

**CHAPLAINCY AT A CROSSROADS:
FUNDAMENTALIST CHAPLAINS IN
A PLURALISTIC ARMY**

BY

CHAPLAIN (COLONEL) BARBARA K. SHERER
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2011

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 03-03-2011			2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Chaplaincy at a Crossroads: Fundamentalist Chaplains in a Pluralistic Army					5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
					5b. GRANT NUMBER	
					5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Chaplain (Colonel) Barbara K. Sherer					5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
					5e. TASK NUMBER	
					5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Chaplain (Colonel) Charles D. Reese Department of Command, Leadership, and Management					8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013					10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
					11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES						
14. ABSTRACT This paper will examine the potential challenges presented to a Christian fundamentalist chaplain by the mandate to ensure a soldier's right to the free exercise of religion. Discussions will include a definition of Christian fundamentalism, a look at the legal issues faced by the Army chaplaincy with a focus on the court case of <i>Katcoff v. Marsh</i> , steps taken during accessions and training to ensure chaplains are equipped to meet religious needs in a pluralistic community, and recommendations for policy and training changes to further strengthen the chaplaincy in its mission to provide religious support in a pluralistic environment.						
15. SUBJECT TERMS Army, Chaplaincy, Pluralism						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			UNLIMITED	36

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**CHAPLAINCY AT A CROSSROADS: FUNDAMENTALIST CHAPLAINS IN A
PLURALISTIC ARMY**

by

Chaplain (Colonel) Barbara K. Sherer
United States Army

Chaplain (Colonel) Charles D. Reese
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Chaplain (Colonel) Barbara K. Sherer

TITLE: Chaplaincy at a Crossroads: Fundamentalist Chaplains in a Pluralistic Army

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 03 March 2011 WORD COUNT: 7,522 PAGES: 36

KEY TERMS: Army, Chaplaincy, Pluralism

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

This paper will examine the potential challenges presented to a Christian fundamentalist chaplain by the mandate to ensure a soldier's right to the free exercise of religion. Discussions will include a definition of Christian fundamentalism, a look at the legal issues faced by the Army chaplaincy with a focus on the court case of *Katcoff v. Marsh*, steps taken during accessions and training to ensure chaplains are equipped to meet religious needs in a pluralistic community, and recommendations for policy and training changes to further strengthen the chaplaincy in its mission to provide religious support in a pluralistic environment.

CHAPLAINCY AT A CROSSROADS: FUNDAMENTALIST CHAPLAINS IN A PLURALISTIC ARMY

“The Chaplain Corps is the Army’s primary agency for practically ensuring the free exercise of religion for America’s soldiers.”¹ The Army chaplain assumes many roles, functions, and responsibilities in the performance of duty, but there is none more key and essential than this, the Constitutional mandate to ensure the free exercise of religion.

Army chaplains² represent a wide variety of denominations and faith groups, with a broad base of theological beliefs. These chaplains must work together collegially in order to provide religious support to a very diverse soldier population. Yet some chaplains hold theological beliefs that are very strict and unwavering. These strict beliefs make it a challenge for the chaplains to interact comfortably with others who do not have the same faith practices. An example of one such belief set is Christian Fundamentalism.

This paper will examine the beliefs and practices of Christian fundamentalists, and consider whether they conflict with the Army chaplaincy stated mission to ensure the free exercise of religion for America’s soldiers. The paper will begin by defining the term “fundamentalist” along with an often associated term, “evangelical.” Next, the author will discuss the legal basis for the existence of the chaplaincy and various related court cases and legal questions. Following the legal section the author will describe some of the challenges that have occurred when fundamentalist chaplains minister in the pluralistic military community. The paper will close with a discussion of the methods currently in place to ensure chaplains are capable of providing religious support in the

current environment and a few recommendations for ways the chaplaincy might strengthen policies and training in order to protect the free exercise of religion.

The underlying theme throughout the paper, which will be demonstrated in both research and discussion, is that Christian fundamentalist beliefs, when put into practice, may be incompatible with the requirements to provide for the free exercise of religion in the pluralistic military environment. Chaplains who hold these beliefs must either moderate their actions and refrain from imposing their theology and values on others, or risk infringing the rights of their soldiers.

Fundamentalism Defined

In modern society, the term “fundamentalism” has varied meanings. Therefore, it is important to establish what the author means by the term. The origin of the term stems from early twentieth century Protestantism. A group of conservative Protestants was very concerned about the apparent lack of morals and values in society and the inability of people of faith to effectively speak to this problem. In response, they published a series of pamphlets meant to point Christians back to the basics of the faith, expressing their conviction that these basics provide the critical foundation for any who are truly religious. They called these pamphlets “The Fundamentals,” and in so doing tagged themselves with the label “fundamentalists.”³

The pamphlets consisted of over ninety articles written by respected pastors and theologians and published for free distribution “to ministers of the gospel, missionaries, Sunday School superintendents, and others engaged in aggressive Christian work throughout the English speaking world.”⁴ At least one quarter of the articles, such as “Fallacies of the Higher Criticism”⁵ and “The Holy Scriptures and Modern Negations,”⁶ were concerned with defending the origin and authorship of Bible against modern

biblical scholarship and literary criticism. Along with this emphasis on Biblical criticism, *The Fundamentals* also contains an entire series of articles devoted to evangelism. The place of evangelism in their movement is best expressed by the words of Robert Speer. "God in truth, is known only where men have been in contact with the message of the historic Christ. This simple fact involves a sufficient missionary responsibility."⁷

These early fundamentalists were certain the values in society were in rapid decline, and science and many non-Christian philosophies and attitudes were largely to blame. Heinz Streib, in his article "The Question of Salvation and Faith-based Radicalism," sums up many of the core beliefs of the fundamentalist movement.

inerrancy or infallibility of the holy scripture as a whole; literal understanding of, and authoritative belief in, a selection of basic propositions (which, in early Protestant fundamentalism, included virgin birth, bodily resurrection and the return of Jesus); rejection of the results of modern science wherever they contradict fundamentalist teachings; and the claim that only people subscribing to these fundamentals are truly religious.⁸

Nancy Ammerman, Professor of Sociology of Religion at Boston University School of Theology, suggests that "this movement provided for its followers an explanation for the apparent decline of Christian civilization and a language in which to describe their traditional orthodoxy."⁹ As the effects of scientific study and new technologies exploded on the scene, conservative Christians felt the need to draw battle lines and defend the faith against this assault which threatened some of their traditional beliefs.

A classic example of the fundamentalist mindset was the "Butler Bill" passed in Tennessee in 1925 prohibiting the teaching of "any theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals."¹⁰ This legislation led to the infamous Scopes

Trial in Dayton, Tennessee, in which a prominent politician, William Jennings Bryan, faced off against defense attorney Clarence Darrow. Darrow was defending a high school biology teacher accused of teaching evolution in his classroom. For the fundamentalist believer the matter of the theory of evolution versus the biblical creation story was an either/or situation. You could not believe in one without totally rejecting the other.

Ammerman explains that the mission to save human souls was a critical strategy used by fundamentalists in the early years, with the “call to evangelism” as an overarching theme of the period after 1925.¹¹ While the numbers and visibility of this group experienced periods of ebb and flow over the next fifty years, this evangelistic fervor carried through into the late twentieth century as fundamentalists affected a resurgence. They built on the original networks created in the early part of the century, building churches popular for many because they provided “a haven where life makes sense. In chaotic times and places, when individuals and communities are searching for moorings, the certainty and clarity of fundamentalism often seems appealing.”¹²

In the latter part of the twentieth century, as the Christian fundamentalist movement was regaining strength and visibility, the term “fundamentalist” was gaining broader use, referring to members of any faith group who struggle against the threat the modern world poses to the basic beliefs of their faith. Richard Antoun, an anthropologist who specializes in Islamic and Middle Eastern studies, defines fundamentalism as “a response to the questioning of the great religious traditions—Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism—in the changing world.”¹³ Despite the broader use by some scholars today, in this paper the author’s use of the term “fundamentalist” will be

limited to its original meaning, relating only to members of the Protestant Christian faith, and not to members of other faith traditions.

“Evangelicalism” is a term sometimes confused with “fundamentalism”. This term, which is currently an acceptable label for certain individuals and even for entire Protestant Christian organizations,¹⁴ is occasionally used interchangeably with fundamentalism. However, its origin and usage dates back centuries before the advent of fundamentalism, and it covers a more wide-reaching and diverse set of views.¹⁵ Noting that there may be some argument about the degree to which the terms are similar, the author will attempt to consistently use the term “fundamentalist”, unless a source specifically uses the term “evangelical”.

Drawing on the common points from the previous paragraphs, the definition of a “fundamentalist” may be summarized as follows: a “fundamentalist” is one who believes the Bible is the inerrant authority on faith and life, salvation is achieved only through faith in Jesus the Christ, and he or she has a personal responsibility to share this belief with non-Christians. Only those who believe these things are truly religious, and these basic beliefs held by fundamentalists are under attack today by modern science and lifestyles.

Now that the term is defined, it is important to consider why the specific beliefs held by fundamentalists might be a concern for the chaplaincy. At first glance, it would seem that a gathering of Christians with a very strong values system and a sense that society needs to get “back to the basics” would be a good thing for the Army. But the problem lies in the fundamentalist’s compulsion to conform the rest of society to meet these basic standards. Nancy Ammerman describes the “we-they” attitude prevalent

within the ranks of the fundamentalists. “Fundamentalists think they have the truth and think that others should accept and live by that truth...There are clear lines of social demarcation between believers and non-believers.”¹⁶

It is not unusual, and maybe even essential, that whatever belief system a person espouses is something that one feels to be “the truth.” The big three faith groups who have a common ancestor in Abraham (Islam, Judaism, and Christianity), all operate under the assumption that they are bearers of the truth. While there are points of agreement among members of all three groups, there are also many points of contention. These differences have been a source of conflict over the centuries. Some Christians, Muslims, and Jews have chosen to “agree to disagree” in order to co-exist peacefully with each other. Others, however, are not comfortable with just letting these differences go unresolved.

A fundamentalist cannot rest easy when confronted by opposing religious values. There is a sense, among those who hold strong fundamentalist beliefs, that anyone who believes differently is, in effect, the enemy. In fact, Antoun suggests that there is a dual sense of both an external and internal enemy. The external enemy consists of those who are not professing Christians at all. But there also exists an internal enemy, those who “...claim to be followers of Jesus but accept the norms laid down by the state and other nonreligious institutions in their daily lives and cavort with members of secular society (e.g., the National Council of Churches).”¹⁷

Evangelism, which is defined as “preaching of, or zealous effort to spread, the gospel,”¹⁸ has been common practice in the armed forces, where members of all ranks have reached out to their peers in hopes of bringing them into the Christian fold.

Historically, some fundamentalist chaplains and their endorsing organizations have seen the search for converts as the key mission of their military duty. In the 1950s, the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) openly professed (in a printed article) that half of those who enter military service have no church or religious connection, and even those who claimed to be Protestant often did so only because their parents went to church. “They have no practical Christian experience. This is a ripe harvest field in which our chaplains are working.”¹⁹ The NAE was endorsing chaplains with the distinct mission to evangelize these service members. The NAE was also concerned about the predominance of Catholic chaplains, and urged evangelical pastors to sign up for service to help level the playing field. “Evangelicals must not fail the proportionately large number of men in the armed forces who are anxious that the New Testament Gospel be preached, and a real evangelistic work be carried on by our chaplains.”²⁰

Loveland describes the situation in the mid-twentieth century through the eyes of the evangelical chaplains, stating they “...found numerous opportunities to engage in evangelization and exploited them to the fullest. Some used personal conferences and consultations to advantage.” One chaplain stated that the many opportunities to counsel with service members about personal problems were “...all potential opportunities to personally witness to a man about his need of Christ.” This constituted, in the words of one Christian and Missionary Alliance chaplain, “a ‘tailor-made’ mission field for the proclamation of the gospel.”²¹

There exists no regulation or law specifically prohibiting evangelistic outreach by chaplains to the Soldiers and Families they serve. The chaplains who conducted such outreach in the past were not bending any rules and were not singled out as

troublemakers. But today their actions might be seen in a different light. The pluralistic nature of the military community, with its very broad base of faith and cultural backgrounds, makes it a virtual minefield for the budding evangelist. It would be tempting to see today's diverse soldier population as a "ripe harvest field" even more promising than in the 1950s. Yet the Army's focus on values, especially the value of "respect", means a chaplain should support another person's right to believe and worship as he or she chooses.

Thus the dilemma exists for fundamentalist chaplains: they are expected to evangelize those who do not hold the "correct" beliefs, yet are required to respect a soldier's right to choose his or her religious beliefs. How can they quietly stand by and let the enemy win the battle? This is the tightrope that every chaplain must walk, but is especially challenging for the fundamentalist.

Legal Questions

Having discussed the definition of fundamentalism and the theology and practices associated with it, this paper will now consider the legal basis for the chaplaincy. In recent years, litigation has ranged from complaints about the practices of individual chaplains and their use of the name of Jesus in public prayer to discrimination against chaplains in the promotion process.²² One lawsuit which challenged the constitutionality, and thus the very existence, of the chaplaincy produced what may be the most important legal decision in the history of the chaplaincy.

In 1979 two Harvard law students began litigation against the Secretary of the Army claiming that a government sponsored military chaplaincy violated the establishment clause of the First Amendment and that "...the Army chaplaincy, as presently constituted, inhibited the free exercise rights of some soldiers because of the

absence of other than Christian and Jewish Army chaplains.”²³ The proceedings for this suit, filed as *Katcoff v. Marsh*, carried on over a number of years. The case was not finally dismissed until 1986. The court settled in favor of the Department of the Army and, by proxy, the Army Chaplaincy, yet there were still a number of things left unresolved by the court findings.

The key complaint presented by Joel Katcoff and Allen Wieder was that the mere existence of a chaplaincy, funded and supported by the U.S. government, constituted the sanctioning of a state religion. They claimed this violated the First Amendment clause stating “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;”²⁴ They argued that the only way to avoid First Amendment entanglements was to use civilian clergy in place of military chaplains. In response, a team of lawyers for the defense, which included Rabbi Israel Drazin, an Army chaplain who also held a law degree, presented a compelling argument that civilian clergy were unable to fulfill the requirements. They demonstrated something which the plaintiffs failed to take into account: “that civilian clergy could not function on the battlefield...civilians, because they lacked the training, experience, acceptance, and knowledge of the military, would be unable to provide the necessary religious services.”²⁵

The crux of the case weighed on the balance between two phrases in the First Amendment: “no law respecting an establishment of religion” and “[no law] prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” Since chaplains, regardless of faith background, are expected to either perform or provide religious services for all Soldiers and their families²⁶, the plaintiffs could not successfully argue that paying for and supporting

clergy from specific denominations constituted the establishment of religion. On the other hand, the lawyers for the defense were able to convince the judges that removing the chaplaincy from existence would in fact place the free exercise of religion in jeopardy. Drazin and Currey, in their book about this landmark case, describe the basis for the Second Circuit Court decision which was given in 1985.

The judges described the primary function of military chaplains as the engagement 'in activities designed to meet the religious needs of a pluralistic military community.' They noted that soldiers had unique needs....The decision spoke of the 'mobile, deployable nature' of the military, the special and serious stresses encountered by its members, the separation, loneliness, strange surroundings, fears, financial hardships, and family problems faced by soldiers. In providing chaplains, 'the Army has proceeded on the premise that having uprooted the soldiers from their natural habitats it owes them a duty to satisfy their Free Exercise rights, especially since the failure to do so would diminish morale, thereby weakening our national defense.'²⁷

The court suggested that there may be some gray areas regarding the establishment clause, but the need for soldiers to be afforded the free exercise of religion took precedence. It is also important to note that the court described the environment as a "pluralistic military community." Both of these concepts, together, constitute the primary legal basis for the existence of the chaplaincy today: a chaplain's primary purpose is to ensure that, in the pluralistic military community, all soldiers have the opportunity to practice their First Amendment right to the free exercise of religion. Unfortunately, this stated purpose for the chaplaincy is also its Achilles' heel. Some years after the court case, Chaplain Drazin issued a warning about what he considered to be the greatest threat to the chaplaincy. "The chaplaincy could be destroyed...by its own members if they were insensitive to soldiers' free exercise rights." He felt that "free exercise was the *raison d'être* of the chaplaincy, without which it had neither rationale nor constitutional basis."²⁸

In summary, the court was willing to overlook what might possibly be a threat to the establishment clause in order to ensure the free exercise for soldiers. Therefore, chaplains must embrace pluralism²⁹ or, at a bare minimum, tolerate it. If they do not support soldiers and their families in pursuit of their chosen faith practices, they threaten the very legal basis for their existence.

It is precisely this requirement to provide religious support in a pluralistic environment that led the Department of Defense to conclude that chaplain services are “inherently governmental.”³⁰ As mentioned previously, Katcoff and Wieder argued that civilian clergy could be hired to work in the place of military chaplains, but the federal government recognized that this would not be sufficient to meet the needs. Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 1100.22 explains that while “the Department of Defense can and does contract for religious ministry from individual faiths, the Department of Defense cannot contract for the type of religious pluralism required in operational environments.”³¹

Over the years since *Katcoff v. Marsh*, a number of incidents have drawn attention to some of the gray areas in the law.³² In 2008, two professors from George Washington University Law School noted that “constitutional issues involving the military chaplaincy have progressed from a low simmer to a rolling boil.”³³ In their article “Instruments of Accommodation: The Military Chaplaincy and the Constitution,” Ira Lupu and Robert Tuttle reviewed these challenges and concluded that when viewed “through the legal prism of permissive accommodation,” the military chaplaincy’s “basic features appear to fit comfortably within our constitutional tradition.”³⁴ They did, however, have some real concern about certain specific practices within the chaplaincy.

Like Drazin, Lupu and Tuttle were worried about chaplain insensitivity to soldiers' free exercise rights, especially pertaining to the act of proselytization. They noted that while chaplains (or any officers, for that matter) are forbidden to harass soldiers about their faith choices, or use non-religious events as an opportunity to proselytize, "chaplains may argue that proselytizing is an essential part of their ministry, and—as long as performed in a non-coercive manner—is fully consistent with service members' rights of free exercise."³⁵ The chaplaincy has resolved this particular dilemma by defining proselytizing and evangelizing as two separate and distinct activities, one which is expressly forbidden (proselytizing) and the other which is not (evangelizing.) This topic will be explored further at another point in this paper.

Beyond the issue of improper proselytizing, Lupu and Tuttle expressed concern that something as simple as pastoral care, inappropriately provided by chaplains in combat zones, might tread on the rights of soldiers.

In a remote area, the service member who wishes to confide in a chaplain is not likely to have a great deal of choice; unless he waits for the occasional visit of clergy of different faiths to provide formal worship, the service member will have contact only with the unit's assigned chaplain....The temporal and spatial likelihood of grave physical danger, the absence of a service member's choice of particular faith affiliation on the part of the chaplain, and the lack of formal supervision cumulatively present a significant risk of unwanted religious persuasion in this context.³⁶

They suggested that the best way to avoid this "unwanted religious persuasion" is to develop standards that "prohibit pro-active, chaplain-initiated religious persuasion by chaplains in any context in which service members might be regarded as both vulnerable and deprived of adequate choice of religious confidant."³⁷ This approach seems rather heavy-handed and legalistic. It would so tie the hands of chaplains that they could hardly speak to soldiers without fear of a legal complaint. There may be a

more moderate approach that both buffers soldiers from unwanted religious counsel yet keeps the full range of skill and talent offered by the chaplain available to them.

Pluralism Challenges in the Chaplaincy

Following *Katcoff v. Marsh*, the Army chaplaincy paid more attention to the need for pluralism. However, this emphasis on pluralism does not change the obligation for chaplains to remain faithful to the tenets of their faith groups. There will always remain a delicate balance between the two. In her book *American Evangelicals and the U.S. Military*, Loveland suggests that the chaplaincy has been fairly successful in maintaining this balance by encouraging both loyalty to denomination and cooperative pluralism.³⁸ Army field manuals stress that the spiritual authority for chaplains is derived from their religious organization, not from the military, and they perform chaplain duties within the principles of their respective churches.³⁹ But just as chaplains are required to uphold the principles of the religious communities they represent, they also work within a government institution with a diversity of faith groups. So the churches must ensure that the clergypersons they endorsed for the chaplaincy can manage activities in the pluralistic environment while remaining true to their denominations. To help establish standards and provide support for this endorsement process, an organization was formed in 1982 bringing together official representatives of all the faith communities who endorse clergypersons for service as chaplains in the armed forces. Known as the National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces (NCMAF), they developed a code of ethics that recognizes both the direction given by an ecclesiastical endorser and the need to respect the beliefs and practices of others.⁴⁰

Unfortunately, not all chaplains have fully embraced the concept of cooperative pluralism. This is not surprising, considering the emphasis some Christian religious

bodies place on conversion of those who are not Christian. A fundamentalist chaplain may feel that his or her personal responsibility to share the Gospel of Jesus Christ with non-Christians conflicts with the concept of religious tolerance and inter-religious dialogue.⁴¹ Loveland described a situation in the 1990s, when evangelical chaplains felt tension between their beliefs and the system of cooperative pluralism. In an article for *Military Chaplains' Review*, one chaplain recalled witnessing “handwringing sessions when our most orthodox brethren [sic] have lamented the possibility of Buddhist, Baha’i, Hare Krishna, or even—Heaven forbid!—‘Moonie’ Chaplains entering our well-paid inner sanctum.”⁴² Another chaplain related experiences of interaction with fundamentalist chaplains who, despite the expectation of cooperative pluralism, treated him as if he were subversive and immoral because his beliefs did not match theirs.⁴³ Chaplain Thomas Schreck, a Unitarian Universalist chaplain, recounts conversations in which he was asked “How can you wear a cross?” and, “How can you be a chaplain?” and, “Don’t you know you’ll die in your sins?” “Based upon his experiences, Schreck questioned whether most military personnel truly accepted religious pluralism in the armed forces. ‘If many members of our community cannot deal with chaplains who express their religious humanism, how shall they ever deal with chaplains who worship Buddha, Baha’u’llah, or the Guru Maharaji?’ he asked.”⁴⁴

Chaplain Schreck’s prediction that many chaplains would have difficulty accepting someone whose faith practices are very different from the Christian tradition was put to the test in 1994, when the Army accessioned the first Muslim chaplain into the armed forces.⁴⁵ According to one observer, when Chaplain Abdul-Rasheed Muhammad came to Ft. Bragg for his first assignment, he was not well received by some of the other

chaplains. A female Jewish Chaplain from that post stated that she was astonished to hear many of her Christian peers saying this new Muslim chaplain was evil, and that they would have absolutely nothing to do with him. She felt it was rather ironic that she, a Rabbi, might be the best advocate for an Imam in this first assignment!⁴⁶

As a junior chaplain on active duty, I had an eye-opening experience when I deployed with 62nd Medical Group to Somalia in 1993. Early in the deployment an officer who was a member of the Latter Day Saints⁴⁷ (LDS) made an appointment to see me and asked, very hesitantly, if arrangements could be made for an LDS service. I was amazed at how wary this company grade officer was in making this request, and asked her why she was so reluctant to speak with me. She explained that in the past when she or her LDS peers had approached a chaplain for help they had been strongly rebuffed. They felt as if they were *persona non grata*, and could expect no help from chaplains who did not share the same faith practices. I was appalled that their experience had been one of such intolerance. Also, during the same deployment, I was frustrated by senior chaplains who were unwilling to assist her in finding a space for two Muslim soldiers to pray. I finally resorted to meeting with the Pakistani Liaison Officer who offered the soldiers the opportunity to pray with his troops.

The LDS or Muslim issues might seem rather tame today, considering some of the diversity challenges that have arisen since that time. The first Wiccan⁴⁸ Open Circle⁴⁹ rituals on a military installation were held at Ft. Hood, Texas, in 1997. These meetings created a firestorm of response in the press, and the organization endured over “two years of political attacks from clergy, conservative lobbying groups, and members of Congress.”⁵⁰ In the midst of this firestorm, the chaplaincy acquitted itself

quite well as an institution, standing firm on the First Amendment rights of the Fort Hood Wiccans to have a designated location on post for their rituals.⁵¹ There remain individual chaplains, however, who do not willingly protect the rights of Wiccan soldiers to practice their faith. In 2006 a chaplain serving in Balad, Iraq, considered changing his endorsement from Christian to Wiccan. His efforts stalled because his proposed endorser (the Sacred Well Congregation,) did not meet all of the DOD requirements to endorse chaplains.⁵² Once his intentions became public, many of his chaplain peers refused to interact with him and considered him a “traitor.”⁵³

One of the greatest challenges faced by a fundamentalist chaplain may be working with female chaplains. A fundamentalist Christian who believes the Bible is the inerrant authority on faith and life will typically find it difficult to accept a woman in a church leadership position. Quoting passages from Paul’s letters to the Corinthians⁵⁴ and Timothy⁵⁵, even an organization as mainstream as the Southern Baptist Convention teaches that “women are not in public worship to assume a role of authority over men lest confusion reign in the local church.” As a result, they do not support the ordination of women to leadership roles in the church.⁵⁶ Conversely, many churches support the ordination of women and endorse female clergy for the military chaplaincy. There are currently 64 women serving on active duty as Army chaplains.⁵⁷ This constitutes a dilemma for those chaplains who believe that women should not serve in positions of religious leadership. How can they serve with women who have been given this authority? As military chaplains, they must accept that in the pluralistic military community they will encounter and must work with these women. Some chaplains have managed to resolve the conflict and work quite collegially with their chaplain sisters.

Others have not. When I was in the Chaplain Basic course in 1984 I was told by some of my fundamentalist male colleagues that I should not be there. Twenty-five years later, women in the current version of the Chaplain Basic course are still enduring harassment from fundamentalist peers who tell these women they do not belong there and should leave.⁵⁸

These anecdotal situations demonstrate that within the chaplaincy there exist pockets of intolerance. That intolerance represents a lack of respect for the views of others, and a failure to embrace the pluralistic environment in which chaplains work. In a corps of approximately 1650 Army chaplains on active duty, it should not be surprising to find a few people who are intolerant of the religious views of others. While there is no indication that these problems have reached epidemic proportion, it is still an issue which cannot be ignored.

Even a small group of chaplains who do not support the pluralistic nature of this ministry could be a threat to the chaplaincy's ability to provide for the soldiers' free exercise of religion. In today's Army, it is not unusual for units to be deployed across a wide geographic area of operations. It is common for one chaplain to serve as the single source of religious support for a number of isolated Forward Operating Bases and Combat Outposts. If that chaplain is intolerant of the wide variety of religious beliefs represented in his or her unit, that chaplain may fail to provide for the free exercise of those soldiers. And yet, as described by Drazin, ensuring the free exercise is the primary basis for the existence of the chaplaincy.

Fortunately, there are methods in place to help ensure that religious professionals serving as chaplains are able to provide support for the wide variety of

faith groups they may encounter. But are these methods enough, or should the chaplaincy consider adjustments to policy and regulations?

Accessions, Training, and Supervision

A clergyperson who wishes to join the Army must pass through two gates in order to be accessioned as a chaplain. First, an official representative of a faith community recognized by the Armed Forces Chaplains Board must endorse the individual as fully qualified and capable of representing that faith group in the armed forces as a chaplain. Second, a board convened by the Army Chief of Chaplains must consider the prospective chaplain's file and, if he or she is deemed fit for military service, select the applicant for military service.

At this time, most communities of faith which endorse individuals for ministry in the armed forces participate in NCMAF, the consortium of endorsing agents mentioned earlier in this paper. This organization has expressed their expectations for ethical behavior by chaplains through the Code of Ethics printed in Appendix 1. The code serves as a reminder of the environment in which ministry is performed. The third statement affirms: "I understand as a chaplain in the United States Armed Forces that I will function in a pluralistic environment with chaplains of other religious bodies to provide for ministry to all military personnel and their families entrusted to my care."⁵⁹ The subsequent statement describes the proper approach by which a chaplain operates in this pluralistic environment.

I will seek to provide for pastoral care and ministry to persons of religious bodies other than my own within my area of responsibility with the same investment of myself as I give to members of my own religious body. I will work collegially with chaplains of religious bodies other than my own as together we seek to provide as full a ministry as possible to our people. I will respect the beliefs and traditions of my colleagues and those to whom I minister. When conducting services of worship that include persons of

other than my religious body, I will draw upon those beliefs, principles, and practices that we have in common.⁶⁰

As the first gatekeeper in the accessions process, endorsing agents may use this code as a baseline for the qualities they seek in chaplains from their organizations. However, there is no legal requirement for prospective chaplains to swear or affirm that they will abide by the NCMAF code. Therefore, the Chaplain Accessions Board, as the second gatekeeper in the process, requires that an applicant submit a signed statement which is similar in content to the NCMAF Code of Ethics.

While remaining faithful to my denominational beliefs and practices, I understand that, as a chaplain, I must be sensitive to religious pluralism and will provide for the free exercise of religion by military personnel, their families, and other authorized personnel served by the Army. I further understand that, while the Army places a high value on the rights of its members to observe the tenets of their respective religions, accommodation is based on military need and cannot be guaranteed at all times and in all places.⁶¹

Two further resources are available to the Chaplain Accessions Board members as they assess the ability of the applicants to minister in a pluralistic environment. The prospective chaplain must submit a one-page essay titled “Why I Want to Be An Army Chaplain.” This essay gives the board insight into the individual’s theology of ministry and purpose for applying to be a chaplain. Also, every applicant must have a personal interview with an Active Duty chaplain who holds the rank of colonel. The chaplain performing the interview is expected to assess the ability of the applicant to operate in a pluralistic environment and offer his or her insights about the prospective chaplain’s “willingness to work cooperatively with chaplains of various faith groups, ethnic backgrounds, and gender.”⁶²

Through diligent efforts of the endorsing agents and the accessions boards there should be enough data to make informed selections of Army chaplains. However, as

evidenced by the anecdotes related earlier in this paper, there are times when clergy who are not comfortable with ministry in a pluralistic environment are commissioned as chaplains. Perhaps they did not fully understand the definition of pluralism or the wide variety of faith practices they would actually encounter. Perhaps they rationalized that it would be possible to “respect” the religious views of other persons and yet make a concerted effort to convert them. For whatever reason, these chaplains will have a difficult time tolerating those with divergent beliefs, and may fail to respect the rights of their soldiers. What, then, are the options for guiding these chaplains toward appropriate behavior, or guiding them back to civilian ministry? The options include training, counseling, mentoring, and the Officer Evaluation System.

The initial entry training for chaplains provided by the United States Army Chaplain Center and School (USACHCS) is a critical step in the transformation of civilian clergypersons into military chaplains. An examination of the curriculum for the course, known as Chaplain Basic Officer Leader Course (CH-BOLC), demonstrates that USACHCS takes seriously the responsibility to prepare chaplains to operate in a pluralistic environment.⁶³ Four hours of classroom time are allotted for specific coursework on pluralism and the constitutional basis for the chaplaincy. Another twenty-two hours of classroom time focus the student on ancillary subjects with direct application to ministry in a pluralistic environment.⁶⁴ In addition, a minimum of fifteen hours are set aside for instructors to coach and mentor students in their staff groups. This training provides a solid foundation for new chaplains, and they should graduate from their CH-BOLC course with an appreciation for their role in providing for the free exercise of religion.

A fundamentalist pastor who attends CH-BOLC will find it difficult to complete the training without recognizing the potential conflict between a conviction to share the Gospel with a soldier, and that soldier's right to free exercise of religion. Some chaplains will successfully resolve the conflict by adjusting their actions to conform to the expectations for ministry in a pluralistic environment. Others may come to the realization that chaplaincy in the armed forces is not for them, and request release from military service. A third group may bury feelings of frustration with the system, and continue to operate according to their personal wishes. By their actions, this group can undermine the constitutional basis for the chaplaincy and threaten its right to exist. Chaplain supervisors⁶⁵ must identify members of this third group, counsel them, and ensure they receive proper mentoring from senior leaders.

While there is a great diversity of faith groups within the Army Chaplain Corps, most units have only one chaplain, and that chaplain cannot be all things to all people. For this reason, Army regulations state that the professional military religious leader must "perform or provide religious support that meets the spiritual and religious requirements of the unique military culture."⁶⁶ Supervisory chaplains help their subordinate chaplains understand the difference between performing and providing religious support for soldiers, and counsel them to ensure they understand the responsibility to provide religious support for all members of the unit. The supervisor can also arrange for someone not in that chaplain's rating chain to serve as a mentor, helping to guide the subordinate chaplain in the right direction. When counseling and mentoring fail, and chaplains continue to indicate by words or actions that they are incapable of providing religious support in a pluralistic environment, the Officer

Evaluation Report (OER) becomes an important tool. When there are problems, it is essential for that supervisor to provide honest input on the OER so that promotion and schools boards can make informed decisions.

Recommendations

The Army Chaplaincy takes seriously its responsibility to ensure the chaplain corps is filled with men and women dedicated to the free exercise of religion. The accessions, training, mentoring and evaluation of chaplains are very thorough, yet further steps could be taken to help the chaplaincy limit instances of religious intolerance. Following are a few recommendations for ways the chaplaincy might further strengthen its ability to support ministry in a pluralistic environment. Although the primary focus for this paper has been the Army chaplaincy, it is the Department of Defense which “establishes requirements and procedures for religious organizations to endorse religious ministry professionals for the chaplaincy.”⁶⁷ Therefore, some of the recommendations will involve policy decisions at the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The accessions process is critical to ensuring chaplains are capable of providing for the free exercise of religion. The Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) which provides guidance for the appointment of chaplains for the military departments requires that the applicant is “willing to function in a pluralistic environment,” and will “support directly and indirectly the free exercise of religion by all members of the Military Services, their family members, and other persons authorized to be served by the military chaplaincies.”⁶⁸ This statement must be stronger. The Armed Forces Chaplains Board (AFCB)⁶⁹ should recommend to the Secretary of Defense that this DoDI be amended so that there is no doubt what it means to “function in a pluralistic environment.” Include statements similar to those found in the NCMAF Code of Ethics,

such as “provide for pastoral care and ministry to persons of religious bodies other than their own” and “respect the beliefs and traditions of their colleagues.”

In the area of training, the topic of pluralism seems absent from chaplain training levels beyond initial entry. An initial scan of the curriculum for the Chaplain Captain Career Course (C4) and Chaplain Brigade Functional Area course indicates that they do not specifically address the need for pluralism.⁷⁰ However, both provide lessons on the topics of leadership, supervision, coaching and mentoring which would offer excellent opportunities to revisit pluralism and free exercise of religion. The pluralism challenges facing a chaplain supervisor at the brigade level are twofold. First, a chaplain may supervise a subordinate chaplain who is intolerant of others, and will need to recognize the problem and be aware of options for dealing with it. Second, chaplains may be supervising others who represent faith groups very different from their own. These chaplains must honestly evaluate their own responses and make sure they provide the same support and understanding for all subordinates, regardless of their faith backgrounds. Discussions about pluralism and free exercise should occur at all levels of the chaplaincy, and include the corps-wide Chaplaincy Annual Sustainment Training and the Chief of Chaplains Senior Leader Development Training.

The most difficult topic that should be addressed is the question of evangelism. As stated in the NCMAF code of ethics, chaplains and their endorsing institutions declare: “I will not proselytize from other religious bodies.” However, the code continues by adding “but I retain the right to evangelize those who are not affiliated.”⁷¹ This statement leaves a rather broad, undefined area known as “those who are not affiliated.” What is meant by this phrase? Does it mean “not affiliated with some

recognized faith group”? Perhaps it means “not affiliated with my faith group”, or even more precisely, “my specific denomination or sect”. In the absence of a definition, each chaplain is free to interpret this as he or she chooses. A fundamentalist chaplain could choose to define “not affiliated” as someone who is not already a professing Christian. This would mean that Muslim, Buddhist, or professed Atheist soldiers would all be appropriate targets for evangelism. Would an unsolicited, unwelcomed attempt to convert any of these soldiers jeopardize their rights to free exercise of religion? On the other hand, if any of the aforementioned soldiers should invite discussion or show interest in learning more about the chaplain’s faith background, is the chaplain then free to share? The challenge, therefore, is in knowing when and how it is appropriate to evangelize another soldier.

Any discussion about setting parameters for evangelism would certainly be contentious and not easily resolved. However, the discussion would be worthwhile, and should occur between the AFCB and NCMAF. The AFCB has the mission, representing OSD, to promote dialogue about religious issues with civilian organizations.⁷² The AFCB could encourage NCMAF to more explicitly define the term evangelism, and discuss appropriate parameters for this activity. They might consider adding a statement to the code of ethics like that found in the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education (ACPE) Code of Professional Ethics, which affirms: “[ACPE members] approach the religious convictions of a person, group and/or CPE student with respect and sensitivity; avoid the imposition of their theology or cultural values on those served or supervised.”⁷³ Regardless of any decision made by NCMAF, AFCB, could recommend to the

Secretary of Defense that the DoD Instruction regarding appointment of chaplains include parameters for appropriate evangelistic activities.

Conclusion

A chaplain is the Army's agent for ensuring the soldier's free exercise of religion, and as such bears a heavy responsibility. Chaplains must diligently defend their soldiers and advocate on their behalf with those who seek to restrict their Constitutional rights. This paper has established the potential conflict with the Army chaplaincy stated mission to ensure the free exercise of religion when the chaplain practices Christian fundamentalism. But are the beliefs held by a fundamentalist clergy person totally incompatible with service as an Army chaplain?

After reviewing the research and anecdotes provided in the paper, I conclude that in some, but not all cases, fundamentalist views are incompatible with service. A fundamentalist Christian holds very strong beliefs, but like every other American retains the right to the free exercise of those beliefs. However, certain tenets of fundamentalism, when taken to extreme, are incompatible with other soldiers' rights to free exercise, and therefore inappropriate for chaplains. It is not the beliefs themselves which are incompatible with chaplain service, but the practice. If by attitude and action a chaplain does not respect the rights of others, denigrates those who believe differently, and refuses to work collegially with peers, that chaplain is not capable of performing the inherently governmental functions of the chaplaincy, that of ensuring free exercise rights. In fact, that chaplain threatens the free exercise of soldiers by his or her very presence. On the other hand, when a chaplain respects the rights of others, even when their beliefs are very different, that chaplain will protect them and their right to free exercise.

Ultimately, the challenge will remain for all chaplains: to live and work in an institution in which they are required to act within the bounds of their endorsed faith group while simultaneously supporting the free exercise rights of others. For all chaplains, this means maintaining a strong sense of ethics regarding the conduct of evangelism and the assistance provided for all soldiers. More specifically, for chaplains holding fundamentalist beliefs, it means understanding that the soldier, not the chaplain, decides when the interaction between the two should be inherently religious in nature. If the chaplain can accept this, he or she will serve the soldiers well.

Endnotes

¹ U.S. Department of the Army, *Religious Support*, Army Field Manual 1-05 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, April 2003), iii.

² The focus of this paper is on the Army chaplaincy, because the regulations, standards and anecdotes from that community are most readily available to the author. However, the recommendations will be extrapolated to the Department of Defense level, since that is where policy for the chaplaincies of all services is established.

³ Gerrie ter Haar, "Religious Fundamentalism and Social Change: a comparative Inquiry" in *The Freedom to Do God's Will: Religious Fundamentalism and Social Change*, eds. Gerrie ter Haar and James J. Busuttill (London: Routledge, 2003), 2.

⁴ R. A. Torrey and others, eds., *The Fundamentals: a Testimony to the Truth*, vol. I, reprinted from 1917 ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980), 5.

⁵ Franklin Johnson, "Fallacies of the Higher Criticism," in *The Fundamentals: a Testimony to the Truth*, vol. I, eds. A. C. Dixon and others, reprinted from 1917 ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980), 55.

⁶ James Orr, "The Holy Scriptures and Modern Negations," in *The Fundamentals: a Testimony to the Truth*, vol. I, eds. A. C. Dixon and others, reprinted from 1917 ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980), 94.

⁷ Robert E. Speer, "Foreign Missions or World-Wide Evangelism," in *The Fundamentals: a Testimony to the Truth*, vol. III, eds. A. C. Dixon and others, reprinted from 1917 ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980), 231.

⁸ Heinz Streib, "The Question of Salvation and Faith-based Radicalism," in *Faith-based Radicalism: Christianity, Islam and Judaism Between Constructive Activism and Destructive*

Fanaticism, eds. Christiane Timmerman, Dirk Hutsebaut, Sara Mels, Walter Nonneman and Walter van Herck (Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 2007), 151.

⁹ Nancy T. Ammerman, "North American Protestant Fundamentalism," in *Fundamentalisms Observed*, eds. Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 54.

¹⁰ Noah Adams, "Timeline: Remembering the Scopes Monkey Trial," *All Things Considered*, July 5, 2005, linked from NPR Home Page, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4723956> (accessed February 27, 2011).

¹¹ Ammerman, "North American Protestant Fundamentalism," 28.

¹² *Ibid.*, 55.

¹³ Richard T. Antoun, *Understanding Fundamentalism: Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Movements* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2001), 2.

¹⁴ For example, National Association of Evangelicals, World Evangelical Alliance, Evangelical Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

¹⁵ "Defining Evangelicalism," linked from *Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals Home Page*, <http://isae.wheaton.edu/defining-evangelicalism/> (accessed February 27, 2011).

¹⁶ Nancy T. Ammerman, "Re-awakening a Sleeping Giant: Christian Fundamentalists in Late Twentieth-Century US Society," in *The Freedom to Do God's Will: Religious Fundamentalism and Social Change*, eds. Gerrie ter Haar and James J. Busuttil (London: Routledge, 2003), 96-97.

¹⁷ Antoun, *Understanding Fundamentalism: Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Movements*, 56.

¹⁸ "Evangelism," *Webster's New World College Dictionary*, linked from *YourDictionary*, <http://www.yourdictionary.com/evangelism> (accessed 1/16/11).

¹⁹ Anne C. Loveland, *American Evangelicals and the U.S. Military 1942-1993* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 5.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 7.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 72.

²² Ira C. Lupu and Robert W. Tuttle, "Instruments of Accommodation: The Military Chaplaincy and the Constitution", *West Virginia Law Review*, (February 2008) 90-91.

²³ Israel Drazin and Cecil B. Currey, *For God and Country: The History of a Constitutional Challenge to the Army Chaplaincy* (Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, 1995), 45.

²⁴ *U.S. Constitution*, amend. 1.

²⁵ Drazin and Currey, *For God and Country: The History of a Constitutional Challenge to the Army Chaplaincy*, 43.

²⁶ U.S. Department of the Army, *Religious Support*, 1-1.

²⁷ Drazin and Currey, *For God and Country: The History of a Constitutional Challenge to the Army Chaplaincy*, 198.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 115-116.

²⁹ Pluralism, as defined by Merriam-Webster in their online dictionary, is “a state of society in which members of diverse ethnic, racial, religious, or social groups maintain an autonomous participation in and development of their traditional culture or special interest within the confines of a common civilization,” see “pluralism,” in *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, 2008, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hacker> (accessed February 27, 2011).

³⁰ Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 defines an inherently governmental function as “a function so intimately related to the public interest as to require performance by Federal Government employees,” see John R. Luckey and Kate M. Manuel, “Inherently Governmental Functions and Department of Defense Operations: Background, Issues, and Options for Congress,” *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*, no. 7-5700 (February 1, 2010): 7.

³¹ U.S. Department of Defense, *Policy and Procedures for Determining Workforce Mix*, Department of Defense Instruction 1100.22 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, April 12, 2010), 21.

³² Examples include *Veitch v. England* in which a chaplain who was relieved from duty for publicly denigrating other religions and refusing to work collegially with his peers claimed religious discrimination, and *Goldman v. Weinberger*, where the court ruled that the military, under certain circumstances, had the right to deny a soldier his or her request for religious accommodation. See Ira C. Lupu and Robert W. Tuttle, “Instruments of Accommodation: The Military Chaplaincy and the Constitution”, *West Virginia Law Review*, (February 2008) 100, 135.

³³ Lupu and Tuttle, “Instruments of Accommodation: The Military Chaplaincy and the Constitution”, 90.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 165.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 123-124.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 163.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 165.

³⁸ Loveland, *American Evangelicals and the U.S. Military 1942-1993*, 310-311.

³⁹ Army field manual FM 16-1, which later was renamed as FM 1-05, states that “A chaplain’s call, ministry, message, ecclesiastical authority, and responsibility come from the religious organization that the chaplain represents,” see U.S. Department of the Army, *Religious Support*, Army Field Manual 1-05 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, April 2003), 1-4.

⁴⁰ National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces, *The Covenant and The Code of Ethics for Chaplains of the Armed Forces*, linked from *National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces Home Page*, <http://www.ncmaf.org/policies/codeofethics.htm> (accessed JAN 27, 2011).

⁴¹ Religious tolerance and Inter-religious dialogue are two of the topics currently taught at the U.S. Army Chaplain School in their block of instruction on pluralism.

⁴² Loveland, *American Evangelicals and the U.S. Military 1942-1993*, 304.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 314.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 315.

⁴⁵ Susanne Kappler, "Chaplain recalls path to making history," June 12, 2009, linked from *The United States Army Home Page*, <http://www.army.mil/news/2009/06/12/22584-chaplain-recalls-path-to-making-history/> (accessed October 6, 2010).

⁴⁶ This information is from a personal conversation between the author and a chaplain serving at Ft. Bragg in 1994.

⁴⁷ Some conservative Christian groups have, in the past, called the Latter Day Saints (LDS) a "cult." Recently, the Southern Baptist Convention removed the "cult" tag, but they still maintain it is not Christian, see David Van Biema, "What Is Mormonism? A Baptist Answer," *TIME*, October 24, 2007, <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1675308,00.html>, (accessed January 29, 2011)

⁴⁸ Wiccans of the Sacred Well Congregation, one of the larger organizations of Wiccan followers in the United States, describe its practice and followers in this way: "Wicca, as practiced today, is a reconstruction of ancient Pagan religions of Northern and Western Europe, with no reservations about drawing on source material of other times and other cultures. Modern Wicca or "Witchcraft" can be directly traced back to the writings of Margaret Murray, a cultural anthropologist," see "History, Development, and Philosophy of Traditional Craft Wicca (TCW)," linked from *Sacred Well Congregation Home Page*, <http://www.sacredwell.org/index.html> (accessed February 26, 2011).

⁴⁹ An "open circle" is a public meeting of Wiccan followers, open to persons of any belief system who wish to attend.

⁵⁰ Charles S. Clifton, "Fort Hood's Wiccans and the Problem of Pacifism", November 20, 2000, paper presented to the American Academy of Religion meeting, Nashville, Tennessee, <http://www.chasclifton.com/papers/hood.html> (accessed January 29, 2011)

⁵¹ Clifton, "Fort Hood's Wiccans and the Problem of Pacifism."

⁵² Alan Cooperman, "A Wiccan Army Chaplain? The Brass Wouldn't Buy it," *The Washington Post*, February 19, 2007, reprinted at http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/nationworld/2003586870_wiccan24.html (accessed October 6, 2010).

⁵³ Personal observations of the author, who was serving in Balad at the time.

⁵⁴ “Women should be silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as the law also says. If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.” I Cor. 14:34-35 (New Revised Standard Version).

⁵⁵ , “Let a woman learn in silence with full submission. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent.” 1 Tim. 2:11-12 (NRSV).

⁵⁶ Southern Baptist Convention, *Resolution On Ordination And The Role Of Women In Ministry*, June 1984, <http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/amResolution.asp?ID=1088>, (accessed January 29, 2011).

⁵⁷ U.S. Army Chaplaincy, *Strength Report* (Washington, DC: U.S. Army Office of the Chief of Chaplains, December 31, 2010).

⁵⁸ Conversation with a Chaplain-Basic Officer Leader Course Instructor from the United States Army Chaplain Center and School, December 2, 2010.

⁵⁹ National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces, *The Covenant and The Code of Ethics for Chaplains of the Armed Forces*.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ The content for the applicant statement was copied from a sample letter provided to the author on October 28, 2010 by Chaplain Karen Meeker, the Accessions Officer for the Department of the Army, Chief of Chaplains Office.

⁶² A copy of an actual shell for an applicant interview memo was provided to the author by Chaplain (Colonel) Charles D. Reese on March 1, 2011.

⁶³ Paul Jaedicke, *Chaplain Basic Officer Leader Course (CH-BOLC) Course Design Matrix / Syllabus* (Ft. Jackson, SC: U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School, October FY 2010).

⁶⁴ Courses considered by the author to have relevance to ministry in a pluralistic environment include: worship traditions, ethics, religious support planning, supervision of Distinctive Faith Group Leaders (DFGLs), privileged communication, religious accommodation, and world religions and culture.

⁶⁵ “Chaplains provide technical supervision to and serve in the rating chain of subordinate Chaplains and Chaplain Assistants,” see U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Chaplain Corps Activities*, Army Regulation 165-1 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 3, 2009), 11.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 10.

⁶⁷ U.S. Department of Defense, *Guidance for the Appointment of Chaplains for the Military Departments*, Department of Defense Instruction 1304.28 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, August 7, 2007), 1.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 3.

⁶⁹ The AFCB is the Department of Defense advisory board which makes recommendations to the Secretary of Defense on issues of religious, moral, and ethical matters related to the Military Services. Among its responsibilities are making policy recommendations regarding “protection of the free exercise of religion according to Amendment I to the Constitution of the United States” and “procurement, professional standards, requirements, training, and assignment of military chaplains.” See U.S. Department of Defense, *Armed Forces Chaplains Board*, Department of Defense Instruction 5120.08 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, August 20, 2007), 2.

⁷⁰ Lane J. Creamer, *Chaplain Captain Career Course (C4) Course Design Matrix* (Ft. Jackson, SC: U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School, November 1, 2010); Kenneth W. Bush, *Brigade Functional Area Qualification Course (Major) Course Design Matrix* (Ft. Jackson, SC: U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School, April 15, 2010).

⁷¹ National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces, *The Covenant and The Code of Ethics for Chaplains of the Armed Forces*.

⁷² U.S. Department of Defense, *Armed Forces Chaplains Board*, DoDI 5120.08, 2.

⁷³ Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, *ACPE Standards & Manuals: 2010 Standards* (Decatur, GA: Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc., 2010) 2.

