is evidence of considerable evangelical interest in the chaplaincy. We have noted the increasing numbers of conservatives among active duty chaplains. There is also growing scholarly interest in military religion from this wing of Christianity. A 1996 book by Louisiana State University historian Anne C. Loveland suggests that conservative Christianity had significant influence in the early 90s in the debates over homosexuality in the armed forces.

Conservative influence, however, has not been institutionalized or focused on the chaplaincy in an organized way. Most of the more conservative Protestant denominations have traditionally been more congregationally-centered, with less central authority, than the mainline churches. Much church growth in the eighties and nineties has been in independent congregations, with no central denominational structure at all. Even groups with historically strong and powerful hierarchies, such as the Roman Catholic and Latter Day Saints churches, have been affected by the growing tendency on their members to make private judgments, following their own consciences rather than official church positions. All in all it is a period of declining strength in the central organizational structures of American religious bodies.

Agencies dealing with the military chaplaincy have largely held their own in this period. Some have suffered budget cuts, but the stance and responsibilities for their military clergy they assumed in the post-World War II period have not changed. Except among the small minority of pacifists (historically always present in the churches) the anti-chaplaincy attitudes of the Vietnam era have abated. For the most

part the chaplaincy is no longer controversial in the churches. But neither is it a high-priority concern; attention of the hard-pressed central agencies is directed elsewhere.

Chaplaincy relationships are necessarily handled by these central offices; individual congregations cannot do so. The outlook, then, for the foreseeable future, is not one of growing church authority over and responsibility for the chaplaincy. There will be no return to the days when the chaplaincy was entirely a military responsibility, with no interest from the churches. But any strengthening of the church side of institutional duality in the period immediately ahead will have to come from the emphasis of chaplains themselves, rather than from ecclesiastical pressure.

Attitude of the Military

The implications of the institutional duality have in the past perhaps been understood even less by military commanders than by civilian church people. Not uncommon was the attitude of a commanding officer at a military base in the Far East. This commander took a paternal interest in the romance between one of the clerks in his office and an oriental girl of the Buddhist faith. When the two decided to marry, the commander volunteered to sponsor the wedding. He called in his chaplain to make the necessary arrangements. The chaplain advised him that the rules of his church permitted him only to perform Christian marriages, and that he could not officiate at a Christian-Buddhist ceremony.

The commanding officer exploded, "What do you mean you can't marry them? You're in the service, aren't you? You'll marry who I tell you to marry!" It took some fast talking on the chaplain's part to convince his commander that he was not only in the service, but also in his church, and that his authority to perform marriages was controlled by the latter, not the former. Here was a senior military officer of many years' experience, who recognized clearly that clergy were necessary for certain professional functions, but did not understand the institutional duality inherent in the chaplaincy. Because his chaplain was also in the military service and a member of his command, he thought of him as a hired professional, available to do his bidding.

The armed forces are accustomed to the use of professionals for those functions that come within their professional province. Physicians, dentists, nurses, lawyers—all have held commissioned officer status, along with chaplains, for many years. These groups of officers make up their professional staff branches, services or corps of the various armed forces. Against this background the military establishment is likely to think of a chaplain's ordination as being comparable to a physician's licensure or a lawyers admission to the bar. It provides him or her with professional credentials. Similarly the chaplain's membership in a religious body is thought of as comparable to a physician's membership in the American Medical Association or the lawyer's membership in a state bar.

The comparison is not entirely a valid one. The medical association and the state bar are professional associations only. While the church operates in some ways as a professional association for its clergy, its function is far broader, the implications of membership far more extensive, and the place of clergy within it is of a different order. The major difference lies at the point of organizational goals. The goals of professional societies are related primarily to the interests of the professionals who make up the membership. Such societies set standards, uphold canons of professional ethics, and promote the professional welfare of members. The goals of religious bodies are broader. They are related to the good of the entire society: they institutionalize

the basic human need for religious faith and expression. The function of clergy professionals within them is instrumental in nature. The clergy are agents used by the churches in the realization of larger institutional goals, rather than the focal point of those goals.

All staff professionals incorporated into the military service bring with them professional specialties, standards, and ethical codes. Physicians, dentists, and lawyers, as well as chaplains, provide specialized services, available to the military only from their respective professions. Only chaplains, however, work for goals established by institutions outside the armed forces and are subject to the authority of those outside institutions. Chaplains are the only military officers who find it necessary to defend themselves against charges that they are "tools of the military establishment." Chaplains are willing to be regarded as tools only of their religious bodies, pursuing their churches' goals within the military establishment.

Few military commanders are deeply aware of this difference between chaplains and other staff professionals. If they think about it at all, they probably regard it as unimportant. This is not to imply that they perceive any conflict between the institutional goals of the churches and their own best interests. Chaplains area recruited by the armed forces to serve as clergy, and for no other purpose. A.B. Aronis, in 1972 research for a doctoral dissertation, compared the role perceptions of chaplains with those of their commanding officers. His research indicated that line commanders, even more consistently than chaplains themselves, gave traditional clergy roles of pastor-counselor and liturgist-preacher-priest primary importance in their expectations of chaplains. Interviews with present-day commanding officers conducted by the author indicate that this is still generally the case. Commanders may see the value of such functions primarily in terms of the effect on military readiness of troops or crews whose needs, spiritual and moral as well as physical and emotional, have been met. But few regard chaplains as anything other than religious professionals. They have long regarded provision for religious worship and expression as necessary for the human welfare of those who make up the armed forces. But they have continued to think of chaplains simply as their own professionals in the field of religion, as in the old days. Institutional duality in the chaplaincy has simply not been an important issue for them.

It therefore becomes an ongoing responsibility of chaplains, in adapting to military ministry, to interpret the dual relationship to their commanders, keeping them fully informed of its implications. Commanders are not likely to oppose ecclesiastical control over ministerial functions, so long as this does not claim to remove chaplains from military command and control. A considerable measure of de facto recognition of institutional duality has evolved over the years, as the armed forces have reached accommodations with the institutional churches on matters relating to the chaplaincy. The authority over Catholic chaplains exercised by the Roman Catholic church, which has asserted control over its priests form the beginning of its significant involvement with the armed forces, has long been recognized at every level.

The essence of institutional duality is the fact that chaplains are as fully clergy of their own denominations as they are officers of their military service, and they can only function in full and current status with both institutions. The Army Field Manual governing "Religious Support" puts it clearly: "As a commissioned officer, the unit chaplain is a special staff officer responsible to the commander for religious support. As a religious leader, the chaplain is responsible to the endorsing faith group. The

chaplain's call, ministry, and ecclesiastical authority come from the religious organization which endorses the chaplain for military service."[55]

The ministry of chaplains will be enhanced as military people at every level understand more fully the institutional duality which characterizes all chaplains. And in light of the declining strength and influence of central ecclesiastical authorities in these times, it is not likely that stronger pressure in this direction will come from the churches. The fostering of full understanding of institutional duality will largely be the responsibility of chaplains themselves. It may be tempting for chaplains to take advantage of their physical absence from church structures, their relative freedom from church restrictions, and the financial independence of a government pay check, giving little attention to their ecclesiastical authorities. This, however, is a serious mistake. The long-range health of military ministry, and the chaplain's best safeguard against the subordination of religious to military goals, depends on a healthy duality.

The chaplaincy will be most effective when both the religious bodies and the military services recognize clearly that chaplains are fully members of both institutions—a unique kind of officer and a unique kind of clergy—with clear responsibilities in both directions.

Lesson 4: The Chaplain's Relationship to Self

Due This Lesson

> 1-page paper from Resource 3-2
> Journaling

Learner Objectives

> By the end of this lesson, participants will
> - understand and discuss the *Foundation Stones of Character* as they relate to ministry
> - apply the *Foundation Stones of Character* to a personal definition of self

Homework Assignments

> Read Resource 4-2. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.
>
> Continue working on your interview and oral presentation as defined in the Syllabus.
>
> Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

> "The abandonment of serious truth-seeking is not the result of intellectual torpor. America has been deliberately dumbed down over the past century. This has been done in the name of progress, with the doctrine of relativism clearing the way for a brave new world to replace the old. Who has done all this you might ask? They go by a variety of names: liberals, leftists, left-libertarians, progressives, globalists, Marxists, secular humanists, and even environmentalists. But they all share one characteristic: hostility to the God of the Bible and his ordering of creation.
>
> "Rising from the ashes of Christendom is the Age of Consent, a morally obtuse world in which the only factor mitigating human action is mutual consent—as in, 'If two or more consenting adults want to (fill in the blank), then it is of no concern to anyone else—period.' The code word for the Age of Consent is *tolerance*. Like a magic oath, it is intoned on television, in education, and even in corporate personnel training. Like any other good thing that has been twisted, tolerance was originally a virtue. Now, to an increasing number of Americans, the word has come to symbolize heavy-handed liberalism, officially sanctioned sexual deviances, group privileges, big government, and hostility toward Judaism and Christianity."[56]

"And here, I am persuaded, you will permit me to observe, that the path of true piety is so plain as to require but little political attention. To this consideration we ought to ascribe the absence of any regulation respecting religion from the Magna Charta of our country.

"To the guidance of the ministers of the gospel this important object is, perhaps, more properly committed. It will be your care to instruct the ignorant, to reclaim the devious; and in the progress of morality and science, to which our government will give every furtherance, we may expect confidently, the advancement of true religion and the completion of happiness."[57]

Who am I?—Foundation Stones of Character

1. Role identity

2. Integrity

3. Credibility

4. Accountability

5. Responsibility

6. Values

7. Ethics

8. Morals

9. Face of Jesus

The Perception Of Wrongdoing Is As Bad As Actual Wrongdoing!

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 3

Setting for Ministry: The Total Institution

The transition from the church environment into the institutional duality of the military environment is a critical step for chaplains. The basic orientation courses at the three chaplains schools try to assist new chaplains in this process. At a graduation ceremony for the Navy's Basic Course the class speaker described in vivid terms the pangs of transition from civilian parish to chaplaincy. "As a civilian minister," he said, "I was a person of some standing in my community. I had a comfortable church, a secretary, and a competent assistant. People looked up to and respected me. Then I entered a strange world in which I had to shout, 'Attention on deck!' when someone, perhaps no older than me but clearly identified as an authority figure, entered the room. I learned to stand in a rigid brace at morning inspection while someone whose sleeves displayed more stripes looked me up and down as if I were a horse. I can only describe the experience as 'culture shock.' "

The graduating chaplains—now old salts of two months' longevity, the gold on their sleeves no longer glaringly new, capable of conversing fluently about bulkheads, billets and dogging the watch—laughed appreciatively if a bit nervously. They had by now survived the initial plunge and had adapted to the outward customs and conventions of military service. But the very intensity of their laughter revealed that they were still in the state of culture shock, and likely to remain there for some time to come. Indeed, there are some military chaplains who remain in culture shock for full twenty-year careers. For beneath the superficial level of adaptation to the external symbols and rituals, effective ministry as a military chaplain requires at a deeper level an understanding of the characteristics of the secular institution in which ministry is offered. These characteristics are different from those of the civilian parish-church, and unless the difference is understood, chaplains may go on for years offering kinds of ministry which neither fit nor bear fruit in the institution they have joined.

Basic spiritual qualifications may be taken for granted when members of the clergy enter the armed forces as chaplains. They begin with mature religious faith, tested by time. They have well-defined systems of belief, shaped by their own consciences and experiences as well as the faith groups to which they belong, and refined and strengthened by at least three years of high quality postgraduate education. They have acquired the essential skills—pastoral, liturgical, homiletical and sacramental—required by their ministerial or priestly profession. They come equipped with an appreciation of and commitment to the spiritual dimension of life, and with the motivating force of a divine calling. The American religious bodies have rightly maintained that the clergy endorsed by them are fully qualified for religious ministry. When the armed forces have become involved in education for ministry, as in the seminary training programs sponsored by all three services, they have left the content of such education entirely to the churches and seminaries, attempting not the slightest measure of interference. Ministerial qualification is the province of the churches, and clergy enter the armed forces fully qualified in this sense.

But religious ministry never takes place in a "spiritual" vacuum. It is always <u>in</u> the world and <u>for</u> the world, and the form of ministry must be appropriate to the particular "world" in which it takes place. The minister's natural tendency is to think in terms of the parish church. Its institutional presuppositions have so long been taken for granted that they are often treated as if they were an integral part of every ministry.

The courses in any seminary catalogue—homiletics, liturgics, worship, counseling, religious education, and pastoral care—are based on parish church presuppositions. But in the ministry of chaplains, which takes place in a secular institution, it becomes necessary to distinguish the essential from the accidental, to separate the inner spirit from the outward shape. Failure to do so means that the form and style of ministry developed in and adapted to one institution will be carried over unwittingly into another, where they may fail to fit. The key to effective ministry as a military chaplain lies here: the secular institution must be understood and the form of ministry must be made relevant to the institution in which it is offered.

Examples of failure to understand and adapt are readily found: family-oriented chaplains who devote all their time to the families of a few officers and senior NCOs, largely ignoring the young adult servicemen and women who make up most of the military population; "chapel-happy" chaplains who are lost without a building, who even on a two-week bivouac feel an urgent necessity to "set up a chapel;" office-centered chaplains who keep themselves remote from the military world, expecting their parishioners to leave their everyday pursuits and seek them out. Such chaplains are physically within one institutional environment, but psychologically within another.

The faith message is the same, regardless of the institutional environment. But that message will be most effectively communicated by chaplains who understand the institution in which they are working, their place within it, and the kind of ministry which is appropriate to it. In the remainder of this chapter we will examine the nature of the military institution. Chapter 4 will look at the chaplain's place within that institution, and Chapter 5 at the unique characteristics of military ministry.

Characteristics of Total Institutions

There are a number of perspectives from which the nature of a military organization can be examined. From the standpoint of implications for the chaplaincy, none is more illuminating than the concept of the "total institution," first developed by sociologist Erving Goffman.

Goffman elaborated his concept more than thirty-five years ago in a lengthy essay, "On the Characteristics of Total Institutions," included in his 1961 book, *Asylums.*[58] An institution, in a broad sense, is a social establishment which regularly engages in a particular kind of activity. Some institutions, like railroad stations or airports, are open to everyone. Others, like social clubs or laboratories engaged in secret research, are highly exclusive. Some, like stores or post offices, have a smaller number of fixed members who provide a service and a continuing flow of visitors who receive the service. Others, like homes or factories, have a relatively permanent set of participants. Some are concerned with vocational activity; others are devoted to leisure-time activity. Some make serious demands; others are entirely voluntary. Institutions, which cover the entire spectrum of human social activity, cannot be readily classified.

According to Goffman's analysis, total institutions are distinguished from other institutions in society by the fact that they control, to a considerable extent, the total

lives of the persons involved. Every institution engages some of the time and interest of its members or users, providing something of a "world" for them. This Goffman calls the "encompassing tendency." Total institutions seek to be totally encompassing. The symbol of this totality is a barrier between the member and the outside world. Sometimes there is a physical barrier—a fence, sentries, barred windows. Always there is a strong sense of the difference between members and outsiders.

A second key feature of the total institution is a breakdown of the barriers which ordinarily separate the different spheres of life. Most people sleep, play, and work in different places with different companions, under different authorities, and without any overall unifying plan. In a total institution these three spheres of life take place under the same authority, generally with the same co-participants, according to a tightly-scheduled plan designed to fulfill the aims of the institution.

Another feature is the handling of human needs by bureaucratic organization of whole blocks of people. This leads to a divergence between the supervisory group, which does the handling, and the managed group (usually much larger). Another feature has to do with attitude toward work. In a total institution there may be a loss of the direct relationship between work done and money paid. Members are frequently forced to engage in "make work" activities. As a consequence there is a certain incompatibility between the total institution and the basic work structure of our society. There is also an incompatibility in many instances with family life, since the member of the institution is an insider but the members of his or her family are outsiders.

Such total institutions include hospitals, sanitariums, homes for the handicapped, jails and penitentiaries, boarding schools, and monastic orders, as well as military organizations. Goffman's analysis was developed during a year at Saint Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, DC, and his basic paradigm is closest to a mental hospital. He uses frequent illustrations and insights from other institutions, however, including numerous military applications.

It is clear that the basic characteristics of total institutions, as Goffman describes them, are all applicable to the military situation. It is particularly important for an understanding of the military chaplaincy to recognize that it is a ministry to persons whose lives are encompassed by a total institution, and to understand the effect of the total institution on those lives and that ministry.

Extended Total Institutions

There are certain differences, however, between the military service as a total institution and the basic Goffman paradigm which was developed in a residential hospital. It is helpful to examine those differences at the outset. The only other type of total institution which shares most of the sociological characteristics of the military service is the monastic or religious order. It is probably not accidental that certain religious orders employ military terminology extensively. The Jesuits, for instance, under the command of a vicar-general, have been known as the "army of the Pope." The Salvation Army is explicitly modeled after a military organization in almost every detail.

The military-monastic type is a single large institution with many small units or branches (bases, squadrons, divisions, wings, ships, monasteries). It might be labeled the extended type of total institution, as distinguished from the autonomous type represented by the single hospital, prison or nursing home. While Goffman did not distinguish between these two types (he used a different typology, and limited himself

to examining the single military base or monastery as a total institution), this avenue is worth pursuing for the sake of understanding the military. All the features of total institutions identified by Goffman and summarized above are shared by both the extended and autonomous types of total institutions. Beyond these similarities there are significant variations:

1. The institutional environment of the autonomous total institution is unique to the local institution. While every hospital or prison has general similarities to all others, the specific regulations, uniforms, and environmental characteristics are locally determined and unique. Even when it is part of a larger system, as when a hospital is owned by a larger company or a prison is part of a state or federal system, the particular institution is largely autonomous.

   The institutional environment of the extended total institution is determined to a major extent by the larger organization of which the local unit is a part. It is virtually identical from one unit to another. Airmen, transferred from one squadron to another, must establish new interpersonal relationships, but they are automatically at home in the new institutional environment which is almost a carbon copy of the one they left. They wear the same uniform, perform the same duties, have the same working hours, fit into the same organizational chart, use the same titles for superior officers, and salute in the same way. The aircraft they work with are the same, and the paint in the hanger may be an identical shade. After some years in the organization, even the interpersonal relationships may not be completely new. Somewhere in the unit they are likely to run into old buddies from previous assignments. The same transferability of environment would apply to a sailor in the Navy, a Benedictine monk, or a Salvation Army officer. In a later chapter we shall look in some detail at the implications for military life and the effect on ministry of this "total mobile environment."

2. Extended total institutions also differ from autonomous institutions in the relationship between the administrator-leaders and the administered members. In the latter type, as Goffman points out, the line between staff and inmate/patient is very sharp, and the relationship is one of natural enmity. Goffman recognized that in certain types of institutions (his example was a nunnery) the notion of a staff-inmate division is not fruitful. Instead there can be, he said, a single collegial group, internally stratified in terms of a finely-graded rank order.[59]

   In a military service, officers and enlisted personnel make up the administrator and administered groups. The line between them is sharp (though not as sharp as in an earlier period), and there is a good bit of natural enmity from the perspective of some in the enlisted ranks—and occasionally from the officer side.

   The relationship of the officer group (the administrators) to the institution itself is a key difference. Staff members in an autonomous total institution lack the total involvement and subjection to institution control that the inmate/patients experience. They are semi-outsiders. Many are nine-to-five employees whose personal lives are centered elsewhere. Civilian employees of the armed forces make up an important part of the overall military establishment, but they are in a similar category. They do not wear uniforms, nor are they subject to military discipline or transfer orders. In these and other ways they do not share the institutional totality.

   But officers in an extended total institution—particularly the military—are as totally involved and as subject to institutional control as enlisted personnel. An extended

total institution is administered by insiders. There is, consequently, a large measure of "we're all in this together" feeling between military officers and enlisted people which may not exist between staff and members of the autonomous total institution.

Religious orders present a further variation. They are likely to be administered largely by the members themselves, with relatively few superiors, who, though given unquestioned obedience, nevertheless share most of the characteristics of membership. The line between administered and administrators is less sharp than in the military service, but the same sense of common identity, or shared membership as insiders, exits.

3. In most autonomous total institutions the job of staff consists exclusively of providing some sort of servicing function—healing, rehabilitation, education, custodianship—<u>for</u> the inmate/patients. In extended total institutions members and staff are united in a task exterior to the organization; national defense, fighting wars, converting the heathen, serving society. This sense of commonality of endeavor does much to ameliorate the kind of enmity which Goffman found to be characteristic of the autonomous total institutions he examined.

Goffman developed at considerable length a picture of "the inmate world" inside the total institution, with a separate examination of the "staff world." This distinction is not applicable to the armed forces. The "inmate world"—the world inside the total institution—is in most respects the same for both officers and enlisted personnel. It is the world of the total institution itself, which is contrasted with the outside. A number of characteristics of this institutional world as described by Goffman contribute to our understanding of military life.

Understanding the Military Service as a Total Institution

Goffman devoted a great deal of attention to an analysis of the significance of induction procedures, which mark the transition from the outside world to the insider world of the total institution. A large number of his illustrations came from military recruit training, which is a highly formalized setting for the transition process. He analyzed it in terms of the "mortification of the self"—a process by which the former self is systematically eliminated and replaced by a new institutional self.

The transition takes place in a setting which minimizes or entirely prevents contact with the former world; the new recruits are kept in virtual isolation from the outside world for the first few weeks. Most of their previous bases of self-identification are ignored or denigrated. They may even be robbed of their customary names and addressed in new ways. The process of photographing, fingerprinting, cutting hair, issuing uniforms, instructing on rules, assigning quarters, all are assaults on the self which prepare the way for new identities. They suffer the indignity of exposure, both physical and psychological.

Even their informational preserve regarding themselves may be violated as they are required to answer questions of a highly personal nature. They suffer forced interpersonal contacts and forced social relationships. Their autonomy is assaulted as they are required to request permission for minor activities that were entirely under their own control on the outside—permission to use the telephone, to smoke a cigarette, to go to the toilet. They are instructed in elaborate deference patterns, of which the salute is the symbol in military organizations. Their lives are governed by detailed regulations covering everything.[60]

These elaborate mortifications of the self, Goffman suggested, are justified on different grounds by different total institutions. In monastic orders, such mortification may be eagerly sought by the novices themselves because of its perceived intrinsic value. In a prison it may be justified on grounds of security, or in the belief the prisoners deserve it. In the military organization it is rationalized because of sanitation or combat capability.[61] But whatever the justification, such induction processes are remarkably similar in every total institution, and the effect in every case is the same—the destruction of the former individualistic self and the creation of a new institutional self which facilitates the bureaucratic management of a large group of people and in other ways serves institutional needs. Its sociological purpose may therefore be described in these terms regardless of the reason given.

The Insider World

The effect of the induction procedures is to create the climate which is the central feature of life in a total institution: an "insider" world, single-mindedly dedicated to the activity for which the institution exists, on which the outside world impinges as little as possible. When they leave recruit training, soldiers, sailors marines (sic) and airmen encounter some relaxation of the high barriers which separate insiders from outsiders. But the whole elaborate process has been designed to make them psychologically insiders no matter how much the physical barriers are relaxed. The graduate is to "think like a marine (sic), act like a marine (sic), be a marine (sic)" twenty-four hours a day. The effectiveness of the process is attested to by the durability of the institutional self, vestiges of which remain long after the member has left the service. Veterans organizations are evidences of this durability, and "when I was in the service" reminiscences provide lifelong conversational material.

There are, of course, aspects of personal and social life which remain always beyond institutional control. The initial intent of the institution, however, is to make that control as total as possible. The extended total institution offers different degrees of totality at different times. Never again is the institution so all-encompassing as in the recruit training period. The early duty assignments of the new members, however, are likely to be situations with a high degree of totality—seagoing ships, infantry training regiments, operational air squadrons, combat divisions—in which their contact with the outside world is limited and their "liberty" (the term itself is characteristic of a total institution, for free time is a privilege granted by military authorities rather than a personal right) is severely restricted. In such assignments life is austere, bureaucratically controlled and highly regimented.

In total institutions the privilege system is such that things assumed as rights on the outside are granted as privileges in return for cooperation with the institution. On this basis, service members will in time "earn" the privilege of assignments which give them greater freedom from the institution's control of their lives: shore duty, a post in the United States, family quarters, the privilege of having families accompany them when they are transferred, moving at government expense. The longer they remain in the military, the less total will be the institutional control.

Officers, in general terms, are less rigidly regimented than enlisted persons. They pass through the same progression, however, from total institutional control at the beginning to lesser control with seniority. Nowhere are the rigid control, the isolation from the former world, the mortification of the self, the psychological exposure, the forced interpersonal contacts, the elaborate deference patterns, the detailed regulations, and the creation of a new institutional identity more systematically and professionally carried out than in the service academies at West Point, Annapolis and

Colorado Springs. The more seniority officers acquire, the more freedom from total institutional control they earn. But the freedom is never complete. In 1995 one of the Navy's most senior admirals was forced into retirement after an inappropriate remark about an incident in Okinawa, where a sailor and two marines (sic) were on trial for raping a young Okinawan girl. A comparable senior executive in industry could perhaps have made such a remark with impunity. But even four stars did not give him that freedom in the military.

All military people, both enlisted and officer, move repeatedly in and out of various degrees of institutional totality, as they rotate from operational divisions to garrison duty, from ship duty to shore duty, from deployment to home bases, from isolated overseas duty to administrative assignments. But the desired effect of the system is to create an overall psychological total institution that embraces the whole career. Military people can return from a suburban home and an eight-to-five office assignment in Washington to the institutional totality of a ship at sea or an infantry regiment on combat maneuvers with relative ease because they have never left the institutional state of mind. As surely as the newest recruit, the most senior general is still an "insider" in the total institution.

Insider Ministry in the Total Institution

An understanding from this sociological perspective of the military service as a total institution provides the setting for an examination of several major aspects of the chaplaincy. The first of these has to do with the conditions of ministry. Military chaplains comprise one of the few groups of clergy—perhaps the only such group—who can minister as "insiders" to a total institution. Hospital chaplains cannot; they belong to the "staff" group in an institution which follows the classic Goffman paradigm, with the staff world quite distinct from the patient world. (Since, however, the ministrations of the hospital chaplain are for the most part confined to a limited crisis situation, this is not a serious handicap.) Even less can the prison chaplain, in a total institution marked by bitter enmity from the inmate groups toward the staff group. (The disadvantage here is probably a serious one.) But the military chaplain, who wears the same uniform, obeys the same regulations, participates in the same goal-oriented organization, sails the same ship, lives under the same combat conditions, is clearly an insider in the military total institution.

To share insider status with parishioners in a total institution is a condition of ministry the importance of which would be hard to overemphasize. Every chaplain has had the experience, while sitting in uniform in an airport or bus station, of watching a member of the same service walk in, look over the crowd, recognize him or her by the uniform, and strike up a conversation. If the two are the only military people in a waiting room full of civilians it is almost sure to happen, provided the chaplain indicates, by a smile or a word, that officer status is not a barrier and company would be welcomed. The service person knows by the uniform that they belong to the same club, that they have something in common.

An Air Force chaplain interviewed for this study spoke of officer status as legitimizing the role of minister with other officers. "My husband is a squadron commander, so I have another peer group higher than my own rank would call for," she said. "The officer part legitimizes chaplains with that peer group, whether they do or don't have a faith. And it's surprising that it even does with those who have a strong faith background."

Shared insider status affects ministry in a number of ways. One way is through the removal of the artificiality, even the elements of hypocrisy, that sometimes get in the way of relationships between ministers and their parishioners. The fact that people tend to put on their best behavior when they go to church, that they bring out tea and the best china when the pastor comes to call, sometimes stands in the way of direct and authentic relationships. Military chaplains are probably the only members of the clergy who habitually see their parishioners at their least presentable. They visit them more often in dirty cammies than in clean dress uniforms. They are accustomed to the earthiness of their everyday language. (Troopers may try to clean it up when the chaplain is in sight, but they know that before coming around the corner he or she heard every profane word.) If they get into trouble, the chaplain is likely to be standing by at captain's mast or colonel's office hours.[62] The fact that most religious people are not plaster saints, that like St. Paul they often fail to do things they would, and do things they would not, is out in the open. As a result sermons can be more relevant, relationships more direct and honest.

A second advantage of shared insider status in a total institution is enhanced pastoral ministry through greater awareness of the problems faced and the life lived by the chaplains' parishioners. Chaplains know the boredom of sailors during long periods at sea or airmen at an isolated radar warning site because they experience it along with them. An Army chaplain, serving with soldiers on a remote assignment, spoke of this insider status: "As a chaplain in the Army I can identify with soldiers. I wear the same dirty clothes, eat the same food, and am limited by the same short showers as they are," he said.[63] Chaplains know the loneliness of separation from family because they are separated from their families too. They share with them the moral contradiction of being part of an organization trained for killing in the face of the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," of fighting wars while loving peace. A ministry of presence and participation offers a useful stance for counseling and pastoral care.

A third advantage of ministry as an insider in a total institution is ready-made contact with the unchurched. Many young persons in today's all-volunteer armed forces come from relatively low socio-economic background. Still, however, every social stratum, every economic group, every region is represented. And from a chaplain's standpoint the most striking thing about them is the large number without meaningful religious affiliation. Church people know that their beliefs and standards are largely disregarded by many Americans today, particularly young adult Americans. The knowledge lacks the relevance of immediacy, however, since church people tend to move in circles in which most other people are also church-related. For a dramatic demonstration of how far from typical is the church-centered, morally-oriented society in which they move, one need only put on fatigues and spend a week in an Army barracks. Most service members consider themselves in some vague fashion to be "Cat'lic," having been baptized that way, or Protestant (perhaps spelled "Prostant" on the preference card), being under the impression that that's what you are if you are neither Catholic nor Jewish. But vast numbers of them have never in their lives spoken meaningfully to a member of the clergy until they enter the armed forces and meet the chaplain. Chaplains serve the total institution, not just the explicitly religious part of it. They have a recognized place in the institution of which they are part, and recognized functions for which people turn to them.

On one occasion a group of chaplains joined with several local churches in Newport, Rhode Island, to sponsor a summer ministry—downtown and on the beach—to off-duty sailors. A seminary student, who was by coincidence a member of the Army's chaplaincy training program, was employed for this ministry. He experimented with a

number of ways of establishing some measure of rapport and pastoral relationship with the young sailors he encountered. He tried wearing a clerical collar, identifying himself as a representative of the local churches, and other gambits. He discovered that the most effective way of establishing a relationship was to identify himself as one training for Army chaplaincy. He found that even this degree of military identity was sufficient to give him some measure of acceptance by the military people he met.[64]

All chaplains are aware that their status gives them a ready relationship to the unchurched of the military population. There is probably no form of ministry that offers a better or more natural opportunity for meaningful encounter with the functionally non-religious majority of the population.

A fourth advantage, rare for civilian clergy, is the opportunity to minister to the secular institution itself. We have learned from social psychology, and particularly from organizational studies, that the lives of individuals are inextricably interwoven with the social groups and organizations of which they are a part. The conditions of life for individuals cannot always be changed without bringing about change in the institutions which establish these conditions. Chaplains have a unique opportunity to act on this insight. As members of the total institution's managerial group, which establishes the conditions of life under which their parishioners live, they are in a position to minister to them by ministering to the institution itself.

A chaplain serving on shipboard participated in a Doctor of Ministry degree program offered in his home port of Norfolk, Virginia. One degree requirement was the design and completion of a major project in the improvement of ministry. This chaplain, whose shipboard office was located near the mess deck and galley, had frequent contact with those involved in food service—the young enlisted persons, often new to the Navy and to the ship, who were assigned to three months of mess duty soon after their arrival on shipboard. The chaplain knew that the mess duty assignment was uniformly disliked by the sailors and regarded as an unpleasant obstacle to be endured by newcomers. He noted that food service people were among the most frequent offenders at captain's mast, charged with such offenses as absence without leave, disobedience of orders, and disrespect to seniors. He set out to design a ministry to meet their particular needs. He interviewed each of them at the beginning and end of mess duty. He offered individual and group counseling. He invited them to attend divine services, which were held on the mess deck. He found that they responded readily to his ministry to them as persons. But he also found that much of their unhappiness was the result of correctable conditions relating to regulations, working hours, and modes of supervision. His ministry led not only to the offering of a more effective and personal pastoral relationship, but also to the proposing of institutional changes which improved their attitudes toward themselves and the persons around them, and to a positive impact on the whole command structure.

The chaplain's place in the total institution makes opportunities of this kind possible. An Air Force chaplain told of an incident during Operation Desert Storm when a three-star general listened to his concerns, and changed a personnel policy. Another Air Force chaplain, stationed in Montgomery, Alabama, was able to eliminate the difficulties experienced by African American airmen in getting their hair cut.

Shared insider ministry in a total institution, then, affects ministry in these significant ways. It removes the element of artificiality which sometimes intervenes when parishioners show pastors only their Sunday selves. It enables chaplains to share fully the conditions under which their parishioners live, and thus prepares them for more

effective pastoral ministry to real needs. It places them in natural and continuing contact with the unchurched as well as the churched. It also makes it possible for them to minister creatively to the institution itself, as well as to the persons who make up the institution.

Questions Regarding Uniforms and Rank

Questions are sometimes raised as to whether chaplains should wear uniforms and hold rank. If the need for insider ministries by persons who are fully part of the military organization is accepted, the uniform must be accepted also. Most chaplains, as we have noted, find the wearing of the uniform to be a bond between them and other insiders in the total institution.

The question of rank, however, merits further attention. It would be possible for chaplains to be part of the military service in which they minister without holding rank. British Navy chaplains wear uniforms, and they hold the equivalent rank (fully recognized among themselves) for administrative purposes. But they do not wear rank insignia on the uniform, and in theory they are presumed to take on the rank of the person to whom they are talking, officer or enlisted. The British Army and Air Force reject this system. Their chaplains hold rank and wear insignia as do all other officers.

The historic rationale for giving rank to American military chaplains was summarized in a 1965 position paper adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church:

> *The reason for the assignment of rank to chaplains comes out of a long history. Before and during World War I there were chaplains who had no rank, and they found, as did the Red Cross men, that they were often regarded by the military as accessories with no standing and of questionable value. When things needed to be done for the men, the chaplains had no power that would provide a basis for action. Only those avenues of help or correction were open that the exceptional personality might be able to create in a given situation. Rank was given to chaplains to introduce order into a confused situation and to give the chaplain a legitimate voice within the establishment.*[65]

The tradition of all three services is that the chaplain, unlike other officers, is not addressed by title of rank but as "Chaplain." For a chaplain to "pull rank," to expect to be addressed by rank, or to be noticeably conscious of rank is almost universally regarded as inappropriate behavior, by chaplains and non-chaplains (officer or enlisted) alike. While there are, obviously, some chaplains who violate this principle, they are the exceptions rather than the rule.

Opponents of rank for chaplains suggest, first, that the rank and promotion system encourage subservience to military commanders, since promotions are dependent on fitness or efficiency reports, which generally convey the commander's evaluation of the performance of the chaplain. They also suggest that the rank of chaplains is a barrier to relationship with enlisted men or women, who are believed to view officers with awe and resentment. Both arguments have some merit, and the question here is whether the disadvantages outweigh the advantages.

With regard to efficiency or fitness reports, some form of evaluation or effectiveness exists in any working relationship, whether in a civilian church or in the military. Similarly there is some form of relative status or ranking in every social group. The question is whether the formalized kinds of evaluation and ranking in the military officer structure are more useful and/or dangerous than the informal kinds found in some church circles.

It should be noted that chaplains in all the armed services are rated and promoted by the same procedures used for the evaluation of performance and promotion of all other officers. Efficiency or fitness reports are filed on all military officers at regular intervals. In the Navy fitness reports are almost always signed by the chaplain's commanding officer, although they are often prepared in draft form by senior chaplains. In the Army and Air Force, where chaplains are likely to serve under the supervision of other chaplains in large commands, they are more likely to be rated by chaplains. The charge that the system encourages subservience to commanders is not, therefore, equally applicable to all three services. But certainly the danger exists to some extent in all three.

Selections for promotion to the next higher rank are made by boards of officers on the basis of official records of fitness or efficiency reports and other official documents. In the Navy those boards are ordinarily composed of chaplains. In the Army and Air Force they are part chaplains and part line officers. In the Air Force such boards now contain a majority of line officers, leading to some concern as to the criteria used. All the military promotion systems are designed to be as fair and impersonal as possible.

Entirely apart from formal titles of rank, some system for the evaluation of professional performance is necessary, as is some system for the recognition of age, experience, leadership ability, and for determination of pay grades. It may be argued that an informal, haphazard, "free enterprise" system (the systems of some civilian denominations might be so characterized) would be better than a planned and formalized system. Churches themselves differ on the issue. In the Roman Catholic church, the hierarchy consists of "ranks" as formalized as those of the military. Protestant churches with Episcopal systems have less elaborate but equally formalized "ranks." In military organizations inclusion in a formalized system is simply part of being fully integrated into the organization.

Military rank is a very open and public matter. Chaplains wear their rank on the sleeve, shoulder, collar, or lapel, and everyone knows what it is. When chaplains are passed over for promotion, everyone knows that, too, and it may be harder to live with than the failure to get a call or appointment to First Church, known only to the minister's spouse and the pulpit committee. But the problems in this area may be balanced by the fact that the whole process is open and aboveboard. Many chaplains are more aware of the danger of rank and status than are their civilian colleagues, whose rank and status are less public, and they may in some cases try harder to overcome it.

The question of whether the rank of the chaplain is a barrier in work with enlisted persons is unique to the military, and one to which a definitive answer is difficult. Sometimes, clearly, it is a barrier—particularly if the chaplain concerned is one of the minority overly conscious of rank. Chaplains generally have been of the opinion that the potential barrier can be readily overcome by the chaplain's own manner and attitude. The U.S. Navy Chaplains School at one time used as a training device a series of taped conversations of groups of enlisted personnel. One such tape included a discussion by a group of five sailors on the rank of chaplains. One recalled a chaplain who "wanted everybody to call him captain," much to the disgust of all. But the general consensus was that a chaplain is a chaplain, and rank doesn't matter much. One member of the group, however, said that when he had a problem and needed the help of a chaplain, he wanted the highest ranking chaplain he could find, because that's the one who "can get things done."

Few chaplains would deny that there are dangers and problems connected with rank and officer status. Greatest, probably, is the spiritual danger to chaplains themselves, who may forget on occasion that their sole purpose in the military is religious ministry. But it is by no means clear that the dangers are any greater than the comparable dangers to all clergy. Who can say that the temptation to work for advancement to the grade of colonel is greater than the temptation to work for a call to First Church? Or that subservience to the military power structure is greater than subservience to the financial power structure that raises the budget of First Church? Or to the ecclesiastical power structure? Who can say that the barrier of officer rank is any greater than the barrier of the clerical collar, or the coat and tie signifying middle class status? It is quite possible that the barriers are less rather than greater, since formalized rank is such an ever-present part of the military way of life that it is taken for granted.

The basic issue, however, is whether the dangers and problems associated with military rank and status outweigh the advantages. Most chaplains believe it has been amply demonstrated that being fully part of the military institution, with a place in the organization that enables them to work effectively, is an immense advantage. It gives them tremendous opportunities for real relationships and real service that they would not otherwise have.

Impact of Contemporary Military Trends on the Total Institution

The end of the Cold War has brought major changes to the military in the last decade of the twentieth century. Prior to that, the experience of the Vietnamese War had a profound impact in the 70s and 80s. Does it appear that the armed forces of the future will continue to be "total institutions?"

Basically, the answer is yes. Soldiers, sailors and airmen continue to experience a way of life that is apart from the civilian world. Military forces exist for military operations. Frequent operational deployments under combat conditions in the post-Cold War period, in the Middle East, in Somalia, in Haiti, in Bosnia have demonstrated the pattern for which armed forces exist. Ships still go to sea and training exercises still simulate combat.

On bases at home, however, the picture is less clearcut. In the period following the Vietnamese War, national disillusionment with the experience brought enormous pressure for change in the armed forces. Selective Service for young men, in existence since World War II, was eliminated. Congress greatly improved military pay, thus moving military service out of its historic status as a duty owed by all young men to their country, to be compensated at a subsistence level only, and into the category of labor, bought in the marketplace at competitive wages. A series of court decisions greatly restricted the applicability of military law, eliminating its jurisdiction over the dependents of military personnel in overseas areas and to some extent over service members themselves when in an off-duty status. Use of commanding officer's non-judicial punishment for minor offenders was severely limited. The right to be represented by counsel in all judicial proceedings was greatly expanded.

Responding to other pressures the services themselves took steps in the direction of improving living conditions and public image. Uniforms were modernized. Rules governing the wearing of civilian clothes off-duty were greatly liberalized. Standards relating to haircuts and beards were for a period greatly relaxed. Living conditions in barracks (renamed Bachelor Enlisted Quarters) were improved. Officers were given sensitivity training to improve their relationships with the personnel they supervised.

These changes were called "liberalization," though it should also be noted that from a sociological standpoint their effect was to make a total institution in some ways less total. It is quite probable that the real significance of the struggle over military haircuts in that period—the insistence of young military men that they be allowed to wear their hair long in the style of their contemporaries, and the battle of the military establishment to keep it short—lay at this point. Sociologically, the issue for military was not style but control. The loss of hair in recruit training is a key symbolic act in the substitution of the institutional self for the civilian self. Competition in the wage market for workers, restriction of the scope of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, more time with families, less off-duty identification with the military through the wearing of civilian clothes—each of these steps represented an erosion of the totality of the institution.

By the late eighties the tide began to turn. "Military" was no longer a dirty word, and standards were tightened. But there was real question as to whether the armed forces were still total institutions.

Two military sociologists, Charles Moskins and Frank Wood, dealt with these cumulative developments in a 1988 book, *The Military: More than Just a Job?* in terms of "the I/O dilemma" (Institution/Occupation).[66] In a book of essays by a number of military scholars they suggested that the military is losing its status as an institution with which members feel strong identification, and becoming, for many merely an occupation, a day job performed for pay with little claim on the rest of life.

The end of the Cold War at the beginning nineties brought a new set of challenges to the armed forces as total institutions. The demise of communism and disbanding of the threat of the Soviet Union made a smaller military establishment feasible. The process of downsizing the armed forces brought its own problems and strains. The need for releasing large numbers of both officer and enlisted personnel led to involuntary separations and career uncertainty. One aspect of life in a total institution is stability. Members know that their needs will be taken care of, and they do not worry about the future. But uncertainty as to future retention and career opportunities leads to personnel turmoil, and a lowered sense of "belonging."

Another product of fiscal pressures related to downsizing has been the privatization of functions formerly performed by military personnel: not only McDonald's, Burger King, and Pizza Hut on military bases, but civilian contractors maintaining buildings and grounds, operating mess halls and laundries, and providing some medical services. Gates are not always guarded by sentries. As a result there are fewer opportunities for soldiers and sailors who perform these functions in combat or at sea to enjoy garrison duty. Bases in the United States are far less like comfortized versions of troop life in the field, or shore-bound copies of ships at sea (complete with "decks" and heads"), and more like ordinary civilian communities.

The purpose behind the total institution is the total mobilization of resources for the job at hand. And a critical question for the contemporary military is how much of its totality it can give up and still accomplish its mission. Can a nine-to-five Army, Air Force, Navy or Marine Corps win wars? In the twenty-first century the difference between conditions at increasingly civilianized bases in the United States, and conditions at sea, deployed, in combat training for peacekeeping missions may make military service a less consistent experience. But since the stateside base establishment exists solely to support the operational forces, a balance must be maintained. Though stateside bases do indeed loosen the institutional totality, the basic paradigm still governs military life.

Former Air Force pilot Robert Denny, in a 1996 article in *The Retired Officer Magazine,* suggested that the Air Force has moved further from the concept of encompassing institution than the other services. The fact that overall it has less deployment to isolated areas than the other services may be a factor. The Marine Corps, Denny suggested, does best at bonding its members together with strong institutional identification.

In all the services, however, operational conditions remain normative. A sea-going ship, as surely in the twenty-first century as in the twentieth, will remain a paradigmatic total institution, in which "insider" opportunities for the free exercise of religion will be as important as galleys and mess decks for bodily nourishment, libraries for leisure-time reading, and regular liberty times ashore. Army, Marine and Air Force combat units ashore in the Persian Gulf region during Operation Desert Storm exemplified the characteristics of total institutions as fully as any troops in any past war. Peace-keeping units in the Sinai since the seventies, in Kurdish regions of Iraq following Desert Storm, in Somalia in the early nineties, in Bosnia in the late nineties, and deployed wherever they may be needed in the future—all follow the classic pattern. These are the situations for which armed forces exist. They are normative. And they reflect no significant changes in the conditions of military ministry described in this chapter.

Military chaplains have a key role in helping the military and the nation find the right balance. As a group <u>within</u> the total institution standing for moral values and the dignity of the individual, they can help the institution avoid the loss of these humanizing qualities. They can serve as bridge figures between those in the institution and those on the "outside." As professionals traditionally associated with families and family life, who officiate at marriages, offer counseling, and frequently serve as communication channels between families at home and personnel in deployed and operational forces, chaplains can help military people live with and overcome the fact that families are inevitably "outsiders" in the total institution. The fact that they represent an outside institution—the church—which has made a place inside is a further bridge to the outside world. Their traditional role as ombudsmen when distressed military persons "tell it to the chaplain" provides a bridge to the values of that outside world.

In the quest for proper balance between human values and institutional control, chaplains must recognize that they have obligations to both the individual and the institution. Sometimes the interests of the two may be contradictory, and because their first allegiance, as representatives of the church, is to God rather than the military, chaplains may become advocates of the individual confronting the institution in such situations. People come first with them, and full military recognition of the nature of the institutional duality of chaplains will concede this. But ministry to individuals without full appreciation of the role of the institution in individual welfare, of the inter-relationships between the person and the organization, becomes frustrating and fruitless. Chaplains stand for human values <u>within</u> the institution, and they have a key role to play in bringing the two together.

Lesson 5: The Chaplain's Relationship to Family

Due This Lesson

> 1-page paper from Resource 4-2
> Journaling

Learner Objectives

> By the end of this lesson, participants will
> - discuss how your family impacts your ministry
> - discuss how your ministry impacts your family
> - discuss ministry stressors, stress relievers and how to incorporate them in your life

Homework Assignments

> Read Resource 5-2. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.
>
> Evaluate your family using the elements discussed in this lesson. Compare your evaluation with that of your spouse, if you are married; or members of your family of origin, if you are single.
>
> Continue working on your interviews as defined in the Syllabus.
>
> Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

Elements for Consideration for Relationship to Family

Role Identity

Integrity

Relationship

Social Expectations

Spouse

Stressors on spouse and children

Stress relievers—hobbies and quality time

Spiritual care of the family

Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 4

Place of the Chaplaincy in the Military Organization

Effective ministry <u>within</u> an organization requires an understanding <u>of</u> the organization. Church management, as a discipline taught in seminaries and explored in professional literature, enables civilian clergy to understand churches as organizations—the forces, structures and processes that shape the life of church institutions—and to apply that understanding in solving the problems faced in church-based ministry. As we have seen, chaplains are clergy ministering in organizations quite different from churches. The approach, however, is similar: that of understanding the institution for the sake of more effective ministry.

The major aspects of military institutions will be explored in this chapter: their bureaucratic organization, and the principle of military command on the basis of which they operate.

The Military Organization as a Bureaucracy

Curiously enough, chaplains can learn much about effective military ministry when they understand that the armed services are bureaucracies. Distasteful as the term may be, a primary fact of life for them is that they are "bureaucrats." Any large organization is likely to be bureaucratically structured, and a member of the clergy whose ministry takes place in such an institution must fit into a carefully defined slot in the organization. Generally this slot is several levels down from the top. This fact alone represents a major adjustment for the clergy.

The classic description of a bureaucracy was outlined by Max Weber, one of the pioneers in the field of sociology, in the early part of the 20th century. Today the term is frequently understood in a negative sense, as referring to bumbling incompetence, red tape, depersonalization, rigidity, and resistance to change. These characteristics are all too evident in contemporary bureaucracies, and the tendency for them to develop in large organizations has been brilliantly satirized in such classic treatments as *The Dilbert Principle*[67] and the comic strip on which it was based.

The minister as bureaucrat is the <u>reductio ad absurbdum</u> in such a view. He or she is likely to be regarded even more scornfully by fellow clergy than is the secular bureaucrat. Religious circles place a premium on spirituality, on sacrifice, on inspiration, on prophetic utterance, and on the immediacy of the Holy Spirit. The picture of clergy-as-bureaucrat, entangled in red tape, shuffling files, reviewing "cases," clock-watching through the working hours, moving papers from in-basket to out-basket, and jealously guarding pension rights, is at the opposite extreme from these values. To ask clergy to appreciate the place of the chaplain in the military bureaucracy, then, is to try their patience.

Basically, however, and in its original usage, the term "bureaucracy" is a neutral one. Underneath the Dilbert-like distortions, there are many positive factors. Weber used the term as almost synonymous with "organization" itself. If one returns to his original

insights there is much to be learned about the functioning of large organizations such as the armed forces.[68]

The function of bureaucracy, as Weber described it, is to bring rationality into institutional life. Every organization is in this sense bureaucratic. In managerial studies today one encounters so-called "non-bureaucratic" models, but they are non-bureaucratic only in the sense that they depart from the classical model as described by Weber. All non-bureaucratic models become to some extent bureaucratized.[69]

The armed forces are bureaucracies not only in the generic sense of being organized institutions but also in that they follow Weber's classic model. To examine the implications of the chaplain's membership in a bureaucratic organization, then, is simply to examine his or her organizational environment. Negative stereotypes express a danger, but not an inevitability.

Weber's Bureaucratic Principles

Max Weber described in some detail the main characteristics of bureaucratic organizations.[70] These include the following aspects particularly relevant to the chaplain's place in the organization:

1. A bureaucracy is "a continuing organization of official functions bound by rules." There is an elaborate system of abstract rules which are applied to particular cases. Such rules save time and make it possible for business at hand to be handled fairly, without the capriciousness of individual decisions in each individual case. This contributes to the rationality of the organization. As Weber pointed out, these regulations, together with decisions and precedents, must be formulated and recorded in writing. The emphasis on written rules is one of the central characteristics of a bureaucracy.

2. A bureaucracy is characterized by a clearcut division of labor. There is "a specific sphere of competence" for each official. This involves "(a) a sphere of obligations to perform functions which have been marked off as part of a systematic division of labor; (b) the provision of the incumbent with the necessary authority to carry out these functions; and (c) that the necessary means of compulsion are clearly defined and their use is subject to definite conditions." Here is the heart of the military staff system. Classically, the divisions of labor has included "line" functions, which are directly concerned with authoritative decisions necessary for the achievement of the organization's goals (hence the term "line officer" for those exercising military command) and "staff" functions, which are technical and advisory in nature, and generally outside the direct chain of the "line" organization.

3. "The organization of offices follows the principle of hierarchy; that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one." Officials are accountable to superiors for subordinates' decisions and actions as well as their own.

4. Incumbency is based on technical qualification and is safeguarded against arbitrary dismissal. "The rules which regulate the conduct of an office may be technical rules or norms. In both cases, if their application is to be fully rational, specialized training is necessary. It is thus normally true that only a person who has demonstrated an adequate technical training is qualified to be a member of the administrative staff." The bureaucratic system depends on the training and competence of incumbents of positions. This proclivity for training has facilitated

the emphasis on continuing education, characteristic of the military chaplaincy, which will be discussed in some detail in a later chapter. A corollary of bureaucracy's emphasis on technical qualifications is that promotions within the system are based on seniority, achievement, or both.[71]

The bureaucratic features of a military service constitute one of its safeguards against arbitrariness and capriciousness in the exercise of military command. Civilian clergy who regard the subjection of ministers to military command as a threat to the authenticity of religion, have accused chaplains (as one church report did) of having "traded the freedom of Christian ministry for bondage to command influence."[72] They need to understand that the threat is balanced by the safeguards of a bureaucratic system. The written word may, as St. Paul suggests, deaden, but it also protects. Written regulations govern every aspect of military life. They prevent quick, rash, decisions.

A bureaucratic division of responsibility recognizes the chaplain's sphere of competence, assigns responsibility, and provides the authority to carry it out. The hierarchical principle places each commanding officer under the supervision of a higher commander, and places chaplains in staff positions as advisors to senior commanders at every level. The recognition of technical training and competence makes chaplains the "experts" in their own sphere of responsibility. Though bureaucracy presents dangers to authentic ministry, each of these bureaucratic principles protects the chaplain's ministry from "bondage to command influence."

Principle of Military Command

Beyond bureaucratic dangers and safeguards, an additional fact of life for military chaplains is that theirs is an authority-based organization. "I am a man under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go,' and he goes, and to another, 'Come,' and he comes," said the Roman centurion to Jesus. Military organizations have changed little in that respect. They operate on the basis of orders, duty, and obedience. A study made by the author examined the "humanization values" which set the tone of interpersonal relationships, not only in contemporary "pop" culture but in management and organizational studies as well. It was discovered that such terms as authority, orders, duty, and obedience carry a negative connotation for contemporary managers. The organizational orthodoxy of the day calls for consensus rather than authority; for management teams rather than bosses, group decision-making rather than orders, self-fulfillment rather than sacrifice for the institution, autonomy rather than obedience.[73]

The anti-militarism of the Vietnam era has long since subsided, and military forces as such are once again held in high regard by the American public. But an authority-based organization in a personal fulfillment-based social climate has inherent problems for both insiders and outsiders. The military services, by extensive employment of managerial and organizational consultants and by graduate training in the social sciences for selected officers from their own number, have sought to deal with such problems. But in so doing they have contributed to their own internal conflict. The humanization values of social scientists have not meshed well with the "duty-honor-country" ethic epitomized by the West Point motto. Despite concessions made to contemporary behavioral doctrine and the uneasy compromise reached with up-to-the-moment managerial expertise, the military services have remained basically authority-based systems. Commanders still command.

The concept of military command is not nearly so fearful, however, as church people without military experience imagine. At its heart it is not so much a matter of arbitrary and autocratic decisions as of pinpointed responsibility. The military commander is, in fact, probably less likely to make arbitrary, capricious, or poorly thought-out decisions than is the executive in business, labor, government, or academe—perhaps even the church—who may be safeguarded by tenure, protected by a "golden parachute," or operating behind fuzzy lines of responsibility. The military staff system (of which the chaplain is a part) is a precisely designed and long-tested instrument for providing commanders at every level with the best possible professional advice and technical expertise on which to base every decision. The greater authority of the military commander is matched by greater accountability. If the commander's decision is wrong, he or she is far less likely to evade the pitiless pinpointing of responsibility than is the non-military bureaucrat. The captain of a ship may be sleeping peacefully when the ship runs aground. The Board of Investigation may find the immediate cause in a factor over which the captain had no control; human error on the part of the officer of the deck, an inaccurate chart, mechanical failure in the engine room. But blameless though the captain may be in a direct sense, the principle of responsibility, for the one in command when it happened, is relentless, and future promotion to higher rank becomes unlikely.

The power of command in a military institution is formidable. Under combat conditions—and it is to be prepared for such conditions that a military organization exists—instant and unquestioning obedience to orders by every person in the command can become a matter of life or death. Military services, therefore, are not likely to surrender this basic institutional characteristic. All chaplains serve under military commanders, administering the "command religious program." In theory the authority of those secular commanders over their religious ministry can be nearly absolute. In practice, however, commanders are unlikely to interfere in what is recognized as the province of the church.

Said an experienced Air Force chaplain interviewed for this study, "The bottom line is that I have never in twenty years been asked to do anything contrary to the teachings of my church. I'm a Missouri Synod Lutheran, and some Lutherans still have closed communion. Nobody has ever asked me why I can't do a general communion service. That's just the way it is." As we shall note in some detail later, the principle of military command and accountability, which operates at subordinate levels as well, is likely to give chaplains far more control over and responsibility for their own religious programs than most civilian clergy enjoy.

The Military Staff System

The military staff system brings together the principle of military command and the principle of bureaucratic organization. The military commander bears the ultimate responsibility for everything that happens in the command. But as we have seen, "expert" advisors are provided in every technical area.

In accordance with the principle of command responsibility the commanding officer is the one who provides for religious worship in the Navy.[74] In the Army, "The commander is responsible for ensuring that soldiers and their families have opportunities for the free exercise of religion."[75] Air Force "commanders through the chaplain service accommodate the religious practices of assigned personnel and family members."[76]

As the Air Force directive indicates, along with the principle of command responsibility goes a staff system in which the commander, who has no technical training whatever in the field of religion and is expected to have none, has been given a staff professional—the chaplain—with a "specific sphere of competence," qualified for the job with "adequate technical training" (the phrases are Weber's) to be the "expert" in that field. Under the staff system the commander is the one who signs the orders and accepts public responsibility, but the staff specialist is the one who has full professional responsibility within the organization.

An understanding of the staff system and acceptance of the staff relationship helps, then, to clarify the place of the chaplain within the military organization. The chaplain's personal role as a religious leader is at the same time more independently responsible, and less so, than is the equivalent role in the civilian church. It is more responsible because the chaplain is a religious professional in a non-religious organization, with fewer ecclesiastical checks and balances than in a church system. The average commanding officer, who in all probability is not of the same denomination and may not be of the same religion, is far more likely to let the unit chaplain do whatever he or she sees fit in the religious sphere than the average bishop, district superintendent, or board of deacons.

A chaplain serving with Marines said, "I have never in the military had a commanding officer tell me what I was to preach on or not preach on. But when I was a civilian clergyman the president of a national trade organization was in my church. Some farm migrant issues arose, and he didn't like one of my sermons. He said, 'You will not preach on any migrant issue.' We had a disagreement about that. But I have never had anything like that in the military. I realize it could happen in the military too. But a chaplain in the military is considered the professional who is to recommend to the command regarding religion. In the civilian world there are many questions raised as to how it's going to affect the budget, how it's going to affect payments coming in, etc."

If a civilian clergyperson should take a notion to rearrange the mass or rewrite the Apostle's Creed, correction by the bishop or by officers of the congregation would come in short order. The chaplain who does so may be considered an oddball, but is likely to be allowed to go right on being an oddball as long as it is confined to religious services. As a staff advisor to the commander in administrative matters related to religion, the chaplain is an "expert" whose advice and recommendations will ordinarily be accepted without question. There is no vestry or session to help make decisions. And, it should be noted, the system is not gentle with "experts" who give bad advice.

But at the same time the chaplain is less independently responsible because he or she is not the focal point of the organizational system, as a pastor is of the local church. In a system of military command, the commanding officer is the focal point of everything. The chaplain, whose credentials are religious, is a sub-focal point, with all religious activities having a subordinate place in the larger picture of the command.

Chaplains are also subordinate in a second way. They are far more likely than civilian clergy to be integrated into a technical or professional chain of responsibility, or staff channel, in which their activities are coordinated and supervised by other chaplains. Relatively few civilian congregations are large enough to be served by multiple staffs in which associate pastors are supervised by senior pastors. The most common pattern is a church of modest size served by a solo pastor. And above the congregational level supervision of pastors is limited largely to questions of adherence to denominational standards.

In the armed forces, large military organizations with a number of chaplains working closely together are normative. Some do serve "solo," as the only chaplain attached to a particular unit. Navy chaplains, assigned to ships, are perhaps the most independent in ministry. But even in such cases, the staff chaplain at the next higher level of command has supervisory responsibilities. In the Army, the battalion chaplain is directly responsible to the unit commander, but is part of the integrated religious program of a larger brigade and division organization. In the Air Force, the wing chaplain ordinarily makes sub-assignments and coordinates religious ministries throughout the wing. In each case there is a staff channel, paralleling the command channel, through which the planning and coordination of religious support at every organizational level are done.

The organizational locus of the military chaplain, then, is quite different from that of the civilian priest, pastor, rabbi, or imam. It is determined by the nature of military command, and by the nature of bureaucratic organizations. But once the principles are understood, it is probably no more restrictive than are church organizations. The chaplain will be in a position to minister effectively when military structures are seen not as bugbears, but simply as the characteristics of a particular kind of institution to be understood and used in ministry.

The Chaplaincy Subsystem Within the Military Command System

Insight into the place of religion in the armed forces can be gained from looking at the chaplaincy subsystem (devoted to the ministry of religion) within the larger military command system. The chaplaincy of each armed force is not an organization except in a limited sense. It has the formal corporate identity as the Chaplain Service (Air Force), Chaplain Corps (Navy), or Chaplain Branch (Army) of its armed force. As such, each has its Chief of Chaplains and administrative staff within the Washington headquarters organization of the particular armed service. But the fixing of authority and responsibility for the task of the Corps, Service or Branch is not done within the chaplaincy. As we have seen the fixing of authority and responsibility is done through command structures.

Though not an organization in its own right, however, the chaplaincy is a clearly identifiable subsystem, with the goal of providing for the free exercise of religion within the armed service. The network of interrelationships between the chaplaincy subsystem and the larger military system is extremely complex, but certain aspects can be isolated for examination. A crucially important element in the relationship is derived from the institutional duality of the chaplaincy, which we have already examined in some detail: the fact that the organizational goals of the chaplaincy are not the same as, nor even derived from, the organizational goals of the military service itself. It exists as a subsystem with its own independent goals—an organizational absurdity. Its goals are derived from the other major institution to which chaplains belong, the churches. It is the constitutionally-guaranteed <u>free</u> exercise of religion—according to the rites and forms of the religion itself—that the chaplaincy provides.

To say that the goals of the chaplaincy subsystem are independently arrived at is not to say they are in conflict with the organizational goals of the military service. As pioneer sociologist Emile Durkheim established, religious needs are basic human needs, and no society has thrived without provision for meeting those needs.[77] For seventy years, until its demise, the Soviet Union tried and failed to do so.

From the beginning military services have recognized the necessity for meeting the religious needs of service members and have accepted the religious ministries of clergy as the normal way of meeting those needs in American society. As we have noted before, military commanders have perceived the church-defined goals of religious ministry as fully compatible with their own organizational goals. They have reasoned that a military force cannot fight wars unless its basic human needs—for food, clothing, health, recreation and medical care as well as the free exercise of religion—are met. On this basis, therefore, they have incorporated religious ministry into the general mission of the armed forces.

Some have gone beyond this to an affirmation of the military value of religion. In the early fifties a book on military chaplains as counselors quoted a senior Army general as saying, "The work of the chaplain is vital to the success of American arms. We believe that the solder who prays is a better soldier…" Chaplains themselves have made similar claims. In the same context the book quotes a senior chaplain as pointing out that "the serviceman of disciplined religious character can be trusted to perform his duties in camp or on the battlefield."[78]

But the more the church-determined goal of religious ministry and the service-determined goal of fighting wars are brought together in this fashion the more uncomfortable chaplains become. For if religion is used to make good fighters, the chaplain becomes a tool of military organizational goals, rather than a servant of the goals of the church. Some of the most biting criticisms of the present form of military chaplaincy are those that depict the chaplain as "a greased cog in a machine for killing."[79] Not only are the churches unwilling to provide clergy who might be used as tools in reaching strictly military goals, but chaplains themselves vigorously reject such a role.

However, the more the church-determined goal of religious ministry and the service-determined goal of fighting wars are separated and perceived as unrelated, the less interested the military becomes. Such a chaplaincy defines itself as peripheral to the goals of the military. It is a basic organizational principle that the resources of the organization are directed toward reaching organizational goals. By carefully separating itself from military goals and insisting that its own goals are extraneously derived (from outside institutions), the chaplaincy limits its access to military structures and resources, and thus its opportunity to be effective within the organization. This is the anomalous position in which the chaplaincy subsystem finds itself.

The anomaly has characterized the chaplaincy since its beginning, and as a result chaplains historically have to some extent been "orphans" in the military. As late as the Second World War, basic items of ecclesiastical equipment, such as altar kits, were provided by churches. A World War II chaplain tells of obtaining a much-needed portable typewriter, to enable him to write his sermons, from a volunteer organization in San Francisco. It would have been unthinkable in that period for the military to fail to provide medical instruments for its doctors, but some vague sense of separation of church and state made it easy to ignore the needs of chaplains.

In the late twentieth century, in all three armed services, the chaplaincy subsystems have become more fully integrated into the basic military systems that nourish them. This has been a period in which the armed forces have engaged in intensive self-analysis and reshaped themselves into the modern fighting organizations they are today, widely respected by the American public. The chaplaincies have been part of this process. The office of the Navy Chief of Chaplains, earlier subordinate to the Chief of Navy Personnel, has been elevated to a position in the office of the Chief of Naval

Operations, the Navy's top commander. The financing and materiel procurement systems have been more fully integrated into the system of the Navy at large, with more entitlement to a share of the pie and less dependence on "handouts." The term "Command Religious Program" (CRP) identifies what chaplains do with what commanding officers want done.

Similar processes have brought a higher level of integration in the Army and Air Force. The Army chaplaincy operates under the rubric of "Religious Support," offering, of course, support for soldiers in exercising their First Amendment right to free exercise of religion, but also mission support as an integral component of the Army. This support is rendered through the "Unit Ministry Team." The Preface of Field Manual 16-1, entitled "Religious Support," begins:

> *This publication sets forth the Army's doctrine on religious support. It provides guidance for commanders, staffs, chaplains, chaplain assistants, soldiers, and Department of the Army civilians for religious support to America's Army. The manual defines the missions, roles, responsibilities and duties of those offering religious support. It identifies the environment of religious support and describes religious support in the context of the stages of force projection.*

> *Field Manual 16-1 is based on U.S. Army doctrine as described in its keystone manual, FM 100-5,* Operations, *and other capstone and combined arms field manuals. Staff procedures are based on FM 101-5,* Command and Control for Commanders and Staffs.[80]

Air Force chaplains point to a promotion system heavily dependent on completion at every rank level of the appropriate "Professional Military Education" (PME) courses. These courses, required of all Air Force officers, deal with such subjects as strategy, tactics, organization, communication—important for understanding the military environment but not "professional" for chaplains in the clerical sense. "Chaplain Readiness Teams" (CRTs) ensure that the Chaplain Service is fully in tune with the Air Force-wide emphasis on readiness.

This trend toward fuller integration into military systems is a positive development for chaplains. It ends an era when chaplains were military stepchildren, welcomed as an add-on, but not regarded as part of the inner circle. It ensures solid financial support for ministry, and equal treatment with other officers. It erects safeguards in an era of downsizing, when upper level decision-makers, looking about for ways to save funds by contracting out support services, cast a questioning eye toward chaplaincies and wonder if they could be replaced by "outsourcing" from contract clergy and civilian churches near bases.

But it also increases the danger that commanders may look at chaplains as tools to be used in reaching military goals, valued for their utility in making the troops better fighters. And the tension is built in. The more fully the chaplain subsystem is integrated into the military system, the greater is the inherent discomfort of clergy whose professional goals, determined by their churches, have to do with the worship and service of Almighty God.

The Reserve Component

In the downsized military of the post-cold war period the reserve component of each of the armed services is of great importance. The concept of utilizing reserves only in all-out "national emergencies" such as major wars is outdated. In an era of relatively small deployments for localized crises or peacekeeping missions, there has been a

growing tendency to activate reservists with specialized skills and capabilities, individually or in small units. With the chaplaincies more fully integrated into the military system than in earlier years, reserve chaplains also are subject to unexpected call to active duty in specialized situations. A growing trend toward deployment of forces for humanitarian purposes adds to the possibility.

Each of the chaplaincy subsystems has major organizational structures with responsibility for reserve and national guard affairs, under the respective chiefs of chaplains. While reserve service remains an attractive choice for clergy who prefer to remain in civilian ministry as a primary calling, the possibility of a temporary call to active duty is part of such a chaplain's career expectations. Some choose a period of extended active duty for a specified number of years as a valuable experience in a clergy career, without seeking regular status. During periods of active duty, whether extended or involuntary, the shape of ministry is, of course, the same as for other chaplains.

The Power-Dependence paradigm

The organizational context of the chaplain subsystem within the military is illuminated by the power-dependence paradigm, developed by Richard Emerson[81] and further elaborated by James D. Thompson.[82] Every element in an organization exhibits both dependence and power. Its dependence on other elements in the organizational environment grows out of its need for resources, services, and other forms of support. Its power within the organization grows out of its ability to produce what is needed by other elements of the organization.

Examined in this light, the chaplaincy subsystem is seen as a highly dependent and relatively powerless organizational element. For fiscal support, personnel assistance, transportation, offices, chapels, and access to people it is completely dependent on the military command structure. But its "product" (call it spiritual well-being) is not nearly so readily identifiable as the products of other professional subsystems. Military physicians can point to healthy bodies and recovered casualties; lawyers to military justice enforced and courts martial completed. Even dentists can point to toothaches subsided. But chaplains are hard put to point to anything specific which contributes to military goals. And when they do, they risk trouble with the churches and their own consciences.

Thompson cites research by Burton Clark for an illustration of a relatively powerless group within its organizational environment. Clark studied an adult education organization which rested on "precarious values" in the sense that adult education was not a high priority activity for any of the elements within the organizational environment. As a result, it had to scrounge for resources and cater to unstable coalitions based on fleeting interests. It had no ongoing, stable power base, and was unable to plan adequately or function efficiently.[83]

The chaplaincy subsystem in the military is in an analogous situation. Its church-derived values are "precarious" in the sense that religion is not a high priority activity in relation to military goals. The extent to which its "product" is needed by other organizational elements is subject to widely differing interpretations. So long as institutional duality remains real, and the goals of religious ministry are determined by the churches, the chaplain subsystem is likely to remain relatively powerless within the military organization.

Possibility 1: Increase of Power

Theoretically, there are two possible ways for the chaplaincy to change the equation. One is to increase its power—that is, to increase the ability of the subsystem to produce what is needed by other elements of the organization. This can be done by emphasizing those "products" which have a clear, identifiable pay-off for the military command. Of necessity the pay-offs must be in the area of improved human resources, and chaplains have a long history of developing "programs" to produce such identifiable pay-off. In the early days chaplains doubled as schoolmasters, producing a clear contribution to organizational goals in the form of literate soldiers and sailors. Through the years (particularly in the Navy where it was long officially sanctioned) they have performed a variety of "collateral duties," as recreation officers, public information officers, tour guides, athletic coaches and general factotums. They have collectively bemoaned such collateral—and non-religious—assignments. Individually, however, many chaplains have welcomed them, and have performed admirably in the full knowledge that commanding officers are likely to consider such activities far more closely related to personnel performance (and therefore to watch them more closely) than religious worship and devotion.

In the years following the Second World War, when chaplaincies were firmly institutionalized in the greatly expanded armed forces, programs were developed in all three services known variously as "character guidance," "character education," "moral leadership," and later, "human self-development." Whatever the name, these programs involved compulsory classes in which chaplains gave instruction or led discussions on morality, citizenship, and personal growth. In the heyday of these programs, character education was sold to military commanders on the strength of studies purporting to show statistically that such classes resulted in fewer AWOL soldier, fewer disciplinary problems, better conduct on liberty in overseas areas, fewer cases of venereal disease, and better fighting forces.

During the Vietnamese War the chaplaincies of both the Army and the Navy (which furnishes chaplains to the Marine Corps) developed a "Personal Response Program" designed to improve relations between American troopers and South Vietnamese nations. It provided once again for compulsory classes, this time in cross-cultural understanding and relationships. Sold to military commanders as a means of "winning the hearts and minds" of the Vietnamese people, it developed an uncomfortably close relationship to psychological warfare, and in many instances was clearly so regarded and so treated organizationally by military command. Chaplains in Vietnam also became heavily involved in "civic action" programs, mustering the humanitarian impulses of soldiers and marines (sic) to build and support innumerable hospitals and orphanages, with a clearly-identified public relations pay-off for the command.

These programs, of course, ceased abruptly with the American withdrawal from Vietnam. In the post-Vietnam years the whole character education movement waned, partly out of failure to deliver to commands what it promised, and partly out of inherent ambiguities for the chaplains themselves. But as the century drew toward its close, a perceived crisis in moral values in the whole American society began to preoccupy military leaders dealing with its fallout in the armed forces. The inescapable relationship between religion and morality brought a renewed emphasis in the chaplaincies on issues of character and values. In a later chapter we shall examine the whole question of character education and moral leadership in an increasingly pluralistic society.

Command pay-off has been an element even in forms of ministry more central to the church-established goals of the chaplaincy than issues related to moral values. Throughout the period since World War II an increasing emphasis on personal counseling in the ministry of chaplains has highlighted an activity with clearly identifiable advantages to the command. Large numbers of chaplains have received specialized training as counselors, many of them becoming specialists in the field with full professional accreditation. The professional counseling skills of the entire chaplaincies have been upgraded.

There is no question that pastoral counseling is a legitimate and ecclesiastically recognized aspect of pastoral ministry. It should be clearly understood that all these various "programs" of the past have been developed by chaplains of the highest motives, who have considered them soundly based theologically and integrally related to a religious ministry to the whole person. Each of them has been an effort to emphasize human values within the military institution, and as such a legitimate and necessary part of ministry <u>to</u> the institution.

It is nevertheless true, however, that each of these programs has also had the effect of bringing church-derived goals of the chaplain subsystem into greater congruence with the military-established goals of the organization itself. Each has therefore served the organizational function of increasing the power of the chaplain subsystem through the production of something needed by other elements of the organization. And each has been accompanied by attempts to stake out a more dependable claim to a front-row potion at the money trough and a more universally recognized place in the organization.

Paradoxically, however, the more these contributions to military goals have been emphasized and the better chaplains have become at them, the more trouble chaplains have found themselves in, not only with the churches but also with their own internal value systems. The more organizational power chaplains acquire through these methods, the more they lay themselves open to the charge that they are being used by their military commanders as "adjuncts of war."

Possibility 2: Decrease of Dependence

A second possible way for the chaplaincy subsystem to change the balance of power-dependency within the military organization would be to <u>decrease its dependence</u> on other elements of the organization. Institutional duality decreases dependence in some measure. To the extent that American religious bodies actively support their chaplains, monitor their ministries, and provide concrete forms of assistance, dependence on the military institution is reduced. At the same time the danger of subservience to military commanders is reduced, and authentic religious ministry is facilitated.

A chaplaincy supported and managed entirely by the churches would not be subservient to commanders at all. Some efforts continue to be made to shift to such a system. The 1979-82 lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the military chaplaincy, <u>Katcoff v. March</u>, proposed an alternative civilian chaplaincy for the military, supported and managed entirely by the churches. It cited the 1973 United Church of Christ task force that made such a proposal, as well as church-supported effort on the part of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod to provide a civilian ministry to the military.[84] As we shall note in greater detail in a later chapter, the proposal was totally impractical.

In the current American religious context the classic "mainline" churches that historically have been the backbone of the chaplaincy are all experiencing a major decline in funding at the national level. They are cutting or eliminating long established programs of their own. The newer, more conservative denominations that are now providing a larger proportion of chaplains do not, for the most part, have large national programs, nor are they likely to launch cooperative endeavors with other denominations and faith groups, as were the historic mainline churches. The chance, therefore, that the dependence of chaplaincies within the military system will be decreased by greater control from the churches is, for all practical purposes, nil. And even if such an unlikely change were to take place, a civilianized chaplaincy organization, severed for all practical purposes from the military organization, would become even more powerless within the military than it is now.

A different kind of effort to establish a less dependent power base, this time within the military, is the attempt to enhance the status of the Chiefs of Chaplains and their chaplaincy subsystems. In days past the significance of the office of Chief of Chaplains within each of the three services was largely ceremonial and symbolic. The development of professional support subsystems or staff channels, headed by Chiefs of Chaplains, has given them a much more substantive role. We noted earlier in this chapter, when examining the chaplaincy subsystems, that the trend in all three services in the last quarter of the twentieth century, has been toward fuller integration into the basic military systems. This has decreased dependence by providing more reliable funding for chaplaincies regarded as integral parts of the military. But at the same time, by deemphasizing the uniqueness of religious ministry with its church-established goals, and emphasizing support for military goals, it has lessened the external, church-derived power of chaplains.

A real if minor lessening of dependency comes with increasing the prestige of the chaplaincy within the organization. According to Thompson, prestige is the "cheapest" way of acquiring power, since there is no requirement to give up anything in return.[85] Fuller integration and a recognized place in the system may have brought higher prestige in this sense to the chaplaincies.

Institutional duality is probably the key factor in evaluating the place of the chaplaincy subsystem in the military organization. It is the source of the subsystem's powerlessness, since the fact that chaplains' basic goals are church-derived rather than service-derived makes their values peripheral for operationally-oriented military commanders. The power-dependence ration of the subsystem is not likely to change greatly—and properly so, since power for chaplains is not in itself a goal the American religious bodies can support. Chaplains are likely to remain a relatively powerless group within the military. But institutional duality is at the same time the source of much of the power the subsystem does have. The churches represent values that have considerable importance to the society at large, and the interest of that society in preserving those values, inside as well as outside the armed forces, represents a potent moral force. The churches form an independent moral power base, outside the military institution, of which the chaplaincy subsystem is the continuing representative inside the institution. Even when due allowance is made for religious pluralism, for the organizational fragmentation which denominationalism expresses, and for the historic failure of the churches to deal in a united way with the government, the moral power is still substantial.

The organizational precariousness growing out of their peripheral place in the institution, their dependence, and the absence of power are difficult for chaplains to live with. Even with fuller integration into the military system the precariousness

continues. In a highly structured organization in which everything is focused on military mission the place of chaplains is relatively unstructured. In a duty-orders-authority oriented organization, chaplains deal with a voluntaristic aspect of life. In a hardware-and-technology oriented organization, they deal with intangibles. The danger is always that chaplains will try to relieve the discomfort by giving priority to military rather than church goals. The danger is that they will fall into authoritarian models of ministry, seeking to provide religious leadership through orders and directives. The danger is that they will accommodate too thoroughly to their environment, in an attempt to escape the sometimes painful tension of institutional duality. A major safeguard against these dangers is an understanding of the organization and the place of chaplains in it, a conscious recognition and acceptance of the precariousness which institutional duality presupposes.

Chaplains participate in both the organizational powerlessness and the moral power of the chaplaincy subsystem. Attempts of the subsystem to acquire power or to lessen dependence are necessarily limited in effectiveness and will not greatly change the ministry of individual chaplains. They will continue to live with the frustration of working in an organization in which money for cannons, cammies and computers will always have a higher priority than money for chapels, in which their own professional goals will always be seen as peripheral to organizational goals.

But this does not mean that they must allow themselves to be peripheral to the organization itself, like a pathetic Chaplain Tappman off in a foggy corner of a Catch-22 world. Organizational understanding provides a key. The chaplain has a real and legitimate place in the bureaucratic organization. Staff specialists have real and identifiable functions, responsibilities and opportunities in military command systems. There are positive factors undergirding effective ministry in the organization. Though the priority may be low, the funding system guarantees support to every legitimate part of the organization. Chaplains who thoroughly understand the system can maximize the support that legitimately belongs to their own area of responsibility. The procedures are certainly different from those associated with church relationships and every-member canvasses, but they can provide just as real a foundation for effective ministry for the chaplain who masters them.

Lesson 6: The Chaplain's Relationship to the Local and District Church

Due This Lesson

1-page response to Resource 5-2
Family evaluation
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- discuss the chaplain's responsibility in maintaining good lay and ministerial relationships with Local Church leadership
- discuss the chaplain's responsibility in maintaining good relationships with District Church leadership

Homework Assignments

Read Resource 6-2. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.

Continue working on your oral class presentation as defined in the Syllabus.

Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

"What are we so afraid of 'out there'? The Pharisees were afraid of becoming contaminated, or unclean, and losing their righteousness. I think we have some different fears. I think we are afraid of not knowing how to engage people in genuine conversation. I think we fear rejection. I think we don't know what to say. I think we are unsure of what we have to offer people. I think we are not that enthusiastic about being evangelistic because we feel we don't have a compelling story. The power of the gospel is lost on church members who can sign off on doctrinal positions but have no story of personal transformation."[86]

"Christians (evangelicals especially) emphasize that our connectivity to God is through a relationship with Jesus. We talk about giving him our hearts or inviting him into our hearts. We use love language to talk about committing our lives to him. Then, as soon as the deal is done, we switch the language and go to head stuff. We pull out the notebooks. We go over what we believe, information about the church, and so on.

"A person who claims to be a follower of Jesus claims to have a relationship with him. This means they know him, not just about him (this was Paul's claim in Philippians 3:10). Yet we have turned our churches into groups of people who are studying God as though they were taking a course at school or

attending a business seminar. We aim at the head. We don't deal in relationship. And we wonder why there is no passion for Jesus and his mission? It's because, in our efforts to disciple people, we've been barking up the wrong tree."[87]

The Chaplain's Relationship to the Local and District Church
Elements for Consideration

Relationship with the Local Pastor

Perception of local congregation

Resource Person

A Military Reserve or National Guard chaplain

Ecclesiastical Credentials

Pastoral Authority

Annual Elder's Report

Communication with District Superintendent

District Assembly

District Pastor's Meetings and Retreats

Training Resource

District Chaplaincy Director

Regional Chaplaincy Coordinator

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 5

The Shape of Military Ministry

"This is our chaplain," said the young paratrooper at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, as he introduced his unit chaplain to his visiting parents. His chaplain was a Roman Catholic priest. The parents were Methodists. The young soldier practices no religion and regarded himself as an agnostic. In introducing "our" chaplain, he did not imply that he intended to become a Roman Catholic and thus recognize the priest as his own religious mentor; nor did he intend to return to the Methodism of his parents and look to the priest for Christian leadership in a more general sense. He was not even demonstrating an ecumenical spirit. He was simply recognizing the fact that a chaplain, in the total institutional environment of the military, serves the entire military society rather than those of his own denomination or faith group alone. This is perhaps the most important difference between chaplaincy in the armed forces and the parochial ministry in a congregation.

All members of the clergy share a common core of professional responsibilities. As ordained ministers they lead worship, they preach, and officiate at sacramental or otherwise sacred observances. As pastors of congregations they nourish the sense of religious community, encourage a feeling of moral responsibility to others, organize activities for outreach and service, and provide pastoral care for the faithful. As educators they teach the young and the newcomers to the faith, and encourage growth toward religious maturity on the part of the faithful. These activities make up the inner essence of all ministry and provide a model generally followed in all American religions, non-Christian as well as Christian. But as we have already noted the external shape of ministry is greatly affected by the people served, their particular needs, and the conditions of their life. We have been examining the institutional and organizational setting of the military chaplaincy, and now we shall look at some of the distinctive characteristics of ministry within this unique setting.

From the perspective of an awareness of common goals, we shall be emphasizing ways in which it is different from parochial ministry. We shall, for example, be examining first the serving ministry of a chaplain to the entire military society (and in later chapters we shall look in even greater detail at some aspects of this general ministry to the whole institution). The forms of service rendered are unique to the military situation. But the impetus to serve the world is shared with all those engaged in ministry. Members of Christian churches follow Christ's example of concern for human welfare, seeking to let the divine light shine before all rather than guarding it under a bushel. In some form, the injunction to serve those outside the particular religious fellowship—to feed the hungry, to visit the sick and imprisoned and receive the stranger—is common to all religions. For chaplains, however, the form of outward-looking service to society is shaped by the unique needs of military society.

Following an initial examination of the chaplain's responsibilities to the entire military institution the remainder of the chapter will look at specific characteristics of the military environment that shape the ministry: the age of military personnel; the kind of mobility characteristic of military life; the frequent requirement for non-building-

centered ministries; the cooperative approach as chaplains of various faiths work together. In all cases the assumption is that the inner essence is much the same as in other religious ministries. The outer shape, however, is different.

Ministry to the Entire Institution

The military minister is chaplain to the entire crew of the ship or garrison of the post. Beyond the ecclesiastical context which assumes a pastor-congregation relationship, chaplains have long met their larger group of parishioners as concerned persons, in a purely human context. The present-day decline in denominational identification, particularly among young adults, facilitates this approach. "Nowadays when people come in they are not really denominationally-minded any more," said an Air Force chaplain. "The Catholics will ask for a priest, but many just seem to want 'a chaplain.' And it doesn't matter whether they're Hindu or Muslim or one of the Protestant denominations."

It is in this connotation of concern for service men and women as human beings of value in their own right—as thinking, feeling persons they are called to serve—which the term "chaplain" chiefly carries in the military society. In this serving ministry to persons as persons, the particular beliefs and denominational affiliation of the chaplain are assumed on both sides as being his or her context. But these beliefs do not make demands on the other uninvited. The paratrooper at Fort Bragg knows his chaplain is a Roman Catholic priest when he turns to him for help, and does not expect him to be anything else. Nor does the chaplain expect the trooper to be anything other than an agnostic of Methodist background. This dimension of the chaplaincy respects but transcends the denominational dimension.

Personal Counseling

Probably the best known and most widely appreciated aspect of the chaplain's ministry to the entire military community, rather than his or her denominational constituency alone is personal counseling. The "tell it to the chaplain" tradition with soldiers and sailors had its origin far back in military history. Long before counseling assumed the specialized connotations it now has, the chaplain was known as the advisor and confidant to the troops. Chaplain G. W. Smith, in a paper submitted to the Secretary of the Navy in 1871, wrote, "The work done by a Chaplain is not simply the holding of services on Sunday as required by Regulations. That which tells most is the intercourse with individuals one by one."[88]

Prior to and during the Second World War, the "sympathetic advice and counsel" for which service people turned to their chaplains was taken for granted, but was not the object of much attention. Navy chaplaincy historian Clifford Drury, in a lengthy chapter on "Chaplains at Work" in the Second World War, devoted less than a page to personal counseling. Yet the statistics he quoted (from chaplains' annual reports) was impressive indeed—118,450 interviews, on "all sorts of personal matters and problems" between sailors and chaplains at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, in 1944.

Drury included a selection of "typical cartoons about chaplains and their work" from that period. Four of the six typical cartoons depicted the chaplain's counseling function. In one, a huge bruiser of a Shore Patrolman weeps on the shoulder of a little chaplain, saying, "And nobody loves me."

In another, a sailor says to a weeping chaplain, "But that's only half my story."

In a third, the chaplain leans over his desk to shake a sailor by the shoulders and shout, "Now, for once, you listen to <u>my</u> troubles."

In a fourth, a Marine during a monsoon in the tropics complains to a chaplain who is sitting on his desk to stay dry in his waterlogged office, "Chaplain, my tent leaks."[89]

The thousands of members of the clergy who served as wartime chaplains learned at first hand the readiness of military people to turn to their chaplains for counsel and the potential of this form of one-to-one ministry. The millions of Americans who fought in World War II, for their part, learned to think of the clergy as helping persons, willing to assist anyone in need of counsel entirely apart from membership in a particular religious community. This experience on the part of both clergy and lay people undoubtedly contributed significantly to the development of pastoral counseling as a specialized discipline within the ministerial profession.

After the Second World War, as large armed forces became a continuing part of the American experience for successive generations of clergy and lay people, the trend continued. Pastors, who while serving as chaplains learned how vital this counseling ministry could be, returned to their civilian churches and sought to offer it there. Feeling inadequately prepared, they looked to their seminaries for more and better courses in pastoral counseling. Former soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen, having learned from their chaplains the value of personal counseling in applying religious truth to concrete situations in life, began to expect the same thing of their civilian pastors. The influence of the military chaplaincy in establishing pastoral counseling as a major element in religious ministry has, in this fashion, been enormous.

In the post-World War II period when permanent patterns were being established, chaplains became increasingly aware of the proportion of their time devoted to counseling and its importance in their ministry. In the 1950's a former chaplain described his experience this way:

> An almost unparalleled opportunity for the chaplain lies in personal counseling. Pacifist critics suggest that by and large such counseling amounts to greasing the sluggish wheels of the military machine . . . According to another image, the maladjusted serviceman waits his turn in line to cry on the padre's well-worn shoulder and receive his condolence slip . . . My own experience is quite otherwise. How account for the fact that almost any chaplain who makes himself available is besieged by more men seeking help with personal problems in a month than most ministers receive in a year? . . . Granted that the strain of military life vastly increases the need for counsel. Granted too, that many a man whose unreasonable request has been denied in the chain of command will try the chaplain as another gimmick. This should not blind us to other aspects of the chaplain's role. No symbol of the military system, his uniform notwithstanding, the chaplain is still sought out by servicemen as representative of an abiding order of deeply human and personal values in a life that too often becomes inhuman and impersonal. In the midst of relationships necessarily authoritarian, here is one relationship in which a man can acknowledge his loves and hates, his doubts and fears, his resentments and conflicts of loyalties without being called on the carpet for insubordination or told to keep his personal problems to himself.[90]

Faced with a counseling ministry of these dimensions, chaplains sought to equip themselves to meet the need. As the chaplaincies developed programs of continuing education in the postwar period, counseling training received priority attention. Since few institutions in that period offered the needed training, special programs were

designed at such places as the Menninger Clinic in Topeka, Kansas, the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, University of Texas, and Catholic University. A survey of the entire Navy Chaplain Corps in the early sixties revealed that specialized counseling training was by far the most widely felt need, expressed by nearly three-fourths of the chaplains.

In the late sixties another form of counseling training for chaplains was initiated in the form of Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE). Such clinical training, standardized and certified by the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education (ACPE) was established in all three armed services by the early seventies. In the late nineties six such training programs were still being operated by the chaplaincies, four in the Army and one each in the Navy and Air Force.

The military chaplaincies have both contributed to and benefited from the growing importance attached to counseling in seminary education and the ministry generally. Because today's clergy are likely to have had CPE and counseling courses in seminary, and are generally better qualified for counseling than were their counterparts in the sixties and seventies, there is less emphasis today on counseling training for active duty chaplains. The counseling ministry itself, however, is by no means diminished. To a considerable extent the term chaplain means counselor to military men and women. Primarily because of this counseling and helping ministry to the whole community—not just because of opportunities provided for worship—a Roman Catholic or Baptist or Episcopal chaplain can be known as "the chaplain" of a battalion, squadron or ship, rather than as chaplain only to the 30% or 10% or .5% who are adherents of his or her own faith group.

Confidentiality Issues

One aspect of counseling in which military chaplains have both special challenges and special protections is the safeguarding of confidentiality. In the total institutional environment of the military community, encompassing both the chaplain and the counselee under the military command system, a chaplain may feel some pressure to break a confidence for the sake of the larger good. The commanding officer may have referred the counselee to the chaplain in an effort to help him or her with a problem, and may expect a report back. Disciplinary action may be involved. Some action or potential action revealed in confidence may threaten the safety or welfare of the command or of persons with it. In a military institution there is a greater likelihood that such information may be confided in a chaplain than might be the case with civilian clergy. As a staff officer the chaplain may feel a strong sense of responsibility to serve the best interest of the whole organization. In all these ways the chaplain may feel a greater tension than the civilian clergyperson, who relates only to the counselee with no parallel relationships to vocational, civic, or law enforcement authorities.

Navy Chaplain Charlotte E. Hunter, in a 1995 master's thesis submitted to Princeton Theological Seminary, explored the multiple counseling-related issues presented by a chaplain's institutional duality. She gave two case study instances of broken confidence (with negative consequences for the reputation of chaplains). Though such breaches do occur, they are presumably rare. Close association with Roman Catholic chaplains, for whom the privacy of the confessional is absolute, strengthens other chaplains in this regard. Commanders, by and large, are aware that the confidentiality of communication with chaplains is a valuable asset. Chaplains may, however, because of their sense of responsibility to commanders, put more pressure on counselees themselves to reveal information or to give permission for the chaplain to

do so, than might occur with civilian clergy. Hunter concluded that in very few instances is a chaplain justified in denying confidentiality.[91]

The Uniform Code of Military Justice provides greater privileged communication protection to the clergy in legal cases than do the statutes of most states. Even chaplains' assistants are covered. Rule 503 of the Manual for Courts Martial gives the general rule of privileged communications:

> A person has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent another from disclosing a confidential communication by the person to a clergyman or a clergyman's assistant, if such communication is made either as formal act of religion or as a matter of conscience.[92]

The institutional duality of chaplains, as both clergy and military officers, and their two-way responsibility within the total institution to both commanders and counselees, are sources of tension. It appears, however, that chaplains handle it well, since their skills as counselors are in great demand and the military tradition to "tell it to the chaplain" continues unabated.

Concern of Chaplains for the General Welfare of Troops

Service to the whole institution has from the earliest days involved chaplains in educational and humanitarian activities. We have seen that early chaplains, in both the Army and Navy, doubled as schoolmasters. Until the Naval Academy was established at Annapolis in 1845, much of the responsibility for educating junior officers in preparation for their future duties rested upon chaplains.[93] During the Civil War Army chaplains assigned to hospitals started and maintained libraries and reading rooms. They established schools, many of them giving individual instruction or conducting formal classes. Chaplain Henry Hill, who had a large penmanship class, mentioned that those who lost their right arms learned to write with their left.[94]

An illustration of the wide-ranging interest of early chaplains in the welfare of military personnel and in general humanitarian endeavors is to be found in the story of Chaplain Walter Colton, who served in the mid-nineteenth century. Early in his career as a chaplain he lobbied for higher Navy pay, published a newspaper which became a platform for his outspoken attempts to put Christian principles into everyday use, campaigned against alcohol, and persuaded the Secretary of the Navy to provide money for reading room periodicals at the Navy Home in Philadelphia. In 1845 he accompanied Commodore R. F. Stockton in USS Congress as chaplain of the historic Pacific squadron sent to blockade the California coast against a threat from Mexico. He saw to it that the ship left Hampton Roads with a fine library. During his California tour, he was appointed by Commodore Stockton to be Alcalde (governing official) of the Monterey District. While there he started the first newspaper in California, built a town hall, and established a school.

No one, however, could have accused this chaplain of allowing his extensive interest in human welfare activities to interfere with his religious ministry. In July 1846 he wrote from Monterey:

> We have had for two or three months past an increased attention in our ship to the subject of religion. It began in my Bible-class but spread beyond that number among the crew. As the interest deepened, I established a prayer-meeting, which has been held three times a week in the storeroom, an ample and convenient apartment for that purpose. Here you will find at these meetings some sixty sailors

on their knees in prayer; some thirty of them, it is believed, have recently experienced religion; the rest are inquirers and come to be prayed for... It would affect you to tears to hear these rough, hardy sailors speak in these meetings of their sins, of the compassion of Christ, and their new-born hopes. Almost every evening some new one, the last perhaps to be expected, comes in, and, kneeling down, asks to be prayed for. These meetings have no opposition among the officers, and very little, if any, among the men. There has been a great change in the Navy within a few years on this subject. We can now have Bible-classes and prayer-meetings on board our men-of-war, and find among our officers many who will encourage them, and not a few who will give of their efficient aid.[95]

Humanitarian Service Activities

Throughout the twentieth century chaplains have led military personnel in a wide range of humanitarian services to civilians. Hundreds of orphanages have been established and supported: in Korea, in Vietnam, and in regions all over the world where troops have been based and ships have visited. They have led parties of soldiers, sailors or airmen engaged in painting hospitals, repairing homes, cleaning up after natural disasters, assisting wherever humanitarian needs have been found.

In the post-Cold War period military forces have, as a matter of national policy, undertaken a variety of Humanitarian Assistance and Peace Operations, engaging officially on a command basis in the kinds of humanitarian endeavors chaplains have historically undertaken on their own. In Operation Sea Signal (1994-96), the Haitian and Cuban refugee mission in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, chaplains were given a significant official role. At the height of the operation forty-eight Unit Ministry Teams (UMTs) were in action there.[96]

Chaplains engaged in humanitarian service among civilians, whether officially or unofficially, often acquire information of value to commanders in connection with military operations. As supporters of military goals, chaplains want to help. But as members of the clergy they have a fine line to walk. The extent to which they may engage in inadvertent intelligence-gathering activities is for them a moral quandary. This was often the case in Vietnam.

In a paper on humanitarian operations, Chaplain Margaret Kibben noted:
> During Desert Storm chaplains would go out to the middle eastern churches to coordinate food distribution and assistance. Their visits yielded vital cultural information, such as the expectations Muslims had of the Americans, and clarification of the differences between the Islamic and Judeo-Christian manners and customs. The human intelligence (HUMINT) gleaned from these conversations proved to be valuable not only culturally but tactically; for example some chaplains learned from their middle eastern counterparts where the Iraqi secret police were operating. Certainly CA (Civilian Affairs) personnel were capable of gathering this same information, but consider how easily it was obtained by chaplains, simply because of their religious "connections."[97]

It is generally agreed that providing information to commanders about religious beliefs, customs and observances of indigenous populations in operational areas is a legitimate function of chaplains, beneficial to all involved. However, it is also generally agreed, as Chaplain Kibben went on to specify, that chaplains may not be used as intelligence agents. They may not under any circumstances violate the rules of confidentiality. Even with information gathered in casual conversations chaplains guard against allowing their clergy role to become a tool used for military purposes.

Young Adult Ministry

The parish church society covers all ages and is often weighted toward older people. The military society decidedly is not. It is made up predominately of young adults. The profile has changed somewhat since the days of the draft, when eighty to eighty-five percent of the military personnel were under thirty. Today's all-volunteer military, with a larger percentage of careerists, is approximately 60% under thirty. But that remains a substantial majority. The military chaplaincy is, along with campus ministry, one of the few places in which the churches are offering a specialized ministry to the young adult generation.

It ought to be noted that it is, to a considerable extent, a ministry with single young adults, in a setting isolated from family influences. Large numbers of servicemen and women are, of course, married. And military commanders assume far more paternalistic responsibility for families than is the case with civilian employers. All of the armed forces have programs centered around Family Service Centers, and all make diligent efforts to provide a wide range of services. Chaplains are deeply involved in these endeavors.

The fact remains, however, that under operating conditions such as deployment, peacekeeping, and combat (and it is for operating conditions that the armed forces exist) families are left behind. Separation from family, indeed, is a major factor to be contended with. The heart of the ministry of military chaplains is with single young adults, whether single in fact or geographically single.

When ministers leave the family-oriented programs of the local parish church and enter a young adult society, they may need help in making the transition. For this reason the chaplaincies have been particularly interested in studies of the "Twenty-somethings," Generation X," or the "Thirteenth Generation"—all currently popular names for the age cohort that makes up most of the military.

The fact that young adults are the missing generation in the conventional parish church comes as no surprise to any observer. And this is a fact of crucial importance, for the young adult years are formative years, years when value systems are tested and commitments given. Ministry with this young adult generation is therefore a special challenge for chaplains.

An Army chaplain spoke of today's soldier as largely unchurched. "This reflects the society," he said.

"How does a chaplain respond?" He asked.

"We can look at it in one of two ways," he said. "We can wring our hands and say, 'Oh, my goodness, we've got a generation of unchurched people. There's nothing we can do.' Or we can look at it as an opportunity. We can say, 'Isn't this great? We've got a whole generation here that needs to hear the gospel, and isn't it wonderful that I have the challenge to figure out a way to present it so they can hear it?' And that's starting to be done."

"In past years it would be, 'Okay, we're going to have a service at the brigade chapel (which is in the middle of the barracks). We're going to have it at 9:00 on Sunday morning, and we'll make up some flyers, we'll announce it at the command and staff meeting, and put it in the paper.' Nothing happens. Now, chaplains have started to take some risks and do different things. One thing is to start up a "seeker service"—

very informal, blue jeans, at a nontraditional time, Saturday or late Sunday afternoon. Some people have taken that and run with it."

In visiting bases of all the armed forces, interviewing in preparation for this project, the author found such lively experimentation aimed at meeting the worship needs of the "twenty-something" generation in many places: gospel rock and other kinds of youth-oriented music, accompanied by combos featuring guitars and drums, straight-from-the-shoulder preaching and lots of opportunities for discussion, all presented with the loose informality that fits a young adult lifestyle.

Not all young adults are unchurched, however. Chaplains find that some who talk loudest about the inadequacies and failures of the church are still concerned about it, and in many cases maintaining an active relationship to it. It is sometimes a love-hate relationship. They may reject it intellectually and complain loudly of its irrelevance and hypocrisy. But they are still bound to it with strong ties.

One chaplain told of a young man who had come to him, late one evening, to talk about his problems. He had been arrested for drunkenness the night before, but his sense of failure went far deeper than that. He had flunked out of college before joining the service, and he felt that everything had gone wrong for him. The attitude toward Christianity he revealed was highly ambivalent. He had come from an active Southern Baptist family, and his thinking and standards had been shaped by his religious background. But he had adamantly rejected what he considered the narrowness and rigidity of his own religious heritage. He refused to identify himself as a Christian. He said he had worked out his own standards and beliefs which were quite different from those of the church. Yet in the five weekends since his arrival at the particular base he had attended services in three different churches—one Episcopal, one Roman Catholic, and the third Assemblies of God. (The only one had liked had been the Assemblies of God, because the singing reminded him of his home church.) He also complained in some disgust that none of the churches in town had anything going on weekday evenings; they were all locked. Presumably he had found this out first hand. It should never be overlooked that the church, often has a strong hold on the very young adults who reject it most vociferously. They have a large residue of respect for chaplains, as representatives of the church, and turn to them readily. Their special problems cry out for religious answers, and they know it.

Ministry and Military Mobility

A chaplain and a civilian minister were discussing their respective ministries. "I have a parish of transients," the chaplain said. "My people are continually coming and going. They are transferred, on the average, every two years. On any given Sunday I don't recognize half the people in the chapel. This is one of the unique aspects of the military chaplaincy."

"You think that's unique?" asked the civilian minister. "My people are continually coming and going too. I have a church in a metropolitan suburb, with a lot of rising young executives. Their companies transfer them around just as the military does. They move within the local metropolitan area as their families grow. Corporate downsizing sends them elsewhere to find work. Two-career families struggle to accommodate both jobs, and sometimes settle for commuting marriages. You have to remember that this is a nation of transients."

And indeed it is. In modern, urbanized America, many people move frequently. The quiet, rural community where families lived in the same homestead for five generations and nearly everyone had deep roots is largely a thing of the past.

Yet chaplains who are sensitive to the implications of their environment are not willing to settle for an easy identification between the problems of military mobility and those of mobile America generally. The suburban church and the post chapel do not confront the same kind of mobility. The total institution adds a special dimension. The relationship of military people to the Service is not one-dimensional, like the relationship of employee to employer. The total institution provides for its people a total way of life.

Military forces are by nature highly mobile. By definition they must be prepared to move at a moment's notice. In the post-Cold War era, when military contingents are quickly inserted and as quickly withdrawn from Lebanon, the Persian Gulf, the region occupied by the Kurds, Somalia, or Bosnia, this historic characteristic of fighters and peacekeepers has been accentuated. No matter how solid and permanent a stateside base may look, it exists to support or train the operating forces: the Air Combat Wings and Squadrons, the Airborne and Air Mobile Divisions, the seagoing ships, the fighting regiments, the Marine Expeditionary Forces. Dry as the ground under the Bachelor Enlisted Quarters of a Navy base may be, its floor is a "deck," and the land-based sailor "goes ashore" after work, for liberty "on the beach." The civilian should not be fooled by the seeming permanence of brick chapels and ivy-covered headquarters buildings. The whole mystique of military service assumes a special kind of operational mobility as a way of life.

The differences between the mobility of military people and that of Americans in general can be summarized in terms of the involuntary nature of personal mobility in the armed forces; the family separation which military mobility requires; and the total mobile environment provided by the armed forces.

1. *Involuntary Personal Mobility*

Rising young executives working for Mobil Oil may be transferred by the company from city to city at frequent intervals. But they will always be consulted about those transfers. If they do not like a particular proposal they will probably have other options open. The price may be a lost promotion, but they can stay put if the family does not want to move. Or there is always the possibility of quitting and going to work for Texaco. No so with the military. The transfer of soldiers, sailors and airmen comes in the form of orders. They have much less control over their personal mobility than do civilians.

Further, it is the white collar and executive portions of the civilian workforce that move most frequently. Blue collar workers, in general, are far less mobile. They may move from rural to industrial areas on graduating from high school, or from one industrial area to another to find work. But such moves are self-motivated. Laborers, whether skilled or unskilled, are rarely transferred by an employer.

Blue collar equivalents in the armed forces are transferred as routinely as executives. For all military personnel, orders are orders. You may phone your detailer, state your preferences, submit your requests, but whether or not they are honored will depend on the needs of the service. If you do not like your orders, in the last resort there is no realistic alternative but to grit your teeth and carry them out. Military people have very little control over their personal mobility.

2. Separation from Family

Another significant dimension of military mobility is family separation. In no other way of life does involuntary separation from family present itself so universally as it does in the armed forces. When units were deployed on short notice to the Persian Gulf during the build-up of Operation Desert Shield, cases of single mothers facing the necessity of leaving behind infant children distressed and sometimes outraged newspaper readers. But the mothers arranged some kind of child care, and they went.

Quantitatively the amount of separation from families varies from service to service. It is probably greatest in the Navy, where long periods at sea are routine. Family separation is also common in the other services, however, particularly in the post-Cold War environment of rapid projection of power. The change is probably greatest in the Air Force, which during the Cold War period required very little extended separation from families but now operates with frequent 90-day deployments. Nearly all service people, sooner or later, must undergo some separation from their families.

This aspect of military service leads to a great deal of loneliness. It produces family tensions and pressures, when mothers or fathers must assume the role of the other as well as their own, and when parents must be parents in absentia. It leads to special needs when emergencies arise in separated families. Whether accompanying the deployed troops or serving in the base chapel at the home port or posts in which families are waiting, this separation is sure to be a major element in the ministry of every military chaplain.

3. The Total Mobile Environment

A third and perhaps even more distinctive dimension of military mobility is an outgrowth of the characteristics of the total institution, which we examined in an earlier chapter. Military service provides a total mobile environment for its highly transient people. Servicemen and women routinely conduct their operations in places—at sea, overseas, in areas experiencing natural disaster or civil unrest, or in combat areas—where a normal community environment is not available. Everything necessary to sustain life and social organization must be taken along. The ship at sea is the obvious example, with its self-contained housing, utilities, food services, workplaces, shopping facilities, medical, dental, religious, and recreational facilities, and even its own charity drives. Deployed operating units ashore similarly provide a total mobile environment.

In foreign areas, where the standard of living and culture are quite different from those of the United States, a total mobile environment which meets explicitly American needs must be provided. The number and size of overseas bases has been greatly reduced since the end of the Cold War, particularly in Germany. They continue, however, to be an important part of military life.

American military communities overseas are sometimes ridiculed as "little America" ghettos, complete with Cub Scout packs, backyard barbecues, and an English-speaking Santa at the base exchange at Christmas time. There is justification for the complaint. Many American families in such ghettos pass up priceless opportunities for involvement in another culture and for enriching experiences. But the complainers must remember the involuntary nature of the overseas service of most military families. To live in a charming tatami-matted, sliding-walled, non-heated house among neighbors who speak only Japanese can be a delightful experience for those who choose it; to have it forced on you is quite another matter. As long as military

mobility remains involuntary, American-type communities for those serving overseas will be necessary to maintain an acceptable level of morale.

Even within the United States the military takes families as well as service personnel into areas where they are cut off from the normal facilities of a civilian community. When an air base was needed, the government did not plunk it down in the middle of Manhattan. It went to the prairies of Texas or the California desert or the wheat fields of the Midwest, where there was plenty of wide open space—but no corner grocery or neighborhood church. Such bases were built as complete communities. In time towns grew up outside the main gate, but such a town is an extension of the military base. Even where isolation is not a problem, the civilian resources of surrounding communities, which would be overtaxed by a large military influx, often have to be supplemented.

In post-Cold War era of downsizing and retrenchment, when bases are closing and budgets are stretched, planners often try to cut back by depending more heavily on civilian community resources to met the needs of military families. Such efforts to meet religious needs are limited by two major constraints. In most cases, surrounding communities are unable to provide for all the needs of the military population. Some military people prefer to affiliate with a civilian congregation when one is available, and local churches almost always welcome them. Often they try hard to minister to the soldiers, sailors or airmen at a nearby base, with special programs designed to meet their needs. An excellent illustration can be found in a special task force of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina, which in 1987 produced a report called "an Overview of Military Ministry."[98] This project led to the publication of a book by Donald W. Hadley and Gerald T. Richard, *Ministry with the Military,* which offers valuable helps for churches seeking to provide such ministries.[99] But no matter how effective, such ministries are denominational, aimed at a narrow segment of the military population, and fall far short of providing the full range of opportunities for the free exercise of religion required by the conditions of military service.

Even if civilian churches in a given locale were able to meet the needs of the entire military population, these churches never accompany the troops on their deployments, combat operations, or ships at sea. A second and far more basic factor is that military forces exist in order to deploy, to move rapidly to trouble spots, or go to sea. The kind of situation that demands a total mobile environment—including a chaplaincy to meet the constitutional right to free exercise of religion—is normative for the armed forces.

An additional factor is that quite apart from operating units such as ships at sea, overseas deployments, and isolated bases, all of which in some measure require the total mobile environment to sustain life, military service tends to crate a self-contained way of life in which people become comfortable. Service life is different from "the outside." People become accustomed to finding a total mobile environment provided for them wherever they go. "Home" goes with them making the involuntary mobility less onerous.

Implications for Ministry

The chaplain's place in the military community is related to all these aspects of this particular kind of mobility. The involuntary dimension of military mobility has certain implications for the nature of the ministry. There is a ministry to those seeking to adjust to unwanted assignments, unchosen jobs. There is a ministry to those trying to make themselves happy in areas they do not like, among customs and cultures they do not understand. There is a sense of permanence and stability, an at-homeness in

even the most unwanted environment, which can be contributed by the presence of the church that is "built on a Rock."

There are equally straightforward implications growing out of the family separation which is part of service life. No chaplain who has watched soldiers aimlessly wandering the streets in off-base towns, who has helped a suddenly-deploying mother make arrangements for the care of a small child, who has talked with a spouse desperate just for the sound of an adult voice, can be unaware of the challenge to provide a religious ministry to the loneliness of separation. Family tensions, caused or intensified by such separation, increase vastly the need for a counseling ministry. And the crises that inevitably arise in separated families offer military clergy some of their greatest opportunities.

There are dangers. Some military people and their families have a tendency to look upon the services of a chaplain as a "government benefit" to which they are entitled as part of their compensation. In such a context the elements of personal responsibility and existential involvement which must be part of a vital religious experience are downgraded. But there are redemptive elements, too. The non-church-related young spouse back home, facing a crisis in the absence of the deployed partner is not likely to search out a civilian minister with whom there is no relationship. But when the chaplain is one of the military community's "benefits" the partner has left behind, the chances are good the spouse will make use of it. In a highly transient life, the total mobile environment becomes a substitute for the kind of stability others may find in the long-established community structure of a civilian neighborhood. It provides a security that would otherwise be lacking. The presence of a chaplain, as part of that environment, contributes to the stability and security. Chaplains will minister effectively when they understand the unique dimensions of this kind of mobility, and respond to them in relevant and creative ways.

Non-Building-Centered Ministry

Conventional religious ministry is centered in a church building. Such a building has a tendency to become the focal point of its own world. One of the dangers is that activities within the building may become isolated from the world at large; that ministers, surrounded by little groups of like-minded believers, may preach from their pulpits a message to which few are listening. The military chaplaincy has helped the church keep in touch with its times, go where the people are, and say things relevant to their needs. It constitutes an assertion that religion cannot be kept in a cloister.

The military chaplaincy has never been a building-centered ministry. This is not to say that chapels are not used and appreciated in permanent bases where they are appropriate; no one wishes to do away with buildings and building-centered ministries where they fit the need. But the important thing is that the chaplaincy is not tied to this pattern. Although it must be admitted that at times chaplains do try in unimaginative ways to translate the structures of a building-centered ministry into a society that does not fit them, the chaplaincy has long recognized that what is really needed for corporate worship and religious community is not a place, but people. Mess compartments, open decks, tents and fields, are routinely adapted for worship, and chaplains learn to use, rather than change, whatever conditions they find.

Chaplain Bill Smith, serving on a Navy ship, is not sitting in his church isolated from the world. He has no church building. Even the space in which he preaches on Sunday morning is a mess hall the rest of the week. When his parishioners go to sea, he goes to sea. When they visit Hong Kong, he visits Hong Kong. When they are waked in the

middle of the night for a General Quarters drill, he is waked and goes to his assigned station. When they eat, he eats; when they get seasick, he gets seasick. Despite his non-combatant status he is present with them even in the thick of battle. He learns to know the non-religious as well as the church-goers: what they do, what they think, what they feel.

SSG Christian Mulvaney described the ministry of Army Chaplain Terry Austin, serving with soldiers who were part of a United Nations peacekeeping mission in Macedonia:

> Every Sunday, Chaplain Austin conducts a church service in Camp Able Sentry for the soldiers in the rear. But on Monday, you'll find him on his knees praying for transportation to get out to the forward Observation Post. Be it by helicopter or wheeled vehicles, he makes it a point to get to the soldiers any way he can.
>
> "I go to the OPs weekly. I think it's important to have personal contact with the soldiers, let them know what they do is important," he said.
>
> While there, the chaplain gathers the troops to a nearby tree and leads them in prayer and worship. "For you guys here at the OPs, let's make Monday or Tuesday, Sunday! A day that you can take a moment and pray for family and friends, strengthen your bond with God," he explained.
>
> Regardless of the soldier's religious preference, the chaplain's arrival seems to bring smiles to their faces."[100]

During the years of the Cold War the Air Force chaplaincy came to be regarded as an exception to the non-building-centered pattern. The mission of that Service in the period of nuclear stand-off with Soviet Union was focused to a considerable extent on intercontinental missiles and the Strategic Air Command with its long-range bombers, all based within the United States. There were, of course, overseas bases and a few deployed units in remote areas, but the basic paradigm was well-established bases from which Air Force planes flew out on their worldwide missions. In such a context, the chaplaincy was largely organized around base chapels with large parish programs similar to those of civilian churches.

In the post-Cold War era, with the lessening of the nuclear threat and dismantling of the Strategic Air Command, the Air Force has placed great emphasis on mobility, on readiness for rapid deployment through the Air Combat Command. In this context its chaplaincy is moving into a new paradigm focused on "outside the walls" ministry: on the flight line, in maintenance areas, with the airmen in Combat wings and squadrons. There is a strong emphasis on Chaplain Readiness Teams (CRTs) for rapid deployment.

An Air Force chaplain described the change. "The Air Force [chaplaincy] has always sat there and chuckled at the Army, because the Army was always out in a tent some place. Navy chaplains were always floating around out there for six months at a time. The Air Force was the home guard. Our planes flew out of bases, but we didn't go too far; we stuck around the base. It's not that way any more. We have a semi-joke that says the Air Force is very quickly joining the Army. We're spending a great deal of time on mobility, preparing for field conditions, combat training—all the things the Army has been doing for years. We're experimenting with a new idea, deploying with your Wing. And this makes total sense."

The basic Air Force pattern continues, however, to be more centralized than in the other services, with all chaplains assigned at the Wing level, from which they are sub-assigned to chapels, squadrons, or work areas, and trained in CRTs for deployment. The chapel programs in established bases continue, of course, but the new emphasis is much closer to the kind of mobility that has earlier characterized the Army and Navy chaplaincies.

Some senior Air Force commanders, accustomed to the old pattern of parish programs at stateside bases and faced with a downsizing requirement, have pressed hard for civilian "outsourcing" to contract with clergy for religious ministries. While some pressure of this kind has been experienced by all the chaplaincies, it has been easier for the Army and Navy chaplaincies, with a long history of deployment with troops and ships, to demonstrate that such an alternative is neither possible nor workable.

One result of these changes has been much more separation from families for Air Force chaplains themselves than was once the case. Apart from a rare one-year isolated assignment in a remote area, such separations were once almost unknown. Now with most overseas air bases closed, and with routine 90-day deployments for Air Combat Command units (120 days in Europe), Air Force chaplains and their families have had to become accustomed to the kind of separation Army and Navy chaplains have long experienced.

Said the same Air Force chaplain quoted above, "With all the brush wars going on you're going to be deployed probably an average of 90 to 120 days a year. For the Air Force this is unheard of. The Army says, 'That's okay,' and the Navy says, 'You've got to be kidding; that's nothing!' But in the Air Force, where in the good old days, you were talking about being gone for a year at most, once or possibly twice in a 20-year career, this is terrible hardship!"

It would be naïve to claim that all chaplains are as creative as they might be in meeting the challenge of a non-building-centered ministry. A group of chaplains who had served at Mogadishu during the Somali operation, described a perimeter containing personnel of all the services, with Army, Navy and Air Force chaplains all present. Conflicts between concepts of ministry—"go where the troops are" vs. "stay in a central place and let the troops come to you"—were experienced. But as one chaplain pointed out, such differences reflect the preferences of individual chaplains as much as differing service traditions. In the nature of things, it is fair to say that the average chaplain conducts more religious services outside of chapels than in them, more services at times other than eleven o'clock Sunday morning than in that hallowed hour, and that he or she is doing more adapting and experimenting to discover the most appropriate forms of worship, pastoral care, and religious community than is the average civilian counterpart. Military ministry demands it.

The non-building-centered nature of the ministry of chaplains, together with their place in the military organization, give them unparalleled opportunities for evangelism. On one occasion a chaplain gave a devotional talk at a breakfast meeting for service people in an Armed Forces YMCA. Since the breakfast was free and the place convenient, attendance included some who probably would not otherwise have been listening to devotional talks. The chaplain spoke on the parable of the talents: the man who was given five talents and returned ten, the man with two who returned four, and the one-talent man who buried his. Afterwards the chaplain was cornered by a little group of sailors who asked questions and wrote the answers in a notebook. Shortly one of them asked, "Chaplain, is it against Navy Regulations to quote the Bible at Captain's Mast?"

"I don't think so," was the reply. "Why do you ask?"

"I'm going to Captain's Mast because I got caught running a slush fund," the sailor said. "I lend out $5 and collect $10 back on payday. And since ten for five is exactly what the Bible teaches, I want to quote it to the captain at mast."

While not necessarily the most fruitful contact between a chaplain and an obviously unchurched sailor, this encounter is typical of the kind of interchange that goes on continually. The young men and women of the armed forces come from a wide variety of backgrounds, and many of them have had no meaningful contact with organized religion. There is no minister who has a better or more natural opportunity for meaningful encounter with this functionally non-religious segment of the young adult population.

Chaplains do not have to stand outside the lives of unchurched young adults, knocking on the door, looking for a way to relate to them, searching for some channel of communication. It is handed to them on a silver platter. In the field, on the flight line or aboard ship, chaplains share the lives of their parishioners. They know how good it feels to get a shower after a week's maneuvers in the field because they are as grimy and stinking as the soldiers. This is a ministry far removed from church parlors and the niceties of religious symbolism: a ministry in the midst of a kind of life that is thoroughly secular and sensual, often rough and crude, sometimes raw, but life as it is being lived. The witness of chaplains to these millions of strong, healthy, bright and skillful, but often spiritually unconcerned and religiously unconnected young men and women, is an unparalleled opportunity.

Ministry Across Denominational or Faith-Group Lines

A representative of the National Jewish Welfare Board, visiting a military base, was invited to attend a meeting of local chaplains. No Jewish chaplain was permanently assigned to the area, and local chaplains had been called together to discuss ways of providing religious services for Jewish men and women. As the meeting was drawing to a satisfactory close the Jewish Welfare Board representative, looking around him, observed, "Only in the military would you find a scene like this: a group of Christian clergy, Protestant and Roman Catholic, sitting around working out arrangements for Jewish services."

The chaplaincy is sometimes called an ecumenical ministry. Certainly it is, in a sense. But the label can be misleading. It can give the impression that denominational differences are ignored and that chaplains are not faithful representatives of the various churches and faith groups that ordained and endorsed them. The basic system of the chaplaincy is more accurately labeled cooperative pluralism than ecumenism, and the relationship of the chaplaincy to American religious pluralism will be examined at length in the next chapter.

The cooperative dimension is, however, a unique element in military ministry. Chaplains of all denominations and faith groups work together in a spirit of teamwork, mutual respect and understanding. They minister to servicemen and servicewomen of many faiths in an atmosphere remarkably free of sectarian tensions. A former chaplain described the experience this way:

One of the most gratifying memories of my term in the naval chaplaincy is of a truly ecumenical Bible-study group on board a destroyer. Twenty-five men from sixteen denominations crowded every other night into the tiny sick bay to study

the Gospel of Mark. They were singularly free from the denominational defensiveness they might have brought to such meetings back home—if you could muster such a group in a parish.[101]

The impetus given to ecumenism of this kind has been a major historical contribution of the military chaplaincy to American religion. In the 80s and 90s, the term ecumenical has come to be associated primarily with the movement within the more liberal wing of Christianity toward conciliar and organizational unity between denominations. Military chaplains are far removed from the upper reaches of this kind of ecumenism, as seen in interchurch organizations. They have, however, pioneered in a practical ecumenicity which has helped immeasurably to make it possible for Americans of different denominations to work and worship together. The effect has been deeply felt by both ministers and lay people. In the second half of the 20th century a significant percentage of the people who have made up the membership of the churches have been, at one point in their lives, members of the armed forces or their families. A significant percentage of their ministers have served at some point as chaplains.

The contribution of the chaplaincy has not been one of promoting church union as such. Ministers who enter the military are and remain clergy of their own denominations or faith groups. But they enter a cooperative ministry in which they soon learn that a narrowly partisan denominational viewpoint can do more harm than good. They must work closely with clergy and with parishioners of many denominations and of other faiths. Some chaplains know little of any church but their own when they enter the military. But they quickly learn that, when it comes to ministering to persons, fine theological and historical distinctions are not nearly as important as they may have seemed back in seminary.

Lay people learn the same lesson. A devout Baptist soldier, serving in a unit whose only chaplain is Methodist, hearing the Word of God truly preached by that Methodist minister and finding her religious needs genuinely met, goes back to civilian life respecting the Methodist church.

When several chaplains are assigned to the same command, inter-denominational teams are the rule; it would be a misuse of denominational resources to place two chaplains of the same denomination on the same team. A team made up of a Lutheran, a Baptist and a Nazarene, serving a congregation ranging all the way from members of the Church of God to Episcopalians, sharing facilities with other congregations of Roman Catholics, Jews, and possibly Muslims as well, is routine in the military.

Another contribution of the armed forces chaplaincy to religious understanding and ecumenical attitudes merits mention. A characteristic of the post-World War II, Cold War, and post-Cold War periods has been the presence of American forces in scores of countries all over the world. In the Far East and Europe and on ships visiting ports everywhere, American Christians led by their chaplains have encountered the worldwide church. With Desert Shield and Desert Storm they had a close-up view of Islam in the Persian Gulf region. In Bosnia they encountered Catholic Croatians, Orthodox Serbs, and Muslim Bosnians, an instructive if not always encouraging view of the place of religion in cultures. Military service has brought hundreds of thousands of Americans into contact with their own and other religions worldwide. On the whole they have responded enthusiastically to their contact with religious people of other races, languages and cultures.

Our starting point at the beginning of this chapter was the recognition that military ministry is not in its essence or its goals different from any other religious ministry. Its outward shape, however—the way in which ministry is done—is a response to the peculiar conditions of military life and the special needs of military people. In this sense, it is a unique ministry.

For more than fifty years now the American churches and faith groups have committed substantial numbers of their clergy to this ministry. In that period the number serving at any particular time has seldom fallen far below thee thousand, and at times it has far exceeded that number. It is strange indeed that a ministry performed by so many of the clergy for such an extended period should have received so little scholarly and professional attention.

The churches—and many chaplains—have assumed that military ministry is the same as civilian ministry. This assumption has been attested by the requirement, almost universal among the religious bodies and generally affirmed by the military, that a member of the clergy, seeking a chaplaincy appointment, serve for a minimum of two or there years in a civilian parish as a prerequisite to endorsement. A ministerial candidate whose vocational goal is the chaplaincy (and many whose calling to the ministry has come during military service have entered their professional preparation with such a goal) has no choice but to prepare for parish ministry. Few seminaries have offered courses in preparation for the chaplaincy, and rarely if ever is the chaplaincy offered as a major field of study. The churches have been content to leave all specialized and adaptive training to the chaplains schools, operated by the military services.

It may be high time for a study of the shape of military ministry on the part of the churches and a rethinking for the scholastic and professional preparation for such ministry.

Lesson 7: The Chaplain's Relationship to the General Church of the Nazarene

Due This Lesson

1-page paper from Resource 6-2
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- discuss why an Ecclesiastical Endorsement is a chaplain's most important credential
- outline the Ecclesiastical Endorsement process
- discuss how a chaplain maintains a strong relationship with the General Church

Homework Assignments

Read Resource 7-3. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.

Finalize your oral presentation from your interview as defined in the Syllabus. The first group of students will present during Lesson 8.

Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

"When Asbury was 13, a spiritual crisis took place under the 'influence of a traveling shoe maker who called himself a Baptist.'

"He held prayer meetings in our neighborhood, and my mother, who was a praying woman, and ready to encourage any one who appeared to wish to do good; invited him to hold a prayer-meeting at my father's house. At that meeting I was convinced there was some thing more in religion than I had ever been acquainted with. And at one of those meetings, held by this man, I obtained that comfort I had been seeking.

"But this . . . did not afford the 'lasting comfort' Asbury was seeking . . . It was left to Alexander Mather to provide the spiritual influence that would be of a more lasting nature. Of that experience he later wrote: 'I was then about fifteen; and, young as I was, the word of God soon made a deep impression on my heart, which brought me to Jesus Christ, who graciously justified my guilty soul through faith in his precious blood; and soon showed me the excellency and necessity of holiness.'

"Alexander Mather had arrived in Birmingham in 1760 and began preaching there and in the surrounding communities. He was one of Wesley's most faithful and discerning preachers. It was to Mather that Wesley wrote in 1777,

'Give me one hundred preachers who fear nothing but sin and desire nothing but God, and I care not a straw whether they be clergy or laymen, such alone will shake the gates of hell and set up the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.' When Mather reported to Wesley that God had called him to preach, Wesley responded, 'Being a Methodist preacher is not the way to ease, honor, pleasure, or profit. It is a life of much labour (sic) and reproach. They often fare hard, often are in want. They are liable to be stoned, beaten, and abused in various manners. Consider this before you engage in so uncomfortable a life.' "[102]

"He is entitled to rank as one of the builders of our nation." Said of Francis Asbury by President Calvin Coolidge at the unveiling of an equestrian statue of Asbury in Washington, D.C., as a memorial to him.

The Chaplain's Relationship to the General Church

Ecclesiastical Endorsement: The most important credential a chaplain possesses.
Without an ecclesiastical endorsement, a minister of the gospel does not have the authority to:
- export pastoral authorities outside the walls of the church
- represent a denomination in the secular world
- operate under organizational protection from threat of lawsuit, and
- function under contract as a chaplain in secular organizations no matter how much training has been accomplished

The Process for Ecclesiastical Endorsement

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

Maintaining a Strong Relationship with the General Church of the Nazarene

Maintain Endorsement Eligibility

Spiritual Retreats

Training

General Assembly attendance

Annual Report

Regional Chaplaincy Coordinator

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 6

The Chaplaincy and Religious Pluralism

From its earliest days America has been religiously pluralistic. New England was settled by English Independents (Congregationalists) who were refugees from religious oppression. The Southern colonies, settled primarily for commercial reasons, adhered largely to the Church of England. In the middle colonies were found settlements of English Quakers (Pennsylvania) and Roman Catholics (Maryland), Dutch Reformed Calvinists (New York) and Swedish Lutherans (Delaware), Scottish Presbyterians (New Jersey, Pennsylvania) and here and there were a dozen other English and European sects. Jews settled early in Rhode Island and elsewhere, and Thomas Jefferson, exploring the implications of religious liberty, even recognized the presence of a sprinkling of "Mohametans."

Every country from which colonists came to these shores had an established church, an officially recognized and supported national religion. Never before had a nation been founded on the basis of freedom of religion, formulated as separation of church and state. And never before had a nation's military forces developed a chaplaincy in such a pluralistic context.

It is difficult for Americans today to conceive of the extent to which religious establishment was taken for granted prior to the founding of the United States. Even in the American colonies an established church had been the normative pattern. Only Rhode Island had a history of non-establishment dating back to the founding of the colony. The last vestiges of religious establishment were not eliminated in some states until many years after the Revolution. The new nation began without an established religion not because a majority of its citizens disapproved of establishment but because different states had different established religions.

The First Amendment's establishment clause, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," applied initially only to the federal government. Records of the debate make it clear that even Madison, the staunchest adherent of strict separation, intended to prohibit only a national establishment. In fact, that part of the First Amendment dealing with religious liberty did not become applicable to the states until it was applied to them by the Fourteenth Amendment.[103]

Historical Development of the Chaplaincy Pattern

The desirability of a chaplaincy was not debated during the Revolutionary period, when the armed forces of the new nation were taking form. The need for it was automatically assumed. Clergy of the national church had accompanied all the fighting forces of western Europe.

Armies of the Middle Ages had been raised by feudal lords when occasions demanded, officered by the gentry, and accompanied into battle by the clergy of the nation's established church. In England, protected as it was by the English Channel, this medieval military model continued well into the seventeenth century, long after other nations developed standing armies. The British militia was simply a new form of the

medieval levy, commanded by the new equivalent of the old feudal leadership. The parliamentary army of the Cromwellian period was the first truly national force in British history.[104]

Even though the Congregationalists and Presbyterians had been dissenters in Great Britain, the chaplaincy tradition with which they were familiar was still that of an established church. The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell had been at least as eager to establish Puritanism as the state religion as the Royalist forces had been to retain the traditionalist Church of England. The New Model Army of the Puritan Revolution had its establishment of Puritan chaplains, just as the Royalist forces had an Anglican chaplaincy. The Scottish Army of the Solemn League and Covenant had its Presbyterian chaplains representing Scotland's established religion.[105]

The colonial militia from which the Continental Army developed continued the English pattern, with elected officers replacing the nobility in providing leadership. Such units, from homogeneous areas, were comprised of persons of the same religion, and the parsons who accompanied them into battle reflected what was essentially an established religion pattern in microcosm.

Neither the American Anglicans, the Congregationalists, nor the Presbyterians (these being the three largest religious groups on colonial America) thought consciously in terms of religious pluralism as the American chaplaincy was established. Although the Anglicans made up the largest religious group, Tory sentiment was strongest in that communion. There were therefore relatively few Episcopal chaplains. It is impossible to determine how many chaplains actually served with military units during the Revolution, but the best estimate is about 115. Of these the largest number were Congregationalists (50) and Presbyterians (21).[106] The principle of choosing chaplains from the denomination to which the majority of men to be served belonged was nearly universal.

Recognition of Minority Rights

Very early, however, there was some recognition of minority rights and of a need for accommodation to the variety of religions existing side by side. As early as the French and Indian War the Virginia Council, at the request of Colonel George Washington, had appointed a chaplain (undoubtedly Anglican, since that was the established church in Virginia) for his regiment. But at the same time, in 1758, provision had also been made for Dissenting (Baptist) clergy to serve with the troops when requested.[107]

During the Revolution minority religion chaplains served minority religion units. In the summer of 1776 a German Lutheran, Christian Streit, was appointed chaplain for the German-speaking Eighth Regiment of Virginia.[108] The only Roman Catholic chaplain of the Revolutionary period (and the first to serve with American forces) was Father Louis Lotbiniere, appointed by General Benedict Arnold to serve with a largely French Catholic regiment organized in Quebec.[109] Even as late as 1861, the first Jewish chaplain to serve with American forces was selected by the 65th Regiment of the Fifth Pennsylvania Cavalry, whose commanding officer and many of the officers and men were Jewish.[110]

James Madison is frequently quoted as the strongest advocate among the Founders of strict separation of church and state. He opposed a military chaplaincy as an unnecessary politicizing of religion (although he seemed less certain that his reasoning was applicable in "the case of navies with insulated crews"[111]). His reasoning with

regard to religious minorities is most clearly expressed in his opposition to a congressional chaplaincy:

> *The tenets of the chaplains elected (by the majority) shut the door of worship against the members whose creeds and consciences forbid a participation in that of the majority. To say nothing of other sects this is the case with that of Roman Catholics and Quakers who have always had members in one or both of the Legislative branches. Could a Catholic clergyman ever hope to be appointed a Chaplain? To say that his religious principles are obnoxious or that his sect is small, is to lift the evil at once and exhibit in its naked deformity the doctrine that religious truth is to be tested by numbers, or that the major sects have a right to govern the minor.*[112]

The consciousness of religious pluralism, and minority needs and rights, was thus present in the developing pattern.

Federal Responsibility Supplants Local Option

As long as militia unites came from local areas which were relatively homogeneous, however, little attention had to be given to religious pluralism as such. And so long as the appointment of chaplains by commanding officers or their selection by the regiment remained the normative pattern, it did not become an issue. It was only as the central government assumed responsibility for the appointment of chaplains (as had been the case with the provision for Dissenters made by the Virginia legislature in 1758) that the necessity for coming to grips with religious pluralism would become inevitable.

Federal involvement in the appointment of chaplains came earlier in the Navy than in the Army. The first ship chaplains had been recruited by commanding officers. As early as 1799, however, Chaplain William Balch was commissioned in the Navy by President John Adams.[113] Thereafter, (although some continued to be appointed by commanding officers or selected by ship's companies, particularly during the War of 1812) the federal government assumed increasing responsibility for providing ship chaplains. Of the forty-one known to have served in the Navy during the second decade of the nineteenth century, eighteen were commissioned by the Navy Department.[114] It must be conceded that many of the Navy Department appointments were political, and that religious pluralism as such received scant attention. Some of the federal appointees were unordained; of the eighteen appointed in the decade only eleven were ordained. One of them was a Unitarian, one a Presbyterian, and the remaining nine were all Episcopalians.

After the War of 1812 local appointments by commanding officers of Navy ships declined rapidly. In 1823 Secretary of the Navy Samuel Southard issued a directive forbidding appointment to the chaplaincy of anyone who was not an ordained clergyman.[115] Two appointments, made by the commanding officers of the Brandywine and the Guerierre in 1827 and 1828 respectively, were both rescinded by Secretary Southard. The last locally appointed chaplain appears to have been John F. Girard, who served on the Potomac from July, 1840, to September 1841. Thereafter all Navy chaplains were appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, with increasing attention to their qualifications if not to their denominational distribution.[116]

Local option continued longer in the Army. General Washington had resisted the substitution of brigade for regimental chaplains during the Revolution, since he felt that "the Christian soldier, defending the dearest rights and liberties of his country,"

should have a chaplain of his own religious persuasion. A brigade was composed of from four to six regiments, and "there might be too many different modes of worship."[117] During the War of 1812 Congress made provision for both brigade chaplains (Act of 29 January 1813) and regimental chaplains (Act of 18 April 1814), but apparently few appointments were made; at the end of the war (1815) there were only four regular Army chaplains, and just one was retained after the war.[118]

In the years following chaplains were informally and locally procured. The Act of 7 July 1838 officially established the post chaplain system, providing for chaplains (who doubled as schoolmasters) to be employed by local councils of administration. During the Mexican War (in 1847), Congress provided for brigade chaplains to be chosen by all the councils of administration of the regiments making up the brigade. As late as the Civil War, regimental chaplains were still being selected by the regiments, and not until 1861 did ordination become an Army-wide requirement.[119] An 1862 provision for the appointment of chaplains for permanent hospitals, subject to Senate confirmation (Act of 17 July 1862) was the first significant departure from the local option pattern.[120]

As we have seen, federal authorities faced with the necessity for appointing chaplains did not at first give much attention to religious pluralism. The American Navy, beginning with the War of 1812, had modeled itself increasingly after the British Navy, including a preference for the Episcopal Church—especially for "officers and gentlemen."[121]

When an academy was established at Annapolis in 1840 to train officers of the Navy, Episcopal chaplain George Jones, who had played a significant role in the founding of the school, was the first chaplain (and head of the English department as well). He became full-time chaplain when the academy was reorganized in 1850, and his successor, Chaplain Theodore B. Bartow, also an Episcopalian, dedicated the first academy chapel in 1854. The service from the Book of Common Prayer became firmly established, and generations of midshipmen became converts to "Naval Academy Episcopalianism." Not until the post-World War II period were modifications made in the Episcopal chapel service, even when the officiating chaplain was Baptist or Presbyterian.

A similar process shaped the religious preference of the Army's regular officer corps. The Military Academy at West Point had been established in 1802, and the Cadet Chapel was begun there in 1836, with a building erected in 1838. Until the mid-twentieth century civilian clergy, consistently Episcopalians, were appointed to head the chapel program.

While the nineteenth century had brought a de facto establishment of Episcopalianism in the officer corps of both services, it has also brought increasing public attention to religious pluralism in the military. In the period between the Mexican war and the Civil War, near the middle of the century, there were a number of attacks on governmental chaplaincies and memorials were sent to Congress asking that they be abolished. A series of replies to these memorials by the Senate and House Judiciary committees, gave evidence of recognition that established church assumptions were no longer relevant, and of increasing attention to questions relating to a chaplaincy serving a pluralistic society.

Judiciary committees of both houses considered the matter after the Mexican War. The Senate Committee reported that neither the letter nor the spirit of the First Amendment were violated by the military chaplaincy. No privileged or preferred status

had been granted to any denomination, the committee claimed, nor had penalties been inflicted on any dissenting individual or group. "It is not seen, therefore," the report concluded, "how the institution of chaplains is justly obnoxious to the reproach of invading religious liberty in the widest sense of the term."[122]

The question of preferred status for one religion over others in a pluralistic society appears to have been involved in two other issues relating to the chaplaincy which received considerable attention in the mid-nineteenth century: the question of appropriate dress for chaplains, and the question of the reading of prayers versus free prayer. Both controversies focused more on the Navy chaplaincy than that of the Army, presumably because of the federalized nature of the Navy chaplaincy compared to the local appointment pattern still normative in the Army.

The debate over the garb of chaplains ranged back and forth between partisans of a plain black suit and those advocating a full officer uniform, between defenders of black buttons and gold buttons. It has sometimes been interpreted by contemporary historians as a reflection of the officer versus clergy role issue.[123] Undoubtedly this question was involved to some extent. It seems clear, however, that questions regarding different denominational traditions were also, and probably more centrally, involved. An 1844 directive from the Secretary of the Navy requiring that chaplains, "while performing religious services on the Sabbath...shall wear the Black Silk Gown usually worn by clergymen" (in fact, usually worn only by the clergy of certain denominations), brought far more protest than the requirement in the same order that the ordinary dress of chaplains would be "a Black Coat, with a black velvet collar, and the navy buttons now in use." A letter written by Chaplain William Colton to the *Independent North American,* in defending the order, recognized that "several religious papers ascribe the introduction of the gown into the Navy as the costume of chaplains to <u>sectarian</u> purposes." Himself a Congregationalist, he stoutly denied that "this originated in a spirit of sectarianism, or that there is anything in it which squints at Episcopacy." His defense, however, was itself a recognition that the denominational issue was important in public opinion. The mandatory black gown for pulpit attire was reversed within a few months, by an order which made the wearing of black gown, plain black coat, or uniform coat optional at divine service.[124]

The other major issue of the period, that of "read prayers," clearly was a denominational question. *Navy Regulations* of 1818 had stated that it was the duty of chaplains "to read prayers at stated periods," and the regulation had remained in effect since that date. The question arose as to whether the clergy of free churches were permitted to offer the extemporaneous prayers customary in their traditions. In January 1859 the House of Representatives sent a resolution to the Secretary of the Navy asking, among other things, whether "there is any evidence on file in the department tending to show that non-Episcopal ministers are required by the officers of the navy to use the Episcopal liturgy." The Secretary replied that the Department was not aware that the regulation of 1818 had "ever been construed other than to offer prayer at stated periods." To avoid any future misunderstanding he immediately issued an order (dated 17 January 1859) to the effect that "it is understood that the Navy Commissioners' Regulations of 1818, requiring Chaplains to 'read prayers at stated periods', have heretofore been construed to require them to <u>offer</u> prayers, and such will hereafter be the construction."[125]

The increasing concern with religious pluralism is indicated by the request, conveyed in the same congressional resolution of January 1859, for information as to the religious denomination of each person appointed as a chaplain in the Navy since 1813.

The fact that the Secretary of the Navy was unable to provide information on the thirty-three of the sixty-one chaplains who had been appointed between 1815 and 1856 (the period covered by the report submitted—including two then on active duty—is eloquent testimony to the Navy's failure, up until that time, to give much attention to the question of religious pluralism. Later research has shown that of the sixty-one chaplains on the Secretary's list, twenty-four (approximately forty percent) had been Episcopalians, thus confirming the suspicions of the non-Episcopalians who had raised the issue with the Congress.[126]

Development of Genuine Pluralism

The real beginning of a military chaplaincy which took seriously the requirements of a religiously pluralistic society can be dated from this debate. It was undoubtedly the source of the naval regulation adopted on 1 June 1860 that "every chaplain shall be permitted to conduct public worship according to the manner and form of the church of which he may be a member,"[127] and still in effect in modified form.

The immediate effect did not include a redress of the balance between Episcopal and non-Episcopal chaplains in the Navy. Of the fifty-six Navy chaplains appointed from 1860 through the remainder of the century, the number of Episcopalians continued at approximately forty percent. The first Roman Catholic Navy chaplain was not appointed until 1888, and the first Jewish chaplain not until 1917.

The Army accommodated far more rapidly to the country's pluralism. In 1861 Congress passed a bill requiring every regimental commander to appoint a chaplain on the vote of the field officers and company commanders, adding that "the chaplain must be a regularly ordained minister of some Christian denomination." An attempt to broaden that with an amendment allowing a "regularly ordained minister of some religious society" was defeated.

Shortly afterwards the officers of the Fifth Pennsylvania Cavalry elected a Jewish soldier to be their chaplain. Under the new law he was forced to resign. The officers of the regiment made a second attempt to elect a Jewish chaplain, this time choosing a Rabbi Fischel. The appointment was once again rejected, but with the encouragement of a Jewish organization Rabbi Fischel met with President Lincoln and asked to have the law amended. As a result of pressure from the president a new law was passed in July 1862, not only broadening eligibility but also providing for ecclesiastical endorsement:

> No person shall be appointed a chaplain in the United States Army who is not a regularly ordained minister of some religious denomination, and who does not present testimonials of his good standing as such a minister, with recommendation for his appointment as an Army chaplain, from some authorized ecclesiastical body of not less than five accredited ministers belonging to said denomination.[128]

As we have noted, the first Roman Catholic Army chaplain served during the Revolution, and the door was now open to Jews as well. During World War I, the first significant number of Jewish chaplains entered both the Army and the Navy, finding in both instances that regulations required them to wear the cross on their uniforms. After some difficulty, including an initial order from the Secretary of the Army that the shepherd's crook be worn by all chaplains (a solution vehemently rejected by Christian chaplains), the matter was resolved in October 1918 when the tablets of the law surmounted by the star of David became the Jewish chaplains' insignia. In the Navy, where there was only one Jewish chaplain during World War I, the shepherd's crook

became the Jewish insignia. The issue was not finally resolved until 1941, when the Army's insignia of the Star of David atop the Tablets of the Law was adopted by the Navy as well.[129]

The military chaplaincies remained Judeo-Christian until 1994, when a Muslim chaplain was appointed in the Army. The Navy appointed its first Muslim chaplain in 1996. This reflected a growing number of self-identified Muslims in the military, from 2,000 in 1989 to about 10,000 in 1995.

Pluralism's Present-day Realities

The armed forces chaplaincies face two realities. One is that only 1.1% of military personnel identify with non-Christian religious groups—Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim and "Other" (B'hai; Druid, Wicca, etc.). 98.9% of those who claim a religious identification are Christians.[130] In practical terms, therefore, the overwhelmingly dominant task of the chaplaincies is providing cooperative ministries for the Christian constituency.

But the other reality is that religious rights of Americans have never depended on numbers. The rights of the few are just as fully protected by the constitution as the rights of the many. The chaplaincies, therefore, take very seriously the duty of providing religious support for all service members. Resources (books, films, research, educational opportunities, etc.) available from the American religious community are overwhelmingly Christian. The chaplaincies are careful, however, to seek out minority resources, and to take seriously in official publications, in their internal culture, and in the terminology they employ, the full range of American pluralism.

An Air Force chaplain interviewed for this study expressed the uncertainty felt by many chaplains in the face of today's changing pluralism. "In the past the chaplaincy was dominated by Catholics, Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists—and we've always had a fairly easy alliance. This is a new day, when we have Muslims, Church of the Burning Bush, Foursquare Gospel, and a good representation of all the 360-some denominations that are present in the United States. And we're a lot more tentative. . . . we're in the era now where we're going to need even greater tolerance and understanding than we did before, to put teams together in this very pluralistic chaplaincy. It's going to take chaplains that are very much team builders, to put it all together in the next twenty years."

Chaplains are taking the challenge seriously. Another group of Air Force chaplains discussed the efforts they were making to provide for the needs of Muslim airmen and a small group of Hindu spouses of airmen at their base. They called on the resources of an Islamic Educational Center in the area, and a Consulate in a nearby major city. One chaplain told of a deployment over Ramadan, when she sought to interpret to commanders how difficult such operations were for Muslims unable to eat in the daytime. "We had a difficult time getting some field rations, MREs, for their religious needs," she added.

"What we're basically saying," added another, "is that we're ministering to all the people as best we can, and our education has branched out to those areas. The only difficulty we have is providing religious services for them, which we work around by referring and calling on local resources." In spite of strains and new challenges, as these chaplains indicate, the chaplaincy system has shown itself to be adaptable to new patterns.

Present Pattern of Cooperative Pluralism

The cooperative pluralism which has evolved in the practice of religion in the armed forces preserves the interests of three parties: the government, the men and women in the military, and the churches and faith groups. The religious neutrality of the government is derived from the establishment clause of the First Amendment. The right of the individual American who is a member of the armed forces to practice the religion of his or her choice is derived from the free exercise clause of the same amendment. The position of the first two parties of this tripartite arrangement is thus clearly staked out on a constitutional basis.

The position of the third party—the churches and religious bodies of America—has been no less important in the development of the chaplaincy's cooperative pluralism, but it has been less easily acknowledged. We traced in chapter one the development by the religious bodies of structures for dealing with the chaplaincy: the ecclesiastical side of institutional duality. The basis of operation is the principle, not precisely defined but generally agreed upon, that the American religious climate is properly one of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperative co-existence between adherents of different religions. Long implicit in the constitutional principles and recognized as the ideal, this principle was slow in reaching full recognition throughout the society. Its implementation in the chaplaincy has probably made a significant contribution to its belated implementation in the society as a whole.

The chaplaincy's pattern of cooperative pluralism, as it now operates, begins with the appointment of chaplains who represent as nearly as possible the religious diversity of America. Ideally every service member, wherever assigned, should be able to participate in the worship of his or her church or faith group. But this ideal must be adjusted to such realities as the large number of such groups; the availability of qualified clergy and willingness of the churches to provide them; practical limitations on the number of chaplains who can be supported by the military; and the geographical location and distribution of service members.

In seeking to provide the required chaplains the military services work closely with endorsing agencies, representing the various churches and faith groups in recruiting and certifying clergy applicants. In an earlier period the services sought to follow a "denominational quota" system in seeking to make their chaplains as broadly representative as possible. But the application of such quotas always had to be modified by the realities noted above. The systems used by the three chaplaincies in recruiting and appointing clergy today are based on their requirements, not ratios or quotas. These requirements reflect a combination of factors, including the necessity for meeting sacramental and liturgical needs on as broad a basis as possible and the "best qualified" principle in selecting from available candidates, as well as denominational and faith group distribution. In the late nineties approximately 200 endorsing agencies were recognized by the Department of Defense (acting through the Armed Forces Chaplains Board), and about 100 faith groups were represented among the chaplains serving in the army, Navy and Air Force.

Over the years the system of providing qualified chaplains to meet the needs of a religiously pluralistic population, scattered in ships, bases, peacekeeping forces and isolated outposts throughout the world, has been studied repeatedly in efforts to make it more effective. The most recent major study was directed by Congress[131] and conducted by the Department of Defense in 1987. It reviewed the faith representation of military chaplains, their recruitment and assignment, and the separation and retention policies of the three services. It sought the comments of the endorsing

agencies which provide chaplains. It gave special attention to the shortage of Roman Catholic chaplains (reflecting a national shortage of priests) and the problems of providing for Jewish personnel. The study generally affirmed the present system, in light of the realities of religious pluralism, military demographics, and military personnel policies, as providing effectively for the free exercise of religion in the armed forces.[132] By and large the churches and religious bodies, through the endorsing agencies, have supported and affirmed these policies and programs.

Mutual Responsibility

Once appointed, the chaplains who represent the various churches and faith groups are assigned to duty—on ships, military bases, with combat units and air wings—on the basis of continuing attention to the requirements of religious pluralism. A "denominational spread" to meet the needs of as many groups as possible is the goal in assigning chaplains to any given organization or locality.

At the unit level the requirements of religious pluralism are met by the assigned chaplains through the operating principle of mutual responsibility. This is a long ingrained tradition in the chaplaincies, accepted by all chaplains as the working basis of their ministry. Each chaplain is obligated not only to serve those of his or her own faith or denomination, but also to make provision for those of other faiths and groups. Where to draw limits is a difficult issue. Chaplains, however, for whom cooperative pluralism is a way of life, are likely to interpret broadly the right to freedom of conscience and religious expression. A particularly difficult case has been the Wicca religion, regarded by some as witchcraft or devil-worship. However, when the issue arises, chaplains are likely to be the defenders of the rights of Wiccans. An Air Force chaplain recalled an incident during a tour of duty at Wilford Hall, the Air Force Medical Center in San Antonio.

"One of the nurses was a Wicca," he said. "She wanted to hold Wiccan services at the hospital chapel. The hospital commander was not too happy to grant the request. But she was backed up by the chaplain, who said it was a valid religious requirement. And they had Wiccan services at Wilford Hall."

The religious needs of the vast majority of military people are met in more prosaic ways, by chaplains themselves. In the Army, Air Force and Marine Corps (served by Navy chaplains), large organizational entities such as brigades, divisions or wings, to which a number of chaplains are assigned, are normative. The requirements of religious pluralism are met primarily by careful attention to denominational distribution of chaplains assigned, to provide for as broad a spread of faith groups and liturgical needs as possible.

In smaller unites of these services or in Navy ships (which except in the case of aircraft carriers, are usually served by one chaplain) the problems are different. Provisions may be made in several ways. One is the exchange of services among chaplains. This operates in its simplest form when the Roman Catholic chaplain assigned to USS Long Beach celebrates mass aboard USS Halsey, whose chaplain is Protestant, when the two are in proximity, and vice versa. In the Navy there are standard procedures for coordinating the exchange of denominational coverage in ports and operating units at sea, with the staff chaplain of the senior commander present having responsibility for coordination. In the Army and Air Force, where independently operating units are more rare, such exchange arrangements, coordinated by staff chaplains of senior commanders, are likely to be more on-going and stable, but are operative wherever needed. Every chaplain assigned to the

operating forces takes for granted his or her responsibility to provide faith group services when needed for those in other units.

Jewish and Eastern Orthodox chaplains, few in number, are usually assigned to commands in areas having large concentrations of military personnel. In the case of Muslims, with a relatively small number of self-identified Muslims in the armed forces and with only one chaplain in the Army and one in the Navy, assignments are similarly made to areas of largest military concentrations.

When chaplain exchanges will not suffice, services of any available civilian clergy are used. Ecclesiastical endorsement for such civilian clergy is required by the Air Force but not by the other services. In deployment areas, including ports frequently visited by Navy ships, lists of English-speaking clergy of various faiths are a standard resource.

In the absence of either chaplain or civilian clergy, provision for those of other faiths may be made by lay leaders, designated to conduct religious worship for their own group. The Roman Catholic Church may designate authorized military lay leaders as eucharistic lay ministers who can distribute the sacrament in the absence of a priest. Ecclesiastical endorsement is required for lay leaders of other faiths by the Army and Air Force, but in the Navy they operate under the supervision of chaplains [This statement is incorrect. All lay leaders must have the endorsement of the church they represent before they can be designated "lay leader" in the Navy/Marine Corps.]. An effort is made to provide lay leadership for any group unable to participate in major faith group services and present in sufficiently large numbers to form a worshipping congregation.

The individual chaplain's part in this religiously pluralistic ministry may be summed up in terms of the following responsibilities:

1. Chaplains are generally responsible for meeting the religious needs of all personnel of the command by scheduling religious services in the unit or offering access to services elsewhere.
2. Chaplains personally provide liturgical, sacramental, and pastoral ministries for those of their own faith or denominational group, on as inclusive a basis as their own churches and the churches of those being served will permit.
3. They arrange for the services of other chaplains, civilian clergy or lay leaders in the command, or send "church parties" (groups of worshipers) elsewhere, to meet the needs of those they cannot serve personally.
4. They hold themselves in readiness to assist other commands which may need their services to provide for personnel of their own faith group or denomination.

Distinction between Administrative and Religious Responsibilities

A major reason for the effectiveness of the religiously pluralistic ministry in the armed services is to be found in the chaplaincy's distinction between the administrative area, in which the chaplain functions without regard to denominational affiliation, and the religious/liturgical area, in which each chaplain functions entirely as a representative of his or her own church.

Organizationally, the American military chaplaincies are fully integrated. In contrast to other nations, where there are parallel Protestant and Roman Catholic chaplaincies, each with its own Chief of Chaplains and organizational structure, our chaplaincies are

administratively unified. A Roman Catholic senior chaplain may and frequently does supervise the work of a group of chaplains made up not only of other Roman Catholics but also Protestants of variety of denominations, and perhaps Jewish, Orthodox and possibly a Muslim chaplain as well. The same title, "chaplain," is used to address a priest, a rabbi, a minister or an imam. The Chief of Chaplains may be of any religion. In the past an effort was made in some of the services to insure that if the Chief of Chaplains was Protestant the Deputy Chief would be Catholic and vice versa, but this is no long the case, and selection for these offices are now made strictly on the basis of qualifications. For a period in the mid-nineties the Chief of Chaplains and Deputy Chief of Chaplains in the Air Force were Catholic, and in the Navy both were Lutherans.

Religiously, however, each chaplain's ministry is determined by his or her own church. The rights of chaplains to conduct public worship—and by implication their entire ministry—in accordance with the rites and practices of their own churches is carefully detailed in official regulations. This distinction between the administrative area, which is completely integrated, and the religious area, which is completely uncoerced, is the working basis of the chaplain's ministry to a pluralistic society. The principle is summarized in a phrase which has long been a motto for chaplains, "Cooperation without Compromise."

The "Protestant Program"

It is not with regard to "cooperation without compromise" between Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, and those of other religions, but with regard to the so-called "Protestant program" (serving approximately two-thirds of military personnel) that misunderstandings most often arise. Certain fallacious statements are sometimes heard:

- "Chaplains are forced to give up their denominational identity and are known only as Protestants."
- "Every service member who is not a Catholic or Jewish is considered a Protestant and must be part of the Protestant program."
- "The armed forces have developed a 'Military Protestant Church' which competes with the various Protestant denominations in communities where bases are located."

None of these statements is accurate. A source of much of the confusion is the widespread use of the term, "General Protestant Service." Technically speaking there is no such thing. Services are conducted by chaplains who represent various specific denominations considered to be Protestant. They are open to all worshipers who, whatever their denominations, consider themselves Protestants. (This reflects civilian society, in which Protestants freely worship in, and transfer between churches of various denominations.) Such Services may legitimately be called Protestant services. Certainly it is a more convenient term for use in the plan of the day or on the bulletin board than "Service Conducted by a Methodist Chaplain Open to Protestants of All Denominations." But the term "Protestant Service" carries with it no implication of enforced conformity.

There is no established liturgy for such a service, nor even a normative pattern. A college chaplain, seeking an order of service that would be appropriate for a wide variety of Protestants, turned to the military for models. She was surprised to learn that there are none. All chaplains are entirely free to follow the liturgy and forms of their own denominations, with such adjustments as the denomination may permit and

the chaplain may care to make to the fact that the worshipers come from many denominations. The fact that most Protestant chaplains do make such adjustments is not an indictment but an indication of their desire to minister effectively. Such adjustments are by no means mandatory. Military worshipers are accustomed to a variety of liturgical forms—and to frequent changes in liturgical forms as chaplain follows chaplain—and they take it in stride.

As we noted in chapter one, significant changes have taken place in American religion in the final third of the 20th century. Cooperative Protestantism is no longer as simple as it was perceived to be in the mid-century. Between 1962 and 1992, according to political scientist Byron E. Shafer, the percentage of the population describing itself as mainline Protestant (Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, United Church of Christ, etc.) has fallen from 45% to 24%. Those describing themselves as evangelical Protestant (Southern Baptist, Assemblies of God, etc.) have increased from 29% to 33%.[133] Further, polarization between liberal and evangelical wings is now found within many denominations, including those called mainline, and is characteristic of Protestantism generally.

In this environment a "general Protestant service" may not meet all Protestant needs. A frequent solution is to offer such a service (which is often "mainline" in its orientation), and a separate service which may be designated a "praise service," more informal, evangelical and sometimes charismatic in its orientation. The evangelical alternative may be called a "gospel service" (sometimes with predominantly African American congregation). In some commands both "praise" and "gospel" services may be offered as alternatives. However the "general Protestant service" itself may be led by a chaplain whose approach is informal and evangelical. A "liturgical" service may be conducted to meet the needs of Episcopalians, Lutherans, and others accustomed to a relatively high liturgy. These alternatives are offered in a spirit of cooperation, in an effort to meet the needs of as many of today's diverse Protestants as possible.
One of the results of late-twentieth century changes within the American religious community has been the decline in the number of chaplains (usually representing "mainline" religious denominations), who baptize infants and conduct services with some level of liturgical formality. This decline has been matched by an increase in the number of chaplains who practice believer (adult) baptism only, and whose worship style is more informal. While the change reflects changes in American religious demographics, the need for a certain number of "baby-baptizers" is reflected in a 1995-96 series of full page advertisements of chaplains in the *Christian Century* (flagship journal of liberal mainline Christianity) placed by the Navy.

It is by no means expected that all Protestant lay people will attend services conducted by any particular chaplain, or that all those who do attend will find their needs fully satisfied. Protestants, however, are accustomed to cooperating, worshiping together, and crossing denominational lines. The various denominations endorse chaplains, expecting them to cooperate in such a fashion. Workable patterns have been developed through long years of experience. For these reasons, the cooperative Protestant program in the military provides a viable system that meets the needs of most Protestants most of the time.

The key to such a system is voluntarism on both side, clerical and lay. Without any coercion on the part of the military, chaplains generally find that they can serve Protestants from a broad denominational spectrum; and far from finding themselves compromised by so doing, they find it an exciting and challenging ministry. Lay people, for their part, find equally without coercion that they can be served by

chaplains from a variety of denominations; and far from being compromised they find it a richly varied and rewarding form of church life.

A Workable System

The pattern of cooperative ministry established in the armed forces chaplaincies still falls short of solving all the problems of government-sponsored religion in a pluralistic society. But given the inherent constraints, it not only works, but works well. This is at least in part because it fits the pattern of present-day church life. Denominational identity is no longer a strong factor for many Protestant Americans.

The military chaplaincy has both contributed to and been affected by this increasingly common pattern in Protestantism. The large numbers of Americans who passed through the military during the Cold War period of massive armed forces learned from their chaplains to be receptive to other denominations, and carried over this openness into civilian life. And the civilian de-emphasis on denominationalism has made it easier for today's service men and women to adapt to the cooperative pattern of the chaplaincy.

Chaplains themselves have achieved an admirable level of cooperation. The reasons are not hard to find. In the first place, the military pressures in an authority-based system are such that chaplains must find ways to work together if they are to work at all. Military commanders, with little knowledge of or taste for the fine points of sectarian hair-splitting, are notably impatient with religious warfare. Second, group pressure is a factor. Studies of social groups have established clearly the tendency of members of such groups to resolve their differences in mutually acceptable ways. Chaplains working in a religiously pluralistic environment with clergy of all religions tend to be influenced by each other in the direction of cooperation and accommodation. Third, there is undoubtedly an element of internal pressure. By a self-selection process, those clergy who knowingly enter the religiously pluralistic ministry of the armed forces are likely to be those naturally inclined to cooperative attitudes. Finally, the trust level among chaplains, built up in a system that has worked well and fairly over a long period of time, provides an element of reassurance.

Problem Areas for Cooperative Pluralism

There are, of course, problems. One has to do with the place of evangelism in such an environment. For many religious traditions, the making of converts is a central trust; a religious environment which did not permit the sharing of the good news and the bringing of others into the household of faith would not be regarded as fully meeting the spiritual needs of believers. More than ninety percent of Americans, however, consider themselves to be adherents of or believers in some religious group, and in such a society the evangelism of one group is usually at the expense of another. In civilian society, where all religious groups operate autonomously, the right to evangelize is not questioned. Within the cooperative pluralism of the armed forces, with all denominational activities carried on as part of a single coordinated "command religious program" or "ministry team," under official military sponsorship, it can conceivably become an issue. It is less likely to be a problem in practice, however, than in theory. Large numbers of young adults of all religious traditions are for all practical purposes religiously uncommitted, and it is from the ranks of the uncommitted that most converts are made. A "no proselytizing" ground rule is generally recognized by chaplains, in the sense that positive efforts on the part of a chaplain to persuade a person to leave a religion to which he or she is actively committed are unacceptable. However, conversions from one faith to another at the

initiative of the person concerned are quite common. For a chaplain to give religious instruction and provide assistance in such an instance is routine. Practically all chaplains rejoice when a religiously uncommitted service man or woman, regardless of formal religious background, becomes an active, committed member of some fellowship of faith.

It is not correct, therefore, to regard the chaplaincy as a ministry of "maintenance" alone, in which the evangelical thrust central to many religious groups must be played down. On the contrary, one of the attractions of the chaplaincy to many of the clergy is the opportunity to bring uncommitted young adults into a vital faith, and the annual statistics revealing the number who find an active religious commitment while in the armed services are impressive indeed.

A related problem in a pluralistic ministry, felt with special strength by chaplains with strong social concern, is that of "prophetic" ministry. Some would like for conferences of chaplains, or the Chief of Chaplains in their behalf, to take position or make pronouncements on controversial social, moral and ethical issues of the day, as their denominational church groups or ecclesiastical authorities, often do. Not only does the diversity of the chaplaincy make common stands on such issues unlikely, but chaplaincies, as arms of the government, face limitations that independent denominations or civilian interest groups do not. Chaplains so minded may participate in their own denominational structures for making pronouncements, but their inability to do so as chaplains may be frustrating for some.

A final problem related to religious pluralism has to do with the homogenizing effect of cooperative ministry, particularly as it affects Protestant Christianity (the category into which close to 70% of chaplains and military personnel fall). The effect of cooperative pluralism on religious faith itself is probably both good and bad. On the positive side it brings about a decrease in sectarianism and contributes to mutual understanding across denominational lines. But on the negative side it may lead to a weakening of those aspects of religious witness which might be controversial, but nevertheless be regarded by some as central, and to a blurring of focus.

A major advantage for the chaplaincies lies in the fact that most Americans, while they are likely to have opinions on the polarizing issues, are not extremists. The extreme positions in the culture war are championed by relatively few activist at each end of the spectrum, while the majority, in a classic bell curve, are somewhere in the middle. A chaplain may be personally liberal or conservative, but so long as basic religious needs are met, military parishioners are not likely to care greatly. A Lutheran may be followed in a particular command by an Assemblies of God chaplain. The style of worship will undoubtedly change. But two compensating factors will be at work. First, the two chaplains having been called to and accepting the challenge of a cooperative ministry, will reach out as inclusively as their respective churches and their own consciences permit. And second, the military parishioners, encountering obvious differences in worship style, will nevertheless adapt surprisingly well so long as the essentials of Christian faith are present.

A Roman Catholic chaplain may personally be liberal or conservative on issues debated within the church, and differences may be reflected in the style of the mass. But the essentials of the mass will be the same. Though the same divisions that affect the rest of American religious are present in a different form in Catholicism, they are less likely to affect the ability of an individual Catholic service person to be served by any available priest than is the case with Protestants.

Does Protestant cooperative pluralism result in a watered-down, least-common-denominator religion, as some critics have charged? Does something of this same homogenization affect Catholic, Orthodox, Jewish and Muslim ministries in the cooperative environment of the armed forces? And even more basically, does the military environment of pluralistic ministry distort such a least-common-denominator religion with nationalistic, patriotic, or militaristic influences? These questions will be addressed in the following chapter on problems related to civil religion.

Lesson 8: The Chaplain's Relationship to Professional and Credentialing Organizations

Due This Lesson

1-page response to Resource 7-3
Oral presentations—first group
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- discuss the chaplain's relationship to professional organizations and credentialing entities

Homework Assignments

Read Resource 8-2. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.

Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

"Change is a natural, positive, and irreplaceable part of growth. Leaders often remind us that what got us where we are is not the same stuff that will get us where we want to go, so we must change. Psychologists remind us that repeating the same behaviors merely generates the same outcomes, and therefore precludes rather than produces positive change. In other words, to grow, we must purposefully alter our routines and approaches. And the Bible is equally clear in telling us that God did not send Jesus to die so we might be comfortable and complacent, but so we might die to self, pick up our cross, and follow the way of the Master.

"The spiritual Revolution that is gathering momentum and influence in America provides evidence of sweeping changes that are taking place today. Some of the most important trends that are reshaping our society relate to the shift in worldview, lifestyle, and expectations that characterize our two youngest generations: the Baby Busters and the Mosaics. In fact, I believe ...particular tends are leading to the New Church that will facilitate the moral and spiritual revolution that millions of us have been praying for over the past several decades."[134]

Professional and Credentialing Organizations

Health Care
Credentialing Organizations Acceptable to the
Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations
and Accreditation of Pastoral Services

AAPC—American Association of Pastoral Counselors
ACPE—Association for Clinical Pastoral Education This is the universally recognized
    training.
APC—Association of Professional Chaplains (Newer form of College of Chaplains)
CPSP—College of Pastoral Supervision & Psychotherapy
NACC—National Association of Catholic Chaplains
NAJC—National Association of Jewish Chaplains
NIBIC—National Institute of Business and Industrial Chaplains
Hospital Chaplain's Ministry of America, Inc
NAVAC—National Association of VA Chaplains

Industrial Chaplains

Correctional/Police Department Chaplains
    ACA—American Correctional Association
    ACCA—American Correctional Chaplains Association
    ICPC—International Conference of Police Chaplains
Educational Chaplains
    NACUC—National Association of College and University Chaplains and Directors of
    Religious Life
Fire Department Chaplains
    FFC—Federation of Fire Chaplains
Industry Chaplains
    AAC—American Association of Chaplains
    CCA—Corporate Chaplains of America
Race Track Chaplains
    RTCA—Race Track Chaplaincy of America
General or Non-specific Industrial Chaplains
    IACC—International Association of Christian Chaplains (legitimate organization—
    requires endorsement by denomination)

Military

MCA—Military Chaplains Association

International

AHPCC (UK only)—Association of Hospice and Palliative Care Chaplains
CAPPE—Canadian Association for Pastoral Practice and Education

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 7

The Chaplaincy and Civil Religion

George H. Williams, in his essay on the history of the military chaplaincy, advanced the theory that the Army and Navy have tended to become "denominations" for the chaplains of the respective services. In part he was speaking in terms of polity, suggesting that relationships and institutional supports and controls within the military have replaced the comparable relationships and institutional structures provided by the various denominations for their clergy.[135] But in addition he suggested at one point that the Army and Navy "denominations" of the chaplains have supplanted civilian ecclesiastical bodies in more substantive ways, both with respect to the replacement of "competitive denominational differences" with a common denominator religion, and the tendency to "descry in Protestant or Christian America with a 'manifest (continental) destiny' the larger church in which they, with their fellow officers and men, constituted the militia of Christ."[136] This, in effect, is a charge that chaplains have substituted a civil religion for church-oriented religion.

Such charges have been leveled repeatedly, not entirely without grounds. Denominational officials, particularly those representing churches with a strong sense of the distinctiveness of their own traditions, have frequently warned chaplains against participation in a "military religion." Every chaplain has met career military families whose members are faithful church-goers, but who have no denominational affiliation, identifying only with military chapels. Observers have noted there is often a liturgical similarity in various Protestant military chapel services, regardless of the denominational affiliation of the officiating chaplain (and that clergy from free churches often move toward high church forms of worship in the military).

Other charges have to do with the using of religion for national, patriotic, or military purposes. Invocations are offered on every occasion from Change of Command ceremonies to Base judo tournaments. Critics of the chaplaincy produce horror stories like that of the American Civil Liberties Union report describing a chaplain who "replaced the Gloria Patre (sic) with 'My Country 'Tis of Thee' . . . and with great gnashing of teeth . . . loudly exclaimed, 'It is the chaplain's job to do everything he can to help his commanding officer whip the troops into a fighting frenzy."[137]

Military Chaplains, the polemical book published in 1971 by Clergy and Laity Concerned about Vietnam, included a chapter claiming that chaplains were communicating a "military religion."[138] Written by Daniel Pinard with Sociologist Peter Berger, it presented an analysis of "educational materials disseminated by chaplains." In content, this military religion was accused of linking God and country. Although the authors stated that "we were impressed by the fact that our materials contained relatively few statements that openly identify America and its political institutions with the will of God," they found circuitous linkage in such things as the title of a book of prayers, *Strength for Service to God and Country,* the front cover of which was "emblazoned with an American eagle in full martial splendor."[139] Military religion, according to their analysis, also legitimates military authority, justifies participation in war, and seeks to further the concept of the "wholesome soldier."[140]

If one leaves aside the undemonstrated implication that such teachings are all or even central in what chaplains teach, a legitimate point can still be made. A great many chaplains (and a great many religious Americans) would, without a moment's hesitation, agree that they try to provide "strength for service to God and country," that they see a relationship between God and country, that they consider military authority legitimate, that they find participation in war justified under some circumstances, and that they prefer "wholesome soldiers" to unwholesome ones. Most chaplains would deny vehemently that such teachings are central to their gospel. But many would admit that they are sensitive to the charges and not completely comfortable with the situation.

Perhaps the essay says more about the poisoned atmosphere of the Vietnamese War period than about what chaplains disseminate. Certainly the anti-militarism that underlay such charges in that period have long since dissipated. But the suspicion remains. The author, interviewed in 1994 by a TV network producer in connection with a forthcoming program on the chaplaincy, was pressed repeatedly as to "whether ministers are being called upon to be morale boosters for the military rather than genuine witnesses to God's message within [the military], and spiritual guides."

Such charges, and the practices underlying them, are a problem both for thoughtful chaplains and for the churches viewing their work. Any substantive effect of the military situation on the content and practice of religion is probably a result of at least two factors. One is religious pluralism, which we looked at in the last chapter, and the possible tendency of cooperative ministry toward homogenization and common denominator religion. Another is patriotism, along with the close identification between the military way of life and national purposes. Both of these factors are aspects of what is commonly known as civil religion. The relationship between the chaplaincy and civil religion is an important issue in any comprehensive examination of the military chaplaincy.

The Rise of the Civil Religion Issue

Civil religion became a clearly identified issue in the last third of the twentieth century. The popularity in this period of the term and the concept are largely traceable to an essay by sociologist Robert N. Bellah on "Civil Religion in America," first printed in *Daedalus* in 1967, and since widely quoted and reprinted.[141] Bellah himself later expanded the concept in a book, *The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial.*[142]

The phenomenon is, of course, much older, and it has been dealt with in a variety of ways by earlier commentators. Rousseau first coined the phrase in *The Social Contract.*[143] He prescribed the content of a simple civil religion, acceptable to all, which he considered appropriate for state sponsorship. While the American founders did not use the term, and may or may not have been influenced by Rousseau, similar ideas on the part of Enlightenment thinkers had wide currency in the Revolutionary period, and the idea, if not the term, is reflected in their writings.

Prominent among more recent American proponents of civil religion was John Dewey, who in the 1930s advocated a "common faith, drawn from those shared elements of religious experience known to all Americans, with the non-essential elements in traditional religions (in Dewey's thought, generally the supernatural elements) eliminated. He commended it as a basis for national life and morality.[144]

In the 1950s the Jewish philosopher Will Herberg, in the book *Protestant-Catholic-Jew,* described what he called the "civic religion of the American Way of Life."[145] In a semi-facetious description he said, "It embraces such seemingly incongruous elements as sanitary plumbing and freedom of opportunity, Coca-Cola and an intense faith in education—all felt as moral questions relating to the proper way of life. The very expression 'way of life' points to its religious essence, for one's ultimate, over-all way of life is one's religion."[146]

Herberg's American Way of Life embraced belief in God and tolerance in religious matters. He made it clear, however, that although it is the "common religion" of American society, it is not the so-called "common denominator" religion, composed of beliefs to be found in all religious groups. It influences and is influenced by what Herberg called the "official religions" of America—Protestantism, Roman Catholicism and Judaism—but is distinct from them. It is repudiated as religion by some groups—certain churches of immigrant-ethnic background, certain Lutheran and Reformed churches, sections of the Catholic Church and those with an "explicit and conscious theological concern" (in fact, Herberg seemed to include in this category almost all those who take their own religions seriously)—but for the remainder, Herberg considered it to be the operative national religion. Its influences, he said has secularized and devitalized the historic Jewish and Christian faiths. On the whole he tended to view it quite negatively.

The civil religion identified by Robert Bellah is neither Dewey's common denominator religion nor Herberg's Coca-Cola and education dimension of national life. Its central symbol is God, belief in whom played a significant part in the founding of the country and its constitutive documents. Its essence is a national recognition of God's sovereignty, which has safeguarded the nation from absolutism. Although the operative source of political authority is the will of the people, the will of the people lacks ultimate significance because the nation stands under higher judgment. The American tradition has recognized a deep obligation, both collective and individual, to carry out God's will on earth. The seeking of God's approbation and subjection to God's judgment are recurring themes. The theme of sacrifice for the nation (seen, in a sense, as sacrifice for God) is a prominent one. God is associated with law and order, with right and justice.

Unlike Rousseau and Dewey, Bellah did not devise such a civil religion and recommend it to the body politic. Rather he described the civil religion he observed as operative in American history. Its body of religious symbol and belief, imbedded in the founding documents of the nation, enunciated by the Founders, has been central in American life, he said. Its themes have been prominent in nearly every presidential inaugural address. Its rituals are embedded in patriotic ceremonies, Memorial Days, Thanksgiving Days, inaugurals and state funerals. It has deep meaning in times of national crisis.

The civil religion of Americans, said Bellah, is clearly distinguished from, but by no means antithetical to, the personal and denominational religions of American life. It is selectively derived from Christianity but clearly not the same thing as Christianity. The average American has seen no conflict between the two. Bellah's evaluation of civil religion was strongly affirmative: "I would argue that the civil religion at its best is a genuine apprehension of universal and transcendent religious reality as seen in or, one could almost say, as revealed through the experience of the American people."[147] Like all religions, it has at times been distorted and deformed. The "religion in general," the "religion of the American Way of Life," and the "American Shinto" derided by critics

are aspects of civil religion, Bellah suggested, but at its worst rather than its best. He felt that civil religion at its best has made a significant contribution to the American tradition—notably in guarding against absolutism by positing a higher standard above the will of the people—and should be regarded as a valid religious manifestation.

Attitudes Toward Civil Religion in the Postmodern Context

Attitudes toward civil religion, always mixed, have become even more polarized in the postmodern context of the closing decades of the twentieth century. The Religious Right as a political movement has brought evangelical Christianity into a more direct and influential role in public life than has been the case since the Protestant hegemony of the late 1800s. Generally speaking, the Religious Right strongly supports the kind of relationship between God and the nation that Bellah described, and would take it further in such areas as encouraging prayer in public schools and promoting a legislative agenda based on Christian standards. Pat Robertson, whose 1988 campaign for Republican presidential nomination, together with the Christian Coalition he later organized, formed the basis for the Religious Right, wrote a campaign book called *America's Dates with Destiny.* It was an explicitly religious interpretation of the nation's history and destiny, designed to "call America once again to its spiritual heritage."[148]

At the other extreme are those who, in the context of the growing pluralism and multiculturalism of the late twentieth century, see no room at all for any relationship between God and national life. Partly in reaction to the Religious Right they seek a totally secular nation. Revisionist historians would write God out of the constitutive documents and the intentions of the Founders, reinterpreting separation of church and state as a total separation of God from national life. A 1996 book called *The Godless Constitution,* which portrayed the Founders as secularists who designed a godless federal structure, was clearly aimed at refuting the claims of the Religious Right.[149] But it reflects a growing perspective among academic and intellectual elites.

The vast majority of the American people are somewhere between these two extremes, supporting separation of church and state as a fundamental principle, but affirming a "nation under God," subject to God's sovereignty and judgment. Indeed, a pluralistic society deeply concerned about moral decay and searching for a way to reaffirm common standards and values, may find a much-needed moral foundation in a healthy civil religion. One has only to listen to political discourse on ceremonial occasions, to campaign speeches, to inaugural addresses and State of the Union messages, to invocations insisted on by private groups as well as legislative bodies for a vast array of occasions, to be aware that the kind of civil religion Bellah identified as a positive force throughout our national history is alive and present for most ordinary Americans. It occupies a different sphere from that of their private denominational and faith group commitments, with neither threatening the other and with both recognized as valid and authentic religious dimensions of life.

Chaplain Involvement in Civil Religion

No group of clergy comes into closer contact with civil religion—in all its versions— than military chaplains. Serving persons of many different denominations, they frequently confront "common denominator" religion, as they work together with lay people of various religions, participate in ecumenical or interfaith services, and conduct or participate in worship for persons of other religions. The temptation is always before them to modify their own faith core in this direction. As members of an institution which exits to serve a national purpose and which is a major focal point for

much of the nation's patriotic sentiment, they are no strangers to veneration of the American way of life, particularly in its patriotic manifestations. As clergy members of a military institution their very presence is seen as a symbol of the national relationship to God.

Sometimes the force of military authority has pushed toward a civil religion. Until the practice was outlawed by court decision in 1972, generations of chaplains officiated at worship services, in recruit training centers and service academies, where attendance was compulsory. In 1971 chaplains had the curious experience of hearing senior Naval authorities claim in a court of law that the divine services conducted at the Naval Academy chapel were "entirely secular in purpose," provided solely as an element in the training of young midshipmen. Such an interpretation (had it been accepted by the chaplains themselves) would have placed the entire liturgical ministry of the chaplains involved in the category of civil religion.

Chaplains are frequently expected to be participants, usually with an invocation and perhaps with a benediction as well, on ceremonial occasions. They offer prayers at change of command ceremonies, ship commissionings, unit anniversaries, or training course graduations. Chaplains have even been urged to pray at ceremonies welcoming a new tank into the division's inventory, cocktail parties celebrating the 4th of July, or officers' club bridge tournaments. Memorial services, all too frequent during times of combat or peacekeeping incursions, may be formal command-sponsored events at which the entire unit is paraded. Military funerals are occasions which combine military ceremony and religious rites.

Many chaplains are highly ambivalent in their attitude toward such activities. They believe the military services themselves are valid and necessary instruments of national policy and defense. They tend to view those values associated with the nation's history and traditions as fully compatible with and generally derived from its religious heritage. Were this not the case it may be safely assumed that they would not be serving. All chaplains are, and historically have been, volunteers. There is an element of self selection in choosing military ministry which would automatically eliminate those clergy who have a negative view of the nation and its armed forces.

It follows that most chaplains would tend to affirm those symbols which Bellah describes as central to civil religion at its best. The sovereignty of God over the nation; the national obligation to follow God's will; the judgment of God over the nation's conduct; the religious dimension of national crises and sacrifices—all these could be expected to strike a responsive chord with persons who have made vocational choices both for the church and the military. It may be assumed that chaplains are naturally disposed to participate enthusiastically in acts and ceremonies which affirm those values.

Yet there are a number of factors which might lead chaplains to view civil religion negatively. As church professionals whose relationship to their own churches comes first, chaplains regard their role as religious leaders of a particular faith group as primary. It is far more important in the overall scheme of things than civil religion ceremonies. At times the sheer number of such ceremonial requirements may begin to impinge on their primary responsibilities: the eighth request for an invocation at the Army Wives' Club bazaar or the meeting of the Navy/Marine Corps Relief Society Advisory Board may be onerous. Further it quickly becomes apparent that at least some of those military leaders who feel most strongly about the requirement for prayer at the change of command ceremony, or for mustering all hands at a memorial

service, are not themselves significantly involved in the religious community of the chapel or a denominational church.

The Herberg view that the religion of the American way of life is a threat to church-oriented religion is widely shared by those who take church-oriented religion seriously, and chaplains may see around them many people for whom the military-patriotic version of the American way of life does appear to be the operative religion. Even some chaplains may seem to fit the category: hard-charging young flag-wavers who take pride in wearing a forbidden pistol into combat, or older burnt-out cases with regimental patches sewed to their stoles, who appear to have nothing left but God-and-country ceremonials.

The "Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition" syndrome, even during the World War II heyday of church support for a just war, was seen by many as a distortion of religious faith. Denominational officials are likely to be suspicious on this score, and to watch their chaplains carefully. Knowledge that they are under suspicion by their colleagues in the civilian church keeps chaplains alert to the danger, and some become seriously concerned. Said one:

> I have grown to have a great aversion for this type of ceremony, change of command, graduations, dedications, etc. If ordered to go, I go, and make an effort to offer a prayer that is meaningful to all of the persons present there. I think that very often the presence of the Chaplain is symbolic and mechanical (or, as a friend said, he indicates when the thing begins, and when it is over) with the people present, and perhaps it is often an opportunity to say something to them, rather than with them to God. I see no point whatsoever in a Chaplain appearing at the burial of a person who had no contact with religion in his life, unless it would be clear that he might be able to offer his help to the family. I do truly deplore formalistic ceremony which has no solid basis behind it.[150]

Though few would go as far as this and many would defend participation in official ceremonials as a valid ministry of presence and witness, it is clear that many chaplains are troubled and ambivalent about their involvement in civil religion.

Distinguishing Between Types of Civil Religion

There is no question that both civil religion and church-oriented religion are present in the chaplain's ministerial environment. Indeed, both are present in the environment of all American clergy, though civil religion is undoubtedly more insistently present for chaplains than for others. The question is whether both are legitimately present—whether civil religion is, as Bellah claims, an authentic religious dynamic in which chaplains may participate with integrity and without betraying their church vocation.

In addressing this question it may be helpful for chaplains to distinguish clearly between various types or manifestations of civil religion. Differing attitudes toward different types may be appropriate. To lump together Herberg's Coca-Cola-and-faith-in-education American Way of Life and Bellah's national submission to God as a higher judge leads to confusion, not clarification. From the standpoint of church-oriented religion, Herberg rightly deplored the tendency to substitute the American way of life, even with its emphasis on religious tolerance and generalized "faith in faith," for dynamic participation in an organized community of faith. The tendency chaplains encounter from time to time, to substitute country for God, the flag for religious symbols, and good citizenship (or wholesome soldiership) for religious commitment, is probably another version of the same thing, and equally illegitimate.

Bellah, however, was talking about something quite different, and he had considerable justification for regarding the God-centered themes of America's civil religion (and every theme and symbol he identified with American civil religion was God-centered) as a valid and genuine apprehension of transcendent religious truth. Bellah was helpful, in this regard, in pointing out the worst aspects of civil religion ("religion in general," "American Shinto," and "religion of the 'American Way of Life'") in contrast to its best aspects. Here (as in church-oriented religion also) we are justified in affirming the best while guarding against the worst. It may be helpful to highlight three kinds of civil religion, using the descriptions of Dewey, Herberg, and Bellah, to clarify the dilemma faced by chaplains.

1. Common denominator religion

Common denominator religion consists of those beliefs and symbols which are held in common by most people. Although the "common faith" recommended by Dewey in the 1930s was a desupernaturalized version derived from religious experience, most contemporary common denominator approaches seek to combine rather than discard particularized religions, focusing on those elements common to the great majority of the denominational religions of the Judeo-Christian family. Some Americans (adherents of non-Judeo-Christian religions and atheists) would not accept them, but since approximately 90% do identity with some branch of the Judeo-Christian family, the vast majority of Americans do hold a significant number of beliefs in common.

The official theism of the United States, incorporated in such national statements as the motto, "In God We Trust," the Declaration of Independence assertion that our inalienable rights are derived from the Creator, and the added phrase in the Pledge of Allegiance, "one Nation under God," is probably even more broadly acceptable. Muslims are theists who have common roots with Judeo-Christians. The fastest growing American Muslim groups, made up of native born African-Americans who have rejected Christianity of their enslaved ancestors and adopted Islam, sometimes in a modified form, hold on to much of the kind of biblically-derived theism common to the African-American community. Even among American Buddhists and Hindus, whose religions are not theistic in the Judeo-Christian sense, there are many who find this level of theism comfortable.

Common denominator religion is an element in all forms of civil religion, including that described by Herberg and that described by Bellah. By definition common denominator religion consists of beliefs held by all, and its limits are flexible, depending on the degree of pluralism present at any given time or place. But in the situations encountered by most chaplains the latitude is fairly wide. All clergy and church people who participate in ecumenical services of any kind, who work together in joint endeavors or joint ministries, do so on the basis of those elements of their respective religions they hold in common. The fact that others hold the same beliefs makes them no less vital as part of the belief systems of particular communities of faith.

Common denominator religion becomes objectionable to adherents of church-oriented religion when it seeks to stand on its own, or become a substitute. This is the negative connotation usually attached to the phrase. If Dewey's common faith is the prototype, his reception was frosty because he suggested that this common faith could become a religion in its own right, replacing denominational religions. A member of a church-oriented community of faith, even an exclusivist one, need have no inherent objection to affirming particular beliefs simply because others share them.

2. American Way of Life religion

Herberg's observations provide the prototype here. He labeled those things to which Americans are obviously devoted, as evidenced by their operative choices, as their religion. Certainly the American way of life he described is a core of common values and a unifying force. Whether operative choices are necessarily the ultimate values may be debated. It may be that the definition of what constitutes a religion is the issue here.

The patriotic dimension of the American way of life is the aspect of this form of civil religion which chaplains encounter in a special way. The real danger for them is the use of religion for nationalistic purposes, the identification of the national will with God's will, when God becomes a means rather than an end. The most serious problem is not with the American way of life itself but with its elevation of the status of a religion, its substitution for more authentic forms of religion. If it replaces worshiping communities of faith, or if it devitalizes them as Herberg claimed, it is highly questionable. Either in its materialistic form which Herberg decried or the patriotic form with which chaplains are most familiar, it is probably, as Bellah suggested, civil religion at its worst.

4. The God-centered dimension of national life

The challenge to chaplains, in a patriotic and country-affirming environment, is to hold up the military version of the American way of life to the measuring rod of religious values. While positive aspects are affirmed, religious values can call into question its shortcomings. Civil religion at its best recognizes God's judgment when American life is in the wrong, and seeks to discern and follow God's will.

Civil religion, as Bellah described it, is the God-centered dimension of national life, and expression of religious faith interpreted in the light of American historical experience. It does not replace or oppose denominational religions; it coexists with them as an added dimension, an additional aspect of valid religious experience. This is the definition of civil religion which, following Bellah's exposition, has gained positive acceptance.

We are therefore justified in adopting this as the understanding of civil religion when we conclude that it is an authentic religious expression in which chaplains may legitimately participate. The Dewey and Herberg versions may be recognized as aspects of civil religion, but they are distortions, unacceptable manifestations to be guarded against as one affirms the validity of civil religion at its best.

Clarifying the Relationship of Chaplains to Civil Religion

Against this background, some observations may clarify the relationship between the chaplaincy and civil religion. First, it might be noted that few churches and few of the clergy would deny that civil religion (so understood) has some authenticity and validity. They may object to the term and point to its pitfalls. But few of the clergy or church people would refuse on all occasions, as a matter of principle, to offer prayer on ceremonial occasions, or to affirm the sovereignty of God over national life and the nation's obligation to seek to follow God's will. For chaplains, the problem of their relationship to civil religion differs only in degree from that of others of the clergy or church people. As members of an institution which in itself embodies patriotic symbolism and national purposes, they naturally encounter it to a great degree in their own professional life. As members of both the church and the military, and

therefore living symbols of the relationship between God and Country, they are likely to be invited to take part in civilian church activities on patriotic occasions, such as Independence Sunday or Memorial Day. But aside from the degree of involvement there is no essential difference between chaplains and civilian clergy at this point. If participation in civil religion is legitimate for the church at all, it is legitimate for chaplains.

Second, it might be noted that civil religion can never be completely separated from church-oriented religion. Civil religion draws its life from Judeo-Christian religion in the American experience. Whether in its worst form or its best, civil religion draws from and reflects elements of denominational religion. Further, when a minister participates in ceremonies or exercise of civil religion there will always be elements of his or her denominational religion present: exposure, witnessing, a ministry of presence, even a form of pre-evangelism. At the same time, however, it might be noted that a denominational religious leader participating in a civil religion ceremonial is justified in regarding the two as separate kinds of activity, each with its own context and justification. There is no inherent conflict between the two.

Since civil religion responsibilities are more prominent in the ministry of chaplains than in other ministries, chaplains have some special obligations:

1. They must have a thorough understanding of what civil religion is, its uses and misuses. They should be familiar with its various manifestations, and should be quite clear as to the limits of legitimate civil religion.
2. Chaplains may sort out their attitudes toward civil religious involvement by regarding it as a separate responsibility from their basic responsibility of leadership in denominational religion. Chaplains can function in both areas, and indeed in their particular calling, they must.
3. Chaplains must continually guard against distortions of civil religion and the dangers of allowing it to get out of proportion. A cooperative ministry in a pluralistic environment makes common denominator religion always a temptation. In the military environment the danger of allowing religion to become a means to an end, a tool of national purposes, is particularly grave. Chaplains must guard against the substitution of civil religion in any form—even at its best—for worship and service in the communities of faith they represent.

The relationship of chaplains to civil religion is likely to remain one of tension, but it need not be destructive tension. Rightly understood and carefully safeguarded, civil religion can have a legitimate place in their ministry. To this end they are in need of guidance and assistance from their churches. The appropriate relationship must be determined, in the last analysis, by the churches themselves. As clergy in direct and continuing contact with civil religion, chaplains can assist in this task—but only as representatives of their churches working within the church context.

Their involvement in civil religion is such that their objectivity may sometimes be open to question. The churches can assist them in this and other areas by providing study opportunities in which they can meet with civilian teachers and leaders to work on the issue. For the churches to allow the chaplains to work out their own independent accommodation with civil religion would be a serious error. But for the churches to deal with civil religion without taking advantage of the insights, the first-hand experience, and the deep involvement of their chaplains in the issue would be an equally serious error.

Lesson 9: The Chaplain's Relationship to the Organization Served

Due This Lesson

1-page response to Resource 8-2
Journals
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- define "congregation" and how to assess the needs of each "congregation"
- describe how to make an assessment of the organization receiving chaplaincy ministry

Homework Assignments

Read Resource 9-3. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.

Bring your journal with you to the next lesson. The instructor will be checking journals to evaluate the faithfulness to the assignment.

Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

A sales team meets to celebrate accomplishments, inspire, motivate, give a vision of what is possible, and provide training. If they make no effort to sell they missed the point of the meeting.

"We in the church are not a sales team but a ministry team, yet we gather for many of the same reasons—to celebrate, to expand our vision, to be inspired to fulfill our mission, to give and receive encouragement, and to become equipped for ministry. If then, at the end of our gathering, we go out into the world but make little attempt to minister, what does that suggest?

"If, upon leaving church on Sunday, we don't go out into the world to minister as the church scattered the rest of the week, we've missed the point. As one pastor says, 'The church is most the church when the sanctuary is empty.' "[151]

The Chaplain's Relationship to the Organization Served

The Chaplain's Congregations

1. The Congregation of faith or lack of faith

2. The Congregation of executives and managers

3. The Congregation of laborers

Organizational Assessment

1. Know why the organization exists

2. Know why the chaplain was hired

3. Know the safety rules and regulations

4. Know how and when to be available without disrupting the work of the organization

5. Know the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP)

6. Know the chain of command and lines of authority within the organization

7. Know the "Gatekeepers"

8. Know how information flows throughout the organization

9. Know what boundaries must be established and protect them

10. Know your role of chaplain in the organization and become comfortable in it

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 8

Moral Leadership and Core Values

A sometimes controversial activity of chaplains has been their participation over the years in a variety of programs often designated "moral leadership." The relationship of these programs to religion has been ambivalent. But to the extent that they have been religiously-based they have tried to call on a core of religious principles common to all, and have thus been closely related to civil religion.

There is strong internal and situational pressure for chaplains to become involved in such programs. We noted in chapter 4 that the goals of religious ministry are determined by the churches rather than the military services. They are, therefore, likely to be peripheral to the operationally-oriented goals of the military. In that chapter we examined the power-dependence paradigm, noting that the power of an organizational element is related to its ability to produce something the organization needs. Chaplains, with their religious ministries, are largely powerless in this sense. But one thing the military greatly needs, for operational as well as general welfare reasons, is moral behavior on the part of its personnel.

The organizational precariousness of the chaplain's position, when religious ministry itself is peripheral to operational goals, leads to a good bit of discomfort. A need to be needed, a desire to find a more central role in the organization, and a search for firmer levels of funding and support, are all natural in such a situation.

More positively, chaplains recognize an obligation to serve the entire military institution. This is clearly an expectation of the churches and one of the church-established goals of their ministry. The historic relationship between religion and morality is widely recognized. So a strong interest in teaching morality, not only to one's own religious congregation but to all military personnel, is understandable. But the bind in which chaplains find themselves is the question as to whether or not, and the extent to which, morality <u>can</u> be taught apart from an explicitly religious context.

Breakdown of the American Moral Consensus

The dilemma of chaplains has been intensified by a growing sense throughout American society of a breakdown in the <u>public moral consensus</u>, a collapse of generally-accepted standards for making moral decisions, both in private and public life. As the century drew to a close there was a very broad perception that such a consensus is lacking, and that this constitutes a crisis for American society.

After General Colin Powell retired as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he was the focus in 1995 of a widespread movement to persuade him to run for president in the 1996 election. Support for his presidential nomination came from all over the political map, including both Democrats and Republicans. His position on issues were not the point. The point was that he reeked integrity. He had a morally impeccable life story that exemplified "the American dream." And he came out of a military tradition that is identified with what the armed services like to call "core values." It was these core

values, often in political circles labeled "traditional values" or "family values," that seemed to many to be threatened.

Historic Background of American Public Morality[152]

The basic issue confronting our society is how a religiously culturally pluralistic nation can find a common core of beliefs about reality and values, on which to base its common life. And this has been a central issue from the beginning of our national life.

Historically, moral codes have been derived from religion. Belief in a just and righteous God, who built moral principles into the way the universe operates, is the foundation of morality in western civilization. The Ten Commandments are the symbolic heart of religiously-based western morality, and these came as absolutes: commandments from an almighty God.

From the beginning the United States has been a religiously pluralistic nation. As we have seen in connection with the history of the chaplaincy, every mother nation in Europe from which American colonists came had an established church, providing an official belief system and moral code. This was the first nation in history to be established on the basis of religious freedom, formulated as separation of church and state, and there was considerable doubt as to whether or not it could be done. Along with the debates among the founders over establishment and freedom of religion went a parallel debate over how to form a national culture. All were agreed—established church advocates, sectarians, and even the Deists, that the moral underpinnings of a society were dependent on its religion. A republican government, dependent on the wisdom and judgment of "we the people" rather than elites, made "public virtue" an absolute necessity. Madison debated with Patrick Henry over a "multiple establishment," but he yielded not an inch to Henry in his caring about this "civil moral substance of the people." Jefferson, commenting on the religious diversity of Pennsylvania and New York, noted that religion was "of various kinds, indeed, but all good enough; all sufficient to preserve peace and order." Benjamin Franklin in this period talked about what he called "public religion,"—"the essentials of every religion" as he said—and he did so in the context of his concern for the public virtue essential to a democracy.

It was the intention of the founders, in a pluralistic nation, to separate institutional churches from the structures of the state, but not to separate religion from society. Quite the opposite. The problem was how to integrate religion and society—to undergird the republic with virtue—in the unavoidable absence of a relationship between church and state.

One reason it worked was that the new American nation had far more of a commonly-held belief system than its intractable pluralism would seem to indicate. It was basically a Calvinistic belief system. New England Puritanism, rigidly Calvinistic, did much to shape the systems and institutions of the emerging nation as numerous historians, notably Perry Miller, have pointed out. But in addition to the New England Congregationalists, most of the other major denominations of the pre-Revolutionary period were also Calvinistic. The Presbyterians, who made up the third largest religious group at the time of the Revolution, were an obvious case. But the Baptists, offshoots of English Separatists who had begun to proliferate with the Great Awakening, also showed strong Calvinist influence. The Dutch Reformed, in New York, were Calvinists by way of the Netherlands. Even the Anglicans were in that period Calvinists. The "39 Articles" which formed their doctrinal base were strongly Calvinistic. So Calvinism provided the dominant religious tradition of revolutionary

America. Church historian Sidney Ahlstrom has suggested that this Puritan Calvinism "provided the moral and religious background of a full seventy-five percent of the people who declared their independence in 1776."

The Great Awakening of the early 18th century, with its revivalism and its emphasis on personal choice, rubbed some of the sharp edges off the endemic Calvinism. At the same time it contributed to a commonality of experience across denominational lines. This massive wave of revivals, which swept the colonies from New England to Georgia beginning in the 1730s, moved through all the denominations, established or otherwise. The second Great Awakening in the early post-Revolutionary period had a similar effect, and the pattern continued in frontier regions throughout the 19th century. The surprisingly general Calvinist background, overlaid by the revivalism and pietism of the Great Awakenings and the frontier, laid the groundwork for a kind of transdenominational evangelical Protestantism that gave to the American culture the commonly held belief system it required.

The Democratic Evangelicalism (Sidney Ahlstrom's term[153]) of the American consensus ceased being Protestant in the second half of the 19th century, when vast waves of Catholic emigrants from Ireland and Central Europe flocked to the freedom of these shores. But they were attracted in part by those very values the country had historically espoused—some of which, incidentally, as Max Weber has suggested, were very closely related to the fact that this was a land of economic opportunity. American Catholicism had major theological differences from Protestantism, and this led to considerable tension in religious circles. But led by people like Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore and John Courtney Murray, Catholicism on these shores eagerly embraced the "American proposition," and this was extremely important in the development of the American moral consensus. Jews, few in number but present in the mix from the beginning, had long since affirmed those values. And from the Protestant hegemony of the nineteenth century, the nation gradually moved into the "Judeo-Christian" paradigm, which dominated our perception of our religiously-based values through the Second World War and the Eisenhower fifties. We saw an America made up of Protestants, Catholics and Jews, all with common roots and shared values.

We noted in chapter one a number of cultural changes in the last third of the twentieth century, many of which have seriously eroded the national sense of shared values, based on a common religious heritage. These included secularization of the culture and the privatization of religion, which together have undercut the sense of a national relationship to God. Our growing pluralism, though statistically the change has not been as great as in our perception, has undercut the sense of a shared religious heritage.

Perhaps more significantly than either pluralism or secularism in understanding the loss of moral consensus is the very broadly shared intellectual orthodoxy of the day which recognizes no absolutes, seeing everything as relative and experience-based. It recognizes no objective truths, only plural possibilities. One makes personal choices and celebrates his or her personal perspective. This postmodern intellectual climate dominates not only the secular universities, but also most mainstream church-related colleges.

The basic question for morality is: what makes right right, and what makes wrong wrong? For religiously-based value systems, the answer is divine authority. God-given values are embedded in the created order. And that kind of authority, which produces absolutes—not relative right and wrong but absolute right and wrong—is what today's intellectual climate rejects.

Reconstituting a Moral Consensus

What can be done to reconstitute a public moral consensus? This is increasingly recognized as a critical question for America today, in political and culture as well as in religious circles. There are two major answers being proposed. One is the quest by secularists to devise a non-religiously based value system. Such a quest, of course, is not new. John Dewey's secularized "common faith," cited in the last chapter, was aimed precisely at this, and his enormous influence on American education had much to do with the removal of religion from the schools. The whole "values clarification" movement of the 60s and 70s, which still hangs on here and there, reflected an assumption that you could somehow "clarify" whatever values were present without imposing a particular value system. Numerous public school systems are seeking ways to teach values apart from religion. The quest has taken on a new urgency with the contemporary awareness of pluralism and multiculturalism.

The other answer being posed today is that of the Religious Right, and it has been far more vigorously promoted than the non-religiously based valued system of the secularists. It calls for a straightforward, no-nonsense return to the Judeo-Christian values of yesteryear. It wants to recreate the days when school opened with prayer, the ten commandments were posted on classroom walls, and the principal did not hesitate to instruct youthful offenders out of the Bible.

Neither of these current attempts to deal with the crisis in public morality, coming from opposite ends of the political and cultural spectrum, is likely to fully solve the problem. The secular left has nothing but human experience on which to base moral standards, and the Religious right is too small a minority of religious America to enforce its program politically. But the fact that both efforts are being made is encouraging.

The armed forces are public institutions, constantly under the critical eye of Congress and of various constituency groups. Both by law and by custom they have been more careful than many other American institutions to maintain equal opportunity policies. Long before the civil rights revolution of the sixties ended segregation and unequal opportunity in the rest of society, African Americans saw the military as a setting in which ability could be recognized and hard work would bring advancement. The armed forces are more careful than other institutions to affirm and respect diversity and multiculturalism. They have been in the forefront of the struggle for gender equality and against sexual harassment. Nowhere else are churches so consistently referred to as "faith groups" (to avoid using a Christian term in connection with non-Christian religions), or are official policies so insistently colorblind.

At the same time, however, the military is associated with the virtues of patriotism, with the wars which have marked turning points in American history, and with the moral values of America's past. They are "conservative" institution in this sense, with a natural affinity for the historic moral consensus which came out of the nation's Judeo-Christian past and is now imperiled by perceptions of pluralism and multiculturalism. No other institution has a stronger interest in finding a way to preserve the values of the past without violating the realities of today. This in considerable measure is the dynamic behind military interest—and chaplain involvement—in moral leadership and core values.

Chaplains and Character Education

Concern on the part of chaplains about the morals of the troops and the moral conditions of their environment is as old as the chaplaincy itself. So has been the conviction of commanders that one of the functions of chaplains is the protection of moral standards for the entire command. George Washington's first expressed interest in the chaplaincy, during the French and Indian War, was to find a "gentleman of sober, serious and religious deportment, who would improve morale and discourage gambling, swearing and drunkenness."[154]

Efforts to promote moral character have been made by military commanders throughout American military history, if not always for the sake of morality as an end in itself, then on the basis of the purely utilitarian consideration that certain moral virtues make for more efficient and effective military organization. Early efforts of chaplains to promote general morality were unorganized and dependent on individual initiative, but were a continuing emphasis. Drury's history of the Navy chaplaincy contains sections, in each historical period, dealing with the morality of the sailors of the day and the efforts of chaplains to improve it. The legitimacy of this area of concern for chaplains is taken for granted.

The earliest *Chaplains Manual,* issued in 1918 by Chaplain John B. Frazier, the first Navy Chief of Chaplains, described an early "moral lecture" program:

> There is one phase of a very difficult but very important subject that can and should be presented by the Chaplain in a series of lectures, delivered once a month. The reference is to social hygiene . . . While the surgeon is the logical person to speak on this theme form a medical standpoint, the Chaplain will find that a wise presentation of its moral, social, and professional aspects will carry just as much weight as does the fear of physical contamination.[155]

As early as 1921 Navy chaplains in recruit training stations were working on a formal program of lectures, presented on company time, to recruits. Such a program was in operation in most of the recruit centers by 1923, and from then on "moral lectures" by chaplains were a regular part of recruit training.

Post-World War II Character Guidance Programs

In the period immediately after the Second World War there began what was probably the most massive, intensive, and carefully organized attempt at character building through education ever attempted under secular sponsorship. It was aimed at changing the moral tone of the entire nation through its young men. In that period it was widely expected that some form of Universal Military Training would be established. Efforts to do so failed. But following the Korean War and throughout the fifties and early sixties, large standing armed forces, with a draft that required a period of military service from nearly every able-bodied young male American, constituted a major factor in American life. It was expected that building "a strong moral, ethical and spiritual foundation" in the armed forces would affect the entire society. These character guidance programs were designed and operated for the military services by chaplains. That movement was probably the most massive experiment ever conducted by a group of clergy in extending their influence beyond the context of religious faith.

It began with a reexamination of the long-established practice of having chaplains give moral lectures to recruits. The Army's Universal Military Training Experimental Unit at

Fort Knox, Kentucky, in 1946-47, provided for moral instruction by chaplains. It was regarded as highly successful. On the basis of this experience a letter, signed by the Secretary of War in January, 1947, initiated such a program throughout the Army. A circular published in August, 1948, directed the establishment of Character Guidance Councils from the Department of the Army down to the battalion level. When the U.S. Air Force became a separate service, it carried over the Army Character Guidance program, which was established by Air Force Directives in November, 1948. In 1946 the Navy had reexamined the moral instruction included in its recruit training, and devised a new series of ten "lectures on moral and ethical subjects" which were included in 1947 in the Curriculum for Recruit Training.

The fifties were the high point of the "revival of religion" of the post-war period. Church attendance was at an all time high, as was formal adherence to religious values. The Judeo-Christian paradigm was almost universally accepted as defining American religion. The influence of chaplains within the military establishment was also high. The climate was never more favorable for a massive experiment in the clergy-dominated teaching to a general adult population of moral values derived from religious systems. It is probably accurate to say that character guidance was the dominant institutional interest of the chaplaincies during that period. Large budgets were made available, and substantial investments of manpower and effort were poured into the endeavor.

In 1950 representatives of the three Chiefs of Chaplains met to review their character guidance instruction. Over an eight-month period they developed and tested a series of six "Armed Forces Chaplains Visual Presentations," consisting of lecture outlines with visual aids for black flannelgraph boards. These were adopted by all three services.

The period of massive emphasis on character guidance was initiated with a letter, dated 26 May 1951, signed by Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall and addressed to the secretaries of the three services. It said, in part:

> It is in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected in the realization and development of moral, spiritual, and religious values consistent with the religious beliefs of the individuals concerned. To this end, it is the duty of commanding officers in every echelon to develop to the highest possible degree the conditions and influences calculated to promote the health, morals, and spiritual values of the personnel under their command.

With this charter, all three chaplaincies moved forward in the fifties and early sixties to develop "cradle to grave" programs of moral education for use throughout the military. Terminology began to change to reflect a broadened concern: "character education" and "moral leadership" began to replace "character guidance." Though the joint approach to character guidance presentations for recruit training had been regarded as successful, the three services moved separately in this period to develop broader programs.

The Navy moved ahead full steam to develop what was probably the most extensive and standardized program. It was envisioned as "a continuous process for all personnel in whatever area of service they may happen to be, whether in Recruit Training, Service School, Officer Candidate School, service with the fleet, or on duty on Foreign Station."[156] Though neither the Army nor the Air Force developed such extensive curricula, all three services in that period were moving toward "cradle to

grave" programs intended to provide chaplain-led character education or moral leadership training for all military personnel.

Problem Areas: Is Moral Character Dependent on Religion

During this period all chaplains were expected to be heavily engaged in the moral leadership task. Before the curricula could be completed, and the standardized instruction could be implemented service-wide, however, internal strains within the program were becoming increasingly apparent.

A basic and never-resolved issue had to do with the relationship of morality to religion. Various curricula developed during this period used differing rationales. Some depended heavily on the behavioral sciences, emphasizing the process of growth and decision-making rather than content, marking a definite break with the "moral lecture" approach of recruit training materials. Common denominator civil religion was present less directly as an undergirding for the general orientation, but not so extensively as explicit subject matter. Other curricula were more explicitly based on common denominator religious principles and teachings. Religious differences, however, were never fully overcome. Some curricula, derived from "natural moral law," were believed to be generally acceptable, but were rejected by some Protestant chaplains who did not accept this basically Roman Catholic approach.

Presented with materials based on behavioral science, many chaplains, who saw morality as religiously-based and their own calling as that of clergy in uniform, saw no reason for their participation. But presented with religiously-based materials which did not represent their own religious convictions, they were equally uninterested.

A religious dimension had to be maintained in the program (and, indeed, was in almost every curriculum developed) in order to retain chaplain interest and commitment. But it had to be common denominator religion. Civil religion generally, as Herberg noted, tends to be regarded as a threat by those most strongly committed to church-centered religion. The common denominator religion of character education was so regarded by many chaplains. Other chaplains, particularly in recruit centers and service schools where teaching such classes was a major activity for some, felt that it tended to get out of proportion, consuming time clergy should be devoting to explicitly religious leadership. These dilemmas undoubtedly contributed much to the rapid decline of the character education movement.

Relationship to Command Structures

A separate but related issue with regard to these programs was the relationship of chaplains to command structures. In conception, philosophy and design, character education was a chaplains' program. Chaplains had originated the idea, promoted its adoption, written the curricula, taught the classes, and served as staff administrators at every level. As a "chaplains' program," however, it was associated by line officers with the voluntarism that characterizes religious observance. It was regarded as suspect by hard-headed pragmatists to whom "character" meant an eccentric old sergeant.

To achieve its goals, however, the program had to be carried out under line auspices, with the clout of military command behind it. From the beginning, therefore, an attempt was made to sell it as a "command program." Starting with Secretary Marshall's character memorandum (the original draft of which had, of course, been written by a chaplain), command responsibility had been emphasized. "It is the duty

of commanding officers at every echelon...," that memorandum had said. The various directives, circulars, and orders which put the program into effect were invariably signed by line commanders and went out through command channels, for command implementation. But no one was fooled about the realities. There were a number of line officers and enlisted leaders at every level who, like General Marshall himself, were thoroughly sold on and became personally involved in this approach to leadership. In general, though, line officers were ambivalent, continuing to regard it as a "chaplains' program."

Both the religious issue and the issue of command sponsorship were further complicated by claims that the program was "non-religious":

> The Character Education program is <u>not</u> a religious program. Confusion on this issue is both dangerous and unnecessary. It is true that the Character Education program attempts to promote the realization of moral, spiritual and religious values. This no more makes it a religious program than the food a man eats makes a . . . no time is any chaplain charged with carrying out a religious ministry contrary to his own creed, or the spirit and tenets of his own church . . . Participation in the Character Education program must not violate this maxim in any respect. If such violation is to be avoided, three facts must remain clear. (1) The Character Education program is not a religious program. (2) The chaplain must never be charged with expressing religious doctrines contrary to his own creed. (3) The participation of chaplains in the program must not lend it a religious "tone."[157]

Such obscure distinctions satisfied neither chaplains nor line officers. The program was thus involved in serious contradictions on this score. Neither side found character education's non-religious religion entirely acceptable.

Gradual Decline

No one officially killed character education for many years. In recruit training and the structured academic setting of some schools, classes continued to be required. Some commanders continued to support it. But for the majority of military chaplains and commanders it faded in importance. What began as a massive crusade, to affect the moral character of the entire American population through moral education as its young manhood passed through the armed forces, was ultimately a failure. It remained in effect in the Civil Air Patrol and in some Reserve components. But by the sixties the original character education movement had largely run its course.

All the basic dynamics that led to it, however, remained in place. Chaplains still needed to be needed. Commanders still wanted to improve the morality of the troops. In less ambitious ways, efforts to develop plausible command-sponsored programs for chaplain involvement in the generalized teaching of morality continued through the sixties and seventies.

During the Vietnamese War the military chaplaincies developed "Personal Response" programs focused on cross-cultural understanding between American service personnel and the Southeast-Asian nationals with whom, in the unique milieu of that war, they were thrown into intimate contact. Elaborate curricular materials were developed to enable chaplains to teach service personnel the customs, values, and behavioral patterns of the Vietnamese, Montagnards, and later, Thais. Line officers and NCOs, led and trained by chaplains, were used as instructors along with the chaplains themselves. The explicit religious content that had been part of many earlier

programs was missing. The heavy emphasis on Southeast-Asian religions in the content of the curriculum, however, gave the classes a "comparative religion" dimension. Beyond this, an elaborate attempt was made to provide a religious rationale for chaplain involvement on the basis of a theology of reconciliation.

The issue of the chaplains' rationale in developing the program, over against the rationale of line commanders in funding and sponsoring it, became far more complex in connection with Personal Response than it had been in connection with earlier forms of character education. "Winning the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people" became a major military objective. Chaplain instruction to American troops aimed at cross-cultural understanding had, therefore, clearly recognizable military value. Furthermore, the American-Vietnamese interaction thus encouraged became an important source of military intelligence. In the army, Personal Response was identified openly with psychological warfare. In the Marine Corps the program was place under the G-3 (Operations) staff section. It was regarded by military leadership as having direct and immediate military payoff, and sometimes "sold" by chaplains to line commanders on this basis. As a result the discomfort of other chaplains at having their ministries "used" for military purposes became extreme. Personal Response became the most controversial of all the moral leadership efforts attempted by the chaplaincies.

Attempts to Revive Character Education

Attempts to revive Character Education itself began in all three services in the seventies. A significant increase in racial unrest and a proliferation of drug use occupied attention at the highest military levels. The chaplaincies, seeking to contribute toward solutions for these serious problems, began to reexamine their generally moribund programs of character education.

A move away from religiously-based programs, in the direction of personal growth programs based on the behavioral sciences, characterized this period. There was growing emphasis on group dynamics from the disciplines of sociology and social psychology, following the pioneering work of Kurt Lewin. Useful also was the new school of humanistic psychology just coming into prominence in that period under the leadership of Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers and others. Many chaplains sent to civilian institutions for postgraduate study chose the behavioral sciences. The self-realization values of humanistic psychology became increasingly the values of a character education focused on personal growth.

Names of programs of this era reflect the emphasis. In addition to Personal Response in Vietnam there were: Lay Enrichment and Development; Personal Enrichment; Values and Decision Making; Human Factors Training; and Human Meaning Program. The Air Force chaplaincy, after a major conference and study, decided not to go back to chaplain-run character education at all except for recruit training. It recommended rather that chaplains work with other staff persons concerned with values and behavior as a resource for command programs.

The most ambitious effort of this period was the Army's Human Self-Development Program. Launched in 1971, it built on the remnants of earlier Character Education programs. It was voluntary rather than mandatory, and it called for cooperation with others, such as medical officers, inspectors general, information officers and unit sergeants major in Human Self-Development Planning Units, required in all commands. Instructional materials, prepared by the Chaplains' Board, were issued quarterly.

None of these second-generation efforts, however, engendered the enthusiasm and support of the original Character Education movement of the fifties. And most programs, of both generations, tended to follow a similar life cycle: (1) birth within the chaplaincy; (2) implementation as a "command program" under the sponsorship of line commanders; (3) evolution into a line-led program; and (4) slow death or transformation into something other than the original intent of the chaplains who designed them.

By the end of the seventies the revived character education movement appeared to have run its course, and through the eighties and early nineties very little was done on a service-wide basis. Individual chaplains or chaplain departments, together with interested commanders, continued to develop, revive, or initiate programs for the particular command, aimed at some form of moral education. When chaplains proposed such local programs they were often greeted enthusiastically by commanders, who continued to be deeply concerned about behavioral and disciplinary problems. But chiefs of chaplains and professional supervisory structures largely stayed out of the field, leaving it to local initiative. The eighties and early nineties saw very little attention by the military chaplaincies to character education or moral leadership programs.

Present-Day Efforts: Core Values

As the century drew to a close, the widespread concern throughout the society about a perceived loss of the public moral consensus, a breakdown of family structures, an absence of commonly-held values was reflected in the military. Specific problems within the armed forces such as sexual harassment, increasing instances of family violence, and suicide, led to fresh round of questions as to what could be done to meet the need.

All three armed forces have devised their own lists of "Core Values" for service wide emphasis. For the Army, there are twelve: (1) Family; (2) Selflessness; (3) Discipline; (4) Patriotism; (5) Moral Courage; (6) Loyalty; (7) Moral Leadership; (8) Total Fitness; (9) Responsibility, Duty, Competence; (10) Moral Standards; (11) Integrity, Candor; and (12) Respect.

The Navy has a much shorter list of core values: Honor, Courage and Commitment, though these concepts are, of course, broadly interpreted and are seen as encompassing the whole range of basic character components. Air Force core values, reflecting a similar broad-brush approach, including integrity, service above self, and excellence.

The concern of senior commanders was expressed in 1996 by the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Charles Krulak, who made morality a major theme of his first year in the Marine's top post. Recognizing that too many young people are emerging from their families, schools and churches without a strong set of moral values, Krulak explored the possibility of adding a week of values training to boot camp. "I believe that the Marine Corps, if we really hold the line, if we can extend boot camp, if we can extend the development of our ethos and our values, can literally transform the youth of America," Krulak wrote.[158] Reflecting the context of the times, the new moral training program was to be conducted by drill sergeants, not by chaplains.

Chaplains themselves, in many instances, have remained ambivalent. One Air Force chaplain interviewed for this study contrasted present-day attitudes with those of an earlier period. "My dad was a chaplain," he said, "and he looks back fondly on

Character Guidance lectures. We don't do that any more. There was a move a couple of years ago to reestablish it, and I hope it dies, because that's not where morals are formed. Morals are formed one-on-one. That's where the unit chaplain really does his character guidance. We have a moral imperative to keep this base headed in a moral direction. Chaplains have a good reputation on base. They know, they care, and they are there."

As the turn of the century approached, all the chaplaincies to varying degrees were taking a fresh look at the role of chaplains in seeking solutions to the breakdown of values and standards. Navy and Air Force chaplains have thus far continued the local option approach. The Air Force has a program called "Adult Values Education" (AVE) in which chaplains participate, although it is a command rather than chaplains' program. The Army chaplaincy has moved in the direction of revitalizing its Moral Leadership Training program, which has remained on the books as part of its officially established chaplains activities.[159] Forces Command, which encompasses most of the Army commands in the United States, developed in the mid-nineties a new "Chaplains' Manual For Moral Leadership Training." Its covering memorandum said:

> The need for a fully developed and well-executed Moral Leadership Training program has come to the forefront. A significant number of commanders and NCOs have observed and expressed concern over the increase in family violence and suicides. In addition, leaders throughout the chain of command have become increasingly aware of many of our soldier's struggles with America's core values, the values upon which this country was founded.[160]

The Manual provided twelve lesson plans, based on the Army's twelve core values. In 1995 they were field tested and revised by chaplains at twenty FORSCOM activities. A "Philosophical Basis for Moral Education Found in Academic Disciplines" by Lydia R. Herndon, Ph.D., was included in the Manual. After examining the basis for Moral Education found in Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology and Studies of Culture, she concluded with a section on "Theology, Religion and Appeals to the Spiritual" in which she noted some issues related to separation of church and state. It was anticipated that the Manual would be made available to the rest of the Army.

Whether a new round of emphasis on chaplain involvement in Character Education and Moral Leadership lies ahead is an open question. The contradictions and ambiguities remain. An Army chaplain, speaking in an interview of his participation in Moral Leadership classes, recalled a class in which the subject was ethics:

> "In the introduction I went over the Ten Commandments. In fact, I made a game of it. I broke the class into small groups of about ten each, and asked each group, collectively, to list as many of the Ten Commandments as they could. I offered a prize for any group that could name all ten. None of them could. But there was some resistance. After the class one or two people said they didn't come here to get religion. And that's okay. The way I incorporated it, though, was from an historical perspective: this has long been viewed as an important document for the study of moral and ethical values."

The chaplain was asked whether or not he could teach moral and ethical values apart from a religious context. "Me personally?" he asked. "I don't think I can." But he later added that he liked participating in the moral leadership classes. His ambivalence is characteristic of many chaplains, but so is his interest.

The basic reasons that have led chaplains, throughout the history of their presence in the armed forces, to become repeatedly involved in attempts to promote morality and core values, remain intact. Issues of right and wrong are deeply imbedded in all religious traditions. God is a God of justice and righteousness. Development of moral persons and a moral society are basic goals of religious faith.

But can it be done in a religiously pluralistic culture? The issue is as vital for civilian society—schools, families, public institutions—as it is for the military. And chaplains may be uniquely situated to continue the quest in behalf of the whole society. They are a group of clergy who have chosen to minister in a context of cooperative pluralism. They are committed to working together across denominational and faith group lines. Moral behavior of troops continues to be a priority concern of military commanders, who need the efforts of chaplains in this area. And chaplains have a vast body of accumulated data and experience, as to what works and what does not work in the field of character education. It may be that development of a viable model of moral leadership in a pluralistic environment is a major challenge now before them.

Lesson 10: The Chaplain's Relationship to Assets and Resources

Due This Lesson

1-page response paper for Resource 9-3
Oral Presentation—second group
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- describe organizational resources and assets and how they are used in support of ministry

Homework Assignments

Read Resource 10-2. Prepare a one-page response paper to this reading giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.

Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

"Today, the new spiritual supplier—inside and outside the religious establishments—cater to this more open religious climate. These suppliers take religious pluralism for granted and play to themes of choice, individuality, and the desirability of a cultivated and spiritually sensitive self. Knowing that pluralism is experienced as expanding psychological boundaries, they consciously define themselves in relation to a broadening and intensifying menu of spiritual possibilities.

"They recognize the fluidity of the self and the popularity of current psychological motifs like 'personal growth,' 'womenspirit,' and 'holistic spirituality,' and by means of definitions and labels claim on this more subjective space, thereby legitimating it and enhancing their market shares. They appeal to primitive desires for ecstasy, for bonding, for health, for hope and happiness, for the resacralization of everyday life. Often they go to great length to point out that personal awakenings and growth can best be achieved beyond the arbitrary limits set by formal institutions. Frequently, they redefine older religious language in ways to make it more acceptable or create alternative concepts altogether to such older notions as sin, grace, and discipleship. In all these ways, spirituality 'invades' pre-existing religious forms, reconfiguring and revitalizing life-experiences."[161]

Assets and Resource Support

Organizational Guidelines

Prioritize Program and Line Items

Justification of Program and Line Items

The Churches and the Chaplaincy
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Chapter 9

Military Chaplaincy in a New Century:
Directions for the Future

Admiral William W. Crowe, Jr., Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Reagan and Bush administrations, ended his term of office as the Soviet Union fell apart and the Cold War ended. In the final chapter of his 1993 memoirs, *The Line of Fire,* he addressed the future of the armed forces in the post-Cold War world. Admiral Crowe explored the changes of the new era: the necessarily declining budgets, the decreasing size of forces, the changing mission as the United States faced not a single hostile superpower but a world of varying vital interests and limited military actions such as Operation Desert Storm. In this radically changed context the single most important factor, he concluded, is the people who make up the armed forces.

> The bedrock position, it seems to me, is that while we can spend less, we still must make a sufficient investment to maintain a healthy cadre, around which we can expand if necessity strikes. If we do not have that, we will be wasting whatever money we spend. This brings the argument back to Colin Powell's theory that there is a certain level below which we cannot reasonably go. To have a viable military we have no choice but to attract and keep good people. And that is really our national insurance.

> The United States is on the brink of making fundamental decisions about the future of its armed forces. These judgments…are a subject for the entire nation. It is impossible for the military to be capable if the country does not want it to be. It is impossible to make people enthusiastic about what they are doing if the country does not believe what they are doing is worthwhile. It is impossible to inspire people to risk their lives if the nation is uninterested.

> The essential lesson, perhaps, is not that we need Patriot missiles or M-1 tanks. The essential lesson is that we need good people, and that good people pay rich dividends when circumstances grow perilous. Whatever else we do, we must have an enlightened policy that offers capable individuals a satisfying career in a prestigious profession. If we have that, they will compensate for many of the material deficiencies we may ask them to endure.[162]

In the period in which downsizing, outsourcing, and mission redefinition have been taking place, the focus on people has at times appeared to receive scant attention. But in the long run people must be central.

Chaplains are specialists in two essential aspects of what makes "good people" good, the spiritual and moral dimensions. Both for reasons inherent in American society and for reasons unique to the military, chaplains will continue to have a major role in America's armed forces. But as a new century dawns, both the society at large and the armed forces are undergoing strains that present special challenges.

We began this book with two major themes. One was the institutional duality that characterizes the military chaplaincy and makes it unique. Chaplains are fully members of, and fully accountable to, two major institutions: the church by which they are ordained and the armed force by which they are commissioned. This duality shapes every aspect of their ministry.

The other major opening theme addressed the social, culture and religious changes in the late twentieth century that present special challenges to this unique ministry. These include changes in the military establishment itself, following the end of the Cold War that shaped its size and mission through most of the second half of the century. But even more importantly we noted changes in the place and social context of religion in American public life that present new challenges to the chaplaincy as a major institution in which religion and public life intersect. This chapter will seek to pull together some conclusions on issues related to each of these two major themes.

Issues Relating to Institutional Duality

As we saw in chapter two, institutional duality is inherent in the very nature of the military chaplaincy. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of this book, analyzing the setting, the context and the characteristics of this highly specialized ministry, all examined aspects and challenges of being at the same time a clergyperson and a military officer. Underlying most criticisms of the combining of the two roles is the question as to whether the constitutional right of service men and women to the free exercise of their religion could be provided in any other way.

Could the Chaplaincy Be Civilianized?

We have noted earlier that during the Vietnamese War significant opposition to the military chaplaincy arose in anti-war religious circles. Particularly influential was the organization "Clergy and Laity Concerned about Vietnam," which published the critical book, *Military Chaplains.* The general tone of this movement was negative toward all things military, and little attention was given to the question of how military personnel might be accorded their right to the free exercise of their religion without a chaplaincy. To the extent that it was considered, however, the alternative suggested was a church-sponsored civilian ministry to the military. A Task Force of the United Church of Christ in 1972 actually proposed a civilianized chaplaincy, though the proposal was later rejected by the General Synod of that church, which endorsed the existing system.

With the end of the Vietnamese War, interest in such proposals languished, as did the whole anti-military tone of that period. The only venue in which a civilian chaplaincy has been seriously discussed in the years since was the constitutional challenge to the Army chaplaincy, <u>Katcoff v. Marsh</u>, litigated to the appellate court level in the early 1980s before being withdrawn by the plaintiffs.

As that case unfolded Katcoff and Wieder, the plaintiffs, used the United Church Task Force report to support their position that a civilian chaplaincy was a feasible alternative to the publicly funded Army program. They were not aware that the parent body, the Tenth Synod of the United Church of Christ, had in 1975 rejected the report, and when this fact was made a part of the record by government attorneys they dropped the argument.

At a later stage, in mid-1982, Katcoff and Wieder obtained an affidavit from an official of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (a 411,000-member separatist

denomination that has chosen not to cooperate even with other Lutherans in most matters) regarding its civilian chaplaincy to its members in the armed forces. The affidavit claimed that the Wisconsin Synod had long conducted its own chaplaincy at its own expense. It stated that "numerous pastors of the Wisconsin Synod served as civilian chaplains in Vietnam" during that war, and that they "performed their ministry at military installations and front-line areas wherever the need arose."

Much of the information in the affidavit turned out to be incorrect, and its author later provided a supplementary statement that corrected the record. The civilian chaplains had received government logistical support, including travel by military aircraft and vehicles, transient housing, and exchange and open mess privileges. Only four clergy of the Synod had assisted service personnel at approximately a dozen locations during World War II. None had served overseas in combat zones in either that war or the Korean conflict. No more than one had been in Vietnam at any one time during the Vietnamese War, and that one had been removed for his own protection when the Tet offensive broke out, and provided with government air transportation back to the United States. In Europe during the Cold War period two clergy were provided, but they could not accompany soldiers during the extended training exercise frequently demanded of troops.[163]

Far from establishing the feasibility of a civilian chaplaincy, Katcoff and Wieder actually raised major questions about their case by citing the experience of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod. Clearly some civilian clergy services have long been provided to—and welcomed by—military personnel, particularly in stateside and sometimes overseas garrison areas. What the Wisconsin Synod experience demonstrates, however, is the implausibility of expecting that such limited and occasional services could substitute for an entire chaplaincy. There is no way in which civilian clergy could accompany military people on battlefields, ships at sea, training exercises, or deployments in remote areas—and it is for such eventualities that military forces exist. There is no way in which civilian clergy could transport, shelter and maintain themselves without military support, even if they were allowed by commanders in such battlefields and deployments. Were the attempt to be made, the ministrations of clergy from some 200 denominations the size of the Wisconsin Synod or larger, attempting to locate and serve military personnel of their own persuasion, under combat conditions or on ships at sea, would be a logistical nightmare.

Beyond the lessons of experience, it is also clear that the present state of the American churches and religious bodies would make the probability of their undertaking such a project even more remote than in earlier periods. Many major denominational headquarters are suffering severely from declining funding. Further, the ecumenical organizations through which they once might have undertaken cooperative endeavors, are in a state of serious disarray. Even if they had the will (which they do not), the churches of America would not at this time have the resources, financial or organizational, for such an undertaking. On the contrary they have long accepted;, officially endorsed, and supported the present system of military chaplaincy. And the organization through which they cooperate in extending their support, the National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces, has the distinction of being the most inclusive cooperative organization of religious bodies in America.

Outsourcing

The fiscal pressure of reduced budgets and downsizing in the post-Cold War period has raised the question of civilianizing the stateside chaplaincy in a new form, this time originating from military planners under the rubric of "outsourcing." McDonald's

and Burger King run base snack bars. Civilian companies contract to provide janitorial services and even guards at military gates. Could not opportunities for military personnel to worship be provided by contracting with local churches or clergy to provide religious services? This kind of pressure has been particularly strong in the Air Force, where religious ministry in the past has centered around chapel programs at stateside bases, and the tradition of chaplains deploying with troops or ships is not as strong or as widely appreciated. But as we have seen, in today's Air Force deployment with operational units is increasingly the pattern.

For a number of reasons it is important to keep chaplains at stateside bases even when there are plenty of churches in the area. Basically, chaplains with troops on military garrison duty in the United States must be there for the same reason the troops themselves must be there. We do not keep combat troops at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, because we expect a Cuban invasion of the coast of North Carolina, but because they must be available somewhere, trained and ready, in case they are needed anywhere for deployment or combat.

Second, although local churches can and do provide opportunities for worship and religious fellowship for large numbers of military people and families, with stateside chapel programs serving only a minority in this way, there remain the extensive counseling ministry and other forms of service to the whole institution which are performed by chaplains throughout the week. Even if the surrounding civilian clergy had the time to fill these needs—which clearly they do not—it is doubtful that they would be able to.

Third, although the chapel program is a relatively minor part of the total ministry of chaplains at stateside bases surrounded by civilian churches, it still meets a particular need. Realistically it must be recognized that the military is the kind of society that encourages its members to allow the "total mobile environment" we examined in chapter 5 to become a substitute for the stability others find in permanent civilian community structures. This becomes a major morale consideration. Base chaplains cannot, therefore, limit themselves to a supplementary ministry to transients, prisoners, and duty personnel unable to involve themselves in off-base churches. They must provide as full a ministry as possible for those who, because of the system, feel more at home and can be better served within the total environment which provides them with security.

Fourth, the kind of cooperative and transdenominational church life a military chapel offers does have something to contribute to the cause of religion, particularly in an era of declining ecumenism and serious polarization. Although it may not offer as full a church life as denominational churches, it models a sort of transdenominational unity that is a needed dimension of religious life today.

It may be reiterated that one final element is the health of the chaplaincy itself. Even if the churches in the civilian communities surrounding military bases were able to provide all the needed ministries and services, it is neither humane nor practical to expect that all chaplains would spend all their time at sea, in combat, or in remote areas. Rotation from sea to shore duty, from overseas hardship tours of duty to stateside assignments, is as necessary to the family life and emotional health of chaplains as for all other human beings serving in the armed forces.

It is clear, then, that civilian ministries could not <u>replace</u> the military chaplaincy without serious loss of opportunities for the free exercise of religion on the part of military personnel. There are unlimited opportunities, however, for civilian ministries

to <u>supplement</u> and cooperate with the ministries of chaplains. This is particularly true within the United States, where large numbers of civilian churches are located in the vicinity of military bases. These churches are already serving a great many military people and families, and in "service towns" such as Norfolk, Virginia, or San Antonio, Texas, churches in which more than half the membership is military-related are not uncommon.

No one, least of all chaplains, would deny that many stateside military people can and should turn to civilian churches for spiritual nurture. Families of chaplains themselves often do so. Most chaplains have no desire to "compete" with churches of the community. They recognize that the local pastor, who confronts military men and women from a stance of relative permanence, can offer a kind of normal and stable church experience which chaplains themselves, because they are part of the institutional environment and its mobility, cannot provide. Denominational relationships and resources, community involvement, and parish church stewardship structures can provide a far more full and complete church life than can a military chapel. Chaplains, therefore, as much as they may enjoy facing from the chancel a full chapel, nevertheless generally encourage military people to become fully and responsibly involved in local churches of their own denomination whenever possible.

We have mentioned earlier the 1992 book, *Ministry with the Military,* written primarily by Donald W. Hadley, pastor of a Baptist church in Havelock, North Carolina, just outside the Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station. The book offers extensive helps to pastors seeking to minister to military people and families in similar situations. Written in cooperation with a retired chaplain, it offers insights into military life and needs that are useful to chaplains as well. This kind of cooperation between churches and chaplains is exemplary. If there were not hundreds of churches like First Baptist of Havelock, far more chaplains than the 2,500 ordinarily on active [duty] would be required to meet the needs of the military community.

The Advantages of Insider Ministry

Beyond the question of whether, from the practical perspective, the chaplaincy <u>could</u> be civilianized, either under church sponsorship or by military outsourcing, is the question of the effectiveness of ministry. We examined in chapter 3 the concept of the total institution, and the advantages of insider ministry by clergy who are fully members of such an institution. Advocates of civilianization point out that a ministry by civilian outsiders would be free to pass judgments on the military command structure and its mission, unaffected by personal involvement. It would be free to urge disobedience of orders, which the organization Clergy and Laity Concerned about Vietnam apparently wanted Air Force chaplains to do during the Vietnamese War. It would be free not just to counsel but to make common cause with dissidents. But it would be limited in its access to people. As we have seen it would be unable to accompany military people wherever they go—particularly in the most stressful situations such as combat, operations in which national security is a significant factor, and extreme isolation. It would be limited in its access to the power structure for effective change. And, of course, the more it exercised its freedom to take an adversarial stance over against the military authority structure—total institutions being what they are—the more limited would be its access to people and structures. Outsiders are more free to be prophets than pastors.

A ministry by military insiders, on the other hand, is completely free in its access to people and structures. It is fee to share the lives—including the moral ambiguities—of military people. It is free to take its ministry into the whole of military society, under

all conditions. Because of the long history which has led to well-recognized relationship with the churches and a clear understanding that chaplains are clergy first and members of the military second, it is free to proclaim an authentic religious message within the institution. It is free to engage with the power structure to affect the quality of life within. But it is limited by the necessity of conforming to military law and regulations. It is limited by the reality of military authority. And, to be fully candied, it is limited by the self-interest of ministers who chose to serve in and identity with the institution of which they are a part.

The extent to which chaplains can perform a prophetic role (in the sense of challenging policy or authority on moral or religious grounds) is an unresolved issue. The dichotomy between pastoral and prophetic functions is not a simple "either-or". Within the limits established by acceptance of military legitimacy and authority, chaplains clearly have prophetic responsibilities. Internal diversity, judgment, and criticism are not only proper at the appropriate time and place, but necessary to institutional health. Acceptance of military command does not require the wearing of a muzzle. Some of the proudest moments in the history of the chaplaincy have been those moments when military clergy stood up and were counted on issues of conscience or conviction. A chaplaincy entirely devoid of prophetic dimensions would be a poor instrument of God's work.

But the distinction is none the less real. It is one of the characteristics of a total institution—particularly the military—that there is a clearly-perceived line between those who are members and those who are not, and a deeply felt sense of common identity within the institution. All evidence indicates that even if civilian ministries could provide for military personnel their constitutionally guaranteed right to the free exercise of religion, they are far better served by an insider ministry that shares their life and experiences.

The Institutional Contributions of the Chaplaincy to the Armed Forces

The primary concern, when the future of the chaplaincy is considered, is the effectiveness of chaplains and their ability to be authentic ministers in a military organization. Throughout this book we have seen that the chaplaincy is generally an effective ministry, meeting the special needs of military people. There is, however, another contribution made by the presence of representatives of American religious bodies as insiders in the military institution. It is a contribution relatively independent of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of individual chaplains. This is the institutional contribution made by the presence of chaplains to the overall well-being of the armed forces, a contribution that civilian ministries or outsourcing could not provide. It is useful for a moment to look at the chaplaincy from a sociological perspective—in terms of the dynamics of social groups rather than individual persons—and at the function thus served by having chaplains in the military.

Historically, the presence within the military of a group representing religious values and humanitarian concerns has been sociologically significant. Beginning with George Washington's call for "gentlemen of sober, serious and religious deportment, who would improve morale and discourage gambling, swearing, and drunkenness," the presence of chaplains has brought a much-needed religious and moral dimension into a kind of environment in which these dimensions are easily forgotten.[164] We have seen in historical sketches in previous chapters the contributions of early chaplains in advancing education, eliminating inhumane punishments such as flogging, and improving the quality of life for the individual soldier or sailor. In March, 1859, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives described the institutional

contribution. Making allowances for the somewhat narrowly focused religious vision of the times, it still makes a valid point:

> The spirit of Christianity has ever had a tendency to mitigate the rigors of war, if as yet it has not been entirely able to prevent it; to lend to it acts of charity and kindness; and to humanize the heart. It was true philanthropy, therefore, to introduce this mitigating influence where, of all places, its fruits were to be more beneficially realized, namely into the Army and Navy, and to abolish it, in this Christian age of the world, would seem like retrograding rather than advancing civilizantion.[165]

In chapter 8 we examined a parade of programs aimed at the promotion of morality and core values. As "programs" few have survived, although attempts to find the right formula continue and efforts are being renewed today. But regardless of their permanent impact, they are important as attempts to wrestle with religious and human values in a non-religious and sometimes inhumane institution. The significant contribution is the continual input of these values and the continuing interaction thus initiated.

All these contributions of chaplains have long been regarded by commanders as militarily useful. Troops who are well integrated persons, internally at peace (in other words, persons with religious convictions), and with strong core values, are better citizens of the military community and better fighters. Chaplains are welcomed by savvy commanders as contributors to their operational goals.

Chaplains have long struggled with this militarily utilitarian dimension of their ministry. They believe in the legitimacy and importance of the mission their services carry out. They cannot, and do not want to, deny their usefulness in the institution. An article by Navy Chaplain Paul R. Wrigley on "The Impact of Religious Belief in the Theater of Operations" was published in the Spring 1996 issue of the *Naval War College Review.* "The commander," said Wrigley, "needs to be concerned with the impact of religious beliefs upon their own forces":

> They are responsible for the religious, spiritual, moral, and ethical well-being of those within their command... The commander who develops a strong plan for combat religious ministry will increase the morale and combat effectiveness of his unit. . . . Spiritual resources can provide strength, inner peace, security and a sense of tranquility to the soldier, thereby increasing the moral force of the unit.[166]

But chaplains resist being regarded, by others or by themselves, as a means to military ends. Religious faith is an end in its own right. They are sent by their churches not to win wars but to serve people. It is well to note, therefore, that a major aspect of the institutional impact is one of amelioration of the most regrettable aspects of the military.

During the Vietnamese War, when the My Lai atrocities were the center of public attention, the question was asked, "Where were the chaplains? Were they aware of such outrages and did they fail to take a stand against them? Chaplains who were in Vietnam at the time denied knowledge of such happenings. It was revealed in testimony at the trial of Lt. Calley, who was convicted of responsibility for the atrocity, that a chaplain, who had heard indirectly of the incident, had been instrumental in bringing it to command attention at one echelon. Other chaplains report incidents in which a potential My Lai did not happen, or was ameliorated, or a brutality was punished.

War is always brutal, and it brutalizes those who engage in it. No war has been without its atrocities. But they have been the exception rather than the rule in the American armed forces, and when discovered they have almost always been severely punished by military authorities themselves. My Lai was not normative. Chaplains generally do not condone such incidents, and because of their presence there are fewer of them than might otherwise be the case. We noted in Chapter 8 programs developed by chaplains during the Vietnamese War aimed at cross-cultural understanding, at teaching American troopers to see indigenous people as human beings rather than "gooks."

We saw in chapter 5 that vast numbers of military men and women, in every war and every area where troops were present, under the leadership and influence of their chaplains, have devoted millions of dollars and countless hours of work to building and repairing hospitals and orphanages, feeding the hungry, caring for the sick and dispossessed, and otherwise showing human concern for people, some of whom might recently have been enemies. There is substantial evidence that throughout American military history the sociological effect of the presence of American clergy and their religious values has been of great significance.

We looked in some detail in chapter 3 at the characteristics of total institutions. As total institutions, the armed forces are in many respects closed societies, with their own customs, conventions, and standards. The stereotype of the dangerous "military mind," often depicted in cartoons, articles, and books, is greatly overdrawn: military minds reflect nearly as much variety as civilian minds. But the danger of such a malign influence developing within the military institution would be far greater were not the religious minds also present, in dialogue with the military minds.

Even if it were possible, from the standpoint of providing for the right of military personnel to the free exercise of their religion, to substitute civilian clergy for military chaplains, there is grave question as to its sociological wisdom. Leaving aside all questions of relative effectiveness, cost, the impracticability of civilian ministry in shipboard, remote deployment and combat situations, and the problems of denominational coordination, it is probable that one of the most serious losses from civilianization would be this loss of the influence of an insider chaplaincy on the institution itself. A chaplaincy might well be justified on these grounds alone, as a contribution of the churches to American society.

A Unified Chaplaincy and Joint Operations

In the context of reduced budgets, the question has been raised as to whether there would be significant savings if the chaplaincies of the three services were replaced by a single military chaplaincy serving all the armed forces. Certainly military chaplaincy is one professional specialty within religious ministry. As we have seen throughout this book, most statements about chaplains and most factors in the analysis of their ministry, apply to all three services. Without exception the churches and religious bodies deal with the military chaplaincy as a single category of ministry.

The possibility of a unified chaplaincy was a lively issue among chaplains interviewed for this study, often discussed under the rubric of the "purple suit" chaplain. There is a considerable measure of openness to the possibility among today's chaplains, for whom joint operations are normative. Many, however, point to the differences in service traditions, cultures and operating styles as evidence that the present system provides more effective ministry.

"Even if we all wore purple suits," said one chaplain, "there would be purple-suiters who go to sea or purple-suiters who fly airplanes. The Canadians found this to be the case."

The question of the unification of the service chaplaincies was examined by a Study Group established by the Armed Forces Chaplains Board from April to October 1992. The study found that each chaplaincy has its own cultural context established by the three services and their varying functions, and that these cultural contexts are important for ministry.

> [I]n considering collaborative efforts, the significant variances related to religious support for ships at sea, an infantry division, or an air base must be faced realistically. Chaplain schools are not preparing persons to be clergy. They prepare them to function as staff officers, supervisors, and clergy persons in the environment unique to each Service. Throughout history each Service has expected its chaplains to be fully immersed in its culture, people and mission.[167]

On this basis the study concluded that unification or consolidation would not improve but would diminish the quality of ministry and therefore was "neither desirable, appropriate nor feasible."

That conclusion is fully supported by the ministry analysis of this book. We have devoted much attention to the characteristics of military services as total institutions, to the desirability of insider ministries by clergy who are full members of the institution, and to the enormous advantage in ministry that comes from fully sharing the life of the institution. At a more pragmatic level, the chaplaincies are very minor parts of the overall military services, involving relatively few people and quite modest budgets. Their administrative staffs (the offices of the three Chiefs of Chaplains) are small and their overhead is relatively minor. The savings from unification, if any, would be so small as to be negligible, and far outweighed by the loss in effectiveness that would result from removing chaplains from their service culture. An Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO) study process came to the same conclusion in 1993-94.

Military authorities do not themselves seem to be seeking unification. An Army chaplain interviewed for this study told of an officer Professional Development (OPD) class in which a 3-star general spoke of proposals to unify the military medical, dental, legal and chaplain services.

"He mentioned the others, but he spoke specifically of the chaplains. He felt strongly about it. He said, 'we have our traditions; we have our customs; we have our mission; we have our needs. And I don't want my chaplain being someone who's from a generic corps. I want my Army chaplain."

In reality the issue was probably decided in the post-World War II period when the possibility of unifying the armed services themselves was considered and rejected. (In that period the Canadian armed services were unified, and their chaplaincies with them). The same basic considerations that justify keeping separate identities for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force, point to separate identities for their chaplaincies.

With regard to joint operations and cooperative initiatives, however, the future direction is clearly one of growing emphasis. The normative pattern of post-Cold War military missions has been one of joint operations. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been

strengthened. Among senior line officers joint staff experience has become a routine requirement for promotion. Since 1982 chaplains have been serving rotationally on joint task force and theater headquarters staffs. Joint training for chaplains and enlisted support personnel has been intensifying. Joint operations has become part of the context for chaplains in today's armed forces.

Effect on the Chaplaincy of Social, Cultural, and Religious Changes

Beyond the issues related to institutional duality, we noted at the beginning of this book a number of major social and cultural shifts that have been taking place in the last third of the twentieth century. Some of these radically undercut the traditional place of religion in American public life. Some are significant shifts in the shape and structure of the American religious community itself.

The historically prominent place of religion in American public life is not declining as the twentieth century draws to a close. In fact, it may be growing, with the emergence of the Religious Right as a major political force. But this very prominence is fiercely resented in a way that is itself new. Church membership and church attendance remain strikingly high in comparison with other western nations. But it is, nevertheless, a period in which the relationship of religion to public institutions and structures has become ambiguous and highly tenuous, the focal point of widespread debate.

The military chaplaincy is perhaps the most critical point at which the interests of religion and those of public institutions intersect. Schools may need prayer, but they can educate without it. Christmas and Hannukah can be publicly celebrated without crèches or menorahs on the courthouse lawn. But the Armed Forces are unique institutions, maintained for a unique purpose under unique conditions, and the constitutional right of service men and women to engage in the free exercise of their religion cannot be provided without a chaplaincy. Here religion and major public institution come inexorably and necessarily together. But there are problems in bringing them together that have never previously been faced.

The social and cultural changes we examined in a preliminary way in chapter one and the impact of which we have noted from time to time throughout this book include the following: the secularization of intellectual life and public institutions; the relativism of postmodern perspective; changed perceptions of pluralism; and the privatization of religion. Additional changes within the American religious community include: the declining significance of denominations; the decline of conciliar ecumenism; the shift of the center of gravity of church life from the denominational to the congregational level; and the polarization between liberal and conservative wings that cuts across all American religious groups.

We have examined in chapters dealing with the ministry of chaplains the accommodations and responses being made to changes within the American religious community. However, the cumulative effect of secularization, relativization of values, a perception of greater pluralism and the privatization of religion is to undermine the central place religion once occupied in the culture. Religion is marginalized. For those who have adopted these postmodern perspectives, religion becomes nothing more than one option among many. We noted earlier Stephen Carter's description of what he called *The Culture of Disbelief,* in which religious views are rejected in the public debate.

To the extent that secularization is accepted as the public philosophy, the military chaplaincy is called into question. Religion no longer has an unchallenged place in public life or a claim to special recognition. The necessity of making opportunities for the free exercise of religion available to military personnel is no longer perceived by secularists as a compelling claim.

Privatization has an even more direct effect. Religious faith is regarded as entirely a matter of personal choice. It is a widely accepted view that each person should arrive at his or her own religious beliefs, entirely apart from any church or synagogue—or religious leader to provide guidance. Robert Bellah et al. in *Habits of the Heart* pointed to "Sheilaism," a young woman's religion that was so personal and private she named it after herself.

An Air Force chaplain described a similar tendency he had observed: "There's a sense that I can pick and choose what I like and what I'm comfortable with. I'll go down this smorgasbord line, and I'm not going to take anything that doesn't keep the focus on me and my desires and what I want. It's a feel-good kind of thing that doesn't challenge us."

Though these are extreme manifestations, and institutional religions are flourishing, affiliation with them is regarded as a matter of personal choice. This view that religion is a personal and private matter is not only characteristic of secularists, but is shared by many participants in organized churches. Religion's public relevance and standing are widely questioned. Why should the government provide for military personnel opportunities for the practice of religious faith if it is regarded as entirely an individual responsibility?

Legal and Judicial Trends

In this secular and privatized context, the place of religion in contemporary American life is both reflected in and affected by official formulations of national policy embodied in judicial decisions. Earlier in this book we have looked in some detail at judicial decisions on the constitutionality of military chaplaincy. This, however, is only one element in a cluster of issues generally called "church-state issues" that mark the legal boundaries when interests of religion and government or public life intersect. Many church-state cases have related to the place of religion in education, particularly in public schools. Another prominent cluster of cases concerns the public celebration of religious holidays, particularly the display of religious symbols (such as crosses or manger scenes at Christmas) on public property.

Over the second half of the twentieth century the "wall of separation" between church and state has been gradually strengthened by a series of judicial decisions in all these areas. Church-state issues have always been difficult and sometimes contentious. But for the first century and a half of national life there was a broadly-shared understanding of the First Amendment freedom of religion clause as designed to provide maximum freedom for religion. In the last half century this has gradually been challenged by a position that sees the clause as designed to prevent any "intrusion" of religion into public life.

Much of this judicial trend has been shaped by the so-called "Lemon test," so named for the Supreme Court's 1971 decision in Lemon v. Kurtzman. The case involved the legality of a state program to reimburse religious schools for expenses in connection with the teaching of non-religious subjects. According to this test, three criteria must be met for state support of a particular program to be met: "First, the statute must

have a secular legislative purpose; second, its principle or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion; finally, the statute must not foster 'an excessive entanglement with religion.'" Stephen Carter in *The Culture of Disbelief* discusses at some length the effects of the application of this test, noting that it exits less for the benefit of religious freedom than for the benefit of secular politics. It assumes that the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment was written for "a secular legislative purpose."[168]

This evolution in interpretation of church-state issues reflects in part the cultural change from a unified Judeo-Christian national self-perception to a new self-perception that is highly pluralistic, seeing no common religious ground underlying public life. It also reflects the secularity of a culture that sees the issue not as one of avoiding favoring one religion over another, but of protecting society from the influence of religion.

How Big a Threat to the Chaplaincy?

To what extent are these cultural changes having to do with the place of religion in public life a threat to the chaplaincy? Secularization of the society, at the minimum, reduces public interest and support for religion in the armed forces, and in some cases arouses active hostility. Privatized religion sees religion as less a public concern, and at worst sees no need for providing at public expense what is regarded as essentially a private interest. Current judicial interpretations of separation of church and state, in erecting a higher "wall" between church and state raise some questions about the inherent "entanglement" of church and state in the chaplaincy.

Though much of contemporary public discourse is couched in terms of these broad cultural changes, the basic threat to the chaplaincy as an institution is probably not as serious as it might appear. There are other aspects of the current social and cultural context that are highly positive from the perspective of the future of the chaplaincy, and that provide safeguards against any negative effects from theses cultural assumptions.

1. The secularizing, relativizing, and privatizing trends are most prominent in academic, intellectual and media elite circles. These are leadership circles, and therefore the threat to the prominent place of religion in public life must be taken very seriously. At the same time, however, the great majority of ordinary Americans are not deeply affected by them. As we have seen, the <u>practice of religion</u> in personal lives remains an extraordinarily wide and deep American phenomenon. The presence of chaplains in military forces is not only an historical reality going back to the beginnings of the nation. It is also a practice deeply ingrained in the feelings of Americans about their sons and daughters who serve the country in uniform.

2. The armed forces, and behind them the society itself, must deal with the realities of American religion. While pluralism is genuine and respect for minority rights is essential, more than 90 percent of Americans are religious believers, and the overwhelming majority of that 90 percent find their religious needs met in the context of organized (church) Christianity, through the agency of clergy. Well over 90 percent reflect a Judeo-Christian worldview. The reality of diversity at the margins cannot be allowed to undermine the much larger reality of common religious needs on the part of the vast majority. Although the percentage of military personnel who list no religious preference is larger than that in the general population, these young servicemen and women belong to an age group of which,

historically, a high percentage have tended temporarily to ignore religion. Numerous studies show that they tend to return to religious beliefs and practices as they mature. Indeed, as they move beyond adolescence into young adulthood, they are at the age when many are likely to seek to recover religious foundations, and the avenues must be present for them. The present chaplaincy pattern reflects an admirable combination of openness to pluralism and respect for diversity, while at the same time dealing realistically and cooperatively with the presence and the down-to-earth religious needs of the very large Judeo-Christian majority.

3. The churches and religious bodies of America, though battered by these cultural trends and undergoing internal strains, remain an enormously powerful force in American society. There is no other American institution or category of institution the constituency of which approaches the number who attend church, synagogue, mosque or temple weekly. And religious bodies and religious people solidly support the military chaplaincy.

    In this regard it continues to be strongly in the interest of chaplains, individually and collectively, to maintain close ties with their churches and religious bodies, to acknowledge and fulfill their accountability to them, and to fully uphold the ecclesiastical side of their institutional duality.

4. By far the most important of these positive dimensions is the fact that a chaplaincy following essentially the present model is the only feasible—indeed the only possible—way of providing for the constitutional right of military personnel to the free exercise of religion. The likelihood of the nation repealing the First Amendment and eliminating that constitutional right is for all practical purposes nil.

Future Directions for a Vital Military Chaplaincy

The military chaplaincy, then, faces the cultural trends of the late twentieth century which challenge the place of religion in American public life from a position of considerable strength. In the midst of the society's secularization, privatization, new forms of pluralism, and legal questions about church and state, the chaplaincy occupies a unique position. Other public institutions may deal with these issues by avoiding them: by pulling away from any contact with religion. The chaplaincy does not have this option. It <u>must</u> provide religious ministries in a governmental setting; that is the purpose for which it exists. And because it must address all the problems directly rather than avoiding them, it has a unique opportunity to model for the larger society cooperative and mutually respectful solutions to pluralistic problems. Americans are indeed secular, pluralistic, and individualistic. But they are aware of serious problems growing out of these characteristics, and they do not want to forsake the beliefs and values on which their country has been based. They need and want a way to transcend their divided present. For these reasons the chaplaincy may want to seek, rather than avoiding, the public spotlight in its arena, where religion and a public institution inescapably intersect.

There are at least three areas in which the military chaplaincy may in the future make unique contributions to larger challenges of public life.

Models of Cooperative Pluralism

American society's pluralistic problem has two dimensions. It is not only a problem of the absence of common ground amidst diversity. It is a problem of allowing the still-

existing common ground of a very broad Judeo-Christian consensus to flourish without violating the rights and integrity of the remainder. Americans see ourselves as a highly pluralistic people, without shared beliefs and values, and we do not know what to do about it.

Most ecumenical and interfaith undertakings in the religious community at large are for the purpose of finding common ground, and in some measure overcoming the effects of diversity. The chaplaincy exits not to bring unity, but to do a job in spite of a fully recognized and affirmed absence of unity. The kind of mutual respect that not only accepts the right of people of other faiths to worship as they choose but assumes responsibility for providing opportunities for them to do so is unique to the military. The chaplaincy's ability to recognize and affirm the commonality within the Judeo-Christian majority and provide a range of appropriate ministries without infringing on the rights of non-Judeo-Christians has been exemplary. Its operating principle in ministry of non-coercive inclusiveness on both sides—the people offering ministries and the people receiving them—has much to say to others.

Obviously the cooperative pluralism of the chaplaincy is a work in progress, which has and will continue to have problems, setbacks and failures. But the fact that on the whole it works well is of great significance to the pluralistic larger society.

The challenge to the chaplaincy is to recognize its unique position, to stake out issues related to religious pluralism as its own territory in a special way, and to consciously share what it has learned and is learning with a society struggling with its pluralism. The American religious community and society at large do not now think of the military chaplaincy as a laboratory-in-being, a source of knowledge and understanding about religious pluralism. The chaplaincy itself has to make that connection. It may need to be more intentional about its own experiments and research in this area, consciously undertaking to share its experience—its failures as well as successes—with the larger religious community through contributions to religious journals, participation in conferences and seminars, and other appropriate means.

Moral Leadership in a Pluralistic Environment

We noted, at the end of chapter 8, both the ambiguities and the challenge of continued chaplain involvement in core value and moral leadership programs. It is a compelling interest, not only of the armed forces, but of the society itself, to preserve the values on which public life and private moral judgments are based.

In 1996 the School Board of Fairfax County, Virginia, leading one of the nation's major public school systems, began developing a program of character education for its students. One Board member said, "There are an awful lot of kids who are becoming high school students without knowing what's right and wrong. It's that simple." Recognizing the difficulties, the Board sought to focus on values that various cultures and religious groups hold in common. Similar attempts are being made in numerous school systems.[169] In the present values crisis every legitimate input and source of moral value is welcome [instructor's note: except Judeo-Christian; especially Evangelical Christian].

But without closing the door to secular sources, the military and the society at large cannot afford to discard the moral structure on the basis of which the nation was founded and has so far guided its path. American values, throughout our national history, have been derived from our Judeo-Christian belief system. Most of them are affirmed by non-Judeo-Christians. The fact that one percent embrace other religious

traditions, and nearly ten percent are secularists who no longer embrace any religion, does not invalidate the moral tradition on which the nations is based.

The history of chaplain involvement in moral leadership in the armed forces is mixed. Not all chaplains want to be part of formal character education programs which are divorced from the religious context, and not all commanders want chaplains involved in their programs intended for the entire command. But despite this ambiguity, chaplains, representing all the religious traditions (including non-Judeo-Christian ones) that undergird public morality are essential players in the quest for moral values in the armed forces.

As with the broader issue of pluralism, the special role of chaplains in dealing with moral education and leadership is not recognized in the society at large. Once again, the chaplaincies must stake out the territory as one in which they have a special contribution to make to American society. For instance, a carefully researched and written history and evaluation of all the post-World War II experiments, programs and efforts of chaplains at character guidance, moral leadership and the teaching of core values would be a significant contribution to the literature in this field of growing importance.

And for the sake of chaplains themselves and their ministries, some careful study of what is now going on in the military in this field and what the future directions ought to be, could be helpful.

Church-State Relations

A third area in which the chaplaincy is something of a laboratory for the larger society is that of church-state relations. How high or low, how permeable or impermeable the "wall of separation" ought to be is a lively contemporary issue. The chaplaincy has a two-fold responsibility. As a major (perhaps the major) arena in which church and state are inevitably and necessarily working together, there is a responsibility to be very much aware of the relevant legal issues and alert to dangers of violating established principles.

There is, however, another area of responsibility in which the chaplaincies may make a special contribution. The founders, in establishing the principle of the institutional separation of church and state, had no intention of separating religion and society. On the contrary, it was their awareness of the important role of religion in society that led to the constitutional safeguard of the right of every American to the free exercise of religion.

As those entrusted with providing opportunities for the free exercise of religion to a special group of Americans who are serving the country in the armed forces, chaplains have a special opportunity. They are representatives of those institutionally separated churches, serving in an arm of the state. They reflect and express the continuing importance of religious faith in the armed forces of the American people.

Lesson 11: The Chaplain's Relationship to Supervisors and Staff

Due This Lesson

1-page paper from Resource 10-2
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- describe a chaplain's relationship to supervisors, staff and colleagues

Homework Assignments

Review all homework reading resources from the Hutcheson text, *The Churches and the Chaplaincy.* Prepare a one-page response paper identifying the single concept or issue from the text that has impacted your view of chaplaincy ministry giving your reaction—positive and/or negative—and how the ideas of this reading affect you and the church. Bring two copies to class.

Use the problem-solving model presented in this lesson. Apply the model to a problem in your present ministry setting. Prepare a one-page response paper that outlines how you used the model and will demonstrate your understanding of the concept and expertise in using the model.

Write in your journal. Follow the instructions in the Syllabus. Also, respond to the motivator.

Motivator

"In a highly subjective religious culture, people move back and forth psychologically across what many regard as porous, somewhat artificial, boundaries, wanting at times a stable anchor, and open at other times to more expansive possibilities. Or put differently, people must hold to some fundamental basis of truth but may still fear being consumed by it, reminding us of Robert Jay Lifton's comment about the protean self wanting to be both fluid and grounded at the same time, however tenuous that possibility. In questioning people about this, the most frequent explanation given was pragmatic, that following one and then another strategy "works" for them. Research on the life-course generally reveals that transitions are to be expected not just in the sense of marriage, divorce, or becoming parents, but psychologically and emotionally as people deal with adversity, stress, and the pain and confusion in life. A psychological culture encourages awareness of emotional hurdles that must be confronted and dealt with. Spiritual hurdles are no less real and call forth a variety of responses: sometimes all that is required is simple faith, other times new insights are needed, as well as discussion about moral and spiritual problems, or even a change of faith or spiritual teachers. It comes as little surprise, then, that the popular religious idioms today by which people define and describe themselves are so colored by life's transitions, or that the terms that convey the deepest meanings are so deeply subjective and experiential in character."[170]

The Chaplain's Relationship to Supervisors and Staff

Items of Interest

Earned Authority

Who is the boss?

Isolation

Advisory capacity

Build trust

Who do you work for?

Problem Solving Model

A supervisor of a different faith

Maintain professional standards

Pastoral presence and pastoral declaration

Problem Solving Model

- Describe the problem in general terms.

- Define the specific problem within the general description.

- Define the parameters of the problem as a confrontation—coming face to face with the manifestation of something different.

- Define the specific areas of conflict—controversy, dispute, or struggle—generated by the confrontation.

- Identify and discuss specific, relevant issues within the problem emerging from the conflict.

- Identify external influences—both positive and negative—that impact the problem.

- Identify all resources available to address the problem.

- Make a specific proposal to resolve the problem.

- Define what your resolution will look like with the problem solved.

- Evaluate your proposal by identifying outcomes of your proposal, including any impact it would have on the organization.

- Identify every unintended consequence of implementation of your proposal. Get help from an outside source who is familiar with the type of organization you serve because as the originator of the proposal you will be subjectively blinded by positive outcomes of "intention" and will be unable to objectively evaluate the realistic impacts.

- Re-tool and revise the proposal in view of the unintended consequences to create a favorable outcome on the organization.

- Propose and defend strategies for effective ministry in response to the problem. This product will form the structure of the chaplain's plan of ministry.

Lesson 12: The Continuing Legacy of Chaplaincy Ministry: The Chaplain's Relationship to Colleagues in a Pluralistic Ministry Setting

Due This Lesson

1-page review paper
Problem-solving model review
Journaling

Learner Objectives

By the end of this lesson, participants will
- identify the implications of Pluralism on interaction with colleagues from other faith groups

Homework Assignments

Covenant to represent the "holy" in your place of ministry.

Motivator

"My friends—no one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these people, I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born, and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when, or whether ever, I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being, who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell."[171]

"To emphasize quest is to make the point that in an age when boundaries are especially permeable, when exchanges freely occur, spiritual searching should come as no surprise. Flexibility and movement encourage creative, soul-searching processes; the actual practice of religion in a context of overlapping religious cultures and blurred boundaries encourages a degree of self-scrutiny and reflection. Both faith as traditionally conceived within religious communities and spirituality conceived in its extreme as its alternative require deliberation and a sustained act of will, certainly under conditions where no single type of religious institution or spiritual activity monopolizes symbolization of the sacred. With so much religious diffusion, old ways of looking at religion simply in terms of established institutions or acceptance of a single tradition as normative, and others not, becomes less and less appropriate. And to speak of 'syncretism" to describe this diffusion is to perpetuate old, misguided notions of religious purity spoiled by contamination. Thus it is that in scholarly discourse on religion psychologists increasingly, and more appropriately, speak of a "quest orientation,' and sociologists call

attention to a 'new quest for community' and 'religious quest' engendered by confrontation with pluralism, individualism, and modernity. Labeled one way or another, spiritual ferment both for individuals and within institutions is apparent to any interested observer. In short, to talk of religion in a place like the United States currently is to raise a host of unresolved issues pertaining to symbolization, the power of tradition, and individual agency."[172]

Pluralism
The Invitation to "Come to the Table"

The Dilemma

The Resource

The Key

The Partnership

The Invitation

The Good News

The Challenge

Endnotes

[1] Robert N. Bellah, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. *Habits of the Heart.* New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1985, 248.

[2] Os Guinness, editor. *Character Counts.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1999, 13

[3] George H. Williams. "The Chaplaincy of the Armed Forces of the United States of America in Historical and Ecclesiastical Perspective," in *Military Chaplains: From a Religious Military to a Military Religion.* Harvey G. Cox, Jr. ed. New York: American Report Press, 1972, 11-57.

[4] A.P. Stokes, *Church and State in the United States,* Vol 1. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950, 269.

[5] J.T. Headley, *Chaplains and the Clergy of the Revolution.* New York: Charles Scribner, 1864, 58.

[6] Williams, 19.

[7] Clifford M. Drury. *History of the Chaplain Corps, United States Navy,* Vol I. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949, 3. Although the chaplain is not mentioned in this article the reference to a sermon implies a member of the clergy.

[8] J. C. Fitzpatrick, ed. *The Writings of George Washington from the Original Manuscript Sources,* Vol V. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1932, 244-245.

[9] Williams, 16-23.

[10] Sidney E. Ahlstrom. *A Religious History of the American People,* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972. See treatment in Part IV, "The Golden Day of Democratic Evangelicalism," 385-509.

[11] Alexis de Toqueville. *Democracy in America,* (1835), trans. George Lawrence, ed. J.P. Mayer. New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1969, quoted in Ahlstrom, 386.

[12] Drury, 63.

[13] Navy Records Collection III: May, 1853:208; quoted by Drury, 75.

[14] Earl F. Stover. *Up From Handymen: The United States Army Chaplaincy, 1865-1920, Vol III.* Washington: Office of the Chief of Chaplains, Department of the Army. 1977, 147-49.

[15] Williams, 49.

[16] Drury, 144.

[17] Drury, 167.

[18] Spencer D. McQueen. "A Half-Century in Behalf of the Chaplaincy," *The Chaplain,* 24:3, May-June 1967, 8-9.

[19] Harvey G. Cox, Jr., ed. *Military Chaplains.* This is the volume in which the Williams history of the chaplaincy, previously mentioned, was published.

[20] Much of the material in this section, on the place of religion in American life, is based on research done by the author in connection with another project, a book tentatively entitled *Peacemaking in the Polarized Pews,* co-authored with Peggy L. Shriver, scheduled for 1998 publication by InterVarsity Press.

[21] Words by Daniel C. Roberts, 1876; tune by George W. Warren, 1894.

[22] Stephen L. Carter. *The Culture of Disbelief.* New York: Basic Books, 1993, 16.

[23] Carter, 57.

[24] Milton J. Coulter, John M. Mulder and Louis B. Weeks. *Vital Signs: The Promise of Mainstream Protestantism.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996, 2-4. The term and concept of the "second disestablishment" came originally from Robert T. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities,* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

[25] Armed Forces Religious Demographics, quoted in Carlos C. Huerta, "Religious Accommodation in the Military," Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Special Topics Pamphlet 95-2, August 1995. There are some variations in statistical studies of the general population. A 1988 Gallup study, reconfirmed in 1994, reported that only 8% of Americans were without religious preference.

[26] Wolfhart Pannenberg, "How to Think about Secularism," *First Things,* June/July 1996, No. 64, 27-32, 28.

[27] Alexis de Toqueville, *Democracy in America,* quoted in Robert N. Bellah, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, 223.

[28] Bellah, et al., *Habits of the Heart,* 220.

[29] Bellah, et al., *Habits of the Heart,* 228.

[30] Reported in Thomas C. Reeves, "Not So Christian America," *First Things,* No. 66, October 1996, 19.

[31] Coulter, Mulder and Weeks, 15.

[32] Israel Drazin and Cecil B. Curry. *For God and Country: The History of a Constitutional Challenge to the Army Chaplaincy.* Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1995, 24-26.

[33] Randolph N. Jonakait, "Is the Military Chaplaincy Constitutional?" in *Military Chaplains,* 129-137.

[34] Randolph N. Jonakait, "The Abuses of the Military Chaplaincy." Mimeographed Report, American Civil Liberties Union, May 1973.

[35] School District of Abingdon Township, PA v. Schemp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963).

[36] Abingdon v. Schemp.

[37] Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 203 (1963).

[38] Drazin and Currey, 174.

[39] Drazin and Currey, 176. The quotations are from Judge McLaughlin's written decision.

[40] Coulter, Mulder and Weeks, 16-18.

[41] John and Sylvia Ronsvalle, "The End of Benevolence? Alarming Trends in Church Giving," *Christian Century,* 113:30, October 23, 1996, 1010-1014.

[42] Robert Wuthnow. *The Restructuring of American Religion.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.

[43] Robert Wuthnow, *The Struggle for America's Soul: Evangelicals, Liberals, and Secularism.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1989.

[44] M. Basil Pennington. *Centering Prayer: Renewing an Ancient Christian Prayer Form.* New York, NY: Image Book, 1980 pb reprint, 143-144.

[45] See Dennis C. Kinlaw, "An Analysis of their Work and the Sequential Derivation of Training Objectives for Senior Chaplains" (Doctoral Dissertation, George Washington University, 1973), 40-48; also Alexander B. Aronis, "A Summary of Research Literature on the Military Chaplain," *The Chaplain,* 29:2 (Summer, 1972), 6-16.

[46] Waldo W. Burchard, "The Role of the Military Chaplain," (Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1953).

[47] Waldo W. Burchard, "Role Conflicts of Military Chaplains," *Religion, Society and the Individual: An Introduction to the Sociology of Religion.* J. Milton Yinger, ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957, 589.

[48] Gordon C. Zahn. *The Military Chaplaincy: A Study of Role Tension in the Royal Air Force.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

[49] Chaplain (Major) Robert Vickers, "The Military Chaplaincy: A Study in Role Conflict," *Military Chaplains Review* (Spring 1984). The article was extracted from the dissertation submitted to Vanderbilt University for the Doctor of Education degree.

[50] Summary is based on records of an interview conducted on Feb. 10, 1994.

[51] Zahn, 241 and 232-34.

[52] The terms denoting the chaplain subsystem are "Branch" for the Army, "Corps" for the Navy, and "Service" for the Air Force.

[53] Israel Drazin and Cecil B. Currey. *For God and Country: The History of a Constitutional Challenge to the Army Chaplaincy.* Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1995, 209-10.

[54] Drazin and Currey, 210.

[55] *Religious Support,* Field Manual 16-1. Washington: Department of the Army, 26 May 1995, 1-2.

[56] Robert H. Knight. *The Age of Consent: The Rise of Relativism and the Corruption of Popular Culture.* Dallas: Spence Publishing Company, 1998, xiv

[57] Os Guinness, ed. *Character Counts.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1999, 52. From an October 1789 letter from President George Washington to ministers and elders of the first Presbytery of the Eastward—Presbyterian churches in northeastern Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

[58] Erving Goffman, "On the Characteristics of Total Institutions," *Asylums.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Anchor Books, 1961, 3-124.

[59] Goffman, 116-117.

[60] Goffman, 14-43.

[61] Goffman, 45-46.

[62] These are Navy and Marine Corps terms for the process by which non-judicial punishment is meted out for minor offenses, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

[63] Chaplain (CPT) Terry Austin, quoted in SSG Christian Mulvey. "A Moment to Care," *The Army Chaplaincy.* Spring 1995, 12.

[64] John W. Brinsfield. "A Summer in Newport: Summary Paper No. One," Privately duplicated, 26 July 1967. The author of this report later entered active duty as an Army chaplain.

[65] "The position of the United Presbyterian Church in the USA on the Practice of Having Ministers of our Church Serve as Military Chaplains Paid by the State," adopted by the 177th General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the USA, May 24, 1965, Pamphlet, Department of Chaplains and Service Personnel, 1965.

[66] Charles Moskos and Frank Wood. *The Military: More than Just a Job?* Pergamon-Brassey's, 1988, cited in Robert Denny, "Today's Military: Institution or Day Job," *The Retired Officer Magazine,* July, 1996, 52:7, 48-52.

[67] Scott Adams. *The Dilbert Principle.* New York: Harper and Row, 1995.

[68] Weber's analysis was based largely on observation of the Prussian army and the Roman Catholic Church of his day.

[69] Charles Perrow. *Organizational Analysis: A Sociological View.* Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1970, 50-91. Contains an excellent discussion of non-bureaucratic models and the bureaucratizing tendency.

[70] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization.* Trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons; Talcott Parsons, ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947, 324-340.

[71] Quotations from Weber, *Theory of Social and Economic Organizations,* 229-230.

[72] *Ministries to Military Personnel.* Report of a United Church task force to the Ninth General Synod, St. Louis, Missouri, June 22-26, 1973. Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1973, 81.

[73] Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr., "An Examination of the Value System Reflected by the Sensitivity and Encounter Group Movement in Adult Education, 1950-1970." Doctoral Dissertation, The American University, Washington, D.C., 1971. Though the sensitivity

and encounter groups of the title are long gone, the organizational climate described has, if anything, become even more firmly fixed, in the years since.

[74] *Navy Regulations,* 0817.

[75] Field Manual 16-1, *Religious Support.* Washington: Department of the Army, 26 May 1995, 1-2.

[76] Air Force Policy Directive 52-1, dated 7 September 1993, 1.7.3.

[77] Emile Durkheim. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life.* Trans. Joseph Swain. New York: The Free Press, 1965, 474-475.

[78] Clifford Ingle. *The Military Chaplain as Counselor.* Kansas City: Central Seminary Press, 1953, 16.

[79] Martin Siegel. "Being a Chaplain in Today's Military," in Harvey G. Cox, ed., *Military Chaplains, From a Religious Military to a Military Religion.* New York: American Repot Press, 1972, 111.

[80] FM 16-1, *Religious Support,* v.

[81] Richard Emerson. "Power-Dependence Relations," *American Sociological Review,* vol. 27. February 1962, 31-40.

[82] James D. Thompson. *Organizations in Action.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1967, 30-34.

[83] Burton R. Clark. *Adult Education in Transition.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1956; cited in Thompson, 31.

[84] Drazin and Currey. *For God and Country.* Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1995, 63-64, 163-68.

[85] Thompson, 33.

[86] Reggie McNeal. *The Present future: Six Tough Questions for the Church.* San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 2003. 36.

[87] Reggie McNeal, 70-71.

[88] Navy Records Collection III: Nov. and Dec. 1971:66; quoted by Clifford M. Drury, *History of the Chaplain Corps,* Vol 1. Washington: Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1949, 110-111.

[89] Drury. *History of the Chaplain Corps,* Vol 2, 254-55.

[90] L. Alexander Harper. "A New Look at the Chaplain's Role," General Commission on Chaplains pamphlet, 1957; reprinted, with revisions by the author, from *Christian Century,* February 13, 1957.

[91] Charlotte E. Hunter, "The Great Vanity: Secrets and the Navy Chaplain," submitted to Princeton Theological Seminary in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Theology degree, 28 April, 1995.

[92] Quoted by Hunter, 19.

[93] Drury, vol. 1, 30.

[94] Herman A. Norton. *Struggling for Recognition: The United States Army Chaplaincy, 1791-1865,* v II. Washington, DC: Office of the Chief of Chaplains, 1977, 120-121.

[95] Walter Colton. *The Sea and the Sailor.* New York, 1851, quoted by Drury, v.1, 83-84.

[96] Margaret G. Kibben, LCDR, CHC, USN, "The Role and Mission of Chaplains in Humanitarian Assistance and Peace Operations (HA/Pos)," paper submitted to the faculty of the Naval War College, 12 February, 1996. The Haitian part of this operation is also described by Chaplain (LTC) Sidney J. Marceaux, "Operation Gitmo: Two Years Later," *The Army Chaplaincy,* Spring, 1995, 4-11.

[97] Kibben, 14-15.

[98] Donald W. Hadley, "An Overview of Military Ministry," written in consultation with the North Carolina Baptist Task Force on Military Ministry, Larry McClure, Chairman: May 1987.

[99] Donald W. Hadley and Gerald T. Richard. *Ministry with the Military.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1992.

[100] SSG Christian Mulvaney, "A Moment to Care," *The Army Chaplaincy,* Spring, 1995, 13.

[101] Donald B. Harris. *CREDO—The Second Year,* Brochure: San Diego, California, 1972, 17.

[102] Darius L. Salter. *America's Bishop: The Life of Francis Asbury.* Nappanee, Indiana: Francis Asbury Press of Evangel Publishing House, 2003, 23.

[103] John C. Bennett. *Christians and the State.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958, 229.

[104] John L. Rand. "The Development of the Military Chaplain in Great Britain," *The Chaplain,* 25:3, May-June 1968, 10-16.

[105] William J. Hughes. "The Military Chaplain in England, 1640-1660," *The Chaplain,* 29:3, Fall, 1972, 6-25.

[106] Ben E. Spurlock. "The Revolutionary Chaplains," *The Chaplain,* 21:6, December, 1964, 3-7.

[107] Eugene F. Klug. "The Chaplaincy in American Public Life," *The Chaplain,* 23:1, February 1996, 15-45; reprinted from *Church and State Under God,* Albert G. Huegli, ed., St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1964.

[108] Klug, 18.

[109] Klaus J. Hermann. "Some Considerations on the Constitutionality of the U.S. Military Chaplaincy," *The Chaplain,* 22:3, June, 1965, 32-47.

[110] Hermann, 35.

[111] Hermann, 36.

[112] James Madison. *Detached Memoranda,* quoted in Klug, 22-23.

[113] Clifford M. Drury. *The History of the Chaplain Corps,* vol. 1. Washington: Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1949, 10.

[114] Drury, 24.

[115] Drury, 43.

[116] Drury, 43.

[117] George H. Williams. "The Chaplaincy in the Armed Forces of the United States of America in Historical and Ecclesiastical Perspective," in *Military Chaplains,* 20. Quoting from Washington's Order of 9 July 1776 and statement of 1777, in Anson Phelps Stokes, *Church and State in the United States,* 3 vol. New York: Harper and Row, 1950, v. 1, 271 f.

[118] Williams, 25-26.

[119] Hermann, 35.

[120] Williams, 37.

[121] Williams, 24.

[122] Klug, 23.

[123] Williams, 27-28.

[124] Drury, 67-68.

[125] Drury, 68-69.

[126] Drury, 69.

[127] Drury, 69.

[128] Dov Peretz Elkins. *God's Warriors: Dramatic Adventures of Rabbis in Uniform.* New York: Jonathan Davis, 1974, 2. Cited in James P. Nichols, "Religious Pluralism: A Challenge to the Chaplain Corps," *Military Chaplain's Review,* 15:4, Fall, 1986, 88-89.

[129] Nichols, 89-90.

[130] Armed Forces Religious Demographics, June 1995, cited in "Religious Accommodation in the Military," Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, August 1995, DEOMI Special Topics Pamphlet 2-95.

[131] National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (Section A-1).

[132] "Study of the Faith Composition of Chaplains of the Armed Forces," Department of Defense, January 1987.

[133] Thomas B. Edsall. "Christian Right Waits in the Wings," *Washington Post,* August 14, 1996, A-27. Note the term "evangelical" is used here in its contemporary American sense, referring to the more conservative and evangelistic wing of Christianity. Elsewhere in the world the term may designate Protestants generally.

[134] George Barna. *Revolution.* Carol Stream, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2005, 41.

[135] George H. Williams. "The Chaplaincy in the Armed Forces of the United States of America in Historical and Ecclesiastical Perspective," in *Military Chaplains,* 12-13.

[136] Williams, 32.

[137] Randolph N. Jonakait. "The Abuses of the Military Chaplaincy" Duplicated Report, American Civil Liberties Union, May, 1973, 7.

[138] Peter Berger and Daniel Pinard. "Military Religion: An analysis of Educational Materials Disseminated by Chaplains," in *Military Chaplains.* 87-108.

[139] Berger and Pinard, 91.

[140] The research behind this essay leaves something to be desired; the fact that Berger permitted himself to collaborate on the essay (a note reveals that the research was done by Pinard) and that it was included in the book reveals, perhaps, the depth of feeling aroused in that period by the Vietnamese War. While the introduction of the essay advises that "we do not want to burden these pages with the dreary methodological discussions to which sociologists are professionally addicted" (88), a footnote does give some dreary methodological information. It reveals that "we asked soldiers of our acquaintance to send us all the material they could get from their chaplains; these materials came from <u>three</u> posts [emphasis added] in different parts of the country" (158). The only other source mentioned is materials "examined in libraries" (158)—presumably on the assumption that chaplains "disseminate" materials from the same libraries. An examination of all the data actually referred to in the essay revels thirty-eight citations, of which nine are from a single pamphlet. There are citations from six other pamphlets published for service personnel, from six general religious pamphlets not related to service personnel but presumably distributed by chaplains from two editorials in *The Chaplain* magazine, and from two articles in general circulation magazines. The total sources, then, are thirteen pamphlets from three Army bases and four magazine articles.

[141] Robert N. Bellah. "Civil Religion in America," *Daedalus,* 96:1, Winter 1967, 1-21.

[142] Robert N. Bellah. *The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial.* New York: The Seabury Press, 1975.

[143] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The social Contract and Discourses,* ed. D.G. H. Cole. New York: Dutton, 1950, 139.

[144] John Dewey. *A Common Faith.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934.

[145] Will Herberg. *Protestant-Catholic-Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology,* rev. ed. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1960.

[146] Herberg, 75.

[147] Bellah, 12.

[148] Pat Robertson. *America's Dates with Destiny.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1986.

[149] Isaac Kramnick and Laurence Moore. *The Godless Constitution: The Case Against Religious Correctness.* New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1996.

[150] Quoted by Leonard L. Ahrnsbrak, "Role Conflicts Among Navy Chaplains in Light of American Civil Religion," Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1971.

[151] Alan E. Nelson, Ed. The New Thing: Cutting Edge Ideas for 21st Century Ministry from Progressive Leaders in the Wesleyan Heritage. Scottsdale, Arizona: The Southwest Center for Leadership, 1998, 41.

[152] Much of the discussion following is based on material in the author's *God in the White House: How Religion Has Changed the Modern Presidency.* New York: Macmillan, 1988.

[153] Sidney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

[154] Letter to Governor Dinwiddie of 12 June 1757; John C. Fitzpatrick, ed. *The Writings of George Washington,* 39 vols. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931-44, II, 56.

[155] John B. Frazier. *The Navy Chaplain's Manual,* 1918, 40. Quoted by Drury, *History of the Chaplain Corps,* vol. I, 174.

[156] *U.S. Navy and Marine Corps Character Education Program,* Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1954, 8th unnumbered page.

[157] *Moral Leadership: The Protection of Moral Standards and Character Education Program.* NAVPERS 15890. Washington: Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1959, 89-90.

[158] "Marines want A Few Morally Upright Men," *Pittsburg Post-Gazette,* July 6, 1996, quoting Krulak article in the 1996 *Armed Forces Journal.*

[159] *Chaplain Activities in the United States Army,* AR 165-1, Aug 1989 Update, Chapter 12, "Moral Leadership Training."

[160] AFCG-CH (165-1) Memorandum from FORCECOM Staff Chaplain.

[161] Wade Clark Roof. *Spiritual Marketplace: Baby Boomers and the Remaking of American Religion.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999, 91.

[162] William J. Crowe with David Chanoff. *The Line of Fire: From Washington to the Gulf, the Politics and Battles of the New Military.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993, 335-36.

[163] Israel Drazin and Cecil B. Currey. *For God and Country: The History of a Constitutional Challenge to the Army Chaplainc.* Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1995, 63-64; 163-168.

[164] Ben E. Spurlock. "The Revolutionary Chaplains," *The Chaplain,* 21:6, December 1964, 6.

[165] Report No. 124, House of Representatives, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 1, No. 583, quoted by Eugene F. Klug, "The Chaplaincy in American Public Life," *The Chaplain,* 23:1, December 1964, 6.

[166] LCDR Paul Wrigley, CHC, USNR. "The Impact of Religious Belief in the Theater of Operations," *Naval War College Review,* Spring 1996, 84-101.

[167] "The Armed Forces Chaplains Board Study Group on Unification of the Service Chaplaincies," Washington: Armed Forces Chaplains Board, 13 October 1992, Tab 6.

[168] Carter, *Culture of Disbelief,* 110-115.

[169] Robert O'Harrow, Jr. "School Board Members Propose System to Teach Values," *Washington Post,* April 18, 1996, 1.

[170] Wade Clark Roof. *Spiritual Marketplace: Baby Boomers and the Remaking of American Religion.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999, 132.

[171] Donald T. Phillips. Lincoln on Leadership: Executive Strategies For Tough Times. New York: Warner Books, 1992, 150.

[172] Wade Clark Roof. *Spiritual Marketplace: Baby Boomers and the Remaking of American Religion.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999, 44-45.