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ABSTRACT

This study explores the Jewish experience within the American military. Information sources include a review of literature, interviews with nineteen Jewish service members, and data files of officers and enlisted personnel who were on active duty as of October 2005. Data files were provided by the Defense Manpower Data Center in Monterey, California. The history of military service by persons of the Jewish faith corresponds roughly to that of persons from many other ethnic or religious groups: military service has been a patriotic calling, especially in periods of war, as well as a path during earlier times toward full assimilation into American society. This study concludes that Jewish military personnel, overall, have consistently performed well in service, given current measures of success; and, this trend is likely to continue. Further research should seek to examine additional measures of success in the military for Jewish personnel. More generally, research should examine the possible relationship between military performance and a person’s religious faith, since religion is such an important part of individual identity. This information would add to existing knowledge of the various background and demographic factors of military members that help to shape a diverse and highly effective force.
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I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Our military is a prime example of how Americans of many faiths can come together to serve and protect America, regardless of their differences.

-Anti-Defamation League
Statement to Congress

A. PEANUT BUTTER AND JELLY

“Duty again! Having duty on Thursday is never a problem,” thought the Command Duty Officer (CDO). “At least half the day the entire crew is still aboard to work, and I’ll have a full weekend to dedicate to my family.” After all non-duty personnel had left for the day the CDO did his pre-“eight o’clock reports” walk through of the warship to see that all was in order. If anything were out of place, the respective departmental duty officer would be made aware of it.

The CDO, making his way to the galley, the final destination of his tour, asked the duty Mess Specialist (MS) what was for supper. In a slow, rural North Carolina drawl, the Seaman Apprentice replied: “Pork chops or catfish, sir.” “Oy Vey,” thought the CDO, not wanting to endure another peanut-butter-and-jelly-sandwich night, replying to the MS: “Is there possibly anything else in this galley that might be available for supper?” The duty MS, with full sincerity and a desire true want to help the officer answered: “Well Sir, I can make you a ham-and-

cheese sandwich, if you like.” A hush filled the galley, followed by a chuckle from the CDO.

The mood of the CDO that night was one of humor. You see, the CDO was a Los Angeles-born Jew, who followed the laws of Kashrut. These Jewish dietary rules forbid the eating of pork products, mixing meat with dairy, and eating fish without scales. The duty MS’s well-intended attempt to assist the CDO missed the mark because he just did not know the dietary restrictions of different religious cultures. The 18-year-old MS, because of his background, had most likely never even heard about Jewish people, let alone anything of their customs and traditions.

As the CDO enjoyed his peanut-butter-and-jelly sandwich that night, he thought about the few events of anti-Semitism he had encountered in the past and of the even greater feeling of acceptance that he had in the Navy during his nine years of sea service. It was clear that this incident was a case of innocent ignorance. But, he recalled events in the past where people, who were trained as he was to work as team players, seemingly acted or said things to intentionally disrespect his culture. It was always disappointing for the CDO to witness this sort of behavior, especially in such a great service as the U.S. Navy, whose purpose is to protect the people of the United States and their constitutional rights.\(^2\) The fact is that the U.S. Navy has always benefited from capable people of all backgrounds. As for Jewish service members, sailors such as Commodore Uriah P. Levy, senior Naval officer at

---

\(^2\) The first amendment to the constitution guarantees the people of the United States freedom of religion when it states: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” U.S. Constitution, amend. 1.
the beginning of the Civil War, and Admiral Hymen G. Rickover, father of the “Nuclear Navy,” helped to build the United States Navy into the best sea service in the world. Knowing this, the CDO wondered how “his people,” fellow Jews, have influenced or been influenced by the military service to date.

B. PURPOSE OF STUDY

Although the American Jewish population is relatively small, and therefore not a group that the military’s recruitment programs would particularly target, Jews still represent an important component of the population and one that has a long history of distinguished service. Due to the small number of studies that address religion and the military, it is hoped that the present research of Jewish persons in the armed forces reveals valuable information, of use in better understanding the opportunities and challenges of population diversity.3

C. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

Chapter II provides a history of the Jewish experience in the United States military from before the founding of the nation to present day. Chapter III is a literature review on the sociological effects of religion within the military; it also includes a review on how Jewish culture in the military is examined. Chapter IV presents the religious demographic make-up of the U.S. military compared with the population of the United States; and also discusses the results of nineteen interviews of Jewish persons in the armed forces

---

military officers and enlisted personnel from all four services. Finally, Chapter V presents a summary of the results of the study, the conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
II. THE AMERICAN JEWISH MILITARY EXPERIENCE

When time came to serve their country under arms, no class of people served with more patriotism or with higher motives than the young Jews who volunteered or were drafted and went overseas with other young Americans.

- General of the Armies John Pershing4

A. HISTORY

1. 1654-1783

The experiences of Jews in America pre-date the founding of the United States. In fact, the first Jewish community was settled in the New Amsterdam colony, which is present-day New York City, in 1654. The Jewish people thrived and prospered in the communities that they inhabited. Jews were noted primarily as successful merchants and businessmen. Because they were few in number, Jews were practically invisible to bigotry,5 but not completely, they did not enjoy many of the same political and social freedoms as their fellow countrymen. “Only black people met greater discrimination in America than the Jews . . . Jews were cursed by the fact that their definition by exclusion had already been sanctioned by European culture.”6

---


5 Estimates of the Jewish population in the American colonies at the time of the Revolutionary War is approximated at 2000 out of a total population of three million colonists. Fredman and Falk, 3.

Even in the earliest days of the colonial period, Jews took an active role in the defense of America. As Freedman and Folk observed: “Before long it was commonplace to see Jews serving in the armed forces of the colonies. At the outbreak of the French and Indian War, Isaac Myers (a Jew) of New York . . . organized a company of men [for] which he was chosen Captain.” 7 During the American Revolution, Jews served predominantly on the side of the colonialists. A company, known as the “Jews’ Company,” was raised in South Carolina, and a few Jewish colonialists rose to prominence in the Colonial Army. Colonel David S. Franks, for example, was a general’s aide and member of the diplomat corps, and Lieutenant Colonel Solomon Bush was cited for valor.8

2. 1812-1865

a. The War of 1812

The War of 1812 saw the United States’ first nautical Jewish hero. Captain Jean Ordroneux was one of the most successful privateers of the entire war. Described as “‘a Jew by persuasion, a Frenchman by birth, [and] American for convenience,’” religion played no part in hindering Captain Ordroneux’s successful disruption of the British economy. In one of the war’s most notable naval battles, a night engagement, Captain Ordroneux and a crew of thirty-seven on his brig, the Prince De Neuchâtel, successfully fended off and escaped from the British frigate Endymion, with a crew at least nine-times larger than that of the Prince. This battle is noted as being one of the war’s most important naval engagements on the high seas.9

---

7 Fredman and Falk, 3.
8 Fredman and Falk, chap. 1.
b. The First General

During the Mexican-American War, David Emanuel Twiggs became the first Jewish general ranking officer in the United States Army. Brigadier General Twiggs led the United States forces into Mexico City at the head of General Winfield Scott’s Army. General Twiggs received a “brevet” (promotion for valor without the benefit of a pay increase) for heroism at the Battle of Monterrey, under the command of General Zachary Taylor. For his war service, General Twiggs was awarded two swords, one from the American Congress and one from his native state of Georgia.10

At the start of the Civil War, General Twiggs was the second-most senior-ranking officer in the American Army, with Lieutenant General Winfield Scott being the first. However, because he was “a southerner,” General Twiggs resigned his United States Army commission and, in 1861, became the first Jewish General and the most senior officer in the Confederate Army.11

c. Uriah P. Levy

If there is one officer whose experience can be said to best manifest the struggles of Jewish military personnel in America’s first century, it is Commodore Uriah P. Levy. Levy achieved his rank of Commodore on February 21, 1860, making him the first Jewish flag officer in the U.S. Navy and, at the outbreak of the Civil War, its most senior officer.

10 Fredman and Falk, 36.
Commodore Levy’s ascent in the ranks was not without turmoil; nor did it suffer from any lack of drama. As Fredman and Falk write:

When Levy was promoted to the rank of lieutenant, he found that a large group of officers in the navy [were noticeably resistant to the presence of] Jews of officer rank in the Navy. He was slighted, rebuffed, and discriminated against during most of his career. He was forced to fight a duel, and several [six] court-martials which were all reversed on appeal.12

Except for accounts of Commodore Levy’s problematic career, little is known about acts of anti-Semitism during the early days of U.S. history. This lack of information is likely due to the small numbers of Jews in the country and the even smaller number that were reportedly represented in the military at the time. The Jewish population in America grew, however, especially with the large influx of German immigrants in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. The ability of these new immigrants to blend into American society and their seclusion within communities largely made up of their fellow immigrants prevented major upheavals against them. Unlike Catholics, who were much more plentiful,14 Jewish communities were located in only a few urban centers, such as Charleston and Savannah in the South and New York and Philadelphia in the North. According to Slomovitz, “By the onset of the Civil War . . . the Jews of America were free, perhaps freer than Jews had been for centuries. America,

13 Fredman and Falk, 25-6.
with her never-ending frontiers offered innumerable economic and religious opportunity.”  

\[\textbf{d. Civil War}\]

Like other religious groups during the Civil War, American Jews were divided between the North and South. Of the estimated 100,000 to 150,000 Jews in the United States at the time, approximately 8,200 served in the armed forces of their respective regions. The exact number of Jewish participants in the American Civil War is unknown and most likely underestimated, given that neither side identified or counted soldiers according to their religious faith.\[16\]

Also like many other racial and ethnic groups, Jews organized and equipped their own volunteer units for the army, usually organized by local communities. Some older Jewish communities formed and equipped entire companies made up almost exclusively of Jewish personnel. In the South, Macon and West Point, Georgia, both sent a company of approximately one-hundred men to serve the Confederate cause, while Syracuse, New York, and Chicago did the same for the Northern war effort.\[17\]

The Chicago volunteers formed the all-Jewish Company C, “the Hebrew Company,” as part of the 82nd Illinois Volunteer Infantry Regiment, a “German Regiment.” Though this unit made up only 10 percent of the entire regiment’s soldiers, Edward S. Salomon, captain of Company C, was chosen to lead the regiment as its Colonel. Colonel Salomon was later promoted to Brigadier General, making him


\[16\] Fredman and Falk, 41.

\[17\] Korn, 116-9.
the most senior Jewish officer at the end of the War.\textsuperscript{18} This was not uncommon. On the Union side, the exploits and merit of Jewish personnel produced eight Jewish general officers and twenty-one Jewish colonels. Seven Jewish soldiers received the Medal of Honor for bravery under fire.\textsuperscript{19}

On the Confederate side, the highest ranking Jewish man was Judah P. Benjamin who, early in the war, held the position of Secretary of War. The first quartermaster general of the Confederate Army, Abraham C. Myers, was also Jewish. Until late in the war, the South did not have an award equivalent to the Union’s Medal of Honor, but accolades for valor were not uncommon. One story of heroism tells of a southern Jewish Soldier, Private Max Frauenthal, of the 16th Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, who so distinguished himself at the battle of Spotsylvania that his name became synonymous with courage in the Confederate States.\textsuperscript{20}

e. The First Rabbi Chaplains

In 1861, the 65th/5th Pennsylvania Volunteers, a combined infantry/cavalry regiment, chose Captain Michael Allen as the first “unofficial” Jewish chaplain in the service of an American Army. At the time, provisions for military chaplains required that “official” chaplains be “ordained” and “Christian.” Though elected by his regiment, Captain Allen had trained as a Jewish cantor, not as an ordained rabbi. Subsequent attacks by the Young Men’s

\textsuperscript{18} Fredman and Falk, 47.


\textsuperscript{20} Fredman and Falk, 58-62.
Christian Association led to his resignation from the Union Army. This stir caused the regiment to ask a prominent rabbi, Arnold Fischel, from New York to become the regiment chaplain. However, the secretary of war denied this request because of the “Christian” requirement, which was law. The resulting public outrage created a whirlwind of media coverage and public hearings. In July 1862, the law was amended to allow “an ordained minister of any religious denomination” to serve as chaplain, thereby making rabbis eligible.\(^\text{21}\)

The first two rabbis to be officially commissioned as chaplains in the Union Army were Jacob Frankel of Philadelphia on September 18, 1862, and Bernhard Henry Gotthelf of Louisville, Kentucky, in May 6, 1863. Both served as a hospital chaplain.\(^\text{22}\)

Brody writes in "Rabbis as Chaplains in America’s Military":

Ferdinand Leopold Sarner was the third rabbi appointed and he was the first rabbi to serve as a regimental chaplain [i.e., in a combat unit]. A native of Germany, he was elected to be the chaplain by the officers of a predominantly German regiment, the 54th New York Volunteer Regiment, the ‘Schwarze Jaeger.’ He served from April 10, 1863, through October 3, 1864. He received a discharge for medical disabilities resulting from wounds received at the Battle of Gettysburg.\(^\text{23}\)

In the South, from the onset of the war there was no law restricting the religious orientation of chaplains in the armed forces. According to Korn, “The Confederate

\(^\text{21}\) Slomovitz, chap 2.

\(^\text{22}\) Slomovitz, chap 2.

military establishment merely stipulated that they [chaplains] should be ‘clergymen.’” Although there is no record of the Confederacy ever commissioning a rabbi, or for that matter, a Catholic priest as a chaplain, history shows that Rabbi M. J. Michelbacher of Richmond, Virginia, attended unofficially to the needs of Jewish personnel of the Army of Northern Virginia. He even wrote an armed forces prayer for Jewish personnel who were unable to attend services in their areas of operation.

f. Cases of “Judaeophobia”

The most documented case of blatant anti-Semitism on either side of the Civil War was General Grant’s ill-reputed General Order Number 11, which was issued while he was commander of the Department of Tennessee. The order was an attempt to stop smuggling across the Union and Confederate lines, which was alleviating the poor economic conditions that existed in the South. The smuggling operations were a problem for the Union Forces, because they aided in supplying the enemy’s armed forces. One measure taken, according to Order No. 11, was to curtail this illicit commerce through the expulsion of all “the Jews, as a class violating every regulation of trade.” As soon as this order was published, the outcry from the public and special groups of the North led President Lincoln to command the Army to retract the order. Until then, and for some time after, no evidence indicated that General Grant (later President) acted in an anti-Semitic

---

25 For text of the prayer for, see Korn, 88-90.
26 Korn, 122. Excerpt taken from a reprint of Major General Grant’s General Order Number 11.
manner. The cause of the order is still debated today, and
the underlying question of the reasoning behind it might
never be known.27

During the Civil War, most cases of anti-Semitism
in the military were directed toward individual Jewish
people. Thus, personal attacks were usually targeted at
individuals rather than the Jewish community as a whole.
Multiple examples of isolated cases can be found of
administrative anti-Semitism and intolerance within the
army, but none of it ever amounted to anything more than
slights and slurs. Instances that did amount to something
more were usually terminated due to public outcry. For the
most part, the American military, both before and during
the Civil War, treated Jews in a more enlightened way than
did its European counterparts.28

3. 1865-1918

a. Post Civil War and the Spanish-American War

In the decades following the Civil War, the
United States saw a rise in anti-Semitism. As Korn
observes:

The Jewish community did not have a clear
consensus as to the origin of this anti-Semitism.
Many believed that it represented a continuation
of the historically stereotypical attitudes found
in Europe.29

What we do know is that the “phenomenon of Jewish
exclusion from upper-level social circles made its first

27 Korn, chap. 6, for an in-depth look at the effect and later
ramifications of “General Order Number 11” and General Grant’s record
of anti-Semitism.

28 Korn, chap. 7. In this section Korn goes into great detail about
specific cases of generals and politicians in both the Union and
Confederate armies who made statements or issued orders of an anti-
Semitic nature.

29 Slomovitz, 26-7.
appearance in the 1870s. It erupted notoriously in 1877, with the refusal of admission to the fashionable Grand Union Hotel at Sarasota Springs to Joseph Seligman.30

Charges of lack of patriotism and lack of service in the military by private citizens led to the founding of the Hebrew Union Veterans Association in 1896. Now considered the oldest veterans organization, presently named the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, it is dedicated to veterans’ rights and honors the history of Jewish Americans’ military service.31

The growing intolerance within the United States did not stop members of the Jewish community from continuing to serve with great distinction in the armed forces. In the years between the Civil War and World War I, three Medals of Honor were awarded to Jewish personnel for heroism. Two were awarded to Army soldiers during the Indian campaigns from 1865-1898, and one to a Marine during the Haitian campaign, 1915.32

When the United States entered war with Spain in 1898, Jewish personnel were there from the onset. Fifteen of the 266 crew members (six percent) who perished aboard the USS Maine when it blew up in Havana Harbor, Cuba, were Jewish. The executive officer, Commander Adolph Marix, who survived the blast and was later promoted to vice admiral,

31 Slomovitz, 29.
was also Jewish. It is estimated that approximately 5,000 of the 300,000 soldiers, sailors, and Marines who served during the Spanish American War were Jewish. The number of those in the military was statistically higher than the number within the general population of the United States. Demonstrating that, regardless of public opinion, the military would accommodate the needs of Jewish soldiers during the High Holidays, in 1898, about 4,000 furloughs were issued to Jewish personnel in the Army.  

Although Jews had clearly proven their loyalty to the country, a growing intolerance for Jews appeared within the military, mostly among the officer corp. A sample comprising the religious orientation of 1,433 Annapolis midshipmen from 1885 to 1920 showed that only “16 were Jewish.” Of these, Karsten writes, “8 graduated, but none of the 8 was still in service 5 years later . . . [This] might not have imperiled the ‘efficacy’ of the service, but the mere threat of their presence imperiled the morale of the naval aristocracy.”

Isolated incidents of intolerance and blatant anti-Semitism were becoming more ubiquitous. In one particular instance in 1915, Army Major Le Roy Eltingle authored a book, *The Psychology of War*, which was used by the Army War College. He wrote that a Jew “doesn’t know what patriotism means. . . . The soldier’s lot is hard physical work. This the Jew despises. He does not have the qualities of a good soldier.” The War Department was later ordered to remove this publication from its reading list;

---

33 Fredman and Falk, 69-71.
35 Quoted in Slomovitz, 35.
nevertheless, it underscored a general attitude that existed in the military at the time.

The military was not the only source of public animosity toward American Jews. The famous industrialist, Henry Ford, in 1915, was adamant in his belief that the 'International Jew' was the source of the world’s problems [which] led him to conduct a campaign against them in the pages of his newspaper, The Dearborn Independent [published from 1920 to 1925]. The articles in Ford’s newspaper blamed the Jews for everything from the Bolshevik Revolution and the First World War to bootlegged liquor and cheap movies.36

Today Ford’s views would appear absurd to most people; such was not the case in the 1920s. The atmosphere influencing the average American’s opinion of the Jews is evident in circulation of Henry Ford’s newspaper:

In 1919, it was distributed only in Dearborn. When the first anti-Semitic article appeared, it had a circulation of 72,000 per week. By 1922, the figure had increased to 300,000. In 1924, the Independent reached its peak with 700,000 subscribers. The largest daily newspaper in America at the time, the New York Daily News, had a circulation of only 50,000 more.37

This high circulation can also be used as a gauge to show how the average military person felt about American Jews. During the first half of the twentieth century, “the persistence of anti-Semitism in the U.S. Army, like most of American society and government, was, of course, a given.”38

37 Logsdon.
Since the military drew the bulk of its officers and enlisted men from the general population, it is understandable that anti-Semitic attitudes were likewise reflected in the nation’s military.

\textit{b. World War I}

As in other wars, World War I again showed that Jews did not shirk from service to their country. According to Brody, “Jews represented only 3.27 percent of the total population, yet they made up 5.73 percent of the country's armed forces.”\textsuperscript{39} Brody estimates that over 250,000 Jews served in the American armed forces during World War I. Most of these soldiers were from poor urban areas of the country. Most were immigrants or first-generation Americans who had migrated from central and Eastern Europe, “lands in which the Jew often lived a life of persecution, suppression, suppression,

\textbf{Figure 1. Civilians},

WW I poster by The Jewish Welfare Board.

[and] terror. . . . to find the American tradition of freedom, [and] fair play . . . No wonder they turned out in the hundreds of thousands to go to war in defense of their country."\textsuperscript{40} Of the 119 Medals of Honor awarded during the war, three were bestowed to Jewish service members.\textsuperscript{41} Additionally, 147 Distinguished Service Crosses and 982 lesser awards were received by Jewish personnel. Of the general officers serving during World War I, one Army general, one Marine Corps general, and one Navy admiral were Jewish.\textsuperscript{42}

At the onset of the United States’ entry into World War I, there had not been a rabbi chaplain in the Army since the end of the Civil War. The Navy had yet to appoint one. Until the war, the Army and Navy saw no need for a commissioned rabbi. Since the proportion of Jewish personnel was relatively small and was spread throughout the country, no practical need existed for a rabbi chaplain. Instead, the military worked with various Jewish organizations and local communities to provide Jewish soldiers and sailors with support for their religious needs.\textsuperscript{43}

At the beginning of the war, Slomovitz writes, “a few rabbis immediately enlisted in the army. Until the bill allowing additional chaplains became law in October 1917,

\textsuperscript{40} Fredman and Falk, 90-91.

\textsuperscript{41} Fredman and Falk, 79-81. The Jewish recipients of the Medal of Honor were: 1st Sgt. Sydney G. Gumpertz, Sep. 29, 1918, Bois-de-Forges, France, 33\textsuperscript{rd} ID; 1st Sgt. Benjamin Kaufman, Oct. 4, 1918, Argonne Forrest, France, 77th ID; Sgt. William Sawelson (Posthumously), Oct. 26, 1918, Grand-Pre, France, 78th ID.

\textsuperscript{42} Fredman and Falk, 69, 94-95, 100. The names of the Flag Officers are: BGen Able Davis, USA (Illinois National Guard); BGen Charles Henry Lauchheimer, USMC; and RADM Adolph Marix, USN.

\textsuperscript{43} Slomovitz, 30-34, 37-42.
they served in the enlisted ranks and filled their rabbinic roles as lay leaders." Forty-five rabbis served as chaplains in the armed forces during World War I. One rabbi, Captain Elkan Voorsanger, who was known as the “Fighting Rabbi,” would go on to receive the Purple Heart and the Croix de Guerre (the highest award France gives to foreign soldiers), and he was recommended for the army’s Distinguished Service Medal for his actions during the Argonne offensive in 1918. Of the twenty-five rabbis who served, only one was in the U.S. Navy: on October 30, 1917, Rabbi David Goldberg was commissioned as the Navy’s first Jewish chaplain.

4. 1919-1945

a. Between the Wars

In the interim years between wars, anti-Semitic propaganda increased along with the general public’s anti-Semitic mindset. The rise of Nazi fascism in Germany, with its literature showing the “inferior race,” found its way also into America. Arguably, as Slomovitz writes, “the United States military, through its Chaplain Corp, symbolized one institution that stood against anti-Semitic beliefs. The Armed Forces clergy symbolized and practiced the ideals of mutual respect and equality.” However, on other levels, and in different departments of the military, “the totalitarian succeeded in spreading and cultivating the poisonous European weed of bigotry. . . . But the good

---

44 Slomovitz, 50.
45 Slomovitz, 54-62.
47 Slomovitz, 63.
judgment of America was asserting itself even before Pearl Harbor.”\textsuperscript{48} No one in the American armed forces could deny the military way of thinking and combat innovations of the New Reich, which resulted in the stunning victories of the German Army, the Wehrmacht, in Europe.

The ascent of the Communist Party to power in the former imperial Russia was a major concern for the United States in the 1920s and 1930s. Led by Jews, such as Leon Trotsky, and based on literature by a German-Jew named Karl Marx, Communism created an undue fear and suspicion of Jews within certain government agencies. As Bendersky observed, the “MID [Military Intelligence Department] and the General Staff in Washington . . . [including] the Departments of Justice, State, and Immigration . . . these agencies were intensely engaged against a Communist and immigrant threat and . . . [between 1917 and 1927] intelligence linked Jews to both.”\textsuperscript{49} Even though institutionalized bigotries influenced the intelligence reports, “editorial commentary to these published documents treated the intelligence on Jews as individual prejudice in specific instances. It was acknowledged that one document showed MID's ‘biases and prejudices in their worst form’ . . . Anti-Semitic references were placed in the context of the declining quality of intelligence reporting or merely characterized as ‘ridiculous’ or ‘idiosyncratic in the extreme.’”\textsuperscript{50} In short, the gathering of intelligence on and the assessment of the intentions of the “international Jew” were in themselves unfounded anti-Semitism within the government.

\textsuperscript{48} Fredman and Falk, 104.
\textsuperscript{49} Bendersky, “The Absent Presence,” 7.
\textsuperscript{50} Bendersky, “The Absent Presence,” 7.
Although not official policy, these activities showed the underlying attitude of some Americans within the government.

Such suspicions of Jews were not only felt in government, but were also most likely an extension of anti-Semitism in certain sections of the American population. In 1928 the Ku Klux Klan, an organization dedicated to hating Blacks, Catholics, and Jews, held one of its largest demonstrations in the nation’s capital. An American icon at the time, Charles Lindbergh, with overt anti-Semitic sentiments, stated before World War II that “Jews, because of their narrow self-interests, were bringing the country to war.” These were just a few displays of the extremist attitudes that were prevalent during the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s.

More shocking was the opinion of one of the country’s most influential presidents, who was considered to be a hero not only to the American Jewish population but also to Jews internationally. In 1947, President Harry S Truman wrote in his diary that Jews were “very, very selfish.” Truman continued: “When they have power, physical, financial or political, neither Hitler nor Stalin has anything on them for cruelty or mistreatment to the

---


underdog." It is interesting that this president was one of the most influential forces in the creation of the state of Israel the following year. On a personal level, President Truman owned a business in the 1920s with a Jewish partner, Eddie Jacobson, who also served with him during World War I. This show that, regardless of individual relationships during this time, there was still an underlying animosity, be it large or small, toward Jews.

b. World War II

By World War II, despite the extended arm of European bigotry and the infestation of societal ignorance at home, the Jewish community in America had become as American as any other. With the entry of America into World War II, as in every other war before and since, the Jewish population also did its part. This time it was not as poor immigrants, as in prior wars, but as second- and third-generation Americans, whose recollections of past experiences in the Old World came only from their grandparents’ stories.

The full story of the Jewish experience during World War II is well beyond the scope of this thesis. In brief, as in past wars, Jews served in numbers far exceeding their statistical representation in the American population. Over 550,000 Jewish men and women joined the military. Brody writes: “Jews were 3.3 percent of the total American population but they were 4.23 percent of the Armed Forces. About 60 percent of all Jewish physicians in the

---


54 Fredman and Falk, chap. 6 through chap. 11. See this section for an in depth look at the exploits and heroism of Jewish military personnel during World War II.
United States 45 years of age and under were in service uniforms."\textsuperscript{55}

The meritorious actions and heroism of Jews in the Second World War was again notable. To summarize, three Medals of Honor were awarded to Jewish personnel, all posthumously, during the conflict.\textsuperscript{56} In one case, the award to an Army dentist, Captain Ben Louis Salomon, was not presented until May 1, 2002, almost 58 years after his heroic action. This happened, reportedly, not because he was Jewish: his commanding general wrongfully believed that, since Captain Salomon was a member of the Dental Corp, he was noncombatant, making him ineligible by the rules of the Geneva Convention for an award explicitly designated for combat valor.\textsuperscript{57} The list of lesser awards given to Jewish personnel during the war is long and impressive, with over 50,000 awards being presented. Of these, 64 were Distinguished Service Crosses; 27 were Navy Crosses, the second highest award for valor in the Army and Navy; and 1,115 were Silver Stars.\textsuperscript{58}

During World War II, 309 rabbis were commissioned, reportedly two-thirds of all the rabbis in the United States at the time. At the end of the war, "288


\textsuperscript{58} Fredman and Falk, 106.
Jewish Chaplains were on active duty: 245 in the Army, 42 in the Navy, and one in the Maritime Service.” 59 Seven Jewish chaplains died during the conflict. One of them, Chaplain (Rabbi) Alexander D. Goode, was posthumously awarded the Distinguish Service Cross for heroic actions taken after his army transport ship, the USAT Dorchester, was torpedoed in the North Atlantic.

The precise number of Jewish general and flag officers who served during World War II is difficult to determine; however, the best estimate is twenty-one. 60 Sixteen of the Jewish general officers were in the Army, three of whom at one time or another held the field command of a combat division. Most notable was Major General Maurice Rose, commanding officer of the Third Armored Division in France, 1944 and 1945. General Rose, son of a rabbi, commanded over victories that led to the allied army’s breakout at Normandy and the liberation of many French and Belgian cities. 61 Upon General Rose’s death on March 31, 1945, a war correspondent said: “the army has suffered its greatest single loss -- great as the loss of Stonewall Jackson in the Civil War. He was a perfect example of the American soldier at his best.” 62

Four Jewish Navy admirals also saw service during the war, one of whom was Admiral Ben Moreel, Chief of the

---

59 Fredman and Falk, 172-3. Chaplain Rabbi Alexander D. Goode perished with three other chaplains aboard the USAT Dorchester; Chaplain Clark V. Poling, Chaplain George L. Fox (both Protestant), and Chaplain John P. Washington (Catholic). All were assisting the solders to get off the sinking ship by giving them their own life preservers and protective gear. In the end they made the ultimate sacrifice for the good of the Solders.

60 Fredman and Falk, Chap. 9.

61 Fredman and Falk, 177-180.

62 Fredman and Falk, 181.
Bureau of Yards and Docks. When Admiral Moreel, who also organized the Navy’s famed Seabees, was promoted to full admiral in 1944, he became the highest ranking Jewish military officer up to that time.  

The U.S. Coast Guard also had a Jewish flag officer, Rear Admiral Joseph Greenspan, the first Jewish admiral ever in the history of the Coast Guard. Though not promoted to rear admiral (two stars) until April 1949, Admiral Greenspan was assigned as an escort commander in the Atlantic, a position that comes with the title Commodore. This occurred at a time when the only admiral in the Coast Guard was the commandant (who also held the rank of rear admiral).

The highest ranking Jewish Marine during World War II was Colonel Melvin Krulewitch. An enlisted veteran of World War I, Colonel Krulewitch took part in most of the Marine Corps' campaigns in the Pacific Theater of Operations. After the war, he served in the Korean Conflict. Krulewitch was promoted to major general in 1955, making him the highest ranking Jewish officer in the history of the U.S. Marine Corps. He is also credited for being the “first to fly the American flag on Japanese territory.”
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c. Other Reasons to Fight

American Jews had more reasons to fight during World War II than perhaps any other ethnic group. The atrocities against European Jews in Nazi Germany and elsewhere were not known to the American public at large until early 1945, when the United States Army started overrunning and liberating the concentration camps. But it was known from people leaving Germany that the civil rights of the Jews were stripped away. Whether the American Jews knew it or not, they were fighting to save their own people, not only at the risk of death on the battlefield, but also almost certain death if captured by the Nazis.

For the American military the most significant concentration camp was the Nazi labor camp located near the town of Berga, Germany. This was no ordinary labor camp, but a slave-labor camp where the inmates were made to build caves for an underground synthetic fuels factory. Although only 4 percent of the soldiers in the American Army were Jewish, 23 percent of the 350 American prisoners of war (POWs) sent to Berga in February 1945 were Jewish. In the three months the American POWs were interned at Berga, twenty-two of them died from either execution, the dangerous working environment, abuse, or malnutrition. On April 23, 1945, eighteen days prior to the liberation of the prisoners, forty-nine more soldiers died during a

---

69 Roger Cohen, Soldiers and Slaves: American POWs Trapped by the Nazis’ Final Gamble, -Large Print- (New York: Random House, 2005), 137.
70 Cohen, 229. Most of the POWs were recent captures during the Battle of the Bulge, December 1944 through January 1945, which were initially held and classified at Stalag IX-B. The Jews were held in barracks number 32.
71 Cohen, Chap. 6.
forced march. As Cohen recounts: "Perceived by their captors as Jewish, Jew-like, or as troublesome as Jews, until more than 20 percent of them were dead. . . . These Americans were herded like cattle to their deaths until seven days before Hitler’s decision to take his own life."  

5. 1946-Present

The end of World War II saw a great social change in the American armed forces. Monumental events such as President Truman’s order to completely integrate the armed forces for all persons, regardless of race, marked a new era for the American military. The subsequent Korean and Vietnam conflicts witnessed American Jews again doing their part in the military. In these two conflicts, a total of three Medals of Honor were awarded to Jewish personnel, two during the Vietnam conflict and one during the Korean War.

Corporal Tibor Rubin was the only Jew awarded the Medal of Honor during the Korean War. Still, he received the award 55 years after the actions that made him worthy of that honor. A Hungarian Holocaust survivor, Corporal Rubin joined the U.S. Army after his liberation in 1948. Sent to Korea, he distinguished himself in battle and, after being taken prisoner, heroically assisted other POWs with the means to survive by bravely stealing food from their captors. Corporal Rubin was “recommended . . . three times . . . for the Medal of Honor, but the paperwork was

---
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not submitted because a member of his chain of command [was] believed to have interceded because of Rubin’s religion.” 75 Similar cases had come to the attention of the public before. They are one sign that the military, like any organization, include those who perpetuate anti-Semitism, regardless of the official standing policy. Or perhaps, as Bendersky observes: “this kind of prejudice was so entrenched that cases are still coming to light of officers denying American Jewish soldiers recognition and medals for their heroic sacrifices on the battlefield.” 76

During the Cold War, another Jewish officer distinguished himself, not in combat, but as the “father of the Nuclear Navy.” Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, a Jewish immigrant from Poland, had one of the longest careers in the United States Navy, a total of 64 years. Admiral Rickover started as a midshipman at the Naval Academy and ended as the Director of the Navy’s Nuclear Propulsion Program, a position he held for 33 consecutive years. He is credited as being the driving force behind the modern nuclear Navy, and the person most responsible for making it one of the military’s most elite and professional communities. To Rickover’s credit, as well, the U.S. Navy boasts having the best safety record of any nuclear power program in the world. 77

75 The America’s Intelligence Wire, "Jewish veteran receives Medal of Honor after 55-year wait," September 23, 2005, InfoTrac OneFile, via Monterey Public Library.
76 Joseph W. Bendersky, "The Absent Presence."
B. CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

1. Recent Notable Achievements

Following in the footsteps of Commodore Levy and Admiral Rickover, American Jews continue to achieve high rank in the military. One of the most recent and noteworthy appointments is that of Admiral Jeremy “Mike” Boorda as the Chief of Naval Operations (the head of the U.S. Navy) in 1994, making him the highest ranking Jewish officer in the history of the United States military. This was the first time a Jewish officer had been put in charge of one of the U.S. armed forces. Admiral Boorda’s career is remarkable in many respects. Said to be “a sailor's sailor,” Admiral Boorda was “the first seaman recruit to become the Chief of Naval Operations [CNO].”\(^\text{78}\) He was also the only officer-candidacy-school (OCS) graduate to be appointed to the position of CNO (Admiral Vern Clark, appointed in 2000, became the second OCS graduate to be CNO), a job that, until then, had always been held by a Naval Academy graduate.\(^\text{79}\)

2. Current Issues

As in the past, the military continues to encounter groups and individuals that who intolerant of Jews in the military. Reassuringly, a 2005 survey conducted by the Anti-Defamation League indicates that “Anti-Semitic propensities” have declined to a level of 14 percent of the


American public. This is a drop from the 2002 level of 17 percent and the 1992 level of 20 percent.\textsuperscript{80} Sadly, to the contrary, the report also shows a continuing high level of anti-Semitism by African Americans--36 percent--and a drastic increase in anti-Semitic propensity by Hispanics, 29 percent, especially among those born outside the United States, at 35 percent.\textsuperscript{81} Statistically, the American Hispanic community is "one of the fastest growing segments in America."\textsuperscript{82} It is also a group that, as it grows, will become more apt to join the military as a means to gain acceptance as American citizens.\textsuperscript{83} On this note, since the 1970s, when the military suffered from severely bad racial relations, the armed services have taken the initiative to better understand the multicultural nature of the American populace. Indeed, the U.S. military vigorously pursues equal opportunity at all levels, and prosecutes individuals who act on bigotries or belong to hate groups.\textsuperscript{84}

Arguably, the biggest showing of any recent form of anti-Semitism in the U.S. military has come from individuals rather than organized groups. Today, the military is doing more for Jewish military personnel and those of other minority affiliations than ever before. For

\textsuperscript{80} Anti-Deformation League, \textit{American Attitudes Towards Jews in America}. The Marttila Communications Group (New York: ADL, 2005), slide 5.

\textsuperscript{81} Anti-Deformation League, "American Attitudes," 18-19.


\textsuperscript{83} Beth J. Asch, et al., \textit{What Factors Affect the Military Enlistment of Hispanic Youth? A Look at Enlistment Qualifications} (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, 2005), 5-6.

example, since the mid-1990s, Jewish personnel have a choice of kosher field rations, or Meals Ready to Eat. Previously, kosher field rations could only be created by the ingenuity of the person desiring them.\textsuperscript{85}

Regardless of the military’s efforts, recent events at the U.S. Air Force Academy show that one form of discrimination, religious insensitivity, still exists in the military. A survey conducted at the Academy in the autumn of 2004 revealed that “32 percent of non-Christian cadets said Christian cadets were given preferential treatment.” This practice was reinforced when “the football coach hung a banner in the locker room that read ‘I am a member of Team Jesus Christ.’” The Academy, after members protested, ordered the coach to immediately remove the banner.\textsuperscript{86} These events resulted in lawsuits against the Academy on the grounds that senior officers and administrators were “looking the other way” when cadet leaders exerted their authority to “evangelize the unchurched.”\textsuperscript{87} In a recent speech, the superintendent of the Air Force Academy conveyed the general opinion of the military when he stated: “If you marginalize a certain part of your team, if you discriminate against a certain part of your team . . . you are not going to have good order and discipline. And when you go into combat you likely will have problems.” The general finished his speech by


specifying the Academy’s intentions to alleviate the problem through training and education, but “More importantly . . . reaffirming . . . what are the rules of conduct.”

Jewish Americans continue to serve in the armed forces, mainly because they are Americans. Regardless of the situation at the Air Force Academy, the experiences of modern Jewish personnel serving in the military seem to say that religious intolerance is not a major factor. As one twenty-year Jewish army colonel said: “We do not have ‘Jews’ in the military. Rather, we have ‘patriotic Americans serving in the military, some of whom are Jewish.’” The colonel went on to claim that “anti-Semitism in the military . . . is non-existent.”

Whether adversity exists in the military or not, Jewish Americans continue to serve in their nation’s armed forces. A primary objective of the present study is to ascertain if there is any credence to the claim that “one could not make soldiers out of Jews . . . [because] they neither could, nor would, bear their share of national defense.” Conversely, the study seeks to also explore the notion that being Jewish actually makes a person even more adaptable to military service.

89 Howard J. Leavitt, Footsteps of David: Common Roots, Uncommon Valor (Bloomington, IN: First Book Library, 2003), 475-76.
III. SOCIOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Intrinsically there are no more patriotic men to be found in the country than those who claim to be of Hebrew descent.

- MGen. Oliver O. Howard, Union Army.91

A. THE STUDY OF RELIGIOUS IDENTITY IN AMERICA

1. Thesis Hypothesis

Is it possible to explore the cultural identity of a religion as it pertains to an ethnic group within the United States? This study assumes that identifying such a culture is not only possible, but instructive. Further the study explores whether persons of the Jewish faith performs any differently than others within the United States military.

2. Method of Studying Social Groups

In many ways, the comprehensive study of religion in America is relatively recent. Two distinct fields of interest have emerged within the past hundred years or so: the theology of religions in the United States and the sociological or psychological dimensions of these religions.92 A researcher could find a great deal of theological information to support any argument as to why a religious sect would support or condemn a career in the military. Arguably, a religious sect’s theological view of

91 Quoted in Fredman and Falk, 42. Quote is taken from Major General Oliver O. Howard, who served with distinction as a Union corps commander in the Army of the Potomac and later the Commander of the Army of Tennessee during Sherman’s march to the sea.

the military would also have a profound effect on the sociological characteristics of that same religious group. For the purpose of this thesis, religion is examined from a social and psychological perspective as a subculture in the United States.

As Albert et al. observe: “It is because identity is problematic—and yet so critical to how and what one values, thinks, feels, and does in all social domains, including organizations—that the dynamic of organization needs to be better understood.”93 Military and religious groups are no exception. A number of sociological studies have looked at the relationship between organized religions and the military. These studies provide a basis for examining the intersection of religious cultures in the United States with the military.

Some religious groups define their position on war on a purely theological basis. Certain groups, such as the Quakers and the Amish, take a staunch pacifistic stance against war. Other religious groups have an institutionalized view of warfare, such as a Jihad, where their rules and codes define how to conduct war.94 Both the military and religious groups base their culture partly on historical factors and partly on adaptations from other social and economic influences. Military organizations and religious groups both have a certain set of beliefs and


sociological traits. But, unlike religious organizations, the military is less philosophically based and strongly founded on a political perspective. This essential difference suggests that the two groups be compared using a sociological framework.

a. Religion and Nationalism

For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that most religious groups can be defined by sociological traits connected to their religious beliefs. This means "that the motive force in religious influence is a 'within-the-individual' drive for consonance between religious beliefs and behavior in other areas of life."95 In other words, when an individual accepts a certain religion, whether by birth or a conversion, that person also accepts the cultural identity of the religion, that is, all of the religion’s aspects of thought, behavior, and tradition. These aspects, in turn, help to sculpt the personality of the individual, to an extent, to fit with the "'normative structure" of one’s chosen religion.

Seul argues that "the well-springs of national identity are more profound than are those associated with religion."96 Seul also points out that national identification normally takes precedence over religious association when a "nation is self-conscious and self-defining [and] where an [non-national] ethnic group is not."97 Examples of countries where nationalism takes

97 Seul, 565.
precedence over religion would include those who have an established national religion, thus incorporating religion into the national identity, such as Poland and Catholicism, or a country that has a national cultural grouping, such as an ancestral tribal link. Seul’s point would also pertain to countries that adopt a form of government, such as Communism, in which religion is expected to play no part in the lives of the people.

b. Religion as Ethnicity

The United States is a nation with a great diversity of religious and ethnic traditions, not a homogeneous nation characterized by one culture. Although groups from multiple religious denominations exist within the United States, some scholars, such as White, suggest that “religion has no real differentiating impact in the contemporary United States--that there is no religious factor operating today.” 98 But, White contends that this “diagnosis is too sweeping. We do, in fact, have some fairly well-established correlations between religion and secular behavior--particularly political behavior.” 99 This argument then suggests that religion in the United States has some sort of ethnic property driving it to maintain an interest in national politics. The position could be carried a step farther to suggest that these religious-oriented ethnic traits could then be quantified to describe a group of American citizens.

Ethnicity, is defined as a social organization bonded by “common historical origins and which may also

98 White, 24.
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include shared culture [and] religion."100 Hammond and Warner elaborate on the role that religion plays in ethnicity in the United States, and that most Americans trace their ethnicity through a geographical location. “Such beliefs need not be taken literally, of course, especially in the case of such diaspora peoples as Jews and Armenians or in the case of a new ethnic group such as Mormons. . . . In other words, what matters is the belief not the actuality.”101 From this, we might infer that the ethnicity of a person is based more on his or her personal opinion of identity than on ancestry or one’s origins. A person’s own perception of ethnicity is a powerful factor for defining religious groups as being ethnic.

Others offer a similar view on religious preference being more racial than simply an orientation. Alba, for example, states that “there is general recognition that a number of characteristics appear as hallmarks of ethnicity . . . language, religion, foods, traditions, folklore, [and] music . . . There is controversy over whether race should be viewed as a form of ethnicity.” But, in the definition of religion, Alba argues that “‘race’ should . . . [be viewed as a] social classification used by members of society.”102 Hence, his definition of race is similar to that of an ethnic group. Pitchford supports this notion, stating that “while race


may lack biological significance, it does have tremendous social significance. . . . 'If men defined situations as real, they are real in their consequences.’. . . . Racial meanings are meaningful because we attach meaning to them.” Pitchford goes on to explore the success of Jewish and Japanese cultures in America in the same manner, even though one group is defined by its geographical background and the other by its religious orientation. She concludes that “cultural differences between groups can be identified. . . . [that] the current trend in sociology is to explain differences in the success of racial and ethnic groups in terms of the economic and political resources by those groups.”103 In essence, this supports the claim that ethnicity is defined by any bond, religious, genetic origin, etc., that unites people to be active economically and politically as a group. This notion also legitimizes exploring religious groups as sociologically ethnic groups.

Further support for valuing religious identity as a cultural characteristic is a study by Hammond and Warner, which observes that “virtually everywhere ethnicity and religion are related, it must be acknowledged that this relationship takes several forms.”104 The one form that would apply to this study of Jewish culture is that “religion is the major foundation of ethnicity; examples include the Amish, Hutterites, Jews, and Mormons . . . and if the religious identity is denied, so is the ethnic identity.”105 This supports the view that people who accept

104 Hammond and Warner, 58-59.
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a religion apply the ethnicity personally. Further, converts are as much a part of the religious cultural group as are those who were born into it and continue to be part of the religion. About this, Seul concludes that, for the individual, “religion frequently serves the identity impulse more powerfully and comprehensively than other repositories of cultural meaning can do.”

**c. The Military as a Study of Culture**

As Burk writes, “Sociology formed no tradition based on the study of military institutions and war and their effects on society until after the Second World War.” A pioneer in this in the field is “Morris Janowitz who is commonly believed, with good reason, to have founded ‘military sociology.’” The socio-military discipline was created to help people better understand the relationship between the military and society. This was especially important after World War II, when approximately 13 percent of the total population of the United States was in the military. Janowitz’s organization, the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, founded in 1960, became the foremost institution dedicated to studying the
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“military profession and military institution and their relation to society.”\textsuperscript{110}

Other noted scholars on social-military affairs, such as Moskos, contend that military sociology is “somewhat of an anomaly in the sociological discipline. . . . Sociologists of the armed forces have long relied on the work of other students of the military in such established and allied disciplines as political sciences and history. . . . Few substantive areas in sociology have such a diffused consistency as does the study of armed forces and society.”\textsuperscript{111} Thus, some may contend that the sociological study of the military is just as complicated as, say, the study of religion, each with a vast number of perspectives.

The military is its own culture within America. To simplify the sociological aspect, the military’s culture is chiefly a derivative of the rules drafted in the Uniform Code of Military Justice and each service’s own governing regulations. These documents clearly define the role an individual must play while in the service of the country and, in effect, outline the explicit culture of the military service. In addition to the overt cultural norms of the military generally, each service also has its institutionally ingrained subculture.

Each of the military services (Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard) has its own history, traditions, language, customs, rivalries, and biases (biases in the sense of inter-service and intra-service rivalries). In his study of naval reserve officers during

\textsuperscript{110} Burk, 180-181.

World War II, Roland L. Warren found that the naval officer candidate had “come to accept the traditional naval ‘write off’ to the Marine Corps . . . ‘Marines are always in the way!’ And as for the Army: ‘What did they ever do?’”

Even without taking into account civil influences, the military is a very diverse culture. Warren points out a number of ways people are categorized within the service. An obvious differentiation exists between officers and enlisted personnel, in terms of their responsibilities and privileges, but subcultures can also be found within these two groups. For example, in the officer corps, along with a person’s rank, members are also classified as an Academy graduate or not. Attitudes for both groups might be rather strained or unsubstantial, but cliques clearly exist between the two groups.

Enlisted personnel are often seen to possess a certain technical expertise on the level of ability associated with their rank. For example, the Navy expression, “Ask the Chief,” implies that the most knowledgeable person is one at the rank of chief petty officer or above, whereas the hardest worker is always assumed to be a second class petty officer. Specific military duties also carry a flavor of individuals’ personal characteristics, such as their cognitive abilities, demeanor, or general attitude. Even certain units and ships are stereotyped based on their historical performance or rivalries.

---

113 Warren, 207-208.
114 Warren, 209.
B. U.S. MILITARY AND RELIGION

Unlike other cultures that people are born into or must learn about on their own, the military has a long-established form of training to indoctrinate the individual into the organizational culture. The training is designed not only to build the needed physical attributes, but also to mold the mind of the individuals so that they will conform to the military identity and the organization’s norms. This is not “brainwashing,” for a person’s inherited cultural characteristics and beliefs prior to joining the military still prevail. Nonetheless, the individual is molded to work as part of a team. Although individuals from any and all religious affiliations can become functional members of the military, one must ask if persons from certain religious groups might be more likely to succeed in the military. More specifically, do military members belonging to particular religious groups have more successful careers than others with different or no religious backgrounds?

1. The Military’s Policy on Religion

In America’s pluralistic society, religious categorization is no longer a common practice. This “hands off” attitude follows the nation’s constitutional separation of church and state as well as its origin as a refuge for persons seeking freedom from religious persecution. Religious preferences of individuals are identified by the military, although this practice is said to be primarily for meeting the needs of the service.
The Army, Air Force and Marine Corps assign religious preference to all personnel. But the Navy, for "legal reasons," only collects data on the religious preferences of enlisted personnel. Chaplains in the Navy are given a job-specification code to categorize them according to the respective religions in which they are ordained. The Coast Guard does not identify service members' religious orientation, because this service adheres to guidance of the Department of Homeland Security, not the Department of Defense (DoD). The Coast Guard also does not have a chaplain corps; chaplains are assigned to the Coast Guard from the Navy. If a member of the Coast Guard is not based in a U.S. region that can accommodate his or her religious needs, the member will most likely be in proximity to other military units that can.

To facilitate the religious needs of individual service members, each service branch is responsible for regulating the use of chaplains within its respective service. All appointments fall under the guidance of DoD Directive 1304.19, which states that the purpose of a military chaplain is to "minister to personnel of their own faith group, and facilitate ministries appropriate to the

---

115 Specific religious needs that will be met for service members are delineated in U.S. Department of Defense, "Accommodation of Religious Practices Within the Military Services," DOD Directive 1300.17, February 3, 1988, paragraph 3.2.

116 Phone interview conducted with Commander (Rabbi) Maurice Kaprow, USN, CHC, on October 24, 2005.

117 Information is based on data provided by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), Monterey, California, Service Personnel Snapshot, October 2005, and through inquiries to the DMDC Naval Representative on December 21, 2005.

Today's U.S. military is dedicated to the notion of diversity and religious tolerance. This could not be made any clearer than in DoD's Equal Opportunity Directive, which states as follows:

Service members shall be evaluated only on individual merit, fitness, and capability. Unlawful discrimination against persons or groups based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin is contrary to good order and discipline and is counterproductive to combat readiness and mission accomplishment. Unlawful discrimination shall not be condoned.120

---

120 U.S. Department of Defense, "Department of Defense Military Equal
One can also see the military’s acceptance of a pluralistic society in the Veterans Administration’s standardized headstone markers. Figure 2 Illustrates a few of the “Emblems of Belief” available for government headstones. This also demonstrates the military’s stance on the issue of religion. Eighteen other symbols, including atheism, are listed but not shown.

2. Study in the Religious Sociology of the Military

According to Armor, “a national military force defends the interests of an entire country and entails the risk of casualties. This obligation should be shared uniformly by all citizens.”¹²¹ This means the military should include minorities and the majority from all ethnic and religious groups. Despite the importance of religion as a personal identifier, barely any studies have focused on the propensity for individuals from different religious groups to serve or succeed in the military.

The military, as an institution, does not harbor animosity toward individuals of any faith. However, a study by Bettelheim and Janowitz just after World War II, sought to classify the source of religious bigotry in the military, and found that anti-Semitism among World War II veterans of equal experience emanated primarily from individuals’ own feelings of animosity toward many parts of society as well as their own personal feelings of low social status. The authors’ main conclusion was that, “although Army experience threw the men into new and varied

contact with Jews . . . the stereotypes applied to the service of Jews . . . in the Army proved largely an extension of the conceptions of civilian life into Army experiences."\textsuperscript{122} This finding supports the notion that anti-Semitism, or any animosity toward a minority religious group, does not flow necessarily from the military organization per se, but comes primarily from what the individual brings into service from his or her own civilian background and personal experiences.

In the past, certain events caused people to conclude that the military culture held some sort of animosity toward non-Protestants, as evidenced by perceptions of anti-Semitism and the way in which awards were distributed. One such case was that of Corporal Tibor Rubin, who was not awarded the Medal of Honor until fifty-five years after the actions that had made him worthy of that honor. Corporal Rubin was "recommended . . . three times . . . for the Medal of Honor, but the paperwork was not submitted because a member of his chain of command [was] believed to have interceded because of Rubin's religion."\textsuperscript{123} From this, we can conclude that any slight or failure of the U.S. military to promote and award members of the Jewish faith is likely based on individuals within the organization who abuse their authority and act on personal biases.

This is not to say that the military has been free of institutional discrimination. As discussed in the previous chapter, discrimination against Jews was quite prevalent.


\textsuperscript{123} America's Intelligence Wire, "Jewish veteran receives Medal of Honor after 55-year wait," September 23, 2005, InfoTrac OneFile, via Monterey Public Library.
during the first half of the twentieth century. But, in cases of suspected bigotry that are now coming to light, the military is taking actions to correct those wrongs. In 1993, for example, a military panel investigated why no African Americans received the Medal of Honor during the Second World War; as a result, seven such medals were awarded. In 1996, a military panel was formed to review awards received by Asian Americans during World War II. The purpose was to see if the awards truly represented the actions for which they were received.\footnote{Joe Mozingo, “Not Forgotten; Military: A panel is investigating whether Asian American and Filipino veterans who received medals for World War II bravery should have received higher honors,” Los Angeles Times, Mar 30, 1998, ProQuest, via Knox Library, www.nps.edu/Library.}

The U.S. military is generally recognized as a trailblazer in race relations and equal opportunity. When President Truman ordered the complete integration of the armed forces in 1948, he opened up recruitment and military occupations to all persons, regardless of their ethnic or racial background.\footnote{Charles C. Moskos, Jr., “The American Dilemma in Uniform: Race in the Armed Forces,” Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 406 (March 1973) 97.} This executive order, not requiring approval by Congress, preceded the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which made it illegal to discriminate against a person based on race, creed, or color (in effect, doing the same for the civilian population sixteen years later).\footnote{Burton Levy, “The Bureaucracy of Race: Enforcement of Civil Rights Laws and its Impact on People, Process, and Organization,” Journal of Black Studies, vol. 2, no. 1 (September 1971) 80.}

\section*{C. Karsten’s Study of Protestants and Catholics in the Military}

Only one study, conducted by Karsten in 1983, could be found that correlates religious upbringing with military service. Karsten studied various sects of Christianity that
existed at the time within the military’s officer corps. Whereas Bettelheim and Janowitz found no real animosity within the military caused by a person’s religious affiliation, Karsten discovered that, until the 1970s, religious contention was common within the officer corps. Jews were not included in the study because of the great difference between their theology and that of Catholics and Protestants and because their numbers in the 1920s were considered too insignificant to measure.

Karsten points out that “Episcopalian cadets and midshipman were disproportionately represented among those entering the service academies . . . less than 3% of the U.S. population . . . some 25% of the Naval Academy midshipmen in the early twentieth century, and 11% of the Annapolis midshipmen and West Point cadets from 1950 to 1975 were Episcopalian.” Karsten concludes that religious affiliation played a role in this, but that people brought up in more “hierarchical” religious sects, such as Episcopalian, Lutheran, or Catholic, had a higher propensity to succeed than did those of a more fundamentalist/egalitarian faiths, such as Baptists or Unitarians (see table 1).

For example, looking at the Annapolis class of 1920, 24.3 percent of the entering midshipmen were Episcopalian. Of the admirals who were part of that class, 29.4 percent had claimed to be Episcopalian when they first entered the Naval Academy; yet in 1952, 42 percent of the same group claimed to be Episcopalian.

127 Peter Karsten, “Religious Affiliation, Father’s ‘Calling’ and Successful Advancement in the U.S. Officer Corps of the Twentieth Century,” Armed Forces & Society, vol. 9, no.3 (Spring 1983) 433.

128 Peter Karsten, 433-435.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Rate (Percent)</th>
<th>More Egalitarian</th>
<th>More Hierarchic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail to Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=71)</td>
<td>(N=121)</td>
<td>(N=69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to Graduate</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Within 1st 5 years</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Within 12 years</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to Make Flag Rank</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Flag Rank</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Modified from Peter Karsten, "Religious Affiliation, Father's 'Calling' and Successful Advancement in the U.S. Officer Corps of the Twentieth Century," *Armed Forces and Society*, vol. 9, no.3 (Spring 1983) 430.

Top Number ------- percent of the row, or career event
Middle Number ---- number of N for specific box
Bottom Number ---- percent of the column, or religious affiliation
From where did the increase in Episcopalians come from? Karsten believes that the additional Episcopalians are probably converts who entered the Academy as Catholics. Midshipmen claiming to be Catholics when they entered the 1920 Academy class comprised 21 percent of the Admirals from that class, as opposed to the original class demographic of 17.8 percent Catholics, demonstrating again that having a more structured religious upbringing tends to correspond with a more successful military career. Conversely, less than half of the admirals who started their career as Catholics claimed to be part of that faith later. This means that over half of those in the 1920 class who achieved the rank of Admiral converted to a different religion, presumably Episcopalian or Lutheran, at some point along the way. This finding also shows that a Protestant affiliation was still the key to promotion, more so than Catholicism.129 Even though the hierarchical upbringing of Catholicism set the foundation for a successful career, it “was not particularly good for promotion to Admiral, and they recognized that.”

It should also be noted that, in Karsten’s study, a strong correlation exists between the success of a military officer and the occupation of one’s father (see Table 2). In his study of religious affiliation father’s occupational group was held constant. In the discussion below, this factor is examined again as it relates to the success of Jewish persons in the military.130

---

Karsten offers some useful insights into the effect of religion in the military. His findings can be applied to the variations within Jewish culture regarding success rates within the military. Indeed, the effect “ritualistic” and “hierarchical” religion on career advancement provides additional insight to understanding Jews’ potential for success in the armed forces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service-Oriented Scale</th>
<th>Most -------------------------------------</th>
<th>Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Factor</td>
<td>Military Officer (N=158)</td>
<td>Farmer (N=66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent failed to graduate</td>
<td>13.9 (22)</td>
<td>19.9 (141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent left in first 5 years</td>
<td>10.8 (17)</td>
<td>19.8 (140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent remaining 12 years,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but did not make O6</td>
<td>10.1 (16)</td>
<td>13.2 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who fail to make flag</td>
<td>57.0 (90)</td>
<td>32.4 (229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who made flag rank</td>
<td>8.2 (13)</td>
<td>14.7 (104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Peter Karsten, “Religious Affiliation, Father’s ‘Calling’ and Successful Advancement in the U.S. Officer Corps of the Twentieth Century,” *Armed Forces & Society*, vol. 9, no.3 (Spring 1983), 432.
D. THE RELATION OF AMERICAN JEWISH CULTURE TO MILITARY SUCCESS

For all faith groups, “religious beliefs are varied and subtle and do not yield easily to categorization.” 131 This certainly holds true for the American Jewish culture. As Lippy observes, “A critical issue for American Judaism became, and remains, whether Jewish identity is a matter of religion or of ethnic culture or some combination of both.” 132 As noted in this study, Jewish religion is categorized largely in terms of ethnicity.

To compare American Jewry with the military, the finite theological beliefs and traits of American Judaism are simplified into more general sociological and ethnic characteristics. Classifying Jews as an ethnic group is not a new idea, but rather a habit in America. For example, U.S. immigration laws, particularly the Johnson Act of 1924, reinforce this notion by limiting immigration by specific ethnicities; regarding of religion, Jews were the only group limited to a quota by the Johnson Act. 133 Other organizations within the United States, such as universities, also imposed limits on the number of Jews who would be admitted as students annually. 134

Unfortunately, “contemporary American Jewish studies suffer from the absence of a question on the U.S. censuses

---


pertaining to religion."\(^{135}\) To profile American Jewish culture, therefore, the present study relies on research by Jewish organizations that use small sample surveys to track trends in the larger Jewish population. Arguably, these surveys do not truly illustrate the status of the American Jewish people; however, the surveys do provide insight into the sociological and demographic trends of Jews in the United States. It is also difficult to study the experience of the American Jew in the U.S. military. Nevertheless, the present study looks at the characteristics of Jewish culture within the context of the American military.

1. **Karsten's Success Model, Based on Jewish Sects**

One approach to exploring the success of Jews in the military is to compare the different Jewish denominations using Karsten's model. This is done by classifying the three main Jewish sects and rating them on a hierarchic-egalitarian scale. Karsten used this approach in his study to determine the success rates of various Christian denominations in the U.S. military. In the order of most to least traditional and hierarchical, American Judaism is categorized as Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed.\(^{136}\) Each of these sects has found a niche in American society, with

---


established synagogues, yeshivas (Jewish schools), community centers, and rabbinical colleges.\textsuperscript{137}

According to Wuthnows, “the organization of Jewish synagogues is similar to that of many Protestant churches in the United States, [but] the Jewish perspective on religious organizations is somewhat different . . . [in that] Jews see no meaningful line of separation between ‘churchly’ purpose and other communal need, and hence Jewish organizations are not neatly divided into religious and non-religious ones.” Though Jewish culture is divided in this way, the need or desire to identify oneself as Jewish is not necessarily related to an affiliation or a particular synagogue, but can come from the individual’s association with other Jewish community groups.

It is difficult to accurately classify a person by a specific Jewish sect, since Jews tend to affiliate with almost any Jewish organization and keep as traditional a Jewish lifestyle as they see fit.\textsuperscript{138} For example, one who attends a reformed synagogue might be more compelled to have a Conservative or even an Orthodox lifestyle, but they may attend services at a particular synagogue because of its convenient location to their home. In other cases, Jews of various denominations may not even belong to a synagogue, but rather play an active role in the local Jewish Community Center. In most cases, if a classification

\textsuperscript{137} The Orthodox being the most diverse group will include all the forms of Hasidism, Haredism, Sectarianism, Ultra-Orthodoxy, Modern Orthodoxy, or Centrist Orthodoxy. Chaim I. Waxman, “From Institutional Decay to Primary Day: American Orthodox Jewry Since World War II,” American Jewish History, vol. 91, no. 3-4 (September and December 2003) 406.

according to Jewish sect needs to be made, organizations simply rely on congregational reports from various synagogues, making identification of the number in each sect relatively inaccurate.

One can find a vast variation in Jewish philosophy as to the extent that an individual should follow Jewish traditions and customs. Great variation also exists in accounts of how prevalent Jewish Talmudic laws—such as those regarding dress, diet, and worship habits—are in modern America. Consequently, it is very difficult to specify all of the many distinctions between Jewish denominations. The present study looks at only the three main sects of Judaism in the United States.\textsuperscript{139}

\textbf{a. American Orthodox Jews}

Orthodox Jews, the most traditional of the three sects, derived their theology from the early Jewish communities of Eastern Europe. As Don-Yehiya writes:

\begin{quote}
The term ‘Orthodoxy’ was created in Central Europe in the beginning of the 19th century. It was used to distinguish between those Jews who kept their commitment to the Jewish religious tradition, and Jews, like the Reformed or Conservative, who sought to make pronounced changes in religious tradition.\textsuperscript{140}
\end{quote}

Orthodox Jews are more prone to follow the traditional laws of the Talmud and are much more observant of the Jewish holidays. They would rate the highest on Karsten’s hierarchic scale, indicating that the Orthodox have the greatest chance of being the most successful in the military.

\textsuperscript{139} Lazerwitz, 363.

Traditionally, the Orthodox sect is seen as more reclusive than other Jewish sects, with members remaining mostly within their own communal structure. They have such a deep regard for Israel and Zionism that it is mistakenly assumed their loyalty to the United States is not as strong as their loyalty to Israel. Indeed, a recent (2005) Anti-Defamation League survey shows that 33 percent of the U.S. population believes that Jews are more loyal to Israel than to the United States.\textsuperscript{141} Don-Yehiya maintains that even though the “Orthodox identify with Israel and keep their attachment to traditional Judaism, they are also attached to their surrounding non-Jewish American society and polity.” He also contends that Orthodox Jews are very patriotic: the “modern Orthodox even tend to render their sense of American patriotism with a religious significance, which finds expression in their synagogues in the citing of prayers for the American state and leaders, and for the American army.”\textsuperscript{142}

None of this shows a particular tendency for Orthodox Jews to enlist or serve in the armed forces. Historically, in fact, the U.S. military has not supported the needs of the more traditional Jewish groups. This might explain why no study could be found that addressed the military service of Orthodox American Jews. However, Waxman points out that, within the past twenty years, some Orthodox American Jews have reached out to the rest of the U.S. population, including political and social organizations. According to Waxman, “Indications are that

\textsuperscript{142} Don-Yehiya, 175.
the Haredim [an Orthodox sect] are increasingly attached to the larger society, and view living their Orthodox lifestyle as a right within it rather than being set apart from it."\textsuperscript{143} This could very well be an indication that Orthodox Jews are starting to lean more toward becoming a part of mainstream American society, and may thus have an increased propensity to join the U.S. military.

\textit{b. Reformed American Jews}

Both the Reformed and the Conservative Jewish movements are distinctly American. Both were formed to help Jews living in America identify themselves more as Americans while retaining their Jewish beliefs. This modernistic Jewish identity has rejected some of the cultural traditions that had been practiced in Europe. It also became a way for Jews to more easily assimilate into American society, which was dominated by non-Jewish faiths, while retaining their distinct Jewish identity.\textsuperscript{144}

The Reform movement, starting as early as 1824 in Charleston, South Carolina, called for a break from traditions that were alienating a new generation of American Jews from the more traditional older generation of immigrant parents. This newer generation was not familiar with the customs of the older Spanish and Portuguese traditions that marked early American Judaism. They wanted a form of Judaism that was more representative of their current life in America. The adoption of the Pittsburgh Platform of 1885 officially organized the Reform movement.

\textsuperscript{143} Waxman, "From Institutional Decay," 418.

The principal belief that separates Reformed Jews from other Jews is “the autonomy of the individual. A Reform Jew has the right to decide whether to subscribe to this particular belief or to a particular practice.”

Reform Judaism is somewhat extreme to the Jewish faith, because it is the only sect that sees Jews as members of a religion and not an ethnicity characterized by the past. The Pittsburgh Platform of 1885 stated that Reform Jews “consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community.” Clearly, “Reform Judaism is the most liberal of the major movements within Judaism today. . . [It] encouraged the examination of religion with an eye toward rationality and egalitarianism.”

c. Conservative American Jews

At the turn of the twentieth century, the Conservative movement emerged with a purpose very similar to that of the earlier Reform movement: it wanted to apply being an American to the Jewish culture. In doing so, however, the Conservatives incorporated more of the traditional ways of Judaism into the modern American experience, instead of dropping most of the older Jewish customs such as the Reform movement. This essentially made “the Conservative movement . . . a ‘halfway house’ between Reform and Orthodoxy for the majority of affiliated Jews.


who were acculturated Americans as a result of their social class and level of education." It appealed to the more conservative of the Reformed Jews, who longed to retain a more distinct Jewish identity. Conservatism also helped American Jewry to assimilate the Jewish immigrants arriving from Eastern Europe in the early 1900s.

**d. Applying Karsten’s Model**

In applying Karsten’s model to the Jewish faith, persons who were raised as Orthodox Jews would have the strongest tendency for success in the military. Persons brought up as Reformed Jews would be placed at the opposite extreme, giving them the least likelihood to succeed in the military. Though this model provides some insight into what might happen between different Jewish sects within the military, it does not indicate how members of these sects would fare among other religious groups or within the American population as a whole. Nor does it say anything about the tendency among members of these Jewish sects to join the military.

Applying Karsten’s model to the American Jewish community is purely speculative, because one cannot gauge Jewish success against everyone in the military. However, it does offer an approach to compare the possible success rates of different Jewish sects. The approach is supported by a survey in January in 2006 that looks at support for America’s war in Iraq. By findings in January 2006 Sixty percent of the Orthodox Jews surveyed said they supported the current war in Iraq; 27 percent of American Conservative Jews and 21 percent of the Reform Jews also

supported the war.\textsuperscript{149} By comparison a Gallup Poll conducted in December 2005 found that 37 percent of the American public supported the war.\textsuperscript{150} These results add some credence to the notion that differences in certain attitudes or positions are found by Jewish sect and that the likelihood of achieving success in the military might be related to whether one is Orthodox, Conservative, or Reformed.

E. JEWISH PROPENSITY TO JOIN THE MILITARY

Karsten’s model, though possibly indicating differences for success rates of American Jews in the military, does not explain or describe the likelihood of American Jews joining the military. Indications of a propensity to join the military might be found in common political beliefs, recruiting studies and the general trust in the military among the American Jewish population. These are described below.

1. Political Beliefs

A person’s political beliefs could be related to their chances for success in the military, or even their likelihood of joining the military. Thus, comparing the political beliefs of different groups could indicate whether a particular group can work well with others. At the same time the military is a notably conservative organization; the American Jewish population as a whole is


sometimes considered a rather liberal group.\textsuperscript{151} Maybe this contradictory circumstance factors into the probability of Jews serving in the U.S. military.

Historically, as Janowitz observed, the American military has taken a nonpartisan stance on national political issues. According to Janowitz, a non-partisan stance by military officers is needed so that the political party in power can operate most effectively.\textsuperscript{152} One dramatic example of the military’s nonpartisan attitude toward politics occurred in 1952 when General of the Army George Marshall was asked if he would vote in the upcoming national election. Marshall replied that he had never voted in a political election while on active duty and would not do so then.\textsuperscript{153} Marshall felt compelled to abstain from voting an otherwise private action, to affirm his nonpartisanship.

The tradition of Jewish political affiliation, however, is quite the opposite from that of the military. Cohen and Liebman argue that Jewish affiliation to political parties and ideologies is based on “historic circumstances combined with minority group interests” that make it necessary for Jews to side with the political party that is “more favorable to their group’s interests.”\textsuperscript{154} This is because the party more favorable of minorities is


considered less likely to practice any form of discrimination against American Jews.

a. The Military’s Political Preference

Political party affiliation is not readily institutionalized within the military. Still, American service members do manifest a collective political characteristic that is quite visible to the general populace. Putting political parties aside and looking solely at the personal beliefs of military individuals, Janowitz found in a 1954 survey that about two-thirds of all officers viewed themselves as politically conservative or to the right of the political spectrum. While a majority of the remaining third described themselves as relatively more liberal, a minority of this group abstained from indicating any political description.155

This trend continues even today, assuming that “Republican” translates generally into “conservative,” and “Democrat” indicates proportionately more “liberal” views. According to a poll conducted by the Military Times Media Group of active-duty personnel prior to the presidential election of 2004, 73 percent said they would vote for George W. Bush while 18 percent would vote for John Kerry.156 A CNN exit poll had the same results, but with a less dramatic separation of party affiliation. Among the veterans surveyed, Bush was chosen over Kerry by a margin of 58 percent to 41 percent.157 Of those surveyed for the

Military Times, 57 percent of military members claimed to be Republican, 12 percent said they were Democrat, and 20 percent called themselves Independent. All three polls support the argument that members of the American military tend to be politically conservative, or Republican-oriented.

b. Jewish Political Alignment

According to Kallen, “The practical political alignment of the Jews has been liberal, not radical. Traditionally, they vote on the Democratic ticket.” A 2005 American Jewish Committee survey of Jewish opinion found that Jews being surveyed took an opposite stand than the military with respect to political party affiliation. Sixteen percent of all respondents stated that they were “Republican;” 54 percent claimed to be “Democrat,” and the rest (29 percent) said they were “Independent.” Another comparison that supports the survey’s findings is the political affiliation of the U.S. Senators and Representatives. As of 2006, eleven Senators were Jewish; two of these (18 percent) were Republican, while nine (82 percent) were Democrat. Of the twenty-six Jewish U.S. Representatives, only one (4 percent) was Republican, while


c. Comparing Two Different Political Ideals

The contrast between the socio-political characteristics of the military and American Jewry suggests that service by American Jews in the nation’s military might be less likely than by members of other, more conservative religious groups. Apparently, Democrats are vastly underrepresented in the military. This might mean that military life is generally not as appealing to American Jews. Thus there may be a proportionately lower inclination for American Jews to join the military as a career or at all.

2. Study of Recruitment

Various studies have examined the issue of which segment of the American population has a greater propensity to enlist in the military. The present study relies heavily on research conducted by Bachman and his associates. This study is compared with findings on the current demographics of the American Jewish population. In their study, Bachman et al. found that men with a higher propensity to join the military “tend to come disproportionately from minority racial and ethnic groups,\footnote{In this case racial and ethnic groups refer to Blacks and Hispanics.} below-average socioeconomic backgrounds, non-suburban residence, and regions other than
the Northeast or West. They [also] tend to . . . have low college aspirations.”

Comparing these characteristics with the 2000-2001 National Jewish Population Survey and a 2005 book by Smith, *Jewish Distinctiveness in America*, it can be seen that the American Jewish population, in all those respects, does not match particularly well with the modal group drawn to military service. Racially, American Jews tend to be Caucasian, of German or Eastern European decent; further, some of the older families are descendants of France or Spain. Most of the Jewish population lives in large metropolitan areas or the surrounding suburbs. In fact, American Jews likely tend to live in the suburbs of the twelve largest U.S. cities. A little more than 53 percent of the American Jewish population lives in the suburbs or metropolitan areas. This is the highest proportion of any ethnic or religious group.

Regionally, 65 percent of the Jewish population resides in the Northeastern and the Western parts of the United States. The Northeast, the area with the lowest propensity for military service, is home to 43 percent of the Jewish population, as opposed to 19 percent of the entire U.S. population. Thus, American Jews are disproportionately represented in areas of the country that

---


tend to have residents with relatively lower interest in joining the military.

The American Jewish population is relatively well educated. “More than half of all Jewish adults (55 percent) have received a college degree, and a quarter (25 percent) have earned a graduate degree. The comparable figures for the total U.S. population are 29 percent and 6 percent.” 167 These statistics, once again, do not correspond well with the average characteristics of young men who are most interested in military service.

Socioeconomically, 5 percent of Jews in America live below the poverty level as opposed to 11 percent for the entire U.S. population. 168 This could possibly be related to the relatively higher education of American Jews. “More than 60 percent of all employed Jews are in one of the three highest-status job categories: professional/technical (41 percent), management and executive (13 percent), and business and finance (7 percent). In contrast, 46 percent of all Americans work in these three high-status areas.” 169 Though these top-three professional groupings do not imply a propensity to join the armed forces, the higher income levels would suggest again a lower interest in military service. Conversely, the occupations listed do coincide with Karsten’s study of “fathers’ occupations” and show

that, once in the military, American Jews could be expected to have a high success rate. (See Table 2.)

3. Trust in the Military

According to a 2002 poll, Jews are the least trusting of the military among any religious group. (See Table 3.) This could be related in some way to the opinions that the parents and grandparents of today’s Jewish population, who emigrated from Europe, had of the military’s role in persecuting Eastern European Jews during the last half of the nineteenth century and the first third of the twentieth century. A possible indicator of this is the rising confidence level among the Jewish population, which is almost double from what it was in the 1980 and 1990 reports.

Table 3. Percent of Americans who state they have a great deal of confidence in the Military by Religious affiliation, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Great Deal of Confidence Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentalist Protestant</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Protestant</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Protestant</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


170 Seeing as there is not clear cut fit to the categories specified in Karsten’s model and those specified in The National Jewish Population Survey, it is best that these three occupational groupings best overlap each other in the two columns of Peter Karsten’s model labeled “Banker . . .” and “Government Official . . .” In effect these columns have the first and third highest success rates, measured in percent who attain flag rank.


172 Tom W. Smith, 175.
To illustrate this notion about the Jewish population’s trust in the military, I use a family story about my father, who, while in high school, wanted to pursue a military career. My father’s parents were appalled at the thought of a Jew joining the military and lectured him about the evils of the military. When my father pointed out that my grandfather had proudly served in the Army, the justification was that my grandfather “had no choice,” because “the Germans were destroying our people.” My grandparents and great grandparents felt that the U.S. military had too much power and that it might therefore become like the “old country.”173 This could be interpreted as the older generations of Jewish immigrants and first-generation descendants of immigrants—those who have a first- or second-hand recollection of the destructive effect the military in the “old country”—pass away, we will see increasing participation by Jews in the military. Stuart Albert’s argument, that “people with more diverse backgrounds, expectations, and values increasingly populate all levels of work,”174 is thus likely to hold true for Jews in the U.S. military.

F. CONCLUSION FROM LITERATURE

The issues covered in this section suggest that, due to various social, political, and demographic characteristics, American Jews are relatively less likely to be attracted to service in the U.S. military. At the same time, Jewish youth may become more interested in military service as the years continue to separate American Jewish attitudes from the generation of American immigrants.

---

who fled religious persecution in Europe. As for the propensity for Jewish Americans to succeed once they are in the military, few studies are available to help determine whether Jews would have a higher success rate in military service, relative to other ethnic groups. This topic is further explored in the following chapters.
IV. MILITARY RELIGIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS AND INTERVIEWS WITH JEWISH MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Department [of War] has no statistics for dissemination on the subject. Religious affiliations and denominations preference are approximately the same in the Army as in the civilian life. The current strength of the Army is a fair cross-section of American life in all its phases, including religion.

-Major General C. S. Adams, Adjutant General, U.S. Army, December 5, 1941175

A. THE MILITARY’S RELIGIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS

In his essay, “Military Sociology,” Armor states that “The military is the largest single government agency and truly represents a microcosm of the larger society.”176 Nonetheless, as Tables A1 through A5 in Appendix A show; many religious denominations are underrepresented within the current military when compared with the general population of the United States. The primary reason for this may be the relatively large number of people in the military who describe themselves as having “No Religious Preference.” As of 2005, the proportion of persons in the military with no preference is 4.2 percentage points higher than found in the general population.177 (See Table A1.)

175 Fredman and Falk, 104. Quote is taken from the Adjutant General, Major General C. S. Adams, on December 5, 1941.


177 In the general civilian population of 2001 the ratio of those claiming “No Religious Preference” was 2.7 times greater then those claiming a minority (non-Christian) religion. The ratio for service members from the 2005 snapshot data is 7.4 times greater.
One problem with an overrepresented “No Preference” group is that it offers a hiding place for people who prefer to avoid religious labeling. As discussed earlier, this could be because the military is perceived as a place where Protestant denominations dominate. How exactly this perception might distort the religious affiliation demographics of the military is unknown. Presumably, this could influence persons of minority religions\textsuperscript{178} to not report their religious preference in an effort to better “fit”—socially—within the mainstream military. This, in turn, would distort the distributions of religious preference.

Arguably, in the military, persons whose religious affiliation is listed as “Unknown”\textsuperscript{179} would not affect the statistics as much as the “No Preference” variable. This theory only holds true if the reason for the “Unknown” category is due to the military’s failure to obtain the information from various random groups of people, and not because of individuals’ failure to reflect a personal preference. The religious distribution of the “Unknowns,” in the military as of October 2005 is comparable to that of the civilian population with regard to those who refuse to identify their religious affiliation. Nevertheless, some branches of the armed services, such as the Army and the Marine Corps, have a disproportionately higher number of members with “Unknown” affiliation. (See Tables A2 through A6.)

\textsuperscript{178} The thesis references to “minority religions” to indicate non-Christian religious groups.

\textsuperscript{179} For the military, the “Unknown” group not only represents those who were never queried, but also includes people who “Refused to Answer” (See Kosmin et al., American Religious Identification Survey 2001.)
B. THE MILITARY’S JEWISH POPULATION

1. Jewish Representation

Service members of the Jewish faith, as with most minority religions, are apparently underrepresented in all branches of the armed forces.\textsuperscript{180} An explanation as to why this is the case might simply be, according to a Navy rabbi, that many “Jewish kids hide” when asked to state their religious orientation.\textsuperscript{181} H. M. Kallen states that Jews are “reluctant to identify themselves as such [because military members with] Jewish names, though honored for gallantry in action, are passed over in promotions, for no other reason”\textsuperscript{182} than their being Jewish. At the same time, lower participation rates might also be due to a lower level of interest among American Jews to serve in the military. (See Chapters II and III.)

2. Estimating the Jewish Military Population

Estimating an accurate number of Jewish personnel within the military is difficult at best. As a Navy chaplain observed, “military faith group statistics are highly inaccurate. . . . Even chaplains do not look at that data seriously.”\textsuperscript{183} For the armed forces overall, 29.7 percent list their religious affiliation as either “No Preference” or “Unknown.” Eliminating persons listed as “Unknown” from the samples, the percent of those listed as

\textsuperscript{180} DMDC, Military Service Personnel Snapshot, October 2005.

\textsuperscript{181} Phone interview conducted with Commander (Rabbi) Maurice Kaprow, USN, CHC, on October 24, 2005.

\textsuperscript{182} H. M. Kallen, “National Solidarity of the Jewish Minority,” Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 223 (September 1942) 27.

\textsuperscript{183} Maurice Kaprow, email to author, February 22, 2006.
“No Preference” is 17.4 percent, which is 4.2 percentage points higher than in the general population of the United States.184 (See Table A1.)

According to data compiled by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), as of October 2005, 3,984 military personnel have identified themselves as Jewish. These data do not include naval officers or members of the Coast Guard, who are not asked to identify their religious affiliation. However, it is estimated that for these groups an additional 522 Jews serve in the military, making the total approximately 4,416 Jewish service members. This additional population is approximated by taking the proportion of Jews in the other services, by rank (officer and enlisted), and multiplying that by the number of personnel in the Naval Officer Corps and the Coast Guard. (See Table A6 and Table A7 for further details.)

C. PROFILE OF INTERVIEWEES

Nineteen Jewish members of the military were interviewed as a part of this study. The interviewees represent the four military services in the Department of Defense (DoD): Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The survey was conducted through convenience sampling from students enrolled at the Defense language Institute and the Naval Postgraduate School, and other persons suggested by interviewees. The sample included thirteen officers from a wide range of military occupations, including chaplain,

Special Forces, doctor, naval surface warfare, artillery, and logistics. Five of the six enlisted who volunteered for the study were linguists enrolled at the Defense Language Institute (DLI) in Monterey.\textsuperscript{185} Nine of the interviews were conducted in person, three were done by telephone, and the rest were conducted by e-mail. Six of the interviewees, were stationed at the Naval Postgraduate School; two were in Iraq; and six were stationed on the East Coast in different capacities.

Two of the enlisted interviewees and five of the officer interviewees were female. (See Table 4.) Two enlisted interviewees had obtained a bachelor’s degree; all but one of the interviewees had had some college experience prior to joining the military. Of the thirteen officers, five had a master’s degree; three were working on their master’s at the Naval Postgraduate School; and five others, one of whom was at the grade of O6, had obtained a bachelor’s degree. Only two of the officers indicated that they were graduates of a U.S. service academy; one was a graduate of a state-sponsored maritime academy.

In looking at Jewish sects, the interviewees were predominantly Conservative, followed by Reform and then Orthodox. (See Table 5.) Demographically, eight of the interviewees came from the Northeast region of the United States; seven were from the South, two hailed from the West; one was from the Midwest, and one was an immigrant from the former Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{186}

\textsuperscript{185} The remaining interviewee was a cavalry scout (infantry) who had lost a leg in Iraq in 2005, and was stationed at Walter Reed Army Medical Hospital convalescing.

\textsuperscript{186} As the majority of the interviewees were from the Northeast, this is contrary to the study by Bachman’s et al., which states that the northeast has the lowest propensity toward military service, at least
Proportionately, the interviewees are considered to be reasonably representative of the general distribution of personnel throughout the armed forces, but not a very good for the Jewish population. This would, in fact, counter the argument made in the last chapter, which stated that, since the majority of Jews reside in the Northeast, Jews have a lower propensity toward military service. The demographics of the interviewees follow the trend identified by Bachman et al. that most recruits come out of the South. With the second highest representation, in this sample, coming from the South. Jerald G. Bachman, et al., 12-15. United Jewish Communities, The National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01, 5.
representation of the officer-enlisted ratios within those services. (See Table 6 and Table A8.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch of Service</th>
<th>Active Duty*</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


D. SUMMARY OF TOPICS ADDRESSED DURING INTERVIEWS

1. Means Used to Interview

Multiple methods were used to interview the participants. In the case of “in-person” and telephone interviews, a structured questionnaire was used, through the interviewee was also allowed to address topics that were not specified in the questionnaire. This was done to better elicit each person’s opinion and to gain a clearer understanding of their views on the military as a Jewish service member. The seven e-mail questionnaires were followed up by subsequent e-mails or phone calls to clarify items on the formatted questionnaire. (See Appendix B.)

2. Topics Addressed

The questionnaire was pivotal in better understanding the primary research question. Eight specific questions were asked during the interview. The questions were designed to obtain an interviewee’s opinion about various aspects of life in the military. The first two questions were intended to identify the reasons why the interviewee
joined the armed forces and the environment from which they came. These questions focused on personal aspects behind the individual’s decision to join the military and the family environment/support surrounding their decision.

Questions three and four focused on the individual’s personal perceptions of the military. The interviewee was asked for an account of his or her personal experiences as a military member. They were also asked if their future plans included making a career of the military. Though not directly related to their being Jewish, these questions led into the final four questions, all of which dealt directly with their experience in the military as a Jewish service member. The interviewees were asked if they had witnessed or been the victim of religious intolerance while in the armed forces. This was followed by inquiries concerning any special accommodations made to enable Jewish personnel to keep religious observances. Question seven asked whether, in the interviewee’s opinion, being a Jew helped the person progress in their military career. The final question simply inquired whether the interviewee wished to add any information that he or she felt was noteworthy for the study but had not been asked.

E. MOTIVATIONS FOR JOINING THE MILITARY

In this sample of nineteen Jewish service members, the most prevalent reason for joining the armed forces was patriotism. One person, who had joined to travel, concluded after nine years that he had liked the military life so much that he planned to do a full twenty-year term. Three of the officers stated that financial assistance with college was also a motivator, while another officer and an enlisted person stated that the military was a “last
resort” as a career path. One interviewee said that part of the reason for joining was inspired by this person’s Jewish past. By serving, the interviewee could help fight against a future repetition of events such as the Holocaust, and thus help to preserve the freedoms provided Jews in the United States.

Family support varied concerning the interviewees’ decision to join the military. Two had parents who had served a full career in the military; three others said that their families were completely opposed to the idea of their joining the military. More than half of the interviewees said that they had a relative or close family friend who had served in the military and that this had some bearing on why they joined. Two interviewees who were not from career military families said that one of their parents had suggested joining the armed forces. In all, the general consensus about family support followed along the lines that, though both parents were proud of the interviewees, fathers tended to be more supportive of military service, while mothers wished their children would leave the service and find a “safer” profession.

F. PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN THE MILITARY

Most of the interviewees said that the military has been a positive experience for them. Two said that they had a very bad experience in some of the commands in which they served. Both of these interviewees blamed the problem on leadership issues, not anyone’s religious orientation or opinions about a religion different from their own. One interviewee stated that some of the jobs had been disappointing, because they were not related to the interviewee’s original job training. All felt that their
co-workers, for the most part, made it a positive experience, with little exception. When asked if they would continue to serve in the military until retirement, most interviewees answered “Yes, barring any bad future events.” The interviewees who were unsure about staying in the military generally had less than three years of service or who had not yet completed their advanced training.

The interviewees who said they would most likely not complete the full twenty years for retirement were predominantly female. The reason given for this, with one exception, was that they eventually wanted to start a family. The one exception was an enlisted female who had obtained her baccalaureate degree prior to joining. She explained that, though she thought her time in the military had been well-spent, she wanted to continue in her civilian career path. This same reasoning held true for a male officer, as well.

Four of the enlisted interviewees expressed a desire to seek an officer’s commission; one was to the Army’s warrant officer flight program. One interviewee was recently retired after twenty-two years; four other officers were past their twenty-year mark and continuing to serve.187

G. BEING JEWISH IN THE MILITARY

In “Military Sociology,” Armor concludes that “a force drawn proportionately from all major sectors of society—all religions, races, and social classes—is viewed as one most likely to respect and advance the shared values of the

187 The longest career among the interviewees was a flag/general officer who had been in for 34 years and was going to retire in two more years.
In the interviews conducted for this thesis, a similar conclusion was reflected in the cumulative response to question numbers five and six, which asked the interviewees about their perception of tolerance in the military.

1. Case of Extraordinary Accommodations

Most of the interviewees reported instances when their commands made a special effort to accommodate Jewish holidays, especially the High Holy Days and Passover. Two such occasions occurred when the interviewees were in Iraq. In 2003, twenty-five soldiers were detailed as guards to protect four Jewish soldiers during their attendance at make-shift Passover services on the banks of the Euphrates River. In 2004, one interviewee attended Passover services provided by a Lutheran chaplain from the Army in one of Saddam Hussein’s former palaces.

These two events were not isolated incidents. Another interviewee noted that his ship had a Torah, the holiest book in the Jewish faith, in the ship’s chapel. And, in some cases, the interviewees’ ships altered the training schedules slightly to accommodate the Passover Seder, a ceremonial meal, or some other religious services. Most of the interviewees who had served in “the field” noted also that the Army and Marines Corps regularly provided kosher rations.

2. Cases of Intolerance

None of the interviewees felt that the military had an ingrained or institutionalized religious intolerance for Jews or for any other religious group. However, most did

---

cite examples of isolated incidents of religious intolerance. Almost all of these cases related to a superior who rejected an appeal either for time off during the Jewish holidays or for the augmentation of group prayers to allow universal representation. With regard to attendance at religious services, the interviewees were eventually allowed to go, but only after persistent requests or intervention from a higher authority. As one interviewee put it, the true culprit is “ignorance, not deep-rooted hatred.”

One interviewee raised an interesting point about accommodating religion, in general, within the military. Though the military calendar takes Christian holidays into consideration, for the most part, major work assignments and commitments are sometimes scheduled during the holiest days in the Jewish calendar. Nevertheless, the interviewee added, Jews should not be too upset by this because any service member may be deployed on Christmas or any other religious holiday. During World War II, for example, the U.S. invasion of Okinawa was carried out on Easter Sunday, 1945.189

H. JEWISH UPBRINGING

The next issue considered is whether being raised Jewish is perceived to affect one’s career success in the military. Most of the interviewees were not sure that their religion made a difference; they tended to feel that it helped in one way or another. One interviewee stated candidly that he could not possibly know if being raised Jewish helped, because he had always “only been Jewish and

nothing else.” Two interviewees said that their upbringing had made them more inquisitive, which both helped and hindered their military success. Three others found that their “religious faith is a source of strength” and that their religious moral standards helped them in many respects in the military. Further, one person also stated that aspects of “Jewish values and ethics stress the ideals of military service--honor, courage, and commitment.”

An interesting point made by three interviewees from the South was that being raised in a minority religion helped them deal with people more effectively. They found that this was especially true when working with other minorities, whether religious or not.

I. SUMMARY OF IMPRESSIONS

All nineteen interviewees expressed the view that their military service has been a good experience. Though several said that it is sometimes difficult to be Jewish in the military environment, one person summarized the interviews best in this regard, pointing out that, “when you are in the military, you become a member of us [the military].” No interviewee felt strongly that being Jewish was either a “help” or a “hindrance” to one’s chances for a successful military career. Most said that their Jewish identity, as with other identities, only added a different perspective that others might not fully appreciate or share.

The interview portion of the study complements the findings of the next chapter, which presents a quantitative analysis of the success rates of Jewish personnel in the U.S. military.
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

“We want the names of all the Jews in the American sector of the camp,” one of the [German SS] officers said. . . . “We don’t differentiate by religion,” he [American POW, Private Johann Kaston] said. “We are all Americans.” This defiance prompted a couple of German officers to rise. They grabbed Kaston and threw him down the stairs.

-Roger Cohen, Soldiers and Slaves, 2000.190

A. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is difficult to study the experience of the American Jew in the U.S. military for a number of reasons. Indirectly, many of these reasons relate to America’s strong affinity for the separation of church and state, a guiding principle in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Over time, this has translated into respect for an individual’s privacy regarding religious affiliation and a reluctance to gather personal data generally on matters connected to religion. In 1956, when the U.S. Census Bureau announced that it might add a question on religious affiliation to the 1960 U.S. Census, members of minority religions strongly opposed the proposal—among them, Jewish groups, in the wake of the Holocaust, who feared an improper use of the new information.191

190 Cohen, 121-2. This incident occurred in January 1945 shortly after American Private Johann Kaston was captured during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II. The Germans were looking for American POWs to send to a slave labor camp in Berga, Germany, to construct an underground synthetic fuel laboratory. Twenty-three percent of the American POWs sent to Berga were Jewish. Kaston was also sent, even though he was not Jewish. Berga had the highest death rate of any POW camp in Germany; of the 350 POWs, 71 died.

191 John P. Marcum, “Why Doesn’t the Census Ask Any Religious Questions?,” Presbyterian Church (USA), www.pcusa.org/research/monday/
Although the U.S. military collects self-reported information on the religious affiliation of its personnel, these data are limited and vary in quality by branch or service. For example, as noted previously, no data are currently available on the religious affiliation of officers in the Navy. Historical data on military personnel are often suspect, missing, or based on questionable sources. Consequently, no conclusive evidence could be found to directly tie the military performance of personnel with their religious affiliation. At the same time, because of certain social, cultural, and educational characteristics, American Jews may have proportionately greater opportunities than many others to succeed in the military. The present study explores this proposition, first, by examining the history of Jews in the American military and their comparative achievements.

1. Historical Research

Jewish personnel have played a significant role in the military throughout American history. Indeed, Jews have shown that they can achieve great success in the military. This is clearly evident through the personal distinctions of Jewish servicemen in times of national emergency, from their many awards and medals, to their contributions toward the social and technological advancement of the military.\textsuperscript{192} At times, success for Jewish personnel in the military came under much adversity.

No historical evidence can be found of institutionalized anti-Semitism in the military; however anecdotal accounts of anti-Semitic attitudes and behavior

\textsuperscript{192} For more detail on contributions to the advancement of the military and awards received by Jewish personnel, see Chapter II.
are plentiful. The root of this intolerance existed mainly in the personal bigotries of individual military members, views that were developed prior to an individual’s military service, with ignorance as the social standard of the day.

As noted previously, during times of national crises, such as the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II (when such records were kept), persons of the Jewish faith have been disproportionately represented in the American military.\(^{193}\) As Karsten observes, this could be because “enlistees during wartime tend to come from cities and towns [that] . . . support the war.”\(^{194}\) Since the majority of the American Jewish population resided within urban areas, this may have led to their relatively greater participation in the military during wartime. This greater participation rate during wartime suggests a high sense of patriotism among the Jewish population and a generally strong willingness to participate in the military during critical times.

A number of Jewish personnel who served during wartime received awards for valor. This could be viewed as a measure of success in military service, but only if the awarding process had used an unbiased system and the number of awards received by Jews was substantially higher than the average for other groups.\(^{195}\) Based on the present study,

\(^{193}\) Statistics for Jewish participation in other American wars are not available or are unreliable. See Chapter II, Sections A.3.a. through b. pages 15-17, and Section A.4.b. page 22 for specific details on Jewish participation in the Spanish American War, World War I, and World War II.


\(^{195}\) For more detail on arguments pertaining to Jewish military personnel and the military’s system for awards for combat valor, see Leavitt, Chapters 1 and 6.
it appears that neither of these two conditions is true. Arguably, the percentage of Jewish personnel who have received awards is no higher than that of service members from any other ethnic or religious group in the military. For this reason, as Howard J. Leavitt explains, “it is clear that bias has played its perverse role in the consideration of not only the Medal of Honor, but of other awards as well. . . . Many Jewish-American servicemen have received less than the Medal of Honor for the same action for which non-Jews were awarded our highest-honor.”

Though awards are a mark of individual achievement and success in the military, they do not necessarily mean that one group performs better or worse than another.

Apparently, religious discrimination against Jews in the military and recorded cases of overt anti-Semitism were observed mostly from around the mid-1800s through the early part of the twentieth century (e.g., General Grant’s “General Order Number 11”).

Despite periods of xenophobia toward Jews in America, they have managed to successfully serve the nation, during war and peace, with historical examples such as Commodore Levy and General Twiggs prior to the Civil War, and Admirals Rickover and Boorda during modern times. Using the achievements of Jewish personnel during periods of adversity as an indicator of success, one can truly appreciate the contributions made by Jewish members of the armed services.

---

196 Leavitt, p. 31.
197 See Chapter II, Section A.2.f., p. 12.
198 See Chapter II, Section A.2., pp. 6-9.
200 See Chapter II, Section B.1., p. 29.
2. Sociological Study

Another way to explore the possible relationship between religious affiliation and military service is through sociological research. Karsten’s study of persons from different Christian denominations in the military suggests that religion can affect the performance, on average, of a religious group. In his study, for example, Karsten finds that persons from more ritualistic and hierarchical religions seem to have a higher rate of success, in the form of promotion and length of service, than do those in more egalitarian religions. Applying this approach to the Jewish faith, Karsten’s study suggests that more conservative Jews have generally fared better than Reform Jews in military service.201

Most Jews tend to align themselves with the more traditional sects of Conservative and Orthodox Judaism. Thus, the majority of American Jews would be expected to have a relatively stronger likelihood of success in the armed services. Unfortunately, the present study found no research that specifically examined whether Jews would have a higher or lower success rate in military service relative to that of persons from other ethnic or religious groups.

3. Demographics

One may also gain insight regarding the possible relationship between religious affiliation and military service by looking for trends and various other indicators in demographic data. Demographic information, provided by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC, October 2005), on the religious identity of military personnel reveal a few interesting characteristics of the Jewish population. Most

---

201 See Chapter III, Section C., pp. 47-51.
striking is that Jews, similar to persons from other minority religions, are under-represented. Further, Jewish personnel are more likely than those in other religious groups to hold a commission. A core explanation for this is the relatively higher education levels attained\textsuperscript{202} by American Jews and their collectively higher socioeconomic status.\textsuperscript{203} According to Smith, “Jews hold more prestigious jobs than any other ethnic/racial or religious group. . . . [and] high education and occupational standing of Jews lead to their exceeding all other ethnic/racial and religious groups in household income.”\textsuperscript{204}

At the same time, relatively high socioeconomic standing may also help to explain why Jews are under-represented in the U.S. military as a whole. Other factors, such as the political and demographic characteristics of American Jews, may further contribute to the disproportionately lower participation rates. Added to this is the finding that American Jews, on average, still possess a higher distrust of the military than do persons from other religious groups.\textsuperscript{205}

The same ethnic, social, and economic characteristics that have helped American Jews achieve a higher standing in

\textsuperscript{202} “Virtually all (99 percent) of commissioned officers across the Department of Defense (DoD) have 4-year college degrees, compared with . . . 4 percent of enlisted service members.” Michael R. Thirtle, \textit{Educational Benefits and Officer-Commissioning Opportunities Available to U.S. Military Service Members}, (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2001) 5. It is a requirement, in most cases, to have a college degree to receive a commission. A relatively high percentage of American Jews, as a group, hold a college degree. If intent to join the military were unrelated to education, it is assumed that proportionately more Jews would be drawn to serve as an officer rather than as an enlistee.


\textsuperscript{204} Smith, 6.

\textsuperscript{205} Smith, 16-17, 33, 168, and 172.
society, on average, would also correspond with higher standing or success in military service. Accordingly, two observations stand out. First, “Jews continue to display extraordinary achievement in terms of educational attainment, occupational prestige and household income.”

Second, Jews are twice as likely to receive a commission as to enlist; and commissioning requires more effort and dedication prior to military service than simply meeting the requirements for enlistment. These two points suggest that American Jews would have a relatively strong capability, on average, to serve successfully in the military.

4. Interviews

Interviews are an important means for understanding individual experiences and for learning, first hand, the views of Jewish persons currently serving in the armed forces. Nineteen interviews were conducted as part of the present study. Obviously, the subjects do not represent a cross-section of Jews in the military. Nevertheless, the interviews still shed some light on the experiences and thoughts of some Jewish service members.

Most interviewees stated that their major reason for joining the military was patriotism. All but one of the


207 The author assumes that attaining a commission is a higher mark of success for two reasons: first, to become an officer, one needs to qualify for a commissioning program, whether it is OCS, ROTC, direct commission (professionals), or a service academy. Some programs lead to a college; others require a college degree for admission. To be commissioned from an enlisted source, a person needs to achieve a certain pay-grade before he or she is eligible for a commission. Both routes demand a high degree of dedication or commitment to one’s job and a drive for success, arguably more so than most other organizations that have education requirements.

208 For American youth surveyed in 1998, patriotism was the fourth strongest motivator for joining the military. Very few of the
interviewees had some college education, indicating a personal drive toward achieving higher goals. Of the junior officers and enlisted personnel interviewed, representing about two-thirds of the population, all but six indicated that they intended to remain in the military until retirement. Two-thirds of the enlisted personnel interviewed wanted to continue their service as an officer; half had already submitted the required paperwork toward achieving this goal. The final third of the sample consisted of senior officers, including one flag officer. Most were past the minimum time required for retirement but had expressed a feeling of success and enjoyment from their time in the military. These trends suggest that, on an individual basis, the interviewees possess a generally strong aptitude for success in the military.

5. Final Thoughts

On average, American Jews tend to hold higher education levels and socioeconomic standing than do persons from other ethnic or religious groups in the general population. At the same time, American Jews are overrepresented in many high-status occupations and professions, such as medicine, banking, law, education, and the arts. This suggests if military service were more desirable to the American Jewish population as a whole, interviewees in the present study mentioned college assistance or job training as a reason for joining. In contrast, college assistance and training were ranked among the top two reasons for joining by American youth in previous studies. See, for example, James Hosek, Mark E. Totten, Does Perstempo Hurt Reenlistment?: The Effect of Long or Hostile Perstempo on Reenlistment (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1998) 78.

209 Two of the six enlisted interviewees had already attained a bachelor’s degree.

210 Smith, 4-8, 70 and 80.

more obvious indicators of success (such as longevity and attainment of higher ranks) might be seen.

Even though only two percent of the American population is Jewish, Jews have made an indelible mark on American society, and the military is no exception. Throughout history, Jews have answered the nation’s call to arms in times of both war and peace. While serving as a Jew in the American military was certainly a challenge at times, Jews have demonstrated significant achievement in obtaining the highest ranks, acting heroically on the battlefield, and pioneering organizational and technical advancements in the armed forces.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Continued research on the subject of this study could include a quantitative analysis and comparison of the first-term attrition, reenlistment, and promotion experiences of military members with different religious affiliations. Such research could provide a reliable probability model that could then be further examined for estimating the success rates of Jewish persons in the military. Also, cost-benefit models and an Annualized Cost of Leaving (ACOL) model, specifically directed toward the recruitment and retention of the American Jewish population, could prove beneficial in measuring and better

---

212 See Appendix A, pp. 95-98.

understanding the military experiences of this group.214 Additionally, further research should continue to explore why American Jews are apparently underrepresented in the military, especially in the enlisted ranks. Such research might help the military to encourage increased participation by American Jews, who have historically contributed so much to the nation’s defense and will continue to do so in the years ahead.

214 A good example of applying an ACOL model is found in, Marc N. Elliott, Kanika Kapur, and Carole Roan Gresenz, Modeling the Departure of Military Pilots From Services (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, 2004).
APPENDIX A. STATISTICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY OF THE U.S. MILITARY AS OF OCTOBER 2005

The benefits of religious freedom equally enjoyed by all would be equally sustained by all, and democracy would prove the best safeguard of religious liberty.

—Alan Pendleton Grimes, Equality in America.215

This appendix presents a more detailed statistical description of religious affiliation in the U.S. military. The first table pertains to the military as a whole. It is followed by a table for each of the armed forces: Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Each table is divided into four columns: the first three are officers, enlisted personnel, and officers/enlisted combined representation. The fourth column indicates whether a religious denomination is over- or underrepresented in the particular service. Table A6 is to calculate the estimated religious distribution of Navy officers and Coastguardsmen. Tables A7 and A8 show the estimated number of Jews in each branch of the military and the percent of those who are officers and enlisted personnel for the various services.

As Segal and Segal write, “There are few comprehensive statistics on religious affiliation in the civilian population, in part because the principle of separation of church and state precludes federal statistical programs, such as the decennial census and current population surveys, from collecting data on religion.”216 One of the


few sources of comprehensive statistics on religion in America is Kosmin et al., *American Religious Identification Survey 2001*, the main source for Tables A1 through A6. The statistics on self identified religious affiliation came from a surveyed population, eighteen years and older.

Information for religious statistics on military personnel was derived from data provided and maintained by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), Monterey, California. The military data are a snapshot of the entire military: Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard, as of October 2005. The information is categorized similarly to that presented by Kosmin and his associates. The purpose is to show the representation of military personnel by their religious affiliation, as compared with that in the U.S. general population.

The DMDC data do not include information on religious affiliation in the U.S. Navy’s officer corps or in the U.S. Coast Guard. However, it was important to get a basic idea of the religious denominations within these two services. In Table A3, the proportions of Jews in the armed forces was calculated for officers and enlisted and officers/enlisted. These proportions were then applied, in Tables A6 through A8, to the total number of personnel in the Navy’s officer corps and the Coast Guard, to estimate the religious population in these services.

Another concern is that the data for the civilian population is for the year 2001, whereas the data for the military is for 2005. In compiling the data, it is assumed that differences in the religious orientations of the civilian population in 2001 and in 2005 would be similar. This assumption was based on a comparison of a similar
civilian survey conducted in 1990 with the 2001 survey. The changes in percentage were small.

The Jewish population percentile is also speculative. Kosmin et al. put the Jewish population at 1.3 percent, which is on the low end of American Jewish population estimates. Other surveys place the American Jewish population at higher percentages. The American Jewish Committee, for example, that placed the 2001 Jewish population at 2.2 percent;\textsuperscript{217} the latest (2003) Gallup poll on religion that put the Jewish population at 2.0 percent.\textsuperscript{218} (This only shows the objectiveness of most surveys regarding religious affiliation, and is not of major importance to the thesis.) The percentages of Jews in the military that the DMDC data revealed still falls below the lowest estimated percentage of the Jewish population in the U.S.

The purpose of the tables is to show, as much as possible, the trends and patterns of religious denominations within the American military. The tables also compare the percentile of the civilian and the military religious populations. Using these tables, we can estimate the situation of the Jewish population as compared to that of other religious groups.

**Key:**

In regards to a denomination’s representation in the military in relation to the general populace: “U” means that the denomination underrepresents that of the United


States; “OV” means that the population is overrepresented in the military.
Table A1. Distribution, by Percentage, Of Religious Denominations in the U.S. Armed Forces for Enlisted Personnel (excluding Coast Guard), Officers (excluding the Navy and Coast Guard), and Combined (excluding the Navy and Coast Guard), and Representation in Relation to the General American Population (18 Years or Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>71.60</td>
<td>82.65</td>
<td>75.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>50.23</td>
<td>53.36</td>
<td>52.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Baptist</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant No Denomination</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Methodist/Wesleyan</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lutheran</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Christian/Non-denominational</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presbyterian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pentecost/Charism.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Episcopal/Anglican</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-LDS</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of Christ</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Congregationalist/Uni. Chur. Christ</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Jehovah Witness</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evangelical</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Assemblies of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Seventh Day Advent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other Christian</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Catholic</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>22.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Orthodox</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonreligious</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Atheist/Agnostic</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Islam</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Buddhism</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Hinduism</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Unitarian/Universal.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Answer/Unk</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Since the U.S. Navy does not track the religious affiliation of officers, the estimated distribution of religious denomination of the officer corps of the Navy is based on the religious affiliation of the combined army, air force and Marine Corps, and officer corps, calculated in Table A1 and multiplied by the reported number of naval officers.

Table A2. Distribution, by Percentage, of Religious Denominations in the U.S. Army Relative to the American Population in General (18 Years or Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>70.03</td>
<td>81.28</td>
<td>71.91</td>
<td>-4.59</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>50.90</td>
<td>51.94</td>
<td>51.09</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Baptist</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Methodist/Wesleyan</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Luther</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Christian/Non-denominational</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presbyterian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pentecost/Charism.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Episcopal/Anglican</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-LDS</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of Christ</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Congregationalist/Uni. Church Christ</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Jehovah Witness</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evangelical</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Assemblies of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Seventh Day Advent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other Christian Denominations</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Catholic</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>-3.78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Orthodox</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonreligious</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>18.74</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist/Agnostic</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian/Universal.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Answer/Unk</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size (n=) 208mil 405,000 80,617 485,617
Table A3. Distribution, by Percentage, of Religious Denominations in the U.S. Navy, Including an Estimate of the Religious Distribution of the Officer Corps, Relative to the American Population in General (18 Years or Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>U.S. Pop. 2001</th>
<th>Navy Enlisted</th>
<th>ESTIMATED Navy Officer</th>
<th>ESTIMATED Navy Over-All</th>
<th>% Diff. US Pop. and Navy</th>
<th>% Pop. Represented in Navy, Over-All</th>
<th>Under/Over Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>65.78</td>
<td>82.65</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td>-8.22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>43.44</td>
<td>53.36</td>
<td>44.90</td>
<td>-6.80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Baptist</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant No Denomination</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Methodist/Wesleyan</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>-3.43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lutheran</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Christian/Non-denominational</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presbyterian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pentecost/Charism.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Episcopal/Anglican</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-LDS</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of Christ</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Congregationalist/Univ. Church Christ</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Jehovah Witness</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evangelical</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Assemblies of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Seventh Day Advent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other Christian Denominations</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Catholic</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Orthodox</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonreligious</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist/Agnostic</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian/Universal.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Answer/Unk</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size (n=) 208mil 303,083 52,708 355,791


Note: Since the U.S. Navy does not track the religious preference of officers, the distribution is ESTIMATED based on the combined distribution of religious affiliations of officers of the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force (which are calculated in Table A1) multiplied by the total number of reported naval officers.

Key: "u" Underrepresented, "ov" overrepresented, "Unk" Unknown.
Table A4. Distribution, by Percentage, of Religious Denominations in the U.S. Air Force and Relative to the American Population in General (18 Years or Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>79.78</td>
<td>82.72</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>58.45</td>
<td>55.27</td>
<td>57.79</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Baptist</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant No Denomination</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Methodist/Wesleyan</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lutheran</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Christian/Non-denominational</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presbyterian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pentecost/Charism.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Episcopal/Anglican</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-LDS</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of Christ</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Congregationalist/</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni. Chur. Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Jehovah Witness</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evangelical</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Assemblies of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Seventh Day Advent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other Christian Denominations</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Catholic</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Orthodox</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonreligious</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>U</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist/Agnostic</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian/Universal.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Answer/Unk</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-4.89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size (n=) 208mil 275,438 72,671 348,109


Table A5. Distribution, by Percentage, of Religious Denominations in the U.S. Marine Corps Relative to the American Population in General (18 Years or Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>U.S. Pop. 2001</th>
<th>Marine Enlisted</th>
<th>Marine Officer</th>
<th>Marine Over-All</th>
<th>% Diff. U.S. Pop. and Marine</th>
<th>% Pop. Represent in Marines, Over-All</th>
<th>Under/Over Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>72.51</td>
<td>88.31</td>
<td>74.16</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>-3.95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Baptist</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant No Denomination</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Methodist/Wesleyan</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-4.05</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lutheran</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Christian/Non-denominational</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presbyterian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pentecost/Charism.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Episcopal/Anglican</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-LDS</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of Christ</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Congregationalist/Uni. Church Christ</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Jehovah Witness</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evangelical</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Assemblies of God</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Seventh Day Advent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other Christian Denominations</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Catholic</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>35.89</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Orthodox</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonreligious</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist/Agnostic</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian/Universal.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Answer/Unk</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size (n=) 208mil 160,935 18,737 179,672


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>% Armed Forces Enlisted</th>
<th>ESTIMATE USCG Enlisted</th>
<th>% Armed Forces Officer</th>
<th>ESTIMATE USCG Officer</th>
<th>ESTIMATE Navy Officer</th>
<th>Combined ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>71.60</td>
<td>22,793</td>
<td>82.65</td>
<td>6,464</td>
<td>43,566</td>
<td>72,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant</td>
<td>50.23</td>
<td>15,990</td>
<td>53.36</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>28,126</td>
<td>48,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Baptist</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>5,563</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>6,889</td>
<td>13,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant No Denomination</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>7,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Methodist/Wesleyan</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>3,316</td>
<td>4,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lutheran</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>3,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Christian/Non-denominational</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>5,249</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>10,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presbyterian</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pentecost/Charism.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Episcopal/Anglican</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-LDS</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of Christ</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Congregationalist/Un. Church Christ</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Jehovah Witness</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evangelical</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Church of God</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Assemblies of God</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Seventh Day Advent</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other Christ Denomin</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Catholic</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>6,779</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>15,290</td>
<td>24,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Orthodox</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonreligious</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>12,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist/Agnostic</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian/Universal.</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Answer/Unk</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>2,623</td>
<td>4,408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size (n=) 1,144,456


Note: Since the U.S. Coast Guard does not track the religious affiliation of the entire force and the Navy does not keep track of the religious affiliation of officers, it is important to ESTIMATE these missing populations. The calculation for the Navy and Coast Guard officers takes the distribution of the other services offices and multiplied the percentages by the reported officer force of that service. The same is done for the Coast Guard’s enlisted force, using the enlisted religious distribution for the combined armed forces.

Table A8. Comparison of Demographic Percentages of Jewish Officers and Enlisted to Percentage of Officers and Enlisted in the Armed Forces General Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percent Jewish</th>
<th>Percent Armed Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army Officer</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Enlisted</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Officer</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Enlisted</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Officer</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Enlisted</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Officer</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Enlisted</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard Officer</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard Enlisted</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces Officer</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces Enlisted</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data are from DMDC, October 2005.

a Jewish Naval Officer population is an estimation calculated in Table A6.

b Jewish Coast Guard Officer and enlisted population is an estimation calculated in Table A6.

c Both Navy and Coast Guard Jewish population estimates are included percentages of the Jewish officer and enlisted populations of the Armed Forces.
APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE: PERSONAL EXPERIENCE AS A JEWISH MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Name: 
Hometown: 
Rank and Branch Service: 
MOS/Job Specialty (noun name): 
Length of time in service: 
Pre-military education (school, degree, completed or not): 
Jewish affiliation: Reform   Conservative   Orthodox   Other: _________

Contact Number: 
Contact E-mail: 
Best Time available for a follow on interview:

1. What were your reasons for joining the military?

2. What does your family think of you joining the armed forces? Is there a history of Military Service in your family?

3. How has your general experience in the military been?

4. What are your plans for the future in or out of the service? Are you a “lifer”?

5. Have you had any case where you have experienced, felt you have experienced, or witnessed any sort of religious intolerance from other service members; senior, peer, or subordinate, would you please explain?

6. Have you experienced any cases of extra ordinary accommodations for religious needs please explain? (Example: when in the Persian Gulf my XO had me flown to the carrier for Yom Kippur services.)

7. Do you feel that your Jewish upbringing has helped to make for a more successful military career? If so, how?

8. Do you have any other comments that you might find important to the exploration of Jewish personnel in the American military?
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