

2016

Whose Needs Does Service Serve? Complicating the Citizen Soldier Narrative

Hannah Lair
Macalester College

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/soci_honors



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lair, Hannah, "Whose Needs Does Service Serve? Complicating the Citizen Soldier Narrative" (2016). *Sociology Honors Projects*. 54.
http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/soci_honors/54

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology Department at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

Whose Needs Does Service Serve?
Complicating the Citizen Soldier Narrative*

Hannah Kenyon Lair

Macalester College

1600 Grand Ave, Saint Paul MN 55105

hlair@macalester.edu

Honors Advisor:

Terry Boychuk

Macalester College

1600 Grand Ave., Saint Paul MN 55105

boychuk@macalester.edu

*I would like to thank my advising dream team, Erik and Terry, as well as my dear friend Rosa. Your support helped this project come alive.

ABSTRACT

The growth of conscript militaries was integral to the creation of civil rights in European nation-states, which established militaries as a key site of claims-making. However, the United States military has diverged from these models, and most cases of inclusion or integration of social groups are not directly connected with claims-making. What has influenced the U.S. military's responsiveness to pressures, both internal and external, and how has this changed over time? I employ a comparative historical approach to three cases—African-Americans, women, and non-heterosexuals—to unpack the U.S. military as a state institution and a site of claims-making. By incorporating elements unique to American institutions into existing models of militaries, I find that the U.S. military has become increasingly vulnerable to domestic political, international political, internal economic, and internal and external cultural pressures since the World War period. Despite its enormous economic and physical strength, the U.S. military is more responsive now than ever before to internal and external demands.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Just prior to this draft's writing, in March 2016, the U.S. Defense Secretary finalized the military's plans to fully integrate women into all military service roles. In July 2015, the Pentagon began discussions to adjust military policy to allow transgender service people to transition gender presentation while in service. These shifts follow the 2011 legislative repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell executive policy that effectively banned non-heterosexual people from military service. Before these changes, the most recent comparable shifts in military policy occurred more than half a century before with the formal inclusion and partial integration¹ of women in the armed forces during World War II, and the formal integration of African-American service people via Executive Order 9981 in 1948. The first such case was the formal inclusion of African-Americans in military service, effected by the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863.

This study analyzes these cases of inclusion and integration of new social groups to tell us to whom and under what circumstances military institutions are responsive. Because identification of the root causes of such changes is necessary to understand the full scope and quality of these phenomena, I focus on the origins of shifts in military policy or practice. A clear grasp of the key forces behind changes in military policy, practice, and organization can tell us how military institutions have changed, which may contribute to broader analyses of contemporary nation-states.

¹ A note regarding terminology is appropriate. Formal inclusion as used herein means legitimate enlistment in the military. Integration is used to mean the dissolution of segregated units and the integration of minority subgroups into general military ranks and all levels and types of military labor.

I review relevant literature to illustrate the theory upon which my analysis builds, supplementing scholarly texts with historical accounts compiled by the U.S. Army on its Heritage web page. Political sociology has mapped foundational models of the relationship of militaries to state-building, and the development of civil rights out of this relationship, based on the experience of European nation-states (Bendix 1964; Bendix and Brand 1973; Bright and Harding 1984; Huntington 1957; Janowitz 1959; Krebs 2006; Skocpol 1979; Tilly 1998). Institutional sociological examinations of the military center the internal and organizational aspects of militaries, and explains why externally implemented transitions face more internal resistance than internally generated changes (Mills 1999; Moskos and Wood 1988; Moskos 1971; Segal 1983; Wells 1971). Military sociology, which originated as a subfield within military organizations, takes a structural functionalist approach to explaining symbolic and organizational characteristics of military institutions (Caforio 2006; Coates and Pellegrin 1965; Cook 2004; Feaver 1999). Contemporary political sociology analyses orient the military as an institution and social site within international and domestic contexts (Dansby 2001; Dudziak 2000).

What remains unexplained in all of this is the military's vulnerability to claims-making. What makes the military a particularly desirable locus of struggle? The cultural, or social, pressures exerted by civilian society onto the military and the political pressures exerted by governmental actors are the main foci of my analysis. I maintain that these realms of society hold the most potential for a satisfying explanation of the military's prevalence as a site of claims-making and struggle for rights and privileges.

Building upon existing bodies of theory, I develop a model with which to understand the driving forces behind policy and practice shifts that implement inclusion

and integration of social groups into the U.S. military. I argue that the military has become significantly more vulnerable to pressures from Congress, the Executive Office, and advocacy groups organizing both within and without the military due to the convergence of three distinct forces during and following the World War period. This transformation is visible in the recent total integration of women into all military positions and in the to-be-finalized integration of transgender service people. These cases illustrate the military's responsiveness to internal and external cultural pressures, which is exacerbated by its institutional economic needs.

A clear understanding of the historical conditions of the military and the marginalized groups under consideration is imperative to my analysis. According to my comparative historical analytical approach, I select representative cases with significant similar and distinct features. These cases demonstrate the most representative and well-documented instances of this phenomenon. I analyze each case individually, followed by a synthesis of the cases together. The cases are more dissimilar than similar; however, the similarities and points of overlap among them illustrate generalizable trends.

The U.S. military's responsiveness to these types of pressure has grown out of a few unique characteristics. Because the U.S. state and military were established in the late eighteenth century, early founders built into the structure their dominant ideologies and attitudes, resulting in federalism. In addition, strong currents of localism among the founders as well as the populace of the early United States resulted in a strong fusionist stance toward the military (Huntington 1957). The economic expansion, specialization, and professionalization of the military through the World Wars and Cold War created opportunities for organization within the military to demand better working conditions

and made the military more responsive to these demands. The United States' involvement in international conflicts and partnerships, which made the state more responsive to international pressure, also originated in the World War period.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

The development of modern volunteer standing armies can be traced from the transition from mercenary armies to conscript standing armies in the process of modern state-building. The construction of standing armies, as part of state-building, required leaders to draw resources from the populations under rule, and challenged states to make military service acceptable for potential recruits. "State intervention in everyday life incited popular collective action, often in the form of resistance to the state but sometimes in the guise of new claims on the state" (Tilly 99). Thus, a reciprocal, if tense, relationship between states and subjects developed in which bundles of rights were proffered to legitimize demands on manpower and resources. Such relationships were forged through conflict and negotiation, a process which informed the relative vulnerability of each party to certain forms of pressure.

The form of claims on the state depended upon the form of state organization, which in turn depended upon the structure of the subject population (Tilly 1998:100). "As workers and bourgeois (or, less often, peasants) organized, they took advantage of the permitted means to press for expanded rights and direct representation. During the age of specialization, states preempted or responded to the growing demands of bourgeois and workers by committing their agents to such programs as social insurance, veterans' pensions, public education, and housing; all of these programs added bureaux, bureaucrats, and budget lines to increasingly civilian state[...]bargaining over the state's

extractive claims produced rights, privileges, and protective institutions that had not previously existed” (Tilly 1998:102-3). In the process, states increased taxation and moved from indirect to direct rule, increasing subjects’ interaction with and access to the state itself in the process.

In comparison with mercenary militaries, standing citizen armies entailed significantly more valid claims on the state. For example, veterans, especially those disabled in service, could claim benefits and compensation, while “families of dead or wounded warriors likewise acquired benefits such as preference in the state-run” industry (Tilly 1998:106). Housing, food supply, public order, health services, and education also came under governmental purview in the course of organizing and preparing populations for military activities (Tilly 1998:106). Through negotiation and conflict, states developed effective approaches to legitimize claims on subjects’ resources and lives, and subjects, through resisting, developed methods of organizing to pressure states for greater rights and privileges. The product of these interactions was reciprocal obligatory relationships, in which bundles of political rights were bargained for access to resources and manpower (Mills 2000). The bulk of the rights demanded by subjects in reciprocity for military service have come to form what is commonly considered citizenship: rights of participation and representation in legislation, access to equitable judiciary treatment, and often state welfare privileges. This outcome is captured in the concept ‘citizen soldier,’ which organized conscript military policies (Krebs 2006, Mills 2000). The citizen soldier ideal directly connects political rights with military service: “one man meant one rifle as well as one vote,” (Mills 2000:178). Thus, the military, where it modernized, became an opportune site for claims-making.

Existing models of military-state relations are founded on European nation-state experience (Tilly 1998). The United States military diverges from this model in notable ways, exemplified in the fact that only the first case of extension of military service corresponds with the allotment of citizenship rights. Comparative studies of modernization provide insight into what distinguishes the American state and military from the European states on which these models of state-building are founded, as well as potential explanations of driving forces in the American military. Three aspects of the American experience are particularly distinct: the historical moment of state establishment, the internal needs of the military as an institution, and the international context in which the American state and military have operated. All of these are theorized independently by comparative political sociology, institutional sociology, and political sociology, respectively. By incorporating these elements into a model of the relation of U.S. military to state and civil society, we can clearly understand why moments of inclusion and integration of social groups happened when and how they did.

First, the peculiar historical moment at which the American state began to establish itself determined the ideology and attitude toward political organization with which the founders and colonial populace approached state-building. Political modernization, characterized by rationalization of authority, differentiation of structure, and growth of public political participation, occurred in Europe while the American state system was still establishing itself (Huntington 1957). The early United States implemented elements more associable with English sixteenth century constitutionalism than with the modernizing state system developing contemporaneously in England.

The defining elements that shaped American political structure “were the idea of

the organic union of society and government, the harmony of authorities within government, the subordination of government to fundamental law, the intermingling of the legal and political realms, the balance of power between Crown and Parliament, the complementary representative roles of these two institutions, the vitality of local governmental authorities, and reliance on local forces for the defense of the realm” (Huntington 1957:172). These ideals drove the organization of functions and powers among branches of government. Instead of separating functions between branches, the American political system inherited in them shared functions (checks and balances) which differentiated and equalized power among the branches (Huntington 1957).

This organizational structure established the environment in which the U.S. armed forces developed. Political and military modernization involved the subordination of military forces to civilian government. In the United States, functions were shared among state institutions, which translated to authority over military institutions. This “division of power among governmental institutions perpetuated the mixing of politics and military affairs, and enormously complicated the emergence of a modern system of objective civilian control,” (Huntington 1957:188). The armed forces faced a variety of pressures because political control of the military was split between the Office of the President and Congress.

In addition, the intense localism that characterized all levels of the U.S. government permeated and in fact defined the form and character of the early armed forces. The prevalence of local militias persisted throughout much of the early life of the U.S. military. “Not until the turn of the century did the United States have many of the institutions of professional officership which the European states had acquired many

decades earlier,” (Huntington 1957:188). This peculiarity of American military is thus attributable to the peculiar cultural ideology--extreme localism--that dominated American governmental organization.

Second, the institutional characteristics and needs of the armed forces has determined internal policy and practice shifts. Like any organization, the military requires for its functioning and propagation constant in-flow of people and resources, which has been extensively theorized in institutional sociology (Wells 1971). However, the institutional impact of contemporary economic developments has not been factored into examinations of the American military.

The enormous technological advancement and economic expansion in civilian industry and the military ushered in during the World War period facilitated economic specialization. The economic expansion and specialization occurring within the military facilitated a process of professionalization. Military positions became increasingly specialized and technicalized, which facilitated service people’s identification with their service roles. In addition, officership was increasingly viewed as a lifelong profession from this period on, attended by structures of recruitment and training in the form of military academies and military training programs in existing public and private educational institutions.

According to institutional sociology, these transformations of the structure of the military increased the military’s responsiveness to internal demands and increased the quantity of those demands. Technicalization and specialization, as well as attendant professionalization, fundamentally reorganized how and whether internal demands came about and how the military responded to them. Because service positions were

increasingly technical and specialized, identification with, commitment to, and organization within those positions increased. Thus, the military faced greater demands from within. Additionally, because of the institutional necessity of training for specialized positions, the military invested more resources into each individual service member, which incentivized responsiveness to said demands. These processes were finalized by the shift to an all-volunteer force in the early 1970s, which increased the military's responsiveness to internal demands and increased the quantity of those demands.

Finally, the growing import of the United States' international reputation due to the World Wars positioned the armed forces as a convenient representative of values that were politically desirable to aver as American. As Cold War tensions increased following the Second World War, persisting racial segregation in the armed forces became controversial, particularly on the international front, which translated to concern in American society and politics (Dudziak 2000:84). Notably, a white American couple wrote to President Truman urging him to desegregate the military, insisting "we feel that one of the most effective, firm, and noticeable ways in which we can show the rest of the world we believe in democracy is to practice such a virtue...at home. We believe this will still Russian propaganda against us for this gross injustice," (Dudziak 2000:85).

Within this international context, pressure fell on President Truman to effect racial progress in the armed forces. Evidencing positive social change in American society, a most visibly the military, was understood to be "the only effective way to convince foreign audiences that the nation was committed to its professed principles of liberty and equality," (Dudziak 2000:213). In this international, ideological context,

Truman ordered desegregation of the armed forces with Executive Order 9981. Thus, the most internationally visible part of American society was, at least in paper, made to represent the egalitarian potential of American democracy. “These integrated troops fulfilled the promise of U.S. propaganda. Their bodies held the line in the battle for the hearts and minds of the people of the world” (Dudziak 2000:88).

Political sociology models of militaries’ relations to states, civil society, and the creation of civil rights, founded on European experience, may be altered to effectively reflect the American case. Including the particular characteristics encompassed within the United States’ historical moment, military institutional needs, and international context within an illustration of the American military, in addition to existing understandings of military’s role in state-building, clarifies the picture significantly.

3.0 METHODS

African-Americans, women, and non-heterosexuals in the military have rarely been grouped together for the purposes of analysis, but studies of each group individually abound. The African-American case is one of the most long-standing and well-documented iterations of policy transition to include and integrate a social group in U.S. military history. Women in the military are included in this analysis because they have been involved in military activities since before the dawn of the U.S. armed forces, but have only recently been totally integrated into the forces. Their participation in military activities and institutions provides an interesting and well-studied example. Finally, the case of non-heterosexuals was chosen for its relative recentness and apparent similarity to the emerging case which forms the topical relevance of this study: transgender people.

These cases resemble one another inasmuch as they are examples of successful shifts in military policy and practice. Their distinctions, however, are evident: each social group experiences unique opportunities and forms of social subjugation, and each struggles for and gains inclusion or integration into the military at unique moments. In the cases discussed, transitions that implemented inclusion or integration did so via internal policy or practice transitions or external mandates by Congress or the Office of the President, or a combination of the two. The form of these changes and their surrounding circumstances are the focus of this analysis. To understand this, we must understand the broader context of these groups in society and in relation to the military. I situate this analysis within a constructed model based on classical political sociology models (Tilly 1998), institutional sociology (Wells 1971), and contemporary political sociology (Dudziak 2000).

4.0 ANALYSIS

African-Americans in the Military

African-Americans have been involved in U.S. military labor since the beginning of the African slave trade to the American colonies. African-Americans were arguably the first subgroup of the American population to be explicitly and systematically excluded from military service, although their exclusion was formal rather than substantive. The American Colonial Army routinely prevented African-Americans from officially enlisting. However, somewhere around 5,000 African-Americans fought in the Revolutionary War, and the conflict saw the formation of the all-black Rhode Island First Regiment (U.S. Army). Two battalions of free African-American soldiers served in the

War of 1812; both African-American freedmen and slaves unofficially enlisted in the Union Army during the Civil War. In addition, enslaved and freed African-Americans were routinely used for military labor, unwillingly and willingly. Thus, the inclusion of African-Americans in military organizations was normalized and implicitly accepted long before it was codified (Nalty 1986).

This exclusion was identified and reversed by the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 which explicitly changed military policy by allowing African-Americans to officially enlist as soldiers (Nalty 1986, U.S. Army). This change was reinforced by the 14th amendment to the Constitution in 1868. While the order to formally include African-Americans in the military faced public controversy and internal tension, the practical transition from informal to formal inclusion was not as substantial as might be expected. Informal enlistment of African-Americans was already common practice and inclusion did not mean equitable treatment. For almost a century after, African-Americans served officially in the military, which remained segregated and prejudiced, both in policy and in practice (Burk 2012, Krebs 2006).

Almost a century later, in 1948, President Truman ordered formal racial integration of the armed forces with Executive Order 9981. The armed forces implemented this change incrementally; the last all-black regiment was disbanded two years later in 1951 (U.S. Army). Like the transition to formally include African-American servicemen in the armed forces, this institutional transition occurred in response to executive orders. However, unlike inclusion, integration was not tied to the provision of political rights, nor did it follow domestic political upheaval. Rather,

integration came on the heels of international conflict, which placed the military in a peculiar position vis-a-vis other governmental institutions.

Integration following World War II brought the United States into the international public eye. It provided an opportunity for the U.S. military to represent U.S. society to our international political allies. To avoid appearing prejudiced against a minority population, as were the United States' adversaries in World War II, it was politically advantageous to improve race relations in the military. This transformation was met with internal tension by white servicemen, which is explained by military sociology and military organizations as due to military personnel's perpetuation of broader social patterns of racial bias (U.S. Army). However, institutional theory of regulation suggests another reason: the fact that change was imposed from outside the military, rather than developing from within, made the transition difficult to accept (Segal and Segal 1983).

Since the implementation of this executive order, the U.S. military has been widely considered a forerunner of progressive racial relations. The military has continuously prompted internal change to improve the status and treatment of African-American service members in military settings, and has adopted an identity of racial progress and equity (Armor 2010, Burk and Espinoza 2012). The U.S. Army Heritage website, for instance, illustrates a timeline of the involvement of African-Americans in the U.S. Army, repeatedly noting the social and institutional oppression faced by black soldiers within the Army and in society at large (U.S. Army). In this resource, the Army links service by African-American soldiers with the social status of the Army itself: "black Soldiers continued the tradition of serving the Army with distinction," (U.S.

Army). This is an example of “the creation and maintenance of social honor” that is an important aspect of the social and cultural function of military institutions illustrated by institutional and critical sociological theory (Beck in Moskos 1971:139). In this ideological storytelling, military institutions perpetuate the idea that military policy responded to social norms (Coates and Pellegrin 1965, Cook 2004, Dansby et. al. 2001).

On the one hand, this ideological storytelling is historically consistent. The story of African-Americans’ service to military institutions—legitimate and illegitimate—implies that military institutions represent the average American citizen, drawing upon the ideal of the citizen soldier. Their formal inclusion and legitimation by the Emancipation Proclamation and the 14th Amendment was ideologically connected with the granting of citizenship to African-Americans, which reflects the same ideal. However, this hypothesis neither explains the integration of African-Americans nor explains why these transitions happened *when* they did. The internal tensions that resulted from integration are not consistent with the idea that policy changes respond to broader social trends.

Rather, inclusion and integration served military economic needs and furthered political goals. Inclusion served the military’s need for bodies, both for labor and combat. While formal inclusion following the Civil War aligns with the institutional theory prediction that institutional transitions follow moments of social and political upheaval, informal inclusion had been common practice long before. This shift also served the ideological intentions of the U.S. political elite at this time. Integration served the international political need for a representation of progressive American society and improved the military’s status as an employer by aligning military practice with

progressive social attitudes. The shift to an all-volunteer force strengthened the status and inclusion of African-Americans in the military, in keeping with institutional theory expectations of specialization resulting from economic expansion and bureaucratization.

Women in the Military

Women have served in some capacity in U.S. military activities since before the formal inception of the Army in 1775. For much of military history, women have served as nurses and non-combatant laborers, performing necessary duties in the field and in civilian society to aid military efforts. The most longstanding, consistent role in which women have served in the military is as nurses. This role of women in military efforts has long been recognized and validated, even encouraged (U.S. Army).

The entrance of women into more technical and combative roles has been met with conflict and controversy throughout US military history. It was not until the early 20th century, when the National Service School was founded in 1916, that women's labor was incorporated into and recognized as part of the military (U.S. Army). The National Service School trained nurses and support staff who served in World War I.

World War II saw the creation of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps in 1942, which was an auxiliary branch of the armed forces supplying non-combat labor (U.S. Army). This organization was the first non-nursing military organization for women. This official inclusion of women contributed to but did not significantly alter the trend, begun during World War I, of expansion of women's labor in the military (Meyer 1992). The WAAC unit was converted to full military status in the form of the Women's Army Corps (WAC) in 1943.

Following the creation of the Air Force in 1947, some members of the WAC transferred to the newly-created Women in the Air Force (WAF) unit, which represented the first relatively direct involvement of women in combative military work (U.S. Army). This provided women with permanent status in the Air Force, as well as opportunities to train and serve in the Air Force. Soon after, the WAC was disbanded by the Women's Armed Service Integration Act of 1948, and service women were integrated into the armed forces: the Marines, the Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard. Later years saw women's roles in the military remain consistent—they mostly served as nurses and in technical positions—until the end of the draft in 1973. Following this internal policy shift, opportunities for women in the military expanded: they were permitted into service academies and allowed to serve in a greater variety of non-combat roles, including as officers.

Formal inclusion of women in the military began in 1943. According to military sociology, we expect this phenomenon to happen soon after the expansion of political or social rights of women. However, development of women's political rights occurred more than two decades prior, in 1919, when the right to vote was granted to women, while the feminist movement of the 1960s and 70s was still far off. Thus, political or social mobilization was not the driving force behind women's inclusion in military institutions.

The clearest explanation for the inclusion of women in the military at this time is economic: women's growing economic power in American civil society and the economic needs of military institutions, both of which are attributable to World War II, contributed to the transformation of women's formal inclusion in military activities. The

former developed out of the consecutive World Wars, which sapped U.S. labor supply and created opportunities for women to work outside the home. The creation of discourses around women's service to the country in industrial and technical labor justified the entrance of women into the labor market. This trend laid the groundwork to normalize women's entrance into official military labor. Their service was labeled patriotic, and connected with their domestic role as keepers of the home(front). Similarly, their entrance into technical and menial positions in military operations was normalized by military advertisements and media representations (U.S. Army).

Additionally, the huge expansion of the military's demand for labor allowed for the creation and later formalization of positions of labor open to female laborers. The formal inclusion of these laborers into military organizations aligned with this expansion of military purview to new areas of economic production. The continuation of this trend following the shift to an all-volunteer force reinforces this interpretation: women gained access to a wider variety of service positions as military labor became increasingly professionalized and specialized. This aligns with expectations of bureaucratization and specialization (Brown 2006, Tilly 1998).

A key feature of these transitions is that they originated within the military, rather than from an external authority, with the exception of codification of integration with the Women's Armed Service Integration Act. There was little internal resistance to the acceptance of women into the armed forces, partially because the change came from within, and largely because their labor was normalized by media and military representations of women's labor in the military. These created the impression that women's work in the military was appropriately gendered and separated from violent,

masculinized combat. Women's participation in combat has been and continues to be a point of contention. Women have only recently been totally integrated into all levels and types of military service, notably combat roles. This policy transition was developed within the ranks of military leadership and finalized with the approval of current Defense Secretary Carter in March of 2016.

This partial integration of a minority group into military service illustrates a motivating force behind such a shift: the economic needs of the military institution as an employer. It also shows us the boundaries of an internal shift: despite the integration of women, gender segregation persisted in practice until very recently. This is because, rather than being required to meet external criteria of integration, women's integration was facilitated by military institutions themselves. The recent total integration of women into all military service positions, and notably direct combat roles, supplements but does not substantially alter this interpretation.

Military sociology's prediction that institutional change follows dominant social views and conditions is unconvincing in this case. This transition is consistent with institutional theory that associates transitions in policy and practice with the needs of institutions. The improvement of opportunities for women following the elimination of the draft in 1973 aligns with institutional sociology predictions that professionalization is accompanied by specialization. Both processes lessen the prevalence of ascribed characteristics in determinations of recruitment and advancement; thus, women's skills, experience, and abilities play more of a role in determining their opportunities in an all-volunteer military force. Specialization creates opportunities for identification with and organization within one's specialized role. As women are increasingly present and

accepted in their service positions, cultural pressure upon the military to integrate women strengthens. The recent shift to totally integrate women further supports this interpretation. As an institution, the military is increasingly vulnerable to pressures from within due to professionalization and specialization. As an employer, the armed forces is particularly susceptible to pressures from its employees.

Non-heterosexuals in the Military

Non-heterosexual individuals have been involved in military activities and institutions since long before social conceptions of heterosexuality and non-heterosexuality existed. Historically, non-heterosexual *activities* were policed and criminalized both in military settings and in civil society. It was not until the 1940s, when the psychological industry developed as a profession and staked occupational claim on character evaluations, that non-heterosexual *identities* came to be policed in military institutions (Stychin 1996, Williams and Weinberg 1970).

In 1941, the grounds for discharge shifted from sodomy to known homosexuality with the issuance of a circular order by the Army Surgeon General. The armed forces implemented screening processes for those entering service, which for the first time included criteria intended to suss out potential or actual homosexuals in order to bar them from service. These screening processes were developed by psychiatrists and psychologists employed by the armed service. The development of homosexual identity was followed by discriminatory practices and a formal ban on non-heterosexuals from military service, persisting until the twenty-first century. Exclusion of non-heterosexual people from military service became more formally implemented throughout the rest of the twentieth century. Exclusion of this minority depended upon their identification,

distinguishing this from the other cases under consideration. Denigration of non-heterosexuals in the military took the form of policies and practices of exclusion.

During the 1970s and 1980s, non-heterosexual social identity became the basis for political movement in civilian society (Miller 1996). Advocates for the rights of non-heterosexuals protested the ban on homosexual service, prompting social backlash by proponents. In 1988, the Gay and Lesbian Military Freedom Project was created. In response to their efforts at organizing non-heterosexual servicemembers, military organizations began to address whether removing the ban was feasible and whether it would harm the well-being and reputation of the military.

Following significant controversy related to these events, in 1994 President Clinton implemented the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy that attempted to prevent subjugation of non-heterosexual service people within military establishments. This policy disallowed investigation or subjugation of closeted queer service people, while excluding openly queer people from military service. This executive order implemented both inclusion and formal segregation of non-heterosexuals in the military.

The implementation of this policy was followed by significant social discontent from both supporters and opponents, in addition to three court challenges of the policy (Belkin 2008). After this period of instability and political fluctuation with regard to the legal and institution status of non-heterosexuals in the military, Secretary of Defense Cohen ordered a review of the policy. The American Psychological Association, responsible for the scientific basis of homosexual subjugation in the military half a century before, stated in 2004 that the policy “discriminates on the basis of sexual orientation [and] empirical evidence fails to show that sexual orientation is germane to

any aspect of military effectiveness including unit cohesion, morale, recruitment and retention” (APA). In his campaign for presidential election, Barack Obama made elimination of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell part of his platform, joining the political fracas.

In 2010, in response to President Obama’s efforts, Congress created legislation to eliminate the ban, formalized in the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Repeal Act of 2010. This piece of national legislation established protocol for the adjustment of military practice to the new legislation. The external elimination of the ban was met with ambivalence on the part of military personnel and the public (Barnes 2007). The ambivalent social response to the transition was due to the amphibian institutional approach to policy change; the Obama Administration, Congress, and military authorities all contributed to developing and administering the transition.

The inclusion of non-heterosexuals into the U.S. military was prompted by the organization of service people, which reflects the idea that social unrest leads to institutional transformation. In addition, integration was made possible by the technicalization and specialization of the armed forces since World War II, which encouraged identification with one’s position in the military and created opportunities for organization within and across roles. Specialization, in relation to professionalization, was a result of the growth of military institutions as economic bodies. This dynamic is a manifestation of the institutional theory idea that specialization and professionalization can reduce opportunity hoarding and promote internal cooperation. Integration also reflects the economic aspect of military organizations’ need for labor: once it was determined that the military’s status would not be tarnished by inclusion more than it would be by exclusion, military organizations did not oppose formal inclusion and

integration of non-heterosexuals because the inclusion of another group of laborers would have no negative effect on military institutions as employers and economic bodies.

5.0 DISCUSSION

These cases illustrate the forms of pressure to which the U.S. military has historically been vulnerable. Cultural pressures manifest as social needs, and are often expressed through congressional acts, even if they originate in civilian organization. This exemplifies the role played by the historical moment at which the U.S. was established, as the dominant ideals that organized state structure at its founding have continued to organize the expression of civilian values and their imposition onto the military. In particular, this is indicative of localism, as advocacy for social groups in civil society becomes cultural pressure that can result in a congressional act. Economic pressures manifest as necessities internal to the military, such as need for manpower or need to improve benefits for service members. These are well understood according to institutional sociology, which maps institutional behaviors and transitions in response to their structural needs. International political pressures manifest through executive orders. This kind of pressure is most clearly theorized by contemporary political sociology, which situates contemporary state-military relations within an international context. Why these pressures take the forms they do, and whether and to what extent the military is responsive to them, are understandable through the tailored model that we have constructed.

Existing political sociology models of militaries based on European experience tell us why the military is targeted as a site of claims-making by service people and by

those who desire service for its purported connection with citizenship rights (Tilly 1998). This is the symbolic foundation of cultural pressures, which originate in the organization of civilian or service people and manifest, in the former case, through internal demands on the military or, in the latter, through Congressional controversies that, when successful, become acts. Institutional sociology predicts inclusion based on internal institutional need for labor, and integration based on internal organization of service people to demand it among other improvements to work environments (Wells 1971). Contemporary political sociology tells us that, during the international political context of the World Wars and the Cold War, the military's position as an international representative of American society made it a prime focus on international political attention that demanded social progress in the form of racial integration (Dudziak 2000).

Thus, by supplementing existing models with institutional and contemporary political sociology interpretations of the military, the similarities and variations among these cases become explicable. These cases illustrate the long-term increase in the military's vulnerability to proliferating pressures. Only the inclusion of African-Americans occurred prior to World War II; this case aligned most closely of all the cases with political sociology models based on the European nation-state experience. The close fit of this case to existing models illustrates their utility as a foundation for understanding the American case. Since World War II, there have been more than six examples of these transitions, which illustrates increasing responsiveness or vulnerability to pressure. The variety of forces to which the military is responsive, visible in the variations between these cases, illustrates the development during this period of two novel institutional or environmental characteristics of the U.S. military.

The first element to develop out of this period was institutional. The military expanded economically, resulting in specialization and professionalization, which made the military more susceptible to internal economic pressures and cultural pressures influenced by economic trends. These trends also created opportunities for identification with and organization within service positions for the purpose of making claims on the military, increasing the quantity of such internal pressures. The growth of this type of pressure, and the military's responsiveness to it, are exemplified in the cases of women's integration and non-heterosexual integration.

The second was an environmental element of the international political context in which the military was situated. The military has developed a greater international presence because of the country's increasing international ties during and since the World War period. This contextual change has increased the military's vulnerability to political pressure to represent American society in prescient ways. The military came to be understood as a primely positioned representative of American social values following World War II and into the Cold War years, when the state's international relationships multiplied and its reputation became a source of political value. The case of African-American integration most clearly manifests the military's vulnerability to this type of pressure.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The expansion of military institutions has made them more accountable to a variety of pressures to include and integrate social groups. Three distinct forces are the primary drivers behind these policy and practice shifts throughout history. The first force has been built into the foundation of this institution: the subordination of military force to

political control by the executive and legislative branches. The military is, by design, vulnerable to domestic cultural pressures by civilian advocates expressed through Congress and international political pressures by allies onto the Office of the President. This vulnerability was realized following the growth of these forms of pressure during and following the World War period.

The other two key forces developed out of transformations related to the World War period: internal economic expansion of military institutions and development of international political involvement. As the military expanded as an economic actor and employer in World War II, opportunities developed within and around it for social groups to organize and advocate for their needs. Opportunities for domestic claims-making on the level of social groups increased due to processes of specialization, technicalization, and professionalization within the military. On the other hand, as the American state developed its connection with other countries, opportunities for international claims-making increased due to the country's political stance.

The integration of African-Americans was a response to international political needs asserted through the executive office. The inclusion and partial integration of women into the armed forces was a response to the military's institutional need for bodies, which was a consequence of economic expansion and specialization. The specialization that resulted from military economic expansion of the World War period created opportunities for identification with and organization within service members' positions, facilitating the growth of internal pressures. The professionalization that resulted from the same processes decreased the prevalence of ascribed characteristics in recruitment and induction practices, increasing access of social groups to military service.

These economic trends laid the groundwork for future organization of non-heterosexual service people in demand for inclusion and integration, which were framed as employment rights and equitable treatment. This novel framing of inclusion and integration as aspects of employment in the military was a result of professionalization, which oriented military service as a type of employment.

Subsequent shifts in military policy and practice--non-heterosexual inclusion and integration--have served the domestic political-cultural needs of U.S. political institutions, expressed as executive orders and congressional acts. The cultural pressures behind these cases originated in the increased opportunities for social and political organization that grew out of the military's developing role as an employer during World War II.

Because military expansion took form primarily as technological and economic development, the military developed as an employer, a development finalized by the transition to an all-volunteer force. This transition made military organizations accountable to their participants in a way that was, in a draft-based military, unthinkable. The military's economic vulnerability to cultural pressures compounds its institutional vulnerability to cultural pressures expressed through Congress, which has been a key feature since its inception.

What this study does not account for are other facets of this phenomenon. How can the model constructed herein be used to understand the form of these policy and practice transformations from their origin to their implementation? What are the effects, in service people's experiences, in the organization of the armed forces, and in civil society, of these transformations? These questions are outside the scope of this study.

The opportunities to expand this research are fertile. This study traces only the macro-level causes of military policy and practice shifts. Micro-level investigations of the processes of claims-making would be valuable, as would studies of the processes of policy change, whether internal to the military or in the executive or legislative branches. In addition, the consequences of such shifts require significant attention, at the institutional, troop, and civilian levels. There are significant possibilities for contributions to institutional, network, political sociology, and critical sociology theory within this subject that have yet to be unearthed.

Substantively, this subject has significant weight. The spark that ignited my interest, the developing policy to include and integrate transgender service members, is still in process. More generally, better understandings of war-making institutions are incredibly necessary to contemporary life, especially as exponential technological advancement transforms these institutions on a daily basis.

References

- Armor, D. J. and C. L. Gilroy. 2010. "Changing Minority Representation in the U.S. Military." *Armed Forces Soc.* 36:223.
- B. Marshall and United States. 1967. "In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves when Not all Serve?" Report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service (U.S. military law, history, and development, 90-450). Washington, D.C.
- Barnes, Mario L. 2007. "But some of (them) are brave: Identity Performance, the Military , and the Dangers of an Integration Success Story." *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy.* 14(2).
- Belkin, Aaron. 2008. "'Don't Ask, Don't Tell': Does the Gay Ban Undermine the Military's Reputation?" *Armed Forces & Society.* 34(2).
- Bendix, R., & Brand, C. M. 1973. *State and society: A reader in Comparative Political Sociology.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bendix, Reinhard. 1964. *Nation-building and Citizenship: Studies of Our Changing Social Order.* New York: Wiley.
- Binkin, M. and M. J. Eitelberg. 1983. *Blacks and the Military.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.
- Bright, Charles and Susan F. Harding. 1984. *Statemaking and Social Movements: Essays in History and Theory.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Brown, Melissa T. 20060101. "'A Woman in the Army is Still A Woman': Recruiting Women into the all-Volunteer Force." *Conference Papers—International Studies Association*:1-1.

Burk, James and Evelyn Espinoza. 2012. "Race Relations within the US Military." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38(1):401-422.

Caforio, Guiseppe. 2006. *Handbook of the Sociology of the Military*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic and Plenum Publishers.

Coates, Charles H., Roland J. Pellegrin and Norman A. Hilmar. 1965. *Military Sociology: A Study of American Military Institutions and Military Life*. University Park, MD: The Social Science Press.

Cook, Martin L. 2004. *The Moral Warrior: Ethics and Service in the U.S. Military*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Dansby, M. R., J. B. Stewart and S. C. Webb. 2001. *Managing Diversity in the Military*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Dudziak, M. L. 2000. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Feaver, Peter D. 1999. "Civil-Military Relations." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2(1):211-241.

Hosek, S. D., P. Tiemeyer, R. Kilburn, D. A. Strong, S. Ducksworth and R. Ray. 2001. *Minority and Gender Differences in Officer Career Progression*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1957. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge, MA: Belk Press of Harvard University Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1962. *Changing Patterns of Military Politics*. New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc.

Janowitz, M. 1959. *Sociology and the Military Establishment*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Krebs, R. R. 2006. *Fighting for Rights: Military Service and the Politics of Citizenship*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.

Krebs, Ronald R. 2009. "The Citizen-Soldier Tradition in the United States: Has its Demise been Greatly Exaggerated?" *Armed Forces & Society* 36(1):153-174.

Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2008. "Globalization as Racialized, Sexualized Violence." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 10(2):216-233.

Leggett, Nicholas R. 1994. "Institutions and the Military's Anti-Gay Policy: Professional, Legal and Organizational Contributions." *Critical Sociology*. 20(3):5-63.

Meyer, Leisa D. 1992. "Creating G.I. Jane: The Regulation of Sexuality and Sexual Behavior in the Women's Army Corps." *Feminist Studies* 18(3):581.

Melman, Seymour. 1974. *The Permanent War Economy: American Capitalism in Decline*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Mills, C. W. 1999. *The Power Elite*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Miller, Laura. 1996. "And the Flag was Still there: Straight People, Gay People, and Sexuality in the U.S. Military." *Gender & Society*. 32(10):32-59.

- Mohanty, Chandra T. 2006. "US Empire and the Project of Women's Studies: Stories of Citizenship, Complicity and Dissent." *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 13(1):7-20.
- Moskos, C. C. and F. R. Wood. 1988. *The Military: More than just a Job?* Washington, D.C.: Pergamon-Brassey. 305.
- Moskos, Charles C., Charles C. Moskos and Inter-university Seminar on Armed Forces and Society. 1971. *Public Opinion and the Military Establishment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mueller, J. E. 1973. *War, Presidents, and Public Opinion*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Nalty, B. C. 1986. *Strength for the Fight: A History of Black Americans in the Military*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Segal, D. R. 1989. *Recruiting for Uncle Sam*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Segal, David R. and Mady W. Segal. 1983. "Change in Military Organization." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 9(1):151-170.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soeters, J. and der M. van. 2007. *Cultural Diversity in the Armed Services*. London, Eng.: Routledge.
- Stychin, Carl F. 1996. "To Take Him 'at His Word': Theorizing Law, Sexuality and the US Military Exclusion Policy." *Social & Legal Studies*. 5(2):179-200.
- Tilly, Charles. 1998. *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

U.S. Army. "African-Americans in the U.S. Army." Retrieved December 15, 2015.
(<http://www.army.mil/africanamericans/timeline.html>)

U.S. Army. "Women in the U.S. Army." Retrieved December 15, 2015.
(<http://www.army.mil/women/history/early.html>)

Wells, A. F. 1971. *Social Institutions*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Williams, Colin J. and Martin S. Weinberg. 1970. "Being Discovered: A Study of Homosexuals in the Military." *Social Problems*. 18(2):217-227.