

To Support and Defend

Several years ago, the Army recognized the need to embark on a period of deliberate introspection of the most basic nature of its core identity. The Army stood up the Center for the Army Profession and Ethic (CAPE) to spearhead this effort. Currently CAPE is in the process of articulating the Army Ethic. The Army's Ethic is not something new; it has evolved since the Army's early days and draws from multiple sources including the Just War Tradition, the Declaration of Independence, the US Constitution, The Law of Land Warfare, the Oaths of Office and the Army Values to name a few. These sources embody the generally stable and enduring concepts that empower and inform the functional framework of the profession. The Army Profession campaign evolved as a result of the morally corrosive effects of projected combat and the implications to the force. However, a larger challenge to the Army's professional identity is the ever-changing American societal culture that increasingly fails to understand or even rejects many of the core tenets of the traditional sources that contribute to the Army's Ethic.

Since we draw our Soldiers from American society, we see the effects of this growing disconnect in our Soldiers. A few examples of the effects of this trend are the ever-increasing number of American youth who are unqualified for military service, the high number of suicide and sexual assaults in the services, the declining number of elected representatives who have served in the military, and the trend of today's youth to approach life with an individualistic versus community orientation.

The Erosion of Trust between America and Its Army

Over the past several decades the military has become elitist and professionalized as the result of the culture gap with society and the consequences of the All-Volunteer Force (AVF). While the decision to abolish the draft results in a highly competent military, it makes it more insular, to the point where some members see themselves as superior to the society and even to the elected representatives under whom they serve. In a 1997 article, “The Widening Gap Between Military and Society,” Thomas Ricks discusses how a contempt for modern American culture has driven military personnel to feel increasingly alienated from the nation. Ricks wrote this piece through the lens of a post Cold War military of the 1990s.¹ This was the force designed to fight high intensity set piece battles and demonstrated its overwhelming superiority against Iraq in 1991. The military then endured huge budget and personnel cuts while reluctantly engaged in peacekeeping missions in Somalia and the Balkans. Although off on his prediction that the military was poised to revert to a garrison status, much of what Ricks described is still evident, even more so today, after our military has been heavily committed to combat operations for the past 13 years. This paper examines two facets of the growing gap between American society and the military. This gap is fostering an erosion of trust between the two. The first facet is the moral divide between a selfless military culture and the growing self-centered individualism of American society. The second facet emerges largely from the unintended consequences of the AVF which is alienating our military from American society and government.

In 2008 the Army established the Army Center for the Professional Military Ethic to lead a campaign to invigorate and educate the force about the Army profession. Last year the Secretary of Defense named Rear Admiral Margaret Klein as the department’s Senior Advisor for Military

Professionalism. Her job is to work with and coordinate all DOD activities and actions that focus on ethics, character, and competence.² In 2013 The Army published ADRP 1: The Army Profession. This publication discusses the characteristics of a profession and argues why the Army is, and must remain, a profession. ADRP 1 describes the five essential characteristics (military expertise, honorable service, trust, esprit de corps and stewardship of the profession) the Army must possess in its culture to fulfill its professional obligations to the country.³

Trust lies at the heart of these five characteristics and forms the relationship Army members must maintain in order to fulfill their strategic roles. Trust is essential within the Army, between the Army and its civilian leadership, and with American society. As described in this doctrine, the Army shoulders the responsibility for establishing and maintaining these trust relationships. However, one might question “how do these entities demonstrate and build trust with the military, and why is that important?” The Army’s current profession campaign seems to address only part of this trust relationship. The Army, and consequently the nation, are facing significant challenges that threaten its trust relationships with the nation’s leaders and the American people.

Foundations of Army Culture

The seeds for the British colonization of America grew out of the quest for religious diversity and freedom. In the early 1500s Martin Luther, father of the Protestant Reformation, challenged the traditions and authority of the Catholic Church. This movement spawned the formation of numerous Christian sects throughout Europe. Followers of these new groups frequently faced state persecution, driving many of them to seek religious freedom and better opportunities in North America. Beginning in the early 1600s the 13 American colonies were founded, and the beginnings of our nation and its culture were forged. The early settlers were largely believers in the Christian God and relied on the Bible as their basis for wisdom and moral living. By 1700

church attendance was estimated to be 75 to 80 percent of the population.⁴ Today that number is believed to be about 20 percent.⁵ Early Americans were resourceful, independently minded and resilient. As the colonies matured and moved towards independence from Britain, their culture was largely described and codified within the founding documents. The Declaration of Independence describes the right to form a “more perfect union” in order to create a society that valued “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” The Bill of Rights created the blueprint for individual liberty in the new nation. The Constitution described the three branches of the federal government and their responsibilities. It also limits the power of the federal government and introduces a system of checks and balances that limit the accumulation of too much power in too few hands or without accountability by the other branches. Although our country promoted individual freedom as a founding principle, with freedom came certain responsibilities of civic engagement and a willingness to protect the country during times of conflict.

George Washington reinforced this sense of duty in the Continental Army. One of his greatest victories was over his own officers during the Newburgh Conspiracy of 1783. A disgruntled band of officers threatened to mutiny due to their frustration with their lack of pay. Washington’s impassioned plea of loyalty to the Army and the country averted a potential disaster during the Revolutionary War.⁶ This incident is widely regarded as one of the hallmarks of Washington’s sense of selfless service that is ingrained in military culture and required of Soldiers .

Along with selfless service the Army established an objectivist perspective that further defined its culture. In order to maintain an effective and ethical fighting military, doctrine stressed values and standards of conduct that placed the individual needs below the good of the

organization and the welfare of the country. The ideal of self-sacrifice became the foundational concept that enabled Soldiers to endure hardship, privation, and, if necessary, death.

Contemporary Moral Issues

Today our cultural institutions exert far less influence on America's youth. Christian Smith describes this phenomenon in *Lost in Transition* (2011). His research is based on the social development and perspectives of 18-23 year olds, a group he names "emerging adults."⁷ A product of their environment, upbringing and social enculturation, he notes the passage to adulthood "has become more confusing and less directed by the cultural and institutional instructions and boundaries."⁸ Our cultural institutions have themselves changed, they no longer promote traditional values or even encourage our young people to confront their moral beliefs in rational ways outside of their own experiences and opinions. Today's young Americans, having been provided fewer boundaries and guidelines, are extending their youth well past that of previous generations. We see an emerging adult population driven by hyper individualistic beliefs and a shallow sense of what entails the "good life." He notes this group is highly materialistic and largely disengaged from political and civic responsibility. American society has largely failed in many ways to help our young people to critically think about the important questions confronting our country or to adopt a sense of responsibility to something larger than themselves.

We have all heard the popular slogans "do the right thing" and "what would Jesus do?" Unfortunately, for many Americans these clichés betray a lack of understanding regarding what morality is and where we find the basis for moral decisions. Moral clarity is a key requirement for Soldiers because it is so closely linked to the concepts of duty and selfless service. Often times making the correct moral decision means sacrificing one's own interests. In his interviews

with emerging adults, Smith describes pervasive moral confusion. His findings point to a general lack of understanding about morality to include the source of moral laws, how to think systematically about moral decisions, or for some, why it would matter to even consider the subject. One third of his test subjects believe morality is simply a matter of personal preference, something that merely exists in an individual's head at a given moment. These emerging adults thought it was wrong to challenge another person's moral choices and they were unaware of any external tools they could consult to help clarify their own beliefs. When interviewed, these individuals were unable to coherently discuss subjects about right and wrong or justify their positions. The other two thirds of subjects were not as individualistic, he describes them as "moral agnostics or skeptics."⁹ When questioned, this group generally possessed a firmer grasp of morals, but when pressed regarding the basis of their knowledge or judgment they found it difficult to stick to a moral claim. Again, few could articulate a moral standard from which to judge right from wrong.

Given that the military operates in morally complex and confusing settings where Soldiers must quickly make life and death decisions, moral judgments matter. The military must operate on clear moral principles that ultimately center on duty and service. Today's social institutions are failing to expose, much less ground, our children in values consistent with a military ethos or even give them the thinking skills needed to make rational moral judgments.

Alienation from Society

Ricks discusses similar issues in his article. Service members who had recently completed initial training and returned home described a feeling of being lost and unable to relate to their old friends and neighborhoods. His article is peppered with quotes that point to a feeling of alienation and contempt for what they saw outside the military.

“You look around and notice that a lot of civilians are overweight, and a little sloppy.”

“People were drinking and their kids were running around aimlessly. You felt like smacking around some people.”

Upon returning home one young Marine commented, “I didn’t know how to act. ‘They said, what do you want to do?’ I’d say, ‘I don’t know,’ I didn’t know how to carry on a conversation.”

“Retired Marine Lieutenant General Bernard Trainer said, ‘When I got out of boot camp, in 1946, society was different. It was more disciplined, and most Americans trusted the government. Most males had some military experience. It was an entirely different society - one that thought more about its responsibilities than its rights.’”

In his 1961 inaugural address, John Kennedy challenged the country to “ask not what your country can do for you - ask what you can do for your country.”¹⁰ The idea of public service corresponds with Lord John Moulton’s “Obedience to the Unenforceable.” This concept is tied to a Judeo-Christian cultural background which enforces the belief that God is always watching, even when no one else is. This concept helps people stay obedient to what they know is right when there is no other mechanism in place to enforce obedience.¹¹ John Kennedy’s speech in 1961 was appealing to our sense of obedience to the unenforceable. Today, however, many people believe that America runs on a very different set of values. Over the last fifty plus years a shift in terms of morality has become apparent; however, it can also be seen in two other important facets of life - our political and legal landscape.

Political and Legal Shifts in Society

As America grew so did the structures of government and business. This growth drove these institutions to become more influential, while at the same time becoming more detached from

and inaccessible to the public. Along the way these institutions were concentrating power and wealth in fewer hands. Over time big government, big business, and now the media have become institutions subject to public suspicion and mistrust. This phenomenon is reflected in polls that measure the public's trust of its major institutions.¹² In fact, Smith describes 49% of emerging adults as either uniformed, apathetic, or distrustful of government. He largely attributes this disconnected attitude toward government due to their cynicism toward our political leaders and the political system. Another 10% feel disempowered, believing their voice is unheard and they lack an ability to influence the system.¹³ The growth and power of the federal government fuels these perspectives.

Beginning around the turn of the 20th century, progressives in government have worked hard to limit the inequities perpetrated by big business on its workers and consumers. Their methods to achieve this end have mainly been through taxation and regulation which has concentrated their own power. Consequently, while the government has ostensibly concerned itself with protecting the public against business excesses, its own power and corruption have been much more insidious and difficult to contain. Politics in America has largely become an endless campaign cycle driven by unimagined dollars, time, and energy spent on congressional and presidential elections. We see far less effort and enthusiasm devoted to meaningful work, especially among political rivals, to solve the nation's most difficult and important problems. Study any of the significant issues our country faces, such as the tax code, environmental law, education, or health care, and we usually discover volumes of stifling bureaucracy that has paralyzed leadership and blocked action that might hope to result in any meaningful change or reform.

America has largely become an individualistic society where each person's perceived rights have created an environment that trumps First Amendment protections. Free speech is often socially regulated in order to avoid someone's perceived offense. We have created a self-imposed censorship in order to accommodate our feelings. In doing so we limit honest and healthy debate. Consequently, it has become increasingly difficult to engage in fair and open discussions on many of the important and contentious topics in our society. This tends to polarize people while discouraging the very means for understanding the truth and achieving fairness. Teachers are afraid or unprepared to engage their students in critical thinking about controversial issues for fear of sparking a fire storm of emotions in the classroom, and complaints and lawsuits from offended parents. Too often we now turn to the courts to settle our civil disagreements with an ever growing eye to secure a disproportional monetary settlement to satisfy a self-centered view of justice.

This trend of lawsuits for dollars is further evidence of how our culture is moving toward a more self-centered society. One case which illustrates this trend is the Washington DC judge who sued a dry cleaner for \$54 million for losing a pair of pants. In order to avoid a court case, the owner offered the judge \$12 thousand to settle out of court, but the judge refused. Despite the judge's plea citing emotional damage, the case was decided in the defendant's favor two years later.¹⁴ Although this is one of the most ridiculous and overblown examples, frivolous lawsuits have become imbedded in the culture, costing all Americans, due to court and legal expenses, insurance rates, time, and loss of work. The problems noted within our political and legal systems are indicators of how our nation as a whole has become a "me centered" society as we have strayed from our original values.

These trends certainly strain the ethical fabric of our culture and represent a glaring contrast between current societal values and those of the military, which espouse selfless service. Our young people, some of whom will eventually become Soldiers, are products of this society. When confronted with a starkly different military ethos, a sense of isolation grows and strains the trust bond with American society.

The All Volunteer Force and War

We will now examine the impact of the AVF on the trust relationship between America and its Army. Some historical context will help frame this issue. Throughout most of America's history, the Army was largely manned by citizen Soldiers. The founders were suspicious of a large standing Army, so none was maintained. Consequently, the Army existed as a relatively small force that was expanded, sometimes dramatically, to meet wartime needs. Until the dawn of the 20th century we fought wars of survival, either to gain and maintain independence, to preserve the Republic, or to defend life and property within our borders. During the past 100 years, the country has fought two world wars, two major but limited regional conflicts in Eastern Asia, a "Cold War" against the former Soviet Union, and, most recently, a series of extended conflicts in the Middle East and Central Asia.

During the years leading up to America's involvement in the two world wars, we were a deeply isolationist country. Protected by vast oceans, we had the luxury of limiting our involvement to providing materiel support to our allies and letting them do their own fighting. However, after the initial years of both wars we were eventually drawn into the fight. During this era we followed our Constitution; Congress declared war, the president waged war, and the nation mobilized to man, equip, and train the military. We used the draft to raise the required troop strength needed to supplement the standing Army. Today we would say the nation was

“all in” on the war effort. We considered these wars of necessity, particularly WWII. These were wars we had to win or our nation’s survival would be at risk. The costs were high in both human and material measure; the pace, scope, complexity, and violence of these conflicts were enormous by any standard. Our citizen Soldiers fought alongside allies from around the world, using new and different weapons and tactics. Casualties were in the hundreds of men killed each day. However, by today’s standards and particularly given the scope of the conflicts, our time of involvement in each war was quite short: about 1 ½ years in WWI and a little over 3 ½ years in WWII. In the end, America and her allies prevailed, we won the wars, peace treaties and surrender documents were signed, and the nation celebrated.

The Vietnam War marked a turning point in American military history. No other conflict drew so much criticism and protest. We failed to develop a winning strategy, the war dragged on for many years, and casualties surpassed 50,000. During the war the draft had become increasingly unpopular, largely because so many of the nation’s elites and privileged class were granted deferments. By 1973, at the end of our involvement, the Army was in shambles. Race relations were terribly strained, drug use was common, discipline was poor, and the non-commissioned officer corps was depleted. This became the backdrop for the adoption of the AVF. Something was needed to move the Army toward a more professional military organization. Adopted in 1973, the AVF began to rebuild and modernize. By the spring of 1991 we could, without doubt, point to its validation after a swift victory in the Gulf War. This modernized, well trained and disciplined force performed better than all predictions. With its 6 week air campaign and blitzkrieg-like 100 hour ground war, the American military seemed all but invincible. We had entered the age of quick, decisive victory with minimal casualties or

pain. Ten years later we would embark on two protracted wars that would yield far different results, and should now make us reevaluate our current civil-military contract we call the AVF.

Richard Nixon's decision to adopt the AVF was largely based on the findings of the Gates Commission of 1970, named after its chairman former Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates. Although the commission recommended adopting the AVF, it also reported five cautions that could potentially harm civil-military affairs: the isolation of the military from society and the threat to civilian control; the decline of civilian respect; overrepresentation by ethnic minorities and the low income of society; an erosion of society's concern with foreign policy affairs; and an inclination for the country to embark on "military adventurism."¹⁵ In light of our experience since 2001 most of these cautions seem prophetic. A number of unintended consequences of the AVF are particularly damaging to the trust relationship between the military and society.

Today's participation in the military as a percentage of the population is at an all-time low since WWII. This is not just a phenomenon associated with the current draw down that began after the end of combat operations in Iraq. In 2011, The Pew Research Center reported that even during the height of our involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan this percentage continued to decline and now stands at below 0.5% of the total population. These facts are not lost on the military. The PEW survey reported that 84% of post 9/11 veterans believe the American public has little or no understanding of the problems faced by the military. 71% of Americans also believe that they don't understand the problems our military faces.¹⁶

To a certain degree, the attitude of politicians using the AVF can be summed up in a quote by former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, "What's the point of having this superb military you're always talking about if we can't use it?"¹⁷ With the professionalization of the military, it becomes a tool for politicians to use to promote their own agenda, especially the president. As

fewer American families are affected by having their sons and daughters subject to death and injury in combat, there is less hew and cry about the use of the military.

Since the 9/11 attacks we fought two wars uninterrupted for 13 years, while at the same time placed no expectations of our society at large to change their lifestyle or contribute to the war effort in any meaningful or sacrificial way. This tended to exacerbate the gap between the military and society. Unless you had a serving family member, you faced no risk of dealing with the possibility of death or injury. Since our leaders chose not to pay for the war, we simply went into greater debt to finance it. Consequently, no one really felt much direct pain other than the ones in the fight and their families.

Reinstating a Draft

Had we been in a position to draft more Soldiers, our beleaguered volunteers might not have been required to make so many deployments. Maybe with an equally distributed burden of service, the population at large would have demanded a better strategy long before the surge in 2007. Had we been able to draft Soldiers from the general population, maybe we wouldn't have been forced to significantly lower recruitment standards to meet the operational demands. Many of our senior military leaders, as well as government officials, rightly boast about America's military being unrivaled and the best in the world. They largely attribute this superiority to the AVF and the professional status it claims. However, this professional status has been created at a cost. Our military is disconnected, misunderstood, and isolated from the society it serves, and our society seems to have surrendered ownership of important military decisions or awareness of the military's purpose.

Forty years ago about 75 percent of our House members and Senators were military veterans. Today that number is below 25 percent for each House. Along with this declining number, less than 1% of our lawmakers have children serving in the military.¹⁸ Some might ask why that would matter; do veterans make better elected officials? That would be a difficult and perhaps rather subjective question to answer and not quite the point to make. Congress has virtually turned over political ownership, oversight and accountability of military affairs to the President and the Pentagon. Not only have we strayed from declaring war as described in Article 1 of the Constitution, our legislators are unfamiliar with how the military runs and we've seen no meaningful hearings on policy or wartime strategy.

Congress' primary interest in military affairs lies with the defense contracts and military bases in their districts. This rather cynical perspective is tied to their own political longevity. Given the level of governmental dysfunction, our elected officials display far less interest in affecting operational matters or demanding accountability from military leaders. Former Ambassador to Afghanistan and retired Army Lieutenant General Karl Eikenberry noted how with its "loss of expertise, family ties, and perhaps even interest, Congress appears less inclined to rigorously challenge senior military officers' advice or question their management practices. Indeed, nearly abject congressional deference to the military has become all too common."¹⁹

This same lack of military participation is also seen in the other so-called elite enclaves of society. Over time, America has come to recognize certain universities and sub-cultures as elite. This distinction is largely given to the Ivy League colleges, the legal profession, Wall Street, and Hollywood. This small group wields tremendous influence at various levels of society, including government. However, they have virtually no contact with, or appreciation for, the purpose and sacrifices of the military. This poses a weakness in our system of governance by the people.

This isolation of the military is unhealthy and demonstrates a lack of concern for the affairs that truly matter to the country. We spend hundreds of billions of dollars annually on defense, yet those we consider as the best, brightest, and certainly most powerful are completely out of the picture regarding any aspect of military service, thought, or consideration. This is further evidence of the loss of a sense of duty between most of society and those who serve. Maybe, due to self-interest or other priorities, we have seen this trend emerge over the past 50 years.

In past generations it was common for graduates of the elite universities to serve in the military. In fact, military service was considered a valuable experience, an opportunity to learn leadership at a young age and accelerated pace. Author Kathy Roth-Doquet notes that in 1956, more than 10 years after WWII, “a majority of the graduating classes of Stanford, Harvard, and Princeton joined the military, and most were not drafted.”²⁰ That same year more than 400 Princeton graduates went on to perform some sort of military service. Twelve years later 200 ROTC departments reported acts of vandalism linked to anti-war protests. The Army shifted many of its ROTC programs from the Northeast to the Midwest during the last years of the Vietnam War. These cultural changes provided further momentum for the AVF. Within a generation we experienced a growing gap and distrust between the military and significant portions of the leadership class of society.

The Triangle Institute of Security Studies reports that the elites, as a group, have the lowest opinion of the military. In this study “the elites were almost six times more likely than those in the military to say they would be ‘disappointed if a child of mine decided to serve.’”²¹ This simply demonstrates that those who seem to benefit the most from the rewards of our free society, who enjoy the greatest wealth and opportunity, are the least willing to serve in the

institution that provides and maintains those privileges. At some point we as a society should reconsider what it means to be “elite.”

Since the adoption of the AVF there has been a marked increase in the deployment of military forces. A volunteer military coupled with a disinterested Congress and elites of society appears to have paved the way for the adventurism warned by the Gates Commission. In looking at the post WWII timeframe, before the AVF (1946-1973), 19 overseas military deployments occurred. Since adopting the AVF (1973-current), more than 144 deployments have occurred.²² Granted the world political landscape has changed over the decades and some of these deployments were tied to UN and NATO commitments, and repeated interventions in Haiti, Somalia, and the Balkans. However, the trend is clear.

It is also ironic that we see this spike in military deployments at the same time we hear an ever increasing call for a “whole of government” approach to solving difficult conflicts and disputes around the world. A more recent example is the almost unnoticed deployment of Army units to Western Africa to fight the Ebola outbreak. We continue to see an ever expanding use of military forces to solve non-military problems or employ non-lethal solutions to either police, feed, or shelter the disadvantaged people around the world. And while we continue to liberally commit the military, we are forced to increasingly rely on contractors to support our own troops in austere theaters. From security to food services, to vehicle and aircraft maintenance, we have grown our reliance on contractors to its highest level. A 2013 Fiscal Times report noted the ratio was 1.46 contractors for every American Soldier in Afghanistan.²³ This is viewed by some as an abdication of many of our core competencies and poses a threat to the military’s professional status. Questions like oversight, expertise, cost, and ethical concerns surround this issue.

As we consider the status of our society and its relationship with the military, imagine three iconic images from WWII. The sinking of the USS Arizona served to rally a nation against Japan after the surprise attack of Pearl Harbor. The raising of the American flag atop Iwo Jima's Mt. Suribachi immortalized American determination and fighting spirit; and, a sailor's spontaneous kiss of a nurse in Times Square, following President Truman's announcement of the defeat of Japan, marked the jubilant end of the war and the anticipation of a brighter future for America and the world. These three images have become timeless artifacts of our culture.

Contrast these scenes with our recent experiences in the War on Terror. The war in Afghanistan traces to the images of commercial airliners destroying New York's World Trade Center. What ensued was America's longest war, one that ended not in victory or defeat, but uncertainty. This war, like the war in Iraq, ended because we were tired of fighting, or we believed our role was complete. Consequently, the president announced the conclusion of these two wars. As recently as December 2014, the president announced the end of combat operations in Afghanistan. Unlike 1945, this time America hardly noticed that the war was over. There were no celebrations or prospects for a safer or more secure future because we failed to achieve any kind of meaningful victory. In fact, our enemies are arguably stronger today than in 2001. This is yet another reminder of what has become a troubling trend since WWII. We keep engaging in wars we can't win, or choose not to win, and we seem unable to learn from these failures. Unfortunately we have no images of success to remember because the war wages on and our military commitments will largely grow unnoticed by a disengaged America.

Conclusion

Today we face an increasingly complex and violent world that poses a real threat to our allies and homeland, but we have yet to develop a coherent winning strategy that the country can rally

behind. Yes we may have prevented additional terrorist attacks following 9/11, but we are still at war and will likely remain so for many years to come. As a country, now would be the time to ask ourselves if what has happened to our military policy best supports our security requirements. This entire episode in our recent history has left the military demoralized and distrusting of our senior leaders.

The foundations of military culture were laid long ago with the Declaration of Independence, with the Constitution, and with George Washington as the first general in charge of the Army and the first President of the United States. Contemporary morals and values have changed, while the values of the military are still based largely on the traditions established during the founding of the country. We embrace these values because they enable the military to function as a professional and ethical organization. The widening gap between the military and society is reflected in the high standards the military must hold itself to, as evidenced by the current efforts to overcome the sexual harassment problem. The situation is bad and needs repair, but it is only reflective of the same issues in society. Part of the gap in contemporary morals is reflected in the current political and legal landscape of selfishness and ego-centric policies. Finally, the AVF has made the military a tool to be used at the beck and whim of the president. Having a draft would serve to mobilize society behind the military, since the sons and daughters of people across the country would be put in harm's way, versus less than 1% of American youth. We continue to see a dire lack of accountability for how our military is used and the results it achieves. In conclusion, the transitioning of society's values and use of the AVF have widened the gap of trust between the military and the American people and government. The military must view this gap as an opportunity versus a threat, and help bridge the gap by fulfilling its espoused ethical standards and continue to develop young men and women of character.

Notes

1. Thomas E. Ricks, "The Widening Gap Between Military and Society," *The Atlantic* (July 1, 1997). Accessed February 23, 2015.
<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1997/07/the-widening-gap-between-military-and-society/306158/>
2. "Statement by Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel Announcing his Senior Advisor for Military Professionalism," U.S. Department of Defense, News Release No: NR-142-14, (March 25, 2014). Accessed February 23, 2015.
<https://www.defense.gov/Release.aspx?ReleaseID=16599>
3. ADRP 1 The Army Profession Headquarters, (Washington DC, Department of the Army, 2013), pp 1-5, 2-1.
4. Religion and the Founding of the American Republic, (Library of Congress), Accessed February 23, 2015. <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/religion/re102.html>
5. Rebecca Barnes, Linda Lowry, "7 Startling Facts: An Up Close Look at Church Attendance in America," (CHURCHLEADERS), Accessed February 23, 2015.
www.churchleaders.com/pastor/pastor-articles/139575-7-startling-facts-an-up-close-look-at-church-attendance-in-america
6. Michael Hattem, "Newburgh Conspiracy," Yale, Accessed February 23, 2015.
www.mountvernon.org/research-collections/digital-encyclopedia/article/newburgh-conspiracy/
7. Christian Smith, *Lost in Transition: The Dark Side of Emerging Adulthood* (New York, Oxford University Press, 2011), 3.
8. Smith, *ibid.* 232.

9. Smith, *ibid.* 29.
10. Inaugural Address, January 20, 1961. The American Presidency Project. Accessed February 23, 2015. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws?pid=8032>
11. Clayton M. Christiansen, "The Importance of the Right Questions," Southern New Hampshire University Commencement Speech, May 18, 2009. Accessed February 23, 2015. <http://www.snhu.edu/8841.asp>
12. "Confidence in Institutions," Gallup, Accessed February 23, 2015. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1597/confidence-institutions.aspx>
13. Smith, *ibid.*, 199-201.
14. Joe Holley, Debbi Wilgoren, "Court Rules for Cleaners," Washington Post, June 26, 2007, Accessed February 23, 2015. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/25/AR2007062500443.html>
15. Karl W. Eikenberry, "Reassessing the All-Volunteer Force," *The Washington Quarterly*, 36:1 pp. 7-24, (Winter 2013). Accessed February 23, 2015. www.csis.org/publication/twq-reassessing-all-volunteer-force-winter-2013
16. "War and Sacrifice in the Post – 9/11 Era," Pew Research Center, (October 5, 2011). Accessed February 23, 2015. www.pewsocialtrends.org/2011/10/5/
17. Michael Dobbs, "With Albright, Clinton Accepts New U.S. Role," Washington Post, December 8, 1996; Page A01. Accessed February 23, 2015. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/govt/admin/stories/albright120896.htm>

18. Rachel Wellford, "By the Numbers: Veterans in Congress," PBS NEWSHOUR, November 11, 2014. Accessed February 23, 2015.

<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/by-the-numbers-veterans-in-congress/>

19. Eikenberry, *ibid.*

20. Kathy Roth-Doquet, "Absence of America's Upper Classes From the Military," ABC News, August 3, 2006, Accessed February 23, 2015.

<http://abcnews.go.com/US/story?id=2270473&page=1&singlePage=true>

21. Roth-Doquet, *ibid.*

22. Eikenberry, *ibid.*

23. David Francis, "U.S. Troops Replaced by an Outsourced Army in Afghanistan," The Fiscal Times, May 10, 2013. Accessed February 23, 2015.

<http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2013/05/10/US-Troops-Replaced-by-an-Outsourced-Army-in-Afghanistan>

Authors:

Ted A. Thomas, PhD
Director Department of Command and Leadership
Command and General Staff College
100 Stimson Ave
Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas 66027
Office: 913-684-4133
Cell: 913-547-0995
ted.a.thomas.civ@mail.mil
tedathomas@gmail.com

Ted Thomas is the Director of the Department of Command and Leadership in the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, KS. Ted graduated from the United States Military Academy (USMA) at West Point, NY in 1978 and served 20 years in various command and staff positions before retiring as a battalion commander in 1998. He received a M.S. degree in Civil Engineering (1986) from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a Ph.D. in Engineering Management (1998) from Missouri University of Science and Technology. He taught at USMA from 1987 to 1990 becoming an Assistant Professor and Course Director for Structural Analysis from 1989-1990.

Dr. Thomas joined the faculty at CGSC in 2005 and became the department director in 2007. He supervises over 35 civilian and military department members who develop and deliver leadership curriculum for the 10-month long resident Command and General Staff Officer Course. Over 1400 resident students annually attend the course, with representation from 80 plus countries across the globe and members from each branch of the armed services. Over nine hundred students attend at satellite locations and non-resident courses teach another four thousand plus students annually.

Ted G. Ihrke
Assistant Professor
Department of Command and Leadership
Command and General Staff College
100 Stimson Ave
Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas 66027
Office: 913-684-4115
Cell: 913-240-1117
ted.g.ihrke.civ@mail.mil
ihrket@hotmail.com

Ted Ihrke is an Assistant Professor and Curriculum Developer in the Department of Command and Leadership in the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, KS. Ted graduated with a Bachelor of Science Degree from Texas A&M University in 1981 and served nearly 27 years in various command and staff positions in the United States Army. He is a graduate of the Command and

General Staff Officers Course and received a Master of Arts Degree in Management and Leadership from Webster University in 2007.

Ted served as a Staff Leader in the Army's Combined Arms Services and Staff School from 1997 to 2000. This six weeks course was designed to prepare officers to assume battalion and brigade staff positions and focused on communication skills, problem solving and staff interaction. Ted joined the Department of Command and Leadership in 2005 where his efforts have focused on curriculum development and instruction in critical thinking, decision making, organizational level leadership, and ethics.