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Five cases of resistance to authority in the United States Navy in 1971 and 1972 were studied intensively. These included anti-war campaigns to keep the USS Constellation and the USS Kitty Hawk from sailing to Vietnam, a movement defense of a sailor charged with sabotage on the USS Ranger, a racial fight of over 200 crew members on the USS Kitty Hawk off Vietnam and two strikes by 130 Black sailors aboard the USS Constellation. White Jacket, Herman Melville's documentary report of life aboard a navy Man O'War in 1843 and 1844 was also studied.

The social construction of authority, that is, the way that authority was produced, strengthened or weakened by participants, was taken as a problematic. Published letters, reports, pamphlets and articles by members and supporters of the groups involved were the primary sources of information.

Officers were found to use either a militarist or a managerial ideology when they commented on authority. Each ideology included assumptions about the practical actions necessary for the exercise of authority and justifications of the right of the few in leadership to demand compliance of the many. The militarist ideology assumed an opposition of interests between officers and men and that authority was manifested by and depended on an inferior's exact obedience to a superior's commands in a face-to-face situation such as the social and technological setting of Melville's sailing Man O'War. The managerial ideology identified authority as the manipulation of institutional paths to career opportunity so that all levels of personnel were channeled into compliant behavior. Anti-war resisters and
Black movement sailors were very critical of authority but at the same time held parallel ideas with one of the two models of how authority was constructed. Anti-war sailors assumed authority depended on a face-to-face command situation as in the militarist ideology and Black movement sailors based their analysis of racism on institutional channeling which was consistent with the managerial view.

The actions of the Black movement sailors were the most effective challenge to authority because their solidarity obviated extensive planning or organization and because their analysis of racism tended to delegitimize managerial authority. The atomization of personnel by the requirements for organizing the technologically complex work of the ship and the militarist maintenance of oppositions between officers, senior NCOs and enlisted men made cooperation in resistance unlikely. At the same time the authoritarian style of lower level leadership also produced an anti-NCO solidarity among enlisted people. The anti-war sailors had hoped to capitalize on this solidarity but their understanding of the base of authority was incorrect and the Navy was able to absorb their actions without direct impact; however, their libertarian attack on authority along with the Black actions precipitated a conflict between 'managerial' and 'militarist' officers throughout the Navy.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ....................................................... 1

**PART ONE: AUTHORITY MODELS, IDEOLOGIES AND TECHNOLOGY** .............. 26

1. Authority organization on a US warship in 1843: The libertarian view of Herman Melville as presented in *White Jacket* ........................................... 29

2. Contemporary militarist ideology and navy organization .................. 47

3. Administration in the 1970s: The emergence of managerial ideology .......... 64

4. A 1970s libertarian view of authority: The critique of anti-war sailors ........ 73

5. Authority as institutional discrimination: The ideology of Black movement sailors 81

6. Face-to-face conduct and the construction of authority in the 1970s ........ 85

**PART TWO: CASE STUDIES** .............................................. 98

7. USS *Constellation* stay home vote: Nine refuse to leave for Vietnam, September 1971 ..... 105

8. USS *Kitty Hawk* stop our ship campaign: Seven refuse to leave for Vietnam, February 1972 .......... 122

9. USS *Ranger* is disabled by sabotage and an enlisted man charged, tried and acquitted, June 1972 to May 1973 .......... 137

10. Over 200 fight aboard the USS *Kitty Hawk*, October 1972 .......... 145

11. 130 Black sailors strike twice on the USS *Constellation*, November 1972 .......... 154

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART THREE: THE IMPACT OF RESISTANCE ON AUTHORITY.</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The anti-war movement and the effectiveness of the managerial methods of control</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Black resistance: A practical and ideological threat to managerial authority</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The interpretative bases of solidarity: Consciousness and conscience</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Managerial crisis: Resistance among enlisted men precipitates conflict between 'managers' and 'militarists'</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature cited</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendixes: i Sources of documents: Annotated list</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii Documentation of White Jacket</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii Sources of background information from interviews and participation</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I am grateful to the people who gave me their cooperation
and time, first of all to my advisor Professor Dorothy Smith for
initial encouragement of an exploratory research project, challenging
criticism in the development of the analysis and counsel in organiz­
ing its presentation. I am also grateful to the Harbor Project
people and the staff at the Center for Servicemen's Rights in San
Diego and to the SOS organizers in San Francisco for their coopera­
tion in searching their files for old pamphlets, news releases and
even bumper stickers from their ship campaigns. I have been
especially fortunate in having Annette Dunseth, a navy veteran,
check the draft for correct use of naval terms and Cathie Wamsley
Langowski take the time and care to proofread and type the final
draft.
INTRODUCTION

This is a study of military authority based on the published reports of people who had been directly and indirectly involved in five incidents of resistance. The cases of resistance occurred on US Navy attack aircraft carriers in 1971 and 1972 during the Vietnam war. The analysis of the documents is directed at the question of how under the actual political, organizational and technological conditions, authority was socially constructed, reconstructed or disappeared. By social construction I refer to the practical actions that have produced and maintained the authority structure. This definition assumes that it is actions of people that are responsible but it does not explain how they do this. This is the question of the study.

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION

In spite of considerable sociological attention to the interdependence of people and their social situations the dynamics of this process remain difficult to conceptualize in terms that can be grounded at a phenomenal level - as C. Wright Mills pointed out in the Sociological Imagination in 1951. Although there is no lack of sociological accounts of a static interdependence, or of how individuals may be affected by changes in the larger social context, or of social change in general, an analysis at the level of the individual of how people may change the structure of social action has not been developed. Marx assumed a dialectical relationship here, for instance in the German Ideology he said:

The social structure and the State are continually evolving out of the life-process of determinate individuals... ...it is men, who, in developing their material production and their material intercourse, change, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking.(1956:74)
This idea has continued to inspire revolutionaries and social philosophers but the practical details of how it works have not been filled out. The actual processes among actual people which is the process of change escapes us and we have not been able to specify the critical points of change or even as we watched or participated in this process, if there were critical points.

Sociologies which focus on society as socially constructed offer a theoretical basis for how social organization is accomplished (Morris 1975). Both Schutz and Mead have developed theories of what these underlying processes are (Schutz 1967; Mead 1934). Ethnomethodologists have also studied the practical ways micro-social contexts are produced by participants (Turner 1974; Cicourel 1974). The symbolic interactionists and some social psychologists have used role theory to explain the connection between society and behavior. To a large extent however, this explains conforming behavior, not innovative action (Blumer 1966; Newcomb, Turner, Converse 1965; Lindesmith and Strauss 1968). Mead's own work is an account in terms of process and includes a conception of how creative action arose but later role theorists did not attend to this as they built on his ideas. The approach identified as the "social construction of reality" uses insights from both Schutz and Mead to develop an account of the interdependence of social institutions, socialization and ideologies in terms of social meaning and interaction (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Holzner 1968). They are concerned with the question of how it happens that society is experienced as having an existence outside of the individual's participation. The question of how practical actions may change a social situation or a pattern of action is not addressed. It is this
neglected area in which I am interested. As I explore this question I take the ability of people to create society for granted. I assume that what they bring into being in a daily routine practice, they can also undo or change. I am concerned with authority structures at this level, with how they are accomplished, how they may be broken and how they are reconstituted.

This question of how people can or may affect their social context is of immediate practical interest in this last quarter of the twentieth century. We citizens of developed countries often find ourselves reluctantly cooperating as members of large formal organizations. We complain of depersonalization and we exchange accounts of injustice. We criticize some of the products and byproducts of these organizations such as pollution, their exploitation of people or their danger to ourselves or others in the policies they pursue, or of the consequences of their products or their work. It is common that in spite of our disapproval we continue to cooperate sufficiently so that the work of these organizations, benign or destructive, continues. It is evidently possible to organize people, including ourselves, to take actions to which we are opposed. Natural resources are polluted or destroyed, people kill and are killed, others are starved and imprisoned, often by people who are most reluctant to have these things happen. In more minor and ordinary ways in the education institutions of which we are part we may find we are actively cooperating in aspects of their work to which we are in principle opposed. It is not even unusual that the persons doing the organization's work are also the ones who suffer from it. This has become a special kind of twentieth century alienation.
As sociologists we should be able to comment on this. If we do not have practical advice of how we and others can extricate ourselves, we should at least know to what extent and under what conditions resistance to bureaucracies is possible and likely in our contemporary world.

Organization theory has been developed around problems of control rather than resistance (Bernard 1938; Mouzelis 1968; Woodward and Reeves 1970; Etzioni 1964). Organizational analysis does not usually locate them in historical, technical or cultural contexts (Woodward's and Crozier's work are welcome exceptions to the latter [Woodward 1965; Crozier 1964]). We sociologists, working away at theories of control present a straightforward example of how the work of people may be used in ways we do not control or foresee and which may ultimately be used against them; for we produce organizational theories relevant to administrators but not theories for ourselves who like others are the employees of organizations.

The classical theorists did consider the parallel problems of their time. Weber analyzed the emerging bureaucratic method of administration and its potential for control. Marx developed explanations as well as recommendations and policies of action for the alienated industrial worker. Today's problem of the individual in bureaucracy cannot be adequately explained by simply borrowing Weber's analysis of German bureaucracy or Marx's theory of alienation of industrial workers under conditions of nineteenth century capitalism. A new broad analysis is needed as Mouzelis has noted (1968).

In spite of the general lack of sociological attention, people have been resisting bureaucracies. Workers have organized together to struggle with management for improved wages and working conditions. This
has not always been a peaceful and orderly process. There is a history of mutiny among navy personnel in a number of countries in this century. (Anthony 1937; Armstrong 1959; Chorley 1943; Fuller 1953; Russell 1974; Schubert and Gibson 1933; Sheehan 1971; Wintringham 1936) The Vietnam War was a recent occasion for resistance among enlisted personnel.

THE CASE STUDIES

From 1965 to early 1973 United States' military forces were involved in large scale warfare against countries in Indochina. By 1969 the US Army had reported serious resistance in the infantry. There were desertions, combat refusals, racial fights and assassinations of officers. Incapacitation from drugs was an additional problem. (Hauser 1973; Jay and Osnos 1971) As the land war became difficult - in part because of these forms of resistance - it was largely replaced by air attacks including automated warfare. In automated warfare target sensors and delayed bombs are dropped by aircraft. Later planes are guided by the sensors for direct bombing. The planes are based on aircraft carriers at sea and on remote land bases. (Indochina Resource Center 1972) As the air war was accelerated, the Navy began experiencing trouble from the enlisted men on these carriers and support ships.

In 1971 and 1972 there were intensive civilian and GI anti-war campaigns in California to keep the USS Kitty Hawk, the USS Coral Sea and the USS Constellation from returning to Indochina. Local churches offered sanctuary to those sailors who publicly refused to return to the ships. Two other carriers, the USS Ranger and the USS Forrestal were delayed for several months because of sabotage. There were similar but less spectacular reports of peace actions and sabotage on other ships.
In late 1972 a racial fight broke out aboard the USS Kitty Hawk while flight operations against Vietnam were underway. There was a smaller fight on the oil tender, USS Hassayampa. Two weeks later there was a Black sitdown strike on the USS Constellation and then a dockside refusal to return to the ship. The ship had been on a training cruise out of San Diego in preparation for another deployment to Indochina.

Admiral Zumwalt, the new Chief of Naval Operations, had been trying to increase re-enlistments by a series of reforms publicized as "Z-Grams." Some Z-Grams were intended to limit humiliating practices toward enlisted people and others intended to reduce racial discrimination. The reforms were protested by many career officers. After the Kitty Hawk and Constellation incidents, Zumwalt publicly blamed these officers. Zumwalt was in turn attacked by some of his subordinates, themselves admirals, who tried to have him removed. A congressional subcommittee investigated the Kitty Hawk fight and Constellation strike and concluded that the fault lay with Zumwalt's new "permissiveness." Zumwalt then modified his program and introduced new control strategies.

The case studies used in this thesis are of five of these instances of resistance: war resistance on the USS Constellation, war resistance on the USS Kitty Hawk, the racial fight on the USS Kitty Hawk, the two racial strikes on the USS Constellation, sabotage on the USS Ranger and finally the admirals' reaction to Zumwalt's reforms.

SOURCES AND METHODS

Published reports of these events and published comments on navy organization make up the sources of information for the case studies. A variety of documents were searched for reports of people with different
relationships to the authority organization of the Navy. Professional military journals, official navy publications, training manuals, GI movement newspapers, underground newspapers, a congressional report, peace movement literature and daily city newspapers were the principle sources. (An annotated list of the documentary sources is given in appendix i.) Herman Melville's White Jacket, an account of his voyage in a US Navy warship in 1843 and 1844 was also used as an enlisted man's report from an earlier technological and organizational setting. Melville expressed much of the libertarian perspective of today's movement enlisted people. (Studies of White Jacket and of Melville's sources are listed in appendix ii.)

The method of documentary analysis was chosen in part because of availability of the documents. Resistance is likely to include actions that are considered illegal by those in a position to punish. It would be difficult to gather relevant information from participants for this reason. It would also be impossible to guarantee anonymity to informants inasmuch as sociologists have not been able to maintain confidentiality of their research over a government's interest. Beyond those practical reasons for using already published material, documents produced as a part of social events are particularly useful in an exploratory study. Selection and deletion in reporting have already been done by the participants rather than by a prior framework of the researcher. Thus the selection has been in terms of what they held to be relevant at that time and in that context of action. Also the interpretations are given in the language the participants chose with the emphasis they considered appropriate for their intended audience.
Molotch and Lester recently pointed out that news reporting is always a political task and no less so if a sociologist does it (1973). Dorothy Smith has discussed how interpretations made by the organizational practices of constituting facts by documentary reports are politically consequential (1973). Recognition of the political process of the production of the reports, however, is not enough to make them into sociological information. To do this I must read them. The reading of a document is not simply a responsive act but involves continual interpretation and selection (Smith 1973). What the participants want others to learn from these documents is available from them to the extent that I can read them properly. Becoming an adequate reader is a practical problem.

My competence as a reader varies for documents produced by anti-war dissenters, career officers, Black movement people and the leading admirals. In order to understand the campaign material of the anti-war officers and enlisted people I interviewed some of them informally. I already had familiarity with similar activists from several years of work in draft and military counseling in the peace movement during the sixties (see appendix iii). As a teacher of sociology at a United States West Coast community college I have many students who have been in the Navy and a few who were "lifers", that is, careerists who had been in the Navy for longer periods. Through informal conversation, class discussions, organization simulations and student papers I have been able to learn some of their views and interests. As an activist of the anti-war movement I already am a qualified reader of underground papers, that is, I am a member of the public to which they were directed. As an adult in the society I am similarly a qualified reader of daily newspapers and weekly news magazines.
Reading military professional journals has presented special difficulties. I gained some vicarious familiarity by studying navy manuals and by using dictionaries of naval terms. I once worked for the US Navy aboard navy ships so that the physical setting is familiar (see appendix iii). After reading a journal article I would check for later letters of criticism and commendation and then replies by the original writer. This gave a basis for making inferences about how the articles were to be taken. Finally I have had informal interviews with some of my colleagues, friends and family who have been naval officers.

There are many aids for interpreting Melville's *White Jacket*. He wrote the book to encourage naval reform and to earn money. The text is now available with supplementary notes explaining his intentions and his sources. The controversies about interpretation are also discussed by several of the recent annotators (see appendix ii for bibliographic information on Melville research). In order to follow Melville's nautical descriptions I used a reference book with explanations, plans and illustrations of the technology of nineteenth century sailing (Lausanne 1971). I was also able to walk aboard several old museum ships of that era.

To this background as a reader of the documents I also bring my perspective as a sociologist and my particular experience as a woman in a western industrial society. As I have read and reread the documents my understanding has deepened as I have become able to attend to more of each account. This study is then a report of what I have been able to make out of these materials for bearing on the question of how military authority is maintained and resisted on attack aircraft carriers in the US Navy of the 1970s.
IDEOLOGY AND THE PRACTICE OF AUTHORITY

In the conflict that went on in the naval organization as this was expressed in the various reports, conceptions of authority and of what was fundamental to its maintenance in practice, were a central topic. Indeed in the 'admiral's revolt' the issue itself was the form of authority which should prevail in the Navy. The different positions within the navy hierarchy and among representatives of the peace and Black movements were organized around and based upon different conceptions of the nature of authority. These conceptions were closely related to the tactics used by the different parties to the conflict in attempts to maintain, reform or resist authority. The ideologies of the different positions identified different practices of authority in the Navy, either in criticizing them or in defining and upholding them and recommending how the Navy should respond to resistance. This section of this chapter is concerned with the significance of ideologies of authority in the context of conflict in formal organization; and with an analysis of the two major 'models' of the practice of authority embedded in the ideologies of the conflicting parties.

By an 'ideology of authority' I refer to beliefs and ideas which both prescribe and justify the nature of authority relations. The justification or legitimation of authority relations is essential to its social construction (Weber 1946). I follow Holzner in his definition of authority as "the institutionalized right to the legitimate exercise of power" (Holzner 1967:148). He considers ideas of authority basic to the social construction of formal organization. Bendix adopts a
similar approach in his study of historical changes in managerial ideologies. He shows how as economic, political and technological changes upset established relations between subordinates and superordinates - servants and masters, workers and owners of the means of production, workers and managers - new justifications of why the few should control the many had to be developed. These were an essential part of the actual mechanism of control (Bendix 1970). Both Holzner and Bendix thus use the concept of ideology not merely to describe beliefs which justify an already established practice, but as integral to the social construction of authority relations in actual practice.

This view of the term 'ideology' as an essential element in the practical construction of organizational forms of authority differs somewhat from its general uses in sociology. One of the most influential thinkers in this area is Mannheim who developed an inclusive account of ideology as a total way of thought in society understood in relation to its social bases and including the particular set of political beliefs representing distinct interest groups. He made a distinction between beliefs based on and arising out of the existing social order and those which projected an ideal system of social and political organization which he calls 'utopia' (Mannheim 1966). The latter term has never taken root in sociology and in current uses of 'ideology' (for example, Bell's in his essay "The End of Ideology": Bell 1960) it identifies an integrated set of ideas in which the interests of different sections of a society are given explicit and sanctioned form. Very generally, however, the use of the term in sociology has followed Mannheim in orienting the sociologist toward how beliefs and ideas are to be understood in relation to a social base, whether social class or some other special interest in society.
As I make use of the term here I follow Bendix and Holzner rather than Mannheim. We will not be concerned here with 'ideology' as a term directing us to investigate the ways in which sets of ideas represent the interests or perspective of sections of society. We are concerned rather with ideologies as systems of ideas which formulate, sanction, organize a process of action; and provide a source of recommendations, recipes and prescriptions for how people should act and respond in definite actual situations. In this study two ideologies are distinguished: a managerial system of control and a militarist view of authority. Similar ideologies were found by Janowitz in his earlier study of top military elites (1960).

MILITARIST IDEOLOGY

The ideology I have called 'militarist' included much of the content of what Vagts has identified as militarism in his historical study of war (Vagts 1937). He identified militarism as distinct from the military way. Militarism involved more than was absolutely necessary to fight. It emphasized customs, prestige, formal regulations and officers' interests that went beyond their usefulness in actual war. He thought militarism became most developed during peacetime. The ideology to which I applied this did include much of Vagts' idea of militarism. However, his use of the term is pejorative and I don't wish to follow him in that. 'Militarist' in its ordinary usage refers to a person who exalts military virtues and ideals. The ideology I named 'militarist' included a definition of military work as very different from civilian work and as requiring very different principles of organization. Militarist then seemed an appropriate name. The officers who used this ideology did not have a name
for it. Evidently they took for granted that their ideas were widely shared in the Navy and did not need special identification. The managerial ideology incorporated disapproving terms for labeling types of militarist officers such as "rocks and shoals officer" or "sundowner." The former refers to excessive use of the military law (rocks and shoals refers to the Uniform Code of Military Justice). Sundowner is an officer who is unnecessarily cruel and officious to his subordinates.

In the militarist ideology a difference of interest and ability between officers and men is assumed. The militarists explained the authority and privileges of officers as due to their superior ability, their dedication and their class position. Enlisted people were thought less capable, although trainable (within limits). Navy work was considered extremely dangerous and sometimes dreadful in its consequences. Hence enlisted people were not expected to do such work except under threat of punishment. Continual drills and formal inspections are thought necessary to insure their automatic obedience in a sea emergency or battle. The etiquette of caste, practice of deference and intricate rituals are explained as important in insuring obedience and respect for authority.

Face-to-face commands and obedience in a chain of command are used to explain how authority works as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Accordingly, sailors will respect the authority figure and obey commands only if they think everyone else does and will. If the officer is shown to be fallible because one person does not show respect by the appropriate symbolic behavior, or if the officer himself uses personalist rather than formal approaches to leadership, or if a superior revokes an order of the officer and the crew knows this, if any of these, then authority may be
lost. Authority then is believed to rest on a unanimous belief in legitimacy and this legitimating is done by social interaction confirming authority. If an enlisted person disobeys in execution of work it may not be as serious a challenge to authority as if he fails to show deference. Disobedience can be handled by immediate punishment - which may even help establish authority. Any departure from the immediate effectiveness of face-to-face authority creates a problem in the authority relation itself. If a number disobey there is a delicate situation. All should be immediately punished. However in such a situation the balance can suddenly turn against the officer. That is the meaning of "mutiny" in this ideological context. This command model is based on a theory of the maintenance of authority very like that of Chester Barnard who in his, The Functions of the Executive (1938) says:

If a directive communication is accepted by one to whom it is addressed, its authority for him is confirmed or established. It is admitted as the basis of action. Disobedience of such a communication is a denial of its authority for him. Therefore, under this definition the decision as to whether an order has authority or not lies with the persons to whom it is addressed, and does not reside in "persons of authority" or those who issue orders. (p. 163)

The navy people using this model went beyond Barnard in stressing unanimous acceptance of authority by group members. Compliance with the orders of a superior by the subordinate is seen as essential in the maintenance of authority. This idea of authority was quite different from that used by the managerial officers as we shall see; however, they were both models or 'recipes' for accomplishing authority, that is, who must do what to whom in what contexts, what sanctions are appropriate and what methods of enforcement should be used.
In addition to face-to-face obedience to commands the militarists' model was believed to depend on maintaining social distance between authority levels, between officers and men, and between senior NCOs and lower rated and unrated men. This model includes elements of two of Weber's types of authority, bureaucratic and traditional. It has the chain of command, the impersonal rules and strict obedience of legal authority of the bureaucratic type but also the ritual, emphasis on tradition and maintenance of caste that are identified with the traditional type. Weber included respect for the office, as opposed to respect for the person, in his criteria for legal authority. The command model does have this but in addition there is respect for the "uniform" which is to be upheld by respecting the person who wears it. Weber relates such symbolic aspects of authority to his charismatic type of legitimation of authority. They are comparable to the wearing of a magical sword or a holy crown (Weber 1946). The uniform as a symbol of the organization and its hierarchy identifies the person who wears it with his position.

Deference to the person in authority in face-to-face situations is integral to how the authority structure of the naval organization is recognized and affirmed in everyday practice.

THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE OF AUTHORITY

Anti-war sailors also used a face-to-face model of authority but they explained it very differently than the militarists. They found authority practice humiliating to themselves and they thought it intended as a device to make them accept their own powerlessness. They resented the regulations that limited their personal dress, leisure, political
expression and political organization. They objected to the use of military laws instead of civilian laws as limiting their rights as citizens. One sub-group of the libertarians were also strongly opposed to the uses of the Navy, particularly in the Vietnam war.

I have called this critique 'libertarian,' because it shares the anti-authoritarian emphasis that has been associated with libertarian political thought. The word libertarian rather than liberal is used by anarchist writers to show a difference between their position and classical liberalism. For instance Chomsky uses 'libertarian' in an article on the themes involved in anarchism (Chomsky 1972). 'Liberalism' is used to refer to a belief in the possibility of an orderly capitalist state based on rational decisions and political freedom. Wolfe uses 'liberal' with this specific meaning in his critique of liberalism (Wolfe 1973). Flacks found that student protestors in the sixties were much more anti-authoritarian than classical liberals (Flacks 1973:104-119). Similarly the GI movement had more in common with this student anti-authoritarian view than with classical liberalism. I have used libertarian, then, to name the emphasis on liberty for itself.

The movement people used the same command model of authority as found in the militarist ideology but viewed through their libertarian perspective. Their ideas of how to resist or protest navy authority organization and of how to slow down or end the war, assumed authority as depending on obedience to commands in a face-to-face setting. Individual chief petty officers and commissioned officers were often mentioned as responsible for specific authority abuses. It was hoped that as some people resisted others would see this and be strengthened
in their own anti-authority thinking and would finally protest or resist. The irreverence of not saluting and of avoiding other deference etiquette was applauded as helpful to resistance. These tactics imply an analysis of authority as taking place in the face-to-face group. Higher authorities, the Navy itself, government and corporations were mentioned as responsible for the war and sometimes for the demeaning regulations, but just how these were involved in naval authority over the enlisted people was not explained. The mechanism of compliance and coordination over the EMs (Enlisted Men) was described in personal face-to-face terms. Explanations of why the lifers (career NCOs or officers) acted as they did included citing individual character defects as well as situational factors such as how the officers might benefit by speedup of work or by avoidance of needed repairs. The "navy way" or the "military way" were blamed for illogical actions or bureaucratic delays. The EMs considered themselves exploited and blamed their immediate chiefs, and officers as well as the Navy command.

The libertarian analysis had usually developed as part of a consciousness change that happened after joining the Navy. Young men joining the Navy from 1967 on had certainly been aware of the youth movement as high school students or later as they interacted with civilian contemporaries in navy towns. The anti-authoritarian values of the movement must have heightened their criticisms of navy life (Goodman 1970). They reported a sense of betrayal from the difference between what they had thought they had been promised and what they found. This was heightened for some by a profound disgust with the United States role in the Vietnam War. Civilian youth who had been most deeply involved in the
anti-draft movement were not likely to be among those volunteering for or being drafted into the military (there were alternatives to the draft). The anti-war consciousness of EMs as reported in the various documents was traced to insights from specific experience in the Navy.

**MANAGERIAL IDEOLOGY**

The managerial view of how control was exercised was quite different from the militarist ideology. They used "teamwork" as a way of describing navy working relationships. They did not recognize a conflict of interest between officers and enlisted people. Career advancement and good pay were used as inducements to all. Personnel policy was used along with publicity about team spirit to motivate sailors, chiefs and officers into required cooperation. Possibilities of unfavorable discharges or reductions in rank and early retirements channeled people away from actions disapproved by the Navy. These practices were all legitimized by the "civilian" idea that work should be rewarded by career advancement and good pay. People writing from this perspective referred to themselves as managers and to their orientation as managerial. Janowitz is partly responsible for the popularization of the term in military circles. His study published in 1960 is often quoted by these officers in articles on authority and personnel policy.

Bendix thought that the change to such managerial ideology resulted from transition to industrial society. In the mature industrial society a work ethic has been accepted by workers but there is still a problem of controlling the workers' discretion as to how much or how little they will cooperate within the framework of a contractual relationship. This could account for managers' attention to workers' attitudes
and to the development of public relations departments (Bendix 1970: 195:197). Similarly we find that navy managers used techniques to encourage cooperative attitudes by invoking the spirit of teamwork and by recommending the use of a friendly manner in face-to-face administrative contacts. Counseling and group development programs were also used along with personnel policy directed toward control of officers who did not share the managerial outlook.

Top level officers representing the managerial position seemed to use this contractual relationship as the basis of their authority. Contractual relationships were maintained from the center by personnel policy and paper authorizations. The policy makers justified their reforms as necessary to maintain their ability to offer a reasonable exchange for work. The reforms that improved living conditions, minimized display of caste and use of face-to-face deference etiquette were all explained as ways to get cooperation. Conversely officers taking the managerial position were concerned that their authority was endangered when they couldn't deliver on their promises of job training, career opportunity and adequate pay. Etzioni's model of compliance with its predicted outcomes for coercive, remunerative and normative methods of control was consistent with these expectations. His model predicts that workers will be most alienated when coercive methods are used, less with remunerative methods and that the most active cooperation would be available from normative controls (Etzioni 1961). This was the view of the "managerial" officers. Control is believed exercised by the careful management of career opportunity so that personnel are channeled into compliance. This corresponds to what Yuchtman and Samuel identified as an
institutional model in their study of the Israeli system of education (Yuchtman and Samuel 1975). They contrasted this model with an interpersonal one in which face-to-face influences were more important. In their institutional model:

...individual goals and plans for future careers are severely constrained by formal mechanisms such as an early separation of more promising students from less able ones, differential training of various classes of students through distinctive types of high schools and the granting of official credentials in the form of various diplomas and licenses. (Yuchtman and Samuel 1975:521)

Within the navy model of institutional control the principal mechanisms were selection, assignment to work or training, promotion, and use of personnel records in awarding punishment, transfers and administrative discharges. As these processes are implemented they have considerable effect on the future of the individual sailor or officer in regard to their lifetime job opportunities. They are implemented via written regulations followed by authorizations from a central bureaucracy. Face-to-face interaction is sometimes involved but only as a sub-part of this process. Even then the written record of the interaction is more important than the interaction itself. In the institutional model control is on a contractual basis and includes a promise of future career opportunity.

A large bureaucratic organization is assumed as the context in which this happens. Levels for orderly handling of procedures and implementation of central orders by a hierarchy of officials are discussed more as a bureaucratic process than as a chain of command. Differentiation between officer, NCO and enlisted levels is not emphasized. This model has similarities to Weber's ideal type, bureaucracy, which rests on legal authority. It lacks his emphasis on exact obedience of functionaries
from level-to-level. Coordination as well as line communication is used in the institutional model. His criterion of selection by impersonal ability and training is satisfied, in fact, it is featured as the essence of the organization's strength, and its legitimacy. In the institutional model, authority is partly legitimized by legality, that is, by acceptance of the validity of the regulations and their source but it differs from Weber's legal legitimation by being more strongly backed by the contractual relationship of work for pay and career opportunity. Weber mentions the contractual relationship but does not identify it as the basis of authority.

The institutional model does not include an assumption of specific technology or technological limitations other than that the work is expected to involve technical processes. The work itself may not be interesting but is not expected to be extremely unpleasant. The personal relationships of the work group and supervisory people are expected to be friendly or at least polite inasmuch as they all work on the same basis of career promise. While the command model permits rudeness from superordinate to subordinates though not the reverse, the institutional model considers rudeness inappropriate in either direction.

Although the models of how authority was constituted differed between the managerial and militarist ideologies, both included the view that the Navy should be strong, should have more money spent on technological development and on personnel as a protection of the American way of life.
THE BLACK MOVEMENT. ANALYSIS OF AUTHORITY

Black movement sailors based their actions on an analysis of institutional racism that was very similar to that of the managerial model. The managerial institutional model did include a recognition of racism but identified it more as the result of militarist practice than of institutional channeling. The Black sailors thought the process of selection, assignment, training and advancement policy all operated so as to discriminate against them. The use of personnel records as a basic element in advancement, assignment or in deciding punishment or type of discharge was cited as reproducing discrimination. They blamed low personnel evaluations on the racism of white officers and NCOs who did the rating. The navy policy of using pre-service records as well as records earned in the Navy was thought to unfairly add the disadvantages of their prior civilian experience in city ghettos or oppressed rural life. This was clearly an institutional analysis. The managerial institutional model differed in that it gave paramount significance to institutional mechanisms for control; however, it did recognize some elements of institutional racism.

The Black movement sailors identified Blacks as brothers, members of a group of which they were proud and to which they should show allegiance. They shared certain of the libertarian views of EMs such as that they should have the right to their own hairstyle and choice of friends and of political expression. However these were not part of a general libertarian view, they rather focused on their distinctive identity as Blacks. They emphasized the rights of equal opportunity for advancement within the Navy for Blacks. Neither the Black movement sailors
nor the libertarian enlisted people expected equal pay or status with NCOs or officers. They did not challenge the system of ranks as such; however the libertarian critique insisted on equal dignity of treatment across ranks. Blacks did not speak to this but to unequal treatment by race particularly in career opportunity. They viewed this discrimination as undermining the legitimacy of the Navy's authority which was seen as resting in significant part on the Navy's obligation to treat them equally with white sailors. They too had joined the Navy with positive expectations and had been disillusioned by their navy experience. Their sense of betrayal included righteous indignation and a readiness to demand what they had been promised.

Their analysis was similar to the civilian Black movement analysis of institutional discrimination in civilian jobs and in education. However, the sailors' analysis had developed in part out of their experience on the ships and was specific to conditions they found in the Navy. The young sailors were, of course, familiar with the Black movement particularly its symbols of solidarity. The early civil rights movement may not have had an impact directly on them as children but the urban uprisings of the later sixties must have (Oberschall 1973; Kerner 1968). Whatever their pre-navy commitment to the Black movement, they had expected to find equal treatment and job opportunity in the Navy. It was only after they were disappointed on this that they developed their analysis of navy racism. Cross's phenomenological interpretation of the "Negro-to-Black" conversion experience, describes Blacks as moving from viewing the world as non-Black or anti-Black through intermediate changes to Black rage with commitment to their whole group (Cross 1973). Black sailors reported this transition.
The two models of authority, command and institutional, and the ideologies that included them must be understood in the context of the actual work organization of the Navy which today consists of a highly complex technological and bureaucratic structure. The ideologies and movement critiques were used in the various struggles concerned with the nature of authority, its mode of exercise, and its use in the Vietnam war. However, the ideological struggles seem, as we shall see in Part Three, to have had relatively little impact on the actual ship operations although they did affect organization on the ships. Clearly the significance of ideologies of authority is given by the organized settings and work relations which they formulate and to which they refer. In the section of the thesis which follows (Part One) Melville's description of life on board a naval vessel during the 19th century is presented. This shows the form of naval organization in which the militarist ideology is central. It allows us to recognize the kinds of changes that have taken place in naval organization and technology and to present a contrast between a technology and division of labor which depend on face-to-face command relations for the day-to-day coordination of ship operations, and the contemporary technologies both of automated machinery and bureaucratic practices which have taken over the work of coordinating routine operation. In the contemporary aircraft carrier, coordination and the execution of the Captain's direction depend to a minimal degree on a command process transmitted by face-to-face orders. Face-to-face authority interactions have a very different place in the context of contemporary organization than they had in Melville's day.

Part Two of the thesis brings together the five case studies and a study of a conflict within the navy command. These are: the USS
Constellation Stay Home Vote, the USS Kitty Hawk Stop our Ship campaign, sabotage on the USS Ranger and the subsequent trial, a racial fight between more than 200 sailors on the USS Kitty Hawk, a prolonged strike of 130 Black sailors on the USS Constellation and finally a protest of admirals as they react to these events and to managerial policies. The case studies allow us to examine in detail the course of the development of specific attempts at resistance, the kinds of responses made to them by naval authorities, and, in the case of the admirals 'revolt', how these types of resistance within the navy by enlisted men gave rise to conflict among factions within the naval hierarchy which was focused on the type of practice of authority appropriate or essential to the Navy.

The case studies are central to the thesis as an account of the development and process of each instance of resistance. The discussion of ideologies and the models of authority embedded in them, and of these in the context of the actual shipboard operations, provide an account of the organizational context in which resistance took place and of the terms in which the issues of authority were formulated by those active in the conflict. The focus on authority is a focus given originally by the aims of the movements, and by the formal organizational contexts in which they developed. In Part Three I have attempted to draw together what we can learn from the case studies with respect to how such movements can challenge effectively or otherwise the established authority structures of the large-scale organization of navy ships, to look at the differences between the Black and anti-war movements in this respect, and to draw out more fully how these movements had repercussions within the naval hierarchy itself resulting in the 'revolt of the admirals' described in Part Two.
PART ONE

AUTHORITY MODELS, IDEOLOGIES AND TECHNOLOGY

In 1850 the U. S. Congress outlawed flogging in the Navy. The civilian government continued to rely on the Navy for protection of shipping, for attacks on enemies and for defense. This use limited further reform efforts of civilians inasmuch as the navy militarist leadership argued that limits on discipline would end their authority. From time-to-time the severe living conditions and Articles of War were modified, but these changes were limited by the tension between the civilian supporters of militarists and of libertarians. Their bit by bit reforms kept the difference between life as a sailor and life as a civilian worker at a more or less constant as conditions improved for both. The formal organization of authority on ships remained almost unchanged.

The uses of navy ships did change. By the 1970s U.S. Attack Aircraft Carriers were being used as bases for aircraft carrying bombs. Aircraft carriers, a new development in the 1920s had already ceased to be useful for major warfare because of their vulnerability to modern weapons. In small wars, against nations without retaliatory technology as in Vietnam, they could serve as movable air bases. An unfriendly nation could not insist on their removal from the sea as it might demand the removal of a land air base. The only combat risks were those that the aircrews might encounter away from the ship. Accidents aboard the
ship remained a danger but not at the level of the 1843 navy. As U.S. international policy required the use of carriers around the world, the expense of maintaining the Navy increased. The adequate repair and maintenance of ships became a problem as the Navy carried out heavy bombing in Vietnam (Klare 1974).

These policy and technological changes had profound effects on the basis of authority. The language describing ship organization does not reflect this. Militarists had preserved these forms, but the actual situations to which the old forms were applied were quite different. Navigation developments, weather prediction, propulsion, ship materials and design had made life at sea much safer and more predictable. This safety was dependent on experts' knowledge of machinery and electronics and their interpretations of indicators of automatic instruments - not seamanship. Wood, ropes, canvas, tar, were all replaced by steel, electronics, machinery and oil and in a few cases nuclear power. New combat technologies replaced hand-to-hand and close ship combat. Firepower now could be used against distant targets and aimed and fired by instrument. It so happened that many men were required to run the complex machinery of combat and crowding on the new large ships continued.

As ship movement changed from dependence on wind to coal, the engineer with his crew of firemen was added. The captain no longer understood all the mechanisms that he commanded. He had more power in respect to the sea and the weather, and less in respect to the officers and crew, because of his dependence on their technical knowledge and expertise. As each of the technical advances came—in navigation, communications, aircraft, ordnance, fuel, machinery and damage control,
his area of control diminished. Above the captains, the fleet commanders had increased power. They could now confidently expect ships to go where they were sent and to participate in war as directed.

Militarists nevertheless refer to battles and heroes from the age of sail to illustrate their ideas of how authority should work. The early technology and organization of sailing warships must be understood to get meaning from much of the militarist argument. Fortunately we have many reports of life on sailing ships. Herman Melville's book *White Jacket* is probably the most exhaustive study of life on a US Navy Man O'War. This will be presented next to provide a referent for traditional ideas of authority and a base from which to assess the contemporary relationship of technology, authority models and ideology.
In 1842 two enlisted men and a midshipman were charged with plotting a mutiny and were hanged aboard the USS Somers. There was a national uproar. James Fenimore Cooper and Richard Henry Dana were among the journalists who wrote newspaper and journal articles against the Captain for ignoring the rights to due process of the three alleged mutineers. The Captain had charged that there was a plot to take over the ship of mostly boy midshipman (the USS Somers was a training sloop) and use it for pirating off the African coast. Even though the supposed plotters were held in chains, the Captain feared the crew would revolt. He went ahead with an extra-legal court martial, found them guilty and sentenced them to immediate hanging. The Executive Officer on the ship, a key person in instituting the court martial, was a first cousin of Herman Melville. (Melville's last novel Billy Budd recreates some of these events and characters.) The role of the Captain was officially investigated by a court martial held when the ship returned to the United States. The trial was well publicized as citizens debated the issues in newspapers and journals. The Captain was finally vindicated. (Harrison 1959)

Herman Melville learned of the case when at sea as an enlisted
man. The charges of mutiny, the summary punishment of death and the solidarity of the officers including his admired cousin were very disturbing to him. He did considerable thinking about the authority structure of the Navy as he continued to participate in the daily life aboard his ship, the USS United States. Five years after his voyage he wrote White Jacket, a documentary of an enlisted man's life on a man o' war.

Melville was not a typical sailor, his education and family connections were above those of the average seaman. However, it was not unusual for a man of his background to enlist in the navy for a voyage or two. He had first gone to sea on merchant ships and had joined the USS United States as a way of returning home from the Hawaiian Islands. He was able to make friends with members of the crew and he was respected by them as a fellow sailor and a competent seaman. He observed their actions and relationships and he listened to their complaints, their plans and their stories of sea adventures.

White Jacket was popular for several years after publication. It received enthusiastic reviews and over 5,000 copies were sold in England and the United States. Readers were sympathetic to the attacks on navy rigidity, abuses of authority and his condemnation of flogging. At this same time the issue of flogging was being debated in the U.S. Congress. Flogging was abolished as a legal punishment three months after White Jacket was published in the United States. (It had been published a few months earlier in England.) There were other books and tracts on flogging and naval abuses, but Melville's is thought to
have been especially influential. (see appendix ii for Melville's own sources and later studies of White Jacket and its reception)

White Jacket was presented as a story of a mythical voyage on the ship USS Neversink but the real source for the story was soon known. Not all of the situations described in the book were actually observed by Melville. He used reports, journals and biographies of other sailors. Scholars have now identified most of these. The book stands in spite of this literary borrowing and partly because of it as a carefully documented study.

I was advised to read White Jacket by a member of the Concerned Officers' Movement in San Diego, "If you really want to know what life on a modern aircraft carrier is like, read White Jacket." It seemed to me impossible that the experiences of a sailor of 1843, even a Melville, could be similar to those of an enlisted man in the 1970s living aboard an utterly different kind and size of ship and under less physically cruel conditions. I was wrong. Melville's interpretation of the world of a "Man o' War" of 1843 is very close to reports of enlisted men today. This should not be taken to mean that their experiences that give rise to the reports were the same but the model of authority they used was from Melville's time. As I examined this puzzle it became clear that this was important for understanding resisters' difficulties in challenging contemporary authority.

Melville interpreted his experiences from a libertarian ideology. He was very much aware of himself as a person with dignity and a citizen of a democratic republic. He felt the demands of the
Navy as an attempt to deny him both this dignity and his citizenship rights. He documented the way that the bureaucracy of the Navy, the caste system and the military purposes of war worked together to attack the citizenship rights and self respect of sailors. He also reported what the sailors did about this as he described the various regular occasions lived through by the USS Neversink's crew.

In 1843 ships were powered by the force of wind acting on sails. The Navy had already commissioned the building of steam-and-sail ships but they were not yet completed. The frigate Melville signed on, the USS United States, was old but seaworthy. It carried heavy cannons and lighter carronades. The 205 foot ship also carried five hundred men, gunpowder, iron shot, fresh water, provisions for a long voyage, farm animals for the officers' mess, extra canvas, wood and iron for replacements at sea and miscellaneous items necessary for life away from shore for months at a time.

A ship's efficiency depended on its seaworthiness, the good judgment of its officers, especially of the captain, the ability and numbers of the crew. Sailing was directed by an officer of the deck for each watch. He had lookouts fore and aft and topside for information about the immediate area of the ship. He also could get a rough reading of the ship's position by sextant, compass and the use of charts and by dead reckoning. His own knowledge of weather in that sea and his interpretations of cloud formations, wind and wave action of the moment completed his guides. Speed was changed by the taking in or letting out of sail, the set of the sails and the ship's position to
the wind. Too much sail in a gale would capsize the ship. In order to move the acres of canvas or the yard arms, many men were needed. The winches that lifted the anchor also required the strength of many men. All of this work had to be done rapidly in careful coordination. Direction was exercised by the officer of the deck who gave orders directly to the Bo'sun or amplified by trumpet to the men. The deck crew were in sight and usually hearing distance of each other.

A first lieutenant acted as ship executive officer in overall charge of the ship's work. The captain had the final word but depended on his executive officer and the standing officer of the deck for continual supervision. Commissioned officers varied in judgment and knowledge of the sea and sailing. They usually had received some training as midshipmen aboard a navy ship. Even so, Melville suspected that a great number of officers were incompetent. He reported a storm in which one of the lieutenants countermanded the captain's inappropriate orders and so saved the ship. This plot has been used in other sea stories both in fiction and non-fiction. The practice of having an officer in charge by virtue of his rank rather than his ability or judgment has not always helped keep ships afloat. Warrant officers who had come up through the ranks to the special positions of bo'sun, gunner, carpenter and sailmaker were competent of necessity, as were petty officers. Any lack of ability would have made a difference to the ship's operations and they would be likely to be cited by the officer of the deck and demoted by the captain.

Organization and cooperation were absolutely necessary in
order to manage the acres of sail. There was a specific division of labor by mast, section of sail, time of watch and quarter watch. On signing on the ship each sailor was given a long series of numbers which indicated his assignment in work and watch groups and emergency conditions as well as where he was to sleep and stow his gear. These numbers were more important to officers than the man's name. Melville cited this as a beginning of depersonalization. Melville's own white jacket enabled officers to identify him as someone who could be pointed to for an impromptu task, "you in the white jacket". The anonymity of standing with others when not under specific assignment was a way for other sailors to escape blame and extra work.

The basic organization of the ship's work was by workcrews. Each crew was led by a petty officer who was a capable seaman. Petty officers received a little more pay than other sailors. They wore no special insignia nor did they have special privilege. They were quartered with the men and messed with them. The most able and experienced crews and petty officers were assigned to the most difficult sections of sail. Men cooperated with their orders by putting incredible energy into dangerous and difficult tasks. Many enjoyed demonstrating their competence and taking the risks of sea life. Much of the work was necessary for everyone's survival. If an occasional man did not work fast enough for an officer, he might order him struck with a colt (a knotted rope) or a man could be held for captain's mast. At mast the captain could formally order punishment. The usual punishment was a flogging by the "cat o'nine tails" in front of assembled ship's company.
The skilled crafts of carpentry, tailoring, canvas making, iron work, cooking and bookkeeping were needed in addition to sailing skills. The craftsmen who did this work were journeymen in their respective trades and no problem was reported in getting their cooperation. They knew what was expected and evidently did it. They were paid somewhat better than the petty officers.

There were many gradations of prestige among the five hundred people on the small ship as well as the caste difference between officers and men. (Although the U.S. Navy had only been organized as such since 1794, its traditional structure was much older having been taken from the British Royal Navy in which many American officers and sailors had served.) Officers were to be shown deference in speech, posture and specific wording of questions and replies. It was an offense to insult an officer. Enlisted persons were not to go into the area where the officers lived. This was "officer's country" and guarded by marines. In addition to this segregation there were different spaces for the midshipmen, warrant officers, the marines together with the ship's corporals and master-at-arms and finally separate spaces for the men's hammocks. The men ate in small groups called "messes". The salt pork and pudding of the men's mess was simple and monotonous. Live chickens and pigs were available to be freshly butchered for the officers' food.

The seamen took regular watches and at other times had to clean and scour the decks, polish metal fixtures, wash their hammocks and clothes, repair ropes and waterproof wood and canvas. Officers directed this work. The effort at cleanliness was much more than was
necessary to run a ship. By 1834 the U.S.Navy had already established its reputation for "spit and polish". Captain and officers insisted that the men uphold this no matter how difficult. There were particular days for washing clothes, airing hammocks and even haircutting, and specific hours for letting down and stowing hammocks, for opening personal lockers, for eating and many other daily events. These schedules were kept in spite of inconvenience or danger to the ship or crew. As the Neversink was met by storms in sailing around the horn the sailors worked aloft in snow, freezing temperatures and high winds. Those whose watch duty ended in the morning found the hammocks stowed and no dry place to sleep. One cold and wet day, the Captain allowed the sailors to lay like sardines on the wet and cold gun deck for a brief nap, but he would not order the hammocks out because this was against navy precedent.

There was regular group practise in obedience. The whole crew was often required to witness punishment. Musters might be called at any hour for practise in an emergency condition such as "man overboard", "fire" or "general quarters" for battle. Scrubbing of the decks sometimes became an exercise in discipline. The decks were to be washed every morning. In cold weather this was painful as the men worked in bare feet in freezing water on the deck. When they finished the officer sometimes would order them to do it over as a thinly disguised punishment. Officers were not officially permitted to order punishments but orders of extra duty and even the summary whippings by the colt were ordinarily overlooked.

The authority, caste privileges and deference given to officers
cannot be explained as simply necessary for the sailing of the ship. Merchant ships had a much simpler organization with less men, less differences in privilege and less punishment. The demands of battle are commonly considered the justification for military caste. The primary function of an armed frigate in the U.S. Navy was to sink or capture other ships as protection of shipping or as an attack on foreign merchant ships or foreign warships. Occasionally ships shelled coast lines. Some ships were used to transport troops and others were used as gunboats on rivers. The Neversink (the USS United States) had been in a famous battle against HMS Macedonia in the war of 1812. Melville reported the battle as told to him by a Black crewmember who had also been on the Macedonia during this battle. (Melville pp.310-316) A recent report of the same battle was reprinted in the United States Naval Institutes journal Proceedings confirming Melville's description (Neff 1973).

When general quarters was sounded the men reported to their battle stations. First they prepared the ship by breaking down bulkheads, stowing loose gear and laying out cots for the wounded. Gun crews assembled and extended the guns out the ports and prepared their station with powder, wadding material and containers of shot. Officers watched over the guns and threatened to kill any man that was unwilling to cooperate. When the battle was underway, shot and cannonballs would whistle across the ship as well as blood, flesh and splinters of wood. The dead and badly wounded were thrown overboard during the fight. "Powder monkeys" rushed up and down the ladders bringing ammunition
Cooperation during battle came easily as the men had practised their particular tasks many times. They knew what to do although they might very well not know what was happening in the overall battle. There was a high level of excitement that energized them in spite of the dreadful scene. For any who might openly refuse to fight there was the officer's sword. Some did manage to avoid fighting, but this was done secretly. When the ship was inspected after the battle guns were often found spiked. After the battle the sights and smells of flesh and blood were promptly removed from the ship by a thorough washing down by water and vinegar, repairs were made and the regular life of the ship resumed.

The captain made the commitment to battle and it was his order that would later end it. According to Melville, it sometimes happened that a captain would not give an order to stop until most of his men were killed and his ship disabled. This might earn him glory if he was killed and possible promotion and heroism if he survived. The enlisted men achieved nothing by their sacrifice. When rumors of war came to the men on the Neversink the officers became excited and the men worried. War promised much to the officer but nothing but hard work and risk of life and health to the sailor. In spite of this difference in interests battle itself has not been the occasion for mutiny. Sailors have refused to sail out to meet the enemy at the end of long wars, but this has involved much more than refusal to do battle itself (Chorley 1973, pp.120-127).
During a battle firepower was coordinated by officers. Their own shouts or shouts amplified by trumpets were the media of communication. The coordination and the obedience necessary for battle hardly seems to warrant the whole elaborate caste system with its ritual and etiquette. There was less difference between officers and men in the years of England's active Elizabethan navy. The definition of officers as gentlemen and their recruitment from the upper classes came under Charles I in the early seventeenth century (Chorley, p.131).

The caste system may have been useful at times for its effect on officers' cooperation but probably not for its encouragement of the men. For an officer to be ready to kill a sailor for disobedience in battle he himself must be very obedient to the Navy. If the officer knew the man individually or thought of him as a person to be treated with respect this would be more difficult. Similarly when a captain ordered a ship into battle and decided how long to continue the fight he was also risking his men. Melville thought that inasmuch as the men were not known as individuals they would be easier to sacrifice. The officers themselves were willing and eager for battle, personal acquaintance and individual respect for them would not be as likely to conflict with the captains decision to fight. This function of military caste systems is widely recognized. In the recent Korean War, Roger Little found that there was a lack of aggressive action among combat officers who identified with their men. As they would spend time with the men isolated in the field they were less likely to order them into action. The army transferred such units to the back.
lines, allegedly for training, but actually to give the officer more
contact with other officers and identification with the military
authority structure. (Little 1969)

In the 1840s in the United States naval officers came from
privileged families while most crew members were from poor families.
Prominent merchants, professional people and government officials were
often able to get their sons a presidential or senatorial appointment
as a midshipman. Once on the ship the young middies learned that they
were not simply of a higher social class but a different caste than
the sailors. Even an old veteran seaman might be whipped for not pleas­
ing a fifteen year old midshipman. The middle might himself be humil­
iated by his own seagoing professor or other officers, but he could
endure this teasing knowing that someday he would hold the officer's
position himself. By the time the midshipman had become an officer
with a command position in battle he would have learned that there was
no conflict between giving life threatening orders to crew members and
being a moral person himself, an officer and a gentleman.

In addition to this use of caste for establishing battle
authority over men it allowed other uses. The sailors were regularly
used by officers for their own career advancement. The officers'
careers depended on laurels won in battle, commendations won in various
competitions, and peacetime maneuvers as well as political patronage
from civilian government. The hope for commendations led to the
frequent cleaning and scrubbing of the ship even when painful or deadly
to the men. In sailing competitions the men were driven at frantic
speed to great exertion sometimes resulting in accidental deaths.

The problem of maintaining dignity as an inmate of a "total institution" were evident on the Neversink. Goffman, in his denotative definition of total institutions included ships. In his examples of life in a total institution he used many scenes from White Jacket itself (Goffman 1961). Haircuts and style of beard were limited by navy rules and officers' orders. The sailors' leisure time, card games, use of liquor, even playing checkers, were all controlled. The Captain or his Executive Officer were often punitive in administering these regulations. Melville noted that the ideal sailor from an officers' view was one who would not consider resistance no matter what the humiliation.

This Landless was a favorite with the officers, among whom he went by the name "Happy Jack". And it is just such Happy Jacks as Landless that most sea-officers profess to admire; a fellow without shame, without a soul, so dead to the least dignity of manhood that he could hardly be called a man. Whereas, a seaman who exhibits traits of moral sensitiveness, whose demeanor shows some dignity within; this is the man they, in many cases, instinctively dislike. The reason is, they feel such a man to be a continual reproach to them, as being mentally superior to their power. He has no business in a man-of-war; they do not want such men. To them there is an insolence in his manly freedom, contempt in his very carriage. He is unendurable, as an erect, lofty-minded African would be to some slave driving planter. (Melville, pp.384,385)

Melville thought that the impossibility of a sailor's speaking in self defense was a direct denial of his rights as a citizen. He also thought it was unfair that the Articles of War could name actions crimes such as "cowardice in the face of the enemy", "desertion" or "sleeping on duty", none of which were crimes for civilians. In the Navy these were not only crimes but they were crimes punishable by death. As Melville remembered the public readings of the Articles of War he
commented:

As, month after month, I would stand bareheaded among my shipmates, and hear this document read, I have thought to myself, well, well, White Jacket, you are in a sad box indeed...It admonishes you to take all bad usage in good part, and never to join in any public meeting that may be held on the gun deck for a redress of grievances. Listen:

Art.XIII. "If any person in the navy shall make, or attempt to make, any mutinous assembly, he shall, on conviction thereof by a court martial, suffer death."

Bless me, White Jacket, are you a great gun yourself, that you so recoil, to the extremity of your breechings, at that discharge?

But give ear again. Here goes another minute-gun. It indirectly admonishes you to receive the grossest insult, and stand still under it:

Art.XIV. "No private in the navy shall disobey the lawful orders of his superior officers, or strike him, or draw, or offer to draw, or raise any weapon against him, while in the execution of the duties of his office, on pain of death."

Do not hang back there by the bulwarks, White Jacket; come up to the mark once more; for here goes still another minute-gun, which admonishes you never to be caught napping:

Part of Art.XX. "If any person in the navy shall sleep upon his watch, he shall suffer death."

Murderous! But then in time of peace, they do not enforce these bloodthirsty laws? Do they not indeed? What happened to those three men on board an American armed vessel a few years ago, ... "Shall suffer death!", those were the three words that hung those three men. ...

By the main-mast! then, in a time of profound peace, I am subject to the cut-throat martial law! And when my own brother, who happens to be dwelling ashore, and does not serve his country as I am now doing - when he is at liberty to call personally upon the President of the United States, and express his disapprobation of the whole national administration, here am I, liable at any time to be run up at the yardarm, with a necklace, made by no jeweler, round my neck! (Melville, pp.294,295)

Evidently other Americans shared Melville's concern, recruiting was a problem. During several periods in the nineteenth century less than twenty percent of the sailors in the fleet were citizens. "Sailors wanted for the Navy" was a common sign in naval harbor towns. Nationals of other countries were more easily recruited.
The harsh regulations, living privations and the caste system that made navy life so difficult for sailors at the same time helped to keep the loyalty and cooperation of officers. The rights of summary punishment protected the captain from future review of his actions and assured him that he would have all authority necessary to rule his ship. The privileges of caste and rank and the relatively comfortable living situations made life as a navy officer appealing. The deference ceremonies were not only flattering to an officer but they also reminded him of navy rule. At the same time that he was placed in a high position relative to the sailors he was subordinate to navy rule and ritual. The forms were above him. According to Katharine Chorley the loyalty of officers to their government is always an important consideration in the use of the military (Chorley p.244). She noted that it was much easier to get the rank and file to cooperate with a government even when cooperation was against their class interests.

The men on the Neversink did sometimes resist orders. There were attempts on the lives of officers and the captain. At night when an officer was walking by the foot of a ladder on a lower deck, heavy iron balls or carronade shot would sometimes be dropped. In the darkness it was impossible to identify the guilty person among the many scurrying men. On an occasion near the end of the voyage the whole crew ignored the captain's order to have their beards shaved. Several days went by as the orders were not followed and tension grew. A mutiny was averted by heroic action of the men's favorite lieutenant, Mad Jack. He bravely jumped in among the very angry men and casually,
as if the situation were not so serious, advised the men to be more thoughtful about their actions. The captain tactfully refrained from bringing any charges over the affair as the men appeared to have their beards shaved. One heroic man, Old Ushant, did hold out and though he was flogged and put in irons, would not give over his beard to the captain and the Navy.

The possibility of resistance was often considered by Melville. The humiliation of powerlessness angered him even more than physical punishment. On one occasion White Jacket himself was to be flogged. As the gratings were being prepared for the flogging he decided he would rush the captain and plunge with him over the ship's side. Before this could happen an officer pleaded on White Jacket's behalf and he was released.¹

There was sabotage as in the spiking of guns during battle. Smuggling of liquor and narcotics by small conspiratorial groups happened and even legal action was used or at least considered as a way to resist. Melville himself protested by the writing of his book. Civilian groups supported reforms. A group resistance, that is, a mutiny, would have been very unlikely according to Melville, because of certain features of the organization of the ship. Divisions within the crew limited co-

¹ Melville researchers have concluded that this event did not happen to Melville himself. There was a report from another ship in which a sailor actually did take the Captain with him to their deaths. Researchers also doubt that the near mutiny-of-the-beards and Old Ushant's heroism occurred on the USS United States. Melville did hear of a similar mutiny over another issue. Haircut and beard regulations were widely disliked at that time and sometimes protested. Melville had been involved in mutiny himself on an earlier merchant voyage. (see Vincent 1970 in appendix ii)
operation. Melville commented on the way the marines were used:

But the mutual contempt, and even hatred, subsisting between these two bodies of men—both clinging to one keel, both lodged in one household—is held by most Navy officers as the height of the perfection of Navy discipline. It is regarded as the button that caps the uttermost point on their main-mast.

Thus they reason: Secure of this antagonism between the marine and the sailor, we can always rely upon it, that if the sailor mutinies, it needs no great incitement for the marine to thrust his bayonet through his heart; if the marine revolts, the pike of the sailor is impatient to charge. Checks and balances, blood against blood, that is the cry and the argument.

What applies to the relation in which the marine and sailor stand toward each other—the mutual repulsion implied by a system of checks—will, in degree, apply to nearly the entire interior of a man-of-war's discipline. The whole body of this discipline is emphatically a system of cruel cogs and wheels, systematically grinding up in one common hopper all that might minister to the moral well-being of the crew. (pp. 374-375)

Navy power over the crew was thus exercised in different ways, but all were used in a face to face setting. Privileges of the caste system helped to keep officers obedient to the government but alienated enlisted men. The reading of the Articles of War reassured officers of the power to punish that they believed necessary. The same Articles allowed them to deny civilian citizenship rights to sailors. Solidarity in mutiny was prevented by division of the crew into opposing groups such as that between marines and sailors. [Marines had joined with sailors in the British fleet mutinies of 1797 (Manwaring 1935)] In battle as in sailing it was skilled men, practice and exact assignment of work that produced cooperation. The threat of death from the swords of the officers may also have been a control in battle as the threat of lesser punishments were in the ordinary routines of daily work. Melville thought this resulting control was a consequence of naval organization not simply of particular individual styles of leadership or of evil intent:
... The immutable ceremonies and iron etiquette of a man-of-war; the spiked barriers separating the various grades of rank; the delegated absolutism of authority on all hands; the impossibility, on the part of the common seaman, of appeal from incidental abuses, ... all tend to beget in most armed ships a general social condition which is the precise reverse of what any Christian could desire. ... It is not that the officers are so malevolent, nor altogether, that the man-o-war's man is so vicious. Some of these evils are unavoidably generated through the operation of the Naval code; others are absolutely organic to a Navy establishment, and, like other organic evils, are incurable, except when they dissolve with the body they live in. (p.375)

The Navy was not likely to dissolve. The interest of the growing industrial nation in a navy that would defend its shipping was a powerful support for maintenance of the Navy and its authority over its members. The nation also held an ideology that stressed political equality of its citizens. This created a tension limiting the exercise of military authority but it did not become a threat to naval organization itself.
Over the past one hundred and twenty-five years since Melville wrote *White Jacket* technological development led to profound changes in the way that people worked together to accomplish navy purposes. The formal organization of authority has remained comparatively unchanged; however, the navy administration changed from a simple chain of command between the ships and the Secretary of War to a vast bureaucracy. This severely limited the traditional practice of authority on the ships. The navy bureaucracy above the ships and fleets is immense. There are also shore establishments for ship repairs, personnel development, training and education and materials as well as many administrative bureaus and special missions with foreign and domestic assignments. Navy regulations, operational orders and technical information come from this bureaucracy in a continuing stream followed by changes, corrections and deletions. Thomas in a friendly satire of navy life commented:

... There is a constantly building pyramid of required operational and maintenance reports, personnel questionnaires, leadership program notes, safety presentations, physical fitness test cards, management directives, special inquiry forms, performance charts, inspection and pre-inspection records and training, and medical and counseling lectures. For example, if an operating aircraft squadron attempted to give every lecture on each subject that is directed by higher authorities (who, incidentally, have never coordinated their requirements) there would seldom be time for either flying or maintenance. (Thomas 1972:21)
This bureaucracy is headed by over three hundred admirals and their staffs. As a group the admirals have higher social class origins than other officers. The contemporary admirals are almost all graduates of the naval academy. Of the ten full admirals on duty in January 1974, three were sons of admirals, one of these was also the nephew of two other admirals and a past Secretary of the Navy! His brother was a vice-admiral. (Navy Times, April 24, 1974)

The Chief of Naval Operations, CNO, is the highest officer of the Navy. This position was held by Admiral Elmo Zumwalt during the period of this study. The civilian Secretary of the Navy is the CNOs superior. The CNO directs the Navy in its various sea, material and technical commands. Other officers including admirals are assigned outside the navy to the Department of Defense and the staff of the Joint Chiefs. The CNO is a member of the Joint Chiefs, the official body that advises the Security Council and through it the Secretary of Defense and the President. The Joint Chiefs are an advisory group and do not have command authority. Formal commands come down from the President, Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Navy, Army, and Air Force to the Chiefs of each military department such as the CNO for the Navy Department.

There are a variety of channels for the development of policy. Their use has varied with the presidential administration and the different Secretaries of Defense. The Department of Defense has a civilian staff for policy recommendations and military advisors for each of the civilian offices. The military staff have access to more technical expertise and personnel than the civilian heads. This gives the military advisors
special influence. The Joint Chiefs also have a military staff as do each of the separate military departments. The chain of command system limits consideration of policy. Superiors send subordinates problems to research for later policy decisions. The report of the research must come back up a chain of command. According to Donovan, innovative suggestions are not made and questioning of the original formulation is rarely done because superiors are not to be contradicted (Donovan 1970: 74-77). The Congress is also involved in policy making. The CNO and other military chiefs and experts are occasionally asked to testify on policy before a congressional committee. The Congress is responsible for funding, for approval of naval law and whatever other aspects of naval policy interest them. The welfare of enlisted people has been an ongoing concern of many.

As the chief officers give advice to congressional committees their personal power is increased as they and their recommendations are heard and accepted and as they also get to know the Washington D.C. elite, White House people and journalists, socially. They are likely to be already acquainted with military industrialists from previous work in materials procurement and in the development of technology. Their personal power can also be expanded by writing in military journals which have a readership of retired and active duty officers. Military contractors advertise heavily in these journals. As officers retire many are offered positions in military industry (Donovan 1970:54-61).

The United States military elite are popularly considered apolitical, that is, willing to submit to any legitimate orders of the civilian government. There have been a few recent conflicts between high
officers and government leaders, but these have not involved the officers' use of command authority over military units against the government. However, in 1861, in the civil war, one third of the officers joined the Confederacy, taking some ships and men with them. In the 1970s the military elite has been politically active through the facilities of their respective military services. Each branch has a vast public relations program with films, periodicals, speakers and news releases which use stories exphasizing the danger to U.S. security from foreign powers and the consequent need for the new weapons used in their particular departments. The possibility of losing control of the sea to the Soviet Union is a major theme used in navy public relations. The navy elite backs the present administration policy of military pressure on selected small nations around the world in favor of U.S. economic interests. They align themselves with civilian politicians who back a strong and well funded navy and for whom the protection of oil by sea power is a central problem. Within the close relationships of the navy elite to government and industry there is room for differences, for instance the managers and militarists differed on authority ideology. In the past there have been many conflicts over the indoctrination of new technology such as in the development and use of aircraft and of nuclear submarines. The policies on use of equipment and weapons have changed with technological progress and international relationships; however, ship organization and deference requirements have not had a parallel development.

Authority is still based on tradition and further legitimized in law and other formal regulations. Its practice is described in handbooks that give detailed specification for its application. The handbooks give
militarist reasons for the caste system and deference etiquette, and militarist arguments for administration by the chain of command. Authority relationships are assumed to depend on face-to-face encounters.

The captain is the Commanding Officer or CO of a ship. He delegates general administration to the Executive Officer, XO. The ship's work is divided into departments. The department heads report to the XO for administrative matters and directly to the CO for operation readiness. Departments are divided into divisions which are further divided into work shifts called sections. On larger ships each division is headed by an officer who may oversee other officers and petty officers. The chief petty officers are responsible for the work of the enlisted men. First and Second class petty officers usually assist with this supervision. (USNI 1972:2-38) (see appendix i. for USNI and other documentary references)

FACE-TO-FACE CONDUCT

Orders are supposed to come down this line of command and requisitions, appeals, requests for leave, and so on, go up the chain for approval at each level. Details of orders involving technical procedures usually originate below the level of the CO because of the expertise involved. Cooperation across levels or messages from lower levels to higher levels are sometimes necessary for certain technical operations. This is done informally. Lower officers and enlisted men must use considerable tact to not seem to insult those of higher rank when giving information or correcting information (USNI 1966:466-467). People of superior rank are to be obeyed in detail and are not to be contradicted or questioned. Superiors may criticize people with lower rank. Requests
or suggestions of superiors are to be taken as a command by the inferior. The inferior is to answer with deference, as "aye, aye, sir", but the superior shows agreement by "very well". (USNI 1968:29-31) Communication of a correction within these limits is thus difficult. The militarist ideology does not include provision for corrections. The need to communicate is reduced by elaborate instructions in technical manuals, manufacturers directions and navy regulations covering expected situations. (USNI 1966:293-294)

Deference to superiors requires more than the use of the proper manner in verbal communications. In its simplest form it involves a salute from an enlisted person to an officer. It may involve the whole ship's company lined up at attention on the weather decks to pay respect to a person of high rank. When the ship is in port eight men are usually available to be used as "sideboys" to give salutes to visiting officers of sufficient rank. At the bo'sun's whistle they come on the double, take their places facing each other and salute as the personage comes aboard - exactly as sailors did on Melville's ship. (USNI 1972:112-117)

Privilege varies with authority position. The living spaces of the ship have separate berthing areas and messes for the Captain, for the senior officers, the junior officers, the chief petty officers and for the enlisted men. Different food is served to officers and they have servants, called "stewards", who clean their quarters. The captain and senior officers have separate cabins, junior officers share cabins, chief petty officers share quarters and lower rated men sleep in tiers of bunks. (USNI 1972:25-26)
Uniforms and insignia indicate difference in status and work assignment. Pay differs by rank, grade, years of service and by certain special assignments. Officers salaries range from 3 1/2 to 21 times as much as non-rated men and from 1/2 to 7 1/2 times as much as chief petty officers. (All Hands, March 1971) Special allowances and privileges increase this difference. The terms of work contracts are different for officers and enlisted people. Under certain conditions officers may resign their commissions, but enlisted personnel may only be discharged by navy order or at the end of an enlistment period.

Officers are encouraged to cooperate in many ways. They are offered good pay, opportunity for advancement, use of servants, extra allowances for housing and families. Retirement provisions are generous and retirement is early. Officers retire in their late fourties or early fifties. A few officers will reach the elite as admirals who command fleets or head Washington D.C. Navy bureaus. Promotions depend on personnel evaluations by superiors and successful completion of certain varieties of duty assignments. Any blemishes on their record may interfere. If they fail to be promoted in a certain period they must resign. For promotion to the higher levels they need the informal sponsorship of elite officers. All of this limits maverick behavior of officers (Donovan 1970:77-80).

CASTE DIFFERENCES

Officers are treated with deference by enlisted people. The caste division of the Navy exaggerates differences in the civilian society. Most officers are from the lower middle or upper middle families, a few are from the upper-classes. Enlisted men are from lower, working class or
lower middle class origins (Janowitz 1960:90). Lang reported that in 1960, 91% of navy officers had attended college and 70% had graduated compared to 5% of enlisted men who had attended and less than 1% who had graduated (Lang 1964:55). Officers are trained at the Naval Academy or by Naval Reserve Officer Training programs at civilian universities and colleges or at Naval Officers Candidate School. Entrance into the academy at Annapolis depends on being nominated and passing examinations. Nominations are made by senators and by presidential appointment. The presidential appointments include one hundred places held for the sons of military professionals. A very few sailors from the fleet may be nominated for the academy and a few more for the officers' candidate schools. Acceptance is by competitive examination. Entrance into the reserve programs is much easier than into the academy. In all programs certain grade and performance levels must be maintained in order to continue. The graduates of the reserve programs have brought a leveling into the navy officers' corps; however, most reservists find the Navy unsatisfactory and don't continue after their initial period of service (Zald 1964:273; Huntington 1965:137). Those few enlisted men who can rise to eligibility for chief in fourteen years and are less than thirty-two years old at that time may apply for promotion to warrant officer.

Officers and senior NCOs are almost all of the white race. This was a matter of policy until late in World War II. For the half century before, the Navy had enlisted Blacks and Filipino nationals as cooks and servants exclusively. Earlier, for instance when Melville served in the Navy, many enlisted men were Black. By 1940 there were almost no Blacks and there is now a strong effort to change this. New enlistments were
over 20% Black producing a total of Black enlisted in 1973 of 6 1/2%.
Three percent of midshipmen at Annapolis were Black but only 1% of
commissioned officers. Blacks make up 12% of U.S. population.
(Proceedings, April 1973:28-36; All Hands, August 1973:54-61) On any
particular ship there are likely to be many Blacks in the lowest enlisted
ratings and very few if any Black senior petty officers or commissioned
officers.

Officers are rotated every two to three years to different
assignments to give them a variety of experience. Sea duty is a necessary
part of most career lines. On a ship, officers either have responsibility
over technical functions or over an administrative area as a line officer.
On shore, officers have many required social obligations as well as navy
assignments. Elaborate etiquette is also expected of officers' wives.
There is a special USNI handbook for wives (USNI 1964). Enlisted wives
are also given some instruction but it has less required etiquette. They
are told how to use the services of the Navy such as in shopping, housing
and health care. Invitations to family programs are sometimes issued to
"officers and their ladies", "chief petty officers and their wives",
"enlisted men and their women" which makes the social status of the
respective wives quite clear. Husbands of navy personnel are a new
phenomena and have not yet been objectified by etiquette. Women in the
Navy are assigned to shore duty except for nurses on hospital ships and
a very few women who were assigned ship duties for a short lived experi-
ment on a hospital ship.

The position of chief petty officer is a new development since
1843. Then there were petty officers who were skilled leaders of work
crews. The petty officer of the old navy was considered a regular
member of the crew and received only a little more pay with no other signs of rank. The men respected him for his competence and personal leadership. If a petty officer lacked these qualities he wouldn't have been useful in leading his crew, in fact he would have been a danger and the captain would very likely have replaced him. Effectiveness of leadership is no longer as observable as it was on a sailing ship. Petty officers now win their rates by passing paper and pencil tests over technical specialties, attending specialty schools and by receiving high marks from their superiors on leadership ability, job performance, acceptance of authority, appearance and ability to get along with others. Requirements for advancement are set by the Bureau of Naval Personnel and require the C0s recommendation as well as satisfaction of the requirements for the promotion. (USNI 1972:62-67)

The senior petty officers direct the actual day-to-day work that runs the complicated systems on the ship. They oversee assignment of men to specific jobs and know what is to be done or where to go to get information. It is commonly said that the chiefs run the Navy. Young junior commissioned officers are the immediate supervisors of the chiefs. They are more or less executive trainees themselves and not prepared to exercise much authority. The chiefs know their own job and don't need special direction (USNI 1972:35-36). This leaves administrative paper work to the new ensigns. One newly commissioned officer wrote back to his former commander at a Naval Reserve Officers' Training Unit:

Also please tell the guys not to worry because they feel they don't know anything when they get commissioned. Ensigns aren't supposed to know anything, seriously, so there's nothing to sweat. (I really worried about this incidentally.) (Proceedings, September 1973:83-84)
The ensign may not be expected to know anything, but he is to be treated as an officer. A chief may be a generation older than the new officer and have more practical knowledge. He must nevertheless show the young ensign deference by language and posture. The pay of the two positions is now similar, in fact a master chief may make twice as much as a new ensign. With promotions the officer will soon pass the salary of even a master chief in two or three years. The chief is at the dead end of his occupational ladder while the ensign is beginning an ascent that may lead to an admiralship. New ensigns are reported as careful not to insult the chiefs. The chiefs have become mid-management. One handbook states:

It is the Navy's intention that the chief petty officer, pay grade E-7, be a "man apart", that there be a distinction between the treatment accorded chief petty officers of all pay grades and the remainder of the ships' enlisted men. (USNI 1972:36)

THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF WORK

Most non-rated enlisted people on ships are assigned as seamen or firemen. They are usually very young, from seventeen to twenty years old. After enlistment they go through "boot camp" for orientation and then receive brief training on a ship. Their first assignments are routine work such as chipping paint, working in the laundries or kitchens or tending machines. Later some are given special training for the servicing, repair and operation of specific technology or equipment. This is called skilled work, but it does not use the same quality of skill that was required for the 1843 sailor. The new skill requires familiarity with particular equipment and knowledge of how to take it apart or at least how to service it and how to recognize when it is in working order. No special physical
ability or skillful movement of hands or body are needed in most jobs. Nevertheless it does take time and training for the enlisted people to learn what to do. Having learned their special job they may have gained some insight into several other allied jobs but probably do not know very much about the whole operation of their division or how work in the different departments fits together so that the various technologies carry out the ship's mission.

The crew of the old sailing ships depended on each other and on the personal direction of an officer, but in an emergency they could do many of the other jobs. Most of them had a broad understanding of the technology of sailing and warfare. The sailors had a number of the necessary skills in their own hands. All sailors had the opportunity to be familiar with some of the crafts from watching the craftsmen at work and they often understood the mechanics or processes that were involved. In the contemporary navy there is little opportunity to watch how any of the systems work since this work goes on by machines within housings, in electrical systems or electronic tubes. There are ship's plans of each system and information in manuals. There are books about the basic theories involved - all on the ship but not in everybody's understanding. A total idea of what is going on as the ship steams and battles is not shared but is available bit by bit from many experts and in manuals. An emergency exchange of most specialties would not be possible except within small technical groups.

Schedules for the day's work are set navy wide. They are applied to the particular ship and its departments, divisions and sections by the Captain's plan of the day published daily and posted in each section.
Bills are set up for each condition of operation of the ship with related assignments of each man to a specific job. Each person has different assignments depending on whether the work is for general maintenance or for special conditions such as a "landing party", "rescue and assistance", "man overboard" or "fire". There are also special assignments for battle stations. (USNI 1972:15-20)

When an enlisted man is to perform a particular job he will not have to be told to do it, it will already be down in the bill for his section and he will check his own card for the specific assignment. There will be information already in writing of what to do, how to do it and how to put away the tools.

1843 sailors were given directions by voice. The superior and inferior were face-to-face and summary punishment was immediately available from the colt coiled in the bo'sun mate's cap. Exact instructions were usually unnecessary. Each sailor would already have learned what to do from watching others, figuring it out for themselves or by direct instructions from the other sailors or their petty officer. Contemporary instruction and authority interaction is more often done via paper rather than personal contact. A face-to-face command and obedience interaction is not usually necessary, direction is done by a third impersonal authority, paper.

When a ship is on active duty or training there are very long working hours. A man may have regular daily work followed by four hours of watch duty. There are also regular daily inspections and musters are called around the clock. When equipment or machinery breaks down at sea the men in that unit may work thirty-six hours without interruption to
complete repair. Work days are more often between twelve and sixteen hours. Most of these jobs are not very interesting or difficult. The major exception to this is work on the flight deck. The activity of planes landing and taking off is very exciting and dangerous and requires skill and judgment for the people on the deck as well as in the plane. This work is done by the special air wing and was not considered in this study. The work in the engine room is probably the most uncomfortable and it is also dangerous. It often involves longer hours than other ratings.

CONTROL OF ENLISTED LIFE

The chiefs are responsible for the appearance of the men, of the living spaces and for the application of the many specific regulations on personal living and deference behavior. On the occasions of inspection by higher officers they may be called to account for any deviations in their crew. There is little opportunity for the chiefs to demonstrate ability in doing work and so they are not able to develop authority on the basis of respect for their skill. First and second class petty officers make most of the face-to-face contact with enlisted people. There are not many opportunities for chiefs to use personal leadership or persuasion.

The huge carriers are crowded with equipment, provisions, aircraft and 4500 men. There is much better food than Melville ate on the Neversink and it is available over a longer period of time. There is provisions for protective clothing in cold weather but ordinarily not air conditioning in the hot and steaming weather of the tropics. Certain kinds of machinery do have the privileges of air conditioning. The lives of enlisted men are more restricted in some ways than they were in 1843.
Now not only where they stow their gear but how they fold their clothes is specified (USNI 1968:70-85). The length of the string of numbers they are assigned for duty and berth stations has grown longer. The numbers still designate their work and bunk and emergency stations and jobs for which they are qualified (USNI 1972:18). The details of their uniforms, style of haircuts and beards and personal cleanliness are more controlled. Exact position of the sailor and his belongings is required during certain inspections, for instance the procedure for seabag inspection includes these directions:

Shoes placed in pairs with the toes of the first pair of shoes two inches or three fingers from the bunk post.
(b) The second pair of shoes in line, two inches or three fingers from toes to heel of first pair of shoes....
Lower personal drawer will be removed from locker and placed athwartship on pillow with contents intact in accordance with Fig. 18-6. Valuables will be placed in upper drawer in locker. (USNI 1968:398)

The personal life of the men is further controlled by scheduling their on-ship recreation and by location of living space. There continue to be rules on gambling, swearing, use of alcohol, narcotics, cigarettes and for social and sexual behavior. As men leave the ship in port they must pass inspection by a senior petty officer. Their haircut, general appearance, uniform and in some cases liberty papers must be approved in order to be allowed to leave.

On the Neversink with its officers, middies and crew of five hundred many of the crew were strangers to each other. This continues to be true of aircraft carriers of 4500. This is not simply a consequence of the large number of people but results from the many physical and social divisions of the ship. It is also part of the plan of administration. Many areas of the ship are off limits to most of the crew.
Officers' country is still unavailable to enlisted men and guarded by marines. Even the officers are not familiar with many of the spaces on the ship. Many people come together during the enlisted men's mess, but they are moved along in lines and seated at tables with little opportunity to talk to more than the friends from their unit who are with them in the line. These are the same people that they will probably accompany on liberty. They are more likely to meet other crew members at events on shore than on the ship.

ENFORCEMENT

The men regularly push against those regulations which limit their personal life. Chiefs may counter by official citations of misconduct, extra work assignments, calling of early morning musters and in some cases extra-legal abuse. The chief may also withhold certain liberty privileges and mark the personnel record so that the enlisted man cannot be considered for promotion and if sent to mast would be likely to receive a more severe sentence. (USNI 1966:430-433)

The enlisted man who does his work promptly and efficiently may receive good marks on his semi-annual personnel evaluation and so have a chance for promotion to the next grade. His attitude and manner are also rated and are important for promotion. (USNI 1972:61-65) For some the only reward they hope for consists of not losing ground such as not being reduced in grade or not getting less than an honorable discharge or in avoiding harassment by the chief. (Pacific News Service, October 1972)

The basic pay itself is now almost comparable to civilian jobs. The increases from step-to-step are substantial.
Men who are late to work or muster or miss any other duty can be easily identified by their immediate petty officer and scolded or "put on report". This means they can be called to account at Captain's Mast where they may be given brig time and/or reduction in pay or grade. If their alleged transgression is considered more serious they can be held for a court martial which is a formal trial.

Courts and punishments now follow the Uniform Code of Military Justice which also specifies what actions constitute crimes. The UCMJ is a reformed version of the old Articles of War. It is more severe than civilian law and does not allow for the rights of the accused to the same extent as civilian courts. Neglect of duty, desertion, insulting an officer and a number of other acts that would not be civilian crimes continue to be identified as crimes by the UCMJ. Punishment can be by summary order of the captain at Mast or by a Summary Court, by the more formal Special Court or by a General Court. These courts vary in the ranks of officers who can convene them and in the formality of proceedings, the rights of the accused and the severity of sentences that can be given. For instance, the General Court can only be ordered by a Fleet Commander. Captain's Mast is the most informal. It is called by the ship's captain and there is no allowance for defense or appeal. The possible sentences are limited to two months in the brig, reduced pay and limited periods on bread and water.² Punishment is much more limited for officers and for many crimes the authority of the court must also be higher than for an enlisted man's trial. (UCMJ Paragraph 815, Article 15, 1968)

² Civilian court decisions in 1973 and 1974 have held that both defense and appeal must be allowed. The extent to which the Navy will comply with this on ships at sea is not certain.
Chapter Three

ADMINISTRATION IN THE 1970s

The Emergence of Managerial Ideology

The managerial ideology was expressed by the CNO and implemented by BUPERS. The CNO's Z-Grams (personal orders to the fleet on personnel issues) and his speeches were reported in *All Hands* as were BUPERS' policy changes and new procedures. *All Hands* is a glossy magazine that at this time was published by BUPERS and sent throughout the Navy. Navy life is presented as an opportunity for enlisted people to learn new skills while enjoying travel and recreation. There are human interest stories about sailors, their work and their families, announcements of new personnel procedures for obtaining promotions, retirement rights and other benefits. Winners of awards and commendations are reported. (Ships as well as people receive awards in navies.) Public speeches to the fleet are occasionally made by the CNO or other elite members and these may be included. The feature articles, public speeches, letters and announcements of new regulations when put together constitute a report of official ideology. Sailors are characterized as eager, hardworking but non-reflective young people, reminiscent of Melville's "Happy Jack".

As this ideology is developed in the magazine it appears to include elements from contemporary management theory. This is not surprising in that it is in part derived from it. Janowitz' work is
often mentioned as an argument for the managerial approach. Social scientists are used by the Navy as researchers and advisors on personnel and administration and as instructors in the special colleges. Team work and concern for people are watchwords, motivation is considered the central problem. Intrinsic interest in the job or in navy purposes are not mentioned as motivating. Pay and living conditions are given considerable attention and career training for either a return to civilian life or for continued service in the Navy is promised. Conflict is rarely identified but when it is it is treated as a problem to be eliminated. It is analyzed as arising from personality differences or misunderstandings rather than as having any political or organizational source. The possibility of development of any adversary organization for enlisted people such as the maritime unions is not explored.

Along with this friendly approach, there are also threats of punishment. These are presented indirectly. For instance, All Hands featured an article about how the navy had begun to use dogs in drug detection. This was presented as a human interest story about dog handlers and dogs rather than an article explicitly warning drug smugglers (Aug. 1973). Drug smuggling is very widespread in the Navy and some readers of All Hands would certainly have seen the article as a warning. Secret agents on the ships are being increased. A story about this told of the difficult and exciting detective work of these agents in their fight against crime (Feb. 1974). The most direct threat was made by the publishing of the various administrative
and court discharges, cross classified by their benefits and disadvantages for civilian life. The accompanying article emphasized the usefulness of an honorable discharge; however, the handicaps of the other discharges were made clear. (August 1973).

The CNO, Admiral Zumwalt has been the principle speaker for managerial ideology. He has been backed by both recent Secretaries of the Navy, Chafee and Warner as well as managers of BUPERS. Zumwalt's personnel reforms, Z-Grams, were aimed at making life less humiliating and uncomfortable for lower level enlisted people and younger officers. He explained his approach in an interview reported in the professional military journal Ordnance:

In any large organization it is essential for individual members to believe with certainty that their contribution is not only important, but also is appreciated and rewarded. ... We are discarding the accumulated barnacles of customary procedures and policies which have become sanctified through past experience but now are found to have no meaningful place in a modern military organization,.....

We see no reason why the new generation of Navy men must give up the grooming and personal-appearance practices which identify them as members of their generation. (Ordnance Jan.-Feb. 1972)

The Admiral visited throughout the fleet in addition to sending out Z-grams. On these visits he would shake hands with a few enlisted people, talk about his "people programs" and answer questions, then move on quickly to another ship. The visits were reported in All Hands with pictures of the smiling admiral. One of these showed him being lowered from a helicopter in a harness to a rolling destroyer deck below in the Southeast China Sea. (All Hands, Dec. 1972, pp. 52-55)
Organization theory has identified feedback as a problem of authoritarian hierarchical organizations. Zumwalt recognized this in the Navy. Messages coming back up the chain of command were limited by deference ritual which specifies words and posture of the subordinate including the position of the hands, distance from superior, facial expression, volume and tone of voice. Humans are still capable of expressing some information within this strict form but certainly much is lost. (Birdwhistell 1970, pp.79-80) To get some of this lost information on personnel matters, Zumwalt held invited round table discussions with Black officers, young commissioned and non-commissioned officers and special occupational groups. For the lower level enlisted people there were also suggestion boxes and open telephone lines to their commanding officers. (Armed Forces Journal Dec. 1970, p.30 and p.42)

Actual administration of personnel policy contrasts with this personal responsiveness to suggestions. Assignment, transfer and promotion are done impersonally. Promotion requires considerable paperwork and the passing of examinations. Recommendations, evaluations, citations, job experience, test performance and specialty school attendance are combined by computer and matched to service needs. The chief petty officer selection board members and detailers consider cases separately but operate anonymously themselves. There is no personal warmth, handshake or hopeful pat on the back. Personnel assignment and promotion seem to be based on a cost accounting system rather than the human relations approach of the people programs. (All
The CNO and his supporters recognized that there were problems in the fleet. These were conceptualized as retention, turbulence and race relations. Retention was the first attacked. The Navy sets certain quotas for reenlistment of personnel at all levels and for several years these goals were not met. (In this period there was a civilian draft which assigned some men to the Navy. Military service was very unpopular partly related to criticism of the Vietnam war.) Zumwalt as the new CNO in 1970 planned to do something about it. This was the genesis of his people programs. He thought that if navy life could allow personal appearance to be more like civilian youth styles more people would be satisfied with a navy career. The retention problem was diagnosed as a lack of career opportunity and annoyance with demanding regulations. (All Hands, Dec. 1970, p.17) His Z-gram orders made changes in the allowed hair styles, rules on wearing uniforms, recreation and availability of beer in quarters and for junior officers, availability of single women in their clubs. (USNI Proceedings, May 1971, pp.294-298) The admiral stated that he did not intend to withdraw navy power over the men but only wished to make the regulations more reasonable. (All Hands Sept. 1971 pp.38-39) He was successful in getting service people a substantial increase in pay. (The Congress legislates pay scales for the U.S. military.) (Armed Forces Journal, Feb. 1972 p. 10) He also introduced foreign homeporting for selected ships and explained this policy as limiting separations of service people from their families who would now live near the ship's new foreign port. (All Hands, May 1973:52-53)
The chiefs and officers who are or who have recently been stationed on ships, had other views about retention. They complained that navy bureaucracy was not helpful for solving the practical problems on the ships. Officers felt powerless in trying to communicate with various bureaus. There were reports of attempts to get a reasonable action from BUPERS such as the promotion or transfer of a deserving and highly skilled officer. Typically a transfer to the wrong job without a promotion would come through. One writer, a commander, complained that this bungling of BUPERS forced competent people to leave the Navy. He thought this was the basis of the retention problem. He complained that the captain of a ship had power to punish but not to reward. He felt no amount of comfortable living arrangements could compensate for the frustration and illogic of the BUPERS orders. (Proceedings, April 1971:31-33) A year later the same complaint was repeated by another writer. This officer went further by suggesting that BUPERS quit the personnel field entirely. (Proceedings, March 1972:110)

The BUPERS magazine All Hands itself provided evidence that there were problems and misunderstandings with personnel procedures. The magazine has several departments devoted to questions and answers on how to get transfers, promotions and social services including retirement benefits. In a regular column, the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy commented on the process of promotion for senior and master chiefs. Those who wanted promotion were advised to build their records from the ground up so that their "service jackets" would reflect well on their performance as the selection boards studied every page.
The name of the game is to be competitive. Long years of faithful service and graying temples are not criteria for promotion. Accept the challenge and spirit of the competition. Prepare yourself. Push yourself, cultivate your study habits. Be marketable. Get busy and create a demand for yourself. Perform! (All Hands, October 1971: 45)

For those who had followed this advice but had not been chosen and wanted to know why, the chief said "the answer is simply not available.... However, secrecy is not to stifle you." This kind of advice continues in All Hands issue by issue.

Retention problems are explained by some officers as a result of lack of promotion opportunities because of budget cuts which in turn have resulted from the long unpopular Vietnam war. Anti-war attitudes or actions within the Navy are not considered. Some of the young officers were among those who opposed the Vietnam war (Berkeley Barb, November 12-18, 1972:2).

Turbulence was used to cover protest, conscientious objection, insubordination, disorder, riot, strikes, sabotage, desertion and challenges to military law. It also was used to mean turnover of personnel. The term lends itself to metaphor in that it has two similar meanings. One is agitation or tumult among many people and the other refers to agitation or disturbance in a body of water as by winds or currents. I thought the context of its use reflected both of these meanings so that resistance became defined as a natural problem similar to a storm. Storms of course eventually blow over. The references were typically "the turbulence now in the fleet". The phenomena was not itself subjected to inquiry or questions of what might be happening to produce turbulence. (Armed Forces
Journal, December 7, 1971) The use of turbulence avoids words like strike which implicitly legitimize mass action against management or "mutiny" which implies the confrontation setting of the militarist ideology.

The third problem was named race relations. Zumwalt recognized that the history of discrimination in the Navy had led to an almost 100% white officer and NCO corps and that new recruits included an over-representation of Blacks. This led to reinforcing the belief of Blacks that they were discriminated against in admissions to specialty training, officers' programs and general promotions. Zumwalt came to recognize this. He became aware of some of the problems of Black people during the roundtable discussions, for instance that many of the recreational, housing and educational programs of the Navy were not open to them or related to their interests. Orders to end discrimination went down the command chain. Zumwalt thought that recruitment and promotion of some Blacks to superior positions would show the Navy's new dedication to equality. An Affirmative Action Program, that is, special training and recruitment efforts, was set up to do this. (All Hands, April 1971) The program helped a select few but did not upgrade the large numbers of very poor relatively unschooled Blacks that were coming in as recruits and being assigned to classifications where there was little or no possibility of promotion. The attention given to race relations following the strike and riot incidents (see the Case Studies in Part Two) show that the potential political power of Blacks acting in solidarity was already recognized by the managerial officers. The tinder box situation of white and Black relations was also noticed and education, counseling and
sensitivity programs were introduced. Fitness reports for officers and chiefs began to include ratings of their "equal opportunity leadership". (All Hands, September 1971:38) Z-gram 66 required that a minority group officer be assigned to each command as an assistant for minority affairs. (USNI Proceedings, May 1971:298)
Chapter Four

A 1970s LIBERTARIAN VIEW OF AUTHORITY
The Critique of Anti-war Sailors

By the early 1970s GI underground newspapers were being published at most major military bases in the United States and overseas. The newspapers were usually one of several projects of the local anti-war group of civilians and active duty people. Other projects were likely to be a bookstore or coffee house and a counseling center where legal aid was available for civil liberties problems with the military. (The Door Nov. 11-25 1971, p.8) The counseling and legal services projects came from two earlier pre-peace movement civilian interests. One branch had developed from a service to conscientious objectors supported by pacifists and the other branch developed as an extension of defense of political dissent by civil-libertarian groups. The local GI centers varied in their emphasis on the Vietnam war, use of socialist analysis and support of non-violent action; however, the newspapers did not reflect these differences. They all reported national GI movement events, local civilian movement news and reports of protest events on the ship or base. Each paper usually included letters from enlisted people about alienating experiences in the military and some humanistic discussion of the war mission of military units at that base. They all had a strong libertarian message, asking enlisted people to think for themselves and explaining the protections
of civil liberties as guaranteed by the constitution.

The enlisted people who edit these papers and those who write letters to them present a very different perspective on navy life than officers writing in the professional journals or than the human interest and teamwork stories of personnel managers in *All Hands*.

Lower level enlisted people divide the Navy into lifers and E.M.s. *Lifers*, names those people who have a career interest in the Navy and are serving their second or more enlistment. They are usually senior enlisted men, but officers who are personally known are also subject to being called lifers. E.M.s refers to lower rated and non-rated enlisted people. *Lifer* is a negative title, it designates an authority person who humiliates his subordinates and is rulebound in his administration. It may or may not have pro-war, anti-Black or other political meaning. GI underground papers often featured a "lifer of the month" with his name, rank and local assignment listed and a short article on how this particular lifer earned this honor by officiousness and overuse of humiliating regulations.

The GI papers carried many personal statements by EMs who had become anti-war or anti-military. They typically reported joining the Navy as very young "Gung Ho" fighters and that a later experience turned them around. This commonly involved a lifer, usually a chief, who had hit them or a buddy with his fist. This act, although illegal within the Navy, would not be punished and the new EM would learn that to complain would get him into more trouble. (*Pacific News Service* Oct. 1972, p.3) The same story recurs whether or not the basic incident
concerned racism, war objection, safety, civil liberties, rock music or "spit and polish". After this truly consciousness raising experience, brotherhood would be found with other EMs against the lifers and the "brass" behind them. (Brass refers to the higher authorities, usually the officers in the hierarchy on and above the ship.)

The regulations that limit beards and haircuts were widely resented and provided occasions for clashes with lifers. Daily incidents occurred when a ship was in port and men were inspected on their way on and off the ship. At other times, abusive language, punitive orders, extra musters and drill as well as direct physical attack were experienced as humiliating. The humiliation seemed to occur because no dignified response was allowed rather than because of the treatment itself. One sailor told me how his chief had been angered about the rock music EMs were listening to in a shore tavern in an Asian port. The chief was very abusive in language and gesture. The EMs accepted the harangue. The chief returned to the ship sometime after the men and by then he was very drunk. He vomited on an EMs bunk and then his own and ordered an EM to clean it. Next he vomited on another sailor's clothes and threw these over the side. (This was a small ship.) My informant insisted this was typical arrogant behavior of lifers.

The EMs who write in GI papers expressed a strong libertarian outlook with more consciousness of being citizens than sailors. They demanded their rights as citizens under the constitution. They were aware of their participation as voters and campaigners for government
representatives. They also relied on certain congressmen and other political figures to help them and some did intervene in response to an EMs letter. (The Door Nov. 17-Dec. 1, 1972)

The navy drug program was considered a trap and more useful to the Navy for surveillance and punishment than as an aid to the people with drug problems. Men on the ship who have a "bad trip" on drugs are simply thrown in the brig along with the drunks for the day. EMs claimed there was no consideration for their heightened consciousness or panic. Drugs are used widely in the Navy and are easily available in Asian ports. (Pacific News Service Jan 1972, p.10) It is not difficult to hide drugs on the ship because of the many crannies and odd spaces. The GI papers frequently pointed out the harmfulness of hard drugs. They considered their use and even the use of marijuana as a way that the Navy controls dissent without putting out any effort. They report that it is only when the "dope" runs out that resistance to authority begins. (The Door Nov 17 - Dec 1, 1972)

The brig is guarded by marines. Men report humiliating treatment and sometimes physical punishment from the more "Gung Ho" marine guards. The brig is in an out of the way area of the ship. Events there are not likely to become general knowledge. (SOS Newsletter Nov 1971) Resisters claimed that newer marines were put on guard duty because experienced marines identify themselves as EMs and sympathize with their sailor prisoners.

EMs reported that most sailors did not think about the war and that only a few of them were ever eager to participate in it. A
few EMs became strongly anti-war from their navy experiences. For instance on the Carrier USS Coral Sea a sailor noted in an SOS newsletter:

One time in the Tonkin Gulf they had a show on closed circuit TV put on by the Flight Ops. They explained everything they did over there - like how many bombs they dropped and where they dropped them. This guy explained how they were bombing the Ho Chi Minh trail and destroyed the trucks, people, and ammunition dumps. He really seemed to get into that, really enjoy telling people they destroyed so many supply dumps, digging that there was a secondary explosion. The dude got up to show the point on the map and when he turned around, in big block letters on his back was written "Murder, Inc." When he did that, man, a lot of people were really up tight. He wasn't there thirty seconds before the Captain came running in and threw him out. He was afraid that people would all of a sudden think about what was going on. (SOS newsletter Nov. 1971)

Duty on "the line" was disliked partly because of the long periods at sea and total months away from home, the discomfort on the steel ships in the hot damp climate, the cockroaches and the long working hours. Sixteen hours was usual but it was not uncommon for some to work 24 hours or more. EMs reported their work as unchallenging and uninteresting. The availability of precise specifications for doing each job make general understanding of the work unnecessary. Certain jobs are more disliked than others, paint chipping was mentioned as an endless grueling task. Work in the engine room is extremely hot and uncomfortable and it is also the most dangerous work on the ship. Engineering crews work longer hours and have less time off in port. They are usually needed to do repairs while the boilers are down. Other jobs require confinement in small spaces deep inside the ship. Painting in such a space can asphyxiate the painter unless complicated artificial ventilation is arranged. (Pacific News Service, Oct. 1971)

There were many reports of hazardous conditions on ships that
according to the EMs had resulted from inadequacy of the NCO, division officer or captain. Sometimes these had resulted from the officers' attempts to win some competition in the fleet. One frequent complaint was that on old ships in unseaworthy condition the captain would not ask for repairs because he didn't want complaints on his record or to be responsible for a delay in ship movement. There have been an increasing number of fires and other accidents on the ships in addition to sabotage. The accidents have involved deaths but up to this time sabotage has only involved property damage. (This assumes that the official naming of an event as sabotage or as an accident is correct.) Complaints about safety have led men to refuse to board several ships. Twenty three men refused to board the minesweeper USS Ogden in March 1973 (CAMP NEWS June 1973). Seven refused to board the USS McCormick in the fall of 1971 (UFTB Oct. 1971).

The attitude toward officers is not always negative. Captains and executive officers are often called lifers but they are also sometimes praised. The difference depends on their attitude toward the Navy and toward the EMs. A young navy veteran told me of two different styles of officer under whom he had worked. One was a mustang, that is, an officer who had come up from the ranks. He was a Lieutenant Commander and the captain of the small ship. The ship was to be delivered to Greece and the captain was to retire after the trip. The ship was not kept overly clean but was in excellent working condition. The men were allowed as much freedom as possible while also getting the work done. They used their own judgment in grooming their hair and
beards. On their way to the Mediterranean they stopped at a U.S. East Coast port. A rear admiral passed by their dock and saw the untrimmed hair and beards of the crew. He called the captain and demanded that the men get regulation haircuts immediately. The captain in best American folk tradition, said that they were not subject to the Rear Admiral's jurisdiction. Their assignment actually was under a different navy command and no hair was cut.

My informant described another officer who was very different. This man was on "his way up" as the young executive officer of another ship. He held continual inspections for both operational effectiveness and "spit and polish". The men were sometimes required to work thirty-six hours to get their equipment in perfect condition. Although hated by the men, this officer was awarded the highest commendations in several fleet competitions. At the end of the trip there were unusual numbers of Unauthorized Absences, transfers, and discharges for drug, alcohol and psychological problems. My informant thought the officers' career pattern was probably similar to the current CNO's climb to success. At forty nine Zumwalt had been the youngest officer ever appointed CNO. His promotion had bypassed thirty senior officers.

The idea of authority that was presented by these enlisted writers and my informants was similar to the militarists' idea of authority as a face to face command and obedience interaction. The particular officer or NCO who dealt with the EMs was held responsible for the men's situations. Actions were taken with effect on the face to face group in mind. They thought an NCO's or officer's authority
would be weakened if they all knew that no-one respected him. (UFTB October 1971) They also thought general navy authority would be weakened as they gained rights of due process and personal and political freedom. (Sherill 1970) (UFTB May 1972) It is true that the GI writers also identified broad economic and political factors as responsible for their military situation but they didn't analyze the institutional connections to maintenance of authority.

The GI writers reported much of the same libertarian viewpoint as Melville, yet the context of citizenship and freedom must have been different in 1843 from the managed society of the 1970s. They did not follow Melville in his insistence that the citizen is sovereign, that he or she need not show deference to anyone. Contemporary EMs negotiated for better treatment but they didn't seem to expect equality with officers. Only when an officer was thought to be acting exploitively or using his power to humiliate them did they complain. The most alienating experience reported was aboard the USS Coral Sea when a rear admiral's body was stored in the enlisted men's mess in their milk refrigerator. (He had been killed in a helicopter accident.) An EMs cynical comments were reported throughout the GI underground press. (UATB September 19, 1972) They took the issue as a measure of their lack of worth to the Navy but they were not outraged.
Chapter Five

AUTHORITY AS INSTITUTIONAL DISCRIMINATION
The Ideology of Black Movement Sailors

The GI press was sympathetic to Blacks and other members of minority groups and often featured articles on military racism. This should not be taken to mean that the white EMs who participated in resistance were themselves particularly sympathetic to Blacks. From the instances of fights and riots it is clear that there was considerable white/Black enmity at enlisted levels. Some Blacks participated in the anti-war movement but groups of Black sailors were not involved. However, United States Congressman, Ron Dellums, an outspoken supporter of GI rights and of opposition to the war was also a Black and concerned about Blacks in the Navy.

The Black rights movement had a long history both in the civilian society and in the military (Moskos 1966). Some measure of integration had been won in the midst of World War II but there was still de facto discrimination, including segregation in recreation and housing in much of the Navy. The Black civilian movement had used non-violent techniques of sit-ins, demonstrations and non-cooperation in a popular movement in the southern United States in the late fifties and sixties. The young Black sailors can be supposed to have heard many of the slogans of the movement. They were aware of the Black power affirmation of Blackness as positive and modified "natural" hairstyles.
were popular. They practised the in-group hand shakes and power gestures. Considering their youth and their choice of enlistment it is unlikely that they had had civilian experience as self-conscious movement participants. They did expect equal treatment in the Navy as a right that was well recognized and for which negotiation should not be necessary.

Blacks are more frequently assigned the menial jobs of chipping paint, painting, laundry work, cleaning, kitchen duties and service work in officers' quarters. These jobs have limited promotion possibilities. Ratings of efficiency are regularly given to EMs by their superior petty officer. These evaluations are later considered in decisions to promote, demote or discharge. Blacks believed they received more low marks than whites for the same quality work. (UFTB Feb. 15, 1973) They also believed that the NCO's cited them for punishable offenses more often than they did whites for similar actions. At Captain's Mast they were given more severe punishments. The COs explained that the entering test scores of Blacks and their civilian arrest records were used in determining punishments at Mast and in discharge decisions. The same scores are reviewed for whites but this does not remedy the discriminatory effect. Blacks have been subject to direct and institutional racism in their civilian life. Their school records, test scores and police records reflect this. In the Navy they felt they were not able to get a fresh start when this background was used in addition to their navy performance. Their initial assignments were limited to unskilled
rates and then as they could not accumulate experience toward skilled rates in these classifications promotion became impossible. This lack of promotion is one indicator that is used to increase punishments at Mast. Blacks claimed that even when some of them did get special training and advancement they would be reassigned downward to unskilled work. (Door Nov. 17-Dec. 1, 1972) Ashore, civilian bars, restaurants and rental housing are usually unofficially segregated. Whites and Blacks sometimes clash in fights in these shore leave towns. Again the Blacks found they were arrested more often and given heavier punishments than whites. (Camp News, May 15, 1973)

The Navy has issued haircut regulations that limit hair that bushes which of course limits the Black movement "natural". Some CO's have also prohibited the Black handshake and the clenched fist salute. Others prohibit Blacks from gathering or walking together in groups of three or more. (Camp News, May 15, 1973) In response to this the Black Servicemen's Caucus, a San Diego support group, issued a poster "You Can't Be Black and Navy Too". This appeared in reduced size in many GI papers. (Camp News, Feb. 15, 1973)

Complaints were often taken to the race relations assistants or race relations councils who could do little. The race relations people had difficulty explaining concerns to the higher officers who were not aware of the Blacks' situation and often didn't believe there was general discrimination. There were very few Black officers or Black senior enlisted men to give them counter information. When nothing was done within the Navy complaints would go to Black community
groups and national support groups such as the NAACP and the Black Congressional Caucus. The Black Servicemen's Caucus was an active support group in the San Diego area. (LA Free Press Dec. 15, 1972)

The Navy treatment of Black EMs was similar regardless of the characteristics of the individual Black sailor. This gave them a shared understanding and brotherhood. Their solidarity could be established easily on the ship inasmuch as most had darker skin than whites and often a "hip" style of talk and movement. After initial recognition common understanding could be assumed with little risk of being mistaken. The Black analysis that developed condemned both the Navy and establishment white society as upholding the general advantage of whites by law and by regulations based on white ideology. Institutional racism was identified as that situation where the ordinary institutional procedures necessary for moving toward political, educational, economic and professional success all limited Black progress. The Navy practise of assignment, discipline, special training and advancement all worked in this way. This recognition came about from more than an abstract analysis, it was grounded in the young Black EMs experience. They also recognized individual NCO's and officers as racist but they put their protest and resistance into changing the institutional arrangements not these individuals. It was their encounter with paper regulations that they experienced as most controlling, as having authority over them. (Door, Nov. 17-Dec. 1, 1972)
Authority functions in the accomplishment of navy work on a day-to-day basis. The militarist ideology is visible in the forms of dress, insignia and deference etiquette, but this is displayed apart from the doing of the work itself. The work is formally organized in an elaborate division of labor with specific assignment of tasks administered by an authority hierarchy but using rules established by a higher bureaucracy. The skeleton of this division of labor came from the sailing ships but it has been elaborated to fit technological change. The hierarchy has been extended, technical specialists have been added and crew chiefs have become mid-management. The militarist ideology emphasizes face-to-face order giving but in the 1970s information is more often passed from one authority level to another in printed words. The day-to-day work involves use of information on how to do particular jobs rather than commands as to what to do. There is little personal supervision of work. Ongoing records are kept of who does what and inadequate work can often be traced back to the worker. There seems to be little need for face-to-face command authority in order to get navy work actually accomplished.

THE PLACE OF MILITARIST AUTHORITY IN THE CONTEMPORARY NAVY

Ship crews not only work together but they must also live together. Face-to-face authority is used here in enforcing dress and
posture codes, cleanliness of person and quarters and deference. But there is no obvious tie between these requirements and practical living. Food, laundry, recreation and sleeping facilities are provided for EMs and use made of them as the EMs have a need and their schedules permit. Most daily living goes on without special enforcement or supervision simply by organization of the activities. Policing is also used. There are guards posted in officers' country, at the brig and in security areas. There is some personal supervision by NCOs. Ship's police and marines are available if trouble develops. Problems such as fights, insubordination, gambling, etc. may be reported on paper to the next level leading to a face-to-face hearing with the Executive Officer and finally Captain's Mast. EMs may be immediately arrested and held for court martial for more serious crimes. These personal confrontations are used as a back up to the organizational plan for work and living, not as ordinary controls.

The inspections that occur when the EMs leave the ships in port are face-to-face authority interactions. These are strongly resented by EMs. However these inspections and the related requirements for dress off the ship do not have an obvious connection to the accomplishment of work. In fact, the caste social division is more rigid with many more elaborations of etiquette, off the ship. The militarist ideology may have produced social constructions with little integration with ship life or work and its purposes. For many years recruitment, officer training and ship organization has been shaped by this militarist ideology. When the managerial elite calls for persuasive leadership or the easing of etiquette or dress codes there is a
militarist outcry. This alarm centers around the dangers of the good
guy leader. The tough guy the militarists prefer may have some
practical uses.

The tough guy NCO may very well benefit militarist senior
officers who interpret cooperation with "spit and polish" and etiquette
as signs that their authority is unchallenged. They insist on this
display and would have no special reason to be concerned if the NCOs
used tough guy methods of enforcing this. This may make EMs very
angry but their anger would be directed at the NCO not the senior
officer. The NCO then may become a very convenient buffer between
the men and the higher chain of command. The men may focus all
their discontent with the Navy on the target at hand.

The NCOs themselves may find enforcement of navy work orders
and militarist standards difficult. Much of the work is monotonous
and has little meaning to the sailors. The sailors strongly object
to the exact militarist regulations on appearance and behavior. Per-
suasion doesn't work well because rationalizing the need for spit and
polish and deference etiquette is not easy, at least not in terms
acceptable to EMs. The NCOs have been selected in part by their
ability to follow navy regulations, they are also self selected as
those who favor a navy career. They aren't likely to share the EMS
view of the regulations as simple harassment. In this situation it is
easier for most NCOs to get compliance by threat of punishment as a
tough guy. Those few who are able to use nice guy styles may be a
threat to the legitimacy of the others.
The tough guy role may also be psychologically comfortable for the NCO who feels powerless in respect to the larger bureaucracy and/or offended by the young officer with his promising career. Some sense of power may still be gained by officiousness and arbitrary demands on subordinates. Such a transfer of anger from its origin to less powerful targets is protected in an authority system that limits criticism by subordinates. Inasmuch as this happens it may serve the Navy purpose of keeping the NCOs cooperative with their superiors and vigilant over their work groups.

Militarist authority relationships may also be related to the military mission of the Navy. The militarist ideology recognizes a conflict of interest between enlisted people and officers. Enlisted people have traditionally had the most difficult work, the most personal involvement in doing violence, the hardest living situation and the most danger of being killed. Officers had somewhat less risks of death and much more to gain from their careers and the display of military status. The national and class interests of officers have more often been involved in particular wars. Battles at sea are rarely explainable as simple defense of home and country. The purposes of sea war must seem irrelevant to the long term interests of most sailors and of immediate danger to their persons. Ships at sea have also been in genuine danger from storms. As a result recruitment into navies had to be done by using prisoners, impressment or civilian draft. Under these conditions it is not surprising that the "tough guy" way of dealing with sailors developed. In addition to the threat of punishment, the tough guy helped create a shared reality of the powerlessness of the men and respect for the power,
if not the person, of the officer, especially the Captain. There were some difficulties with this. Sailors sometimes reacted by murdering officers or by mutiny. These actions were in turn handled punitively unless a mutinous group was successful, in that case there might be considerable negotiation between the mutinous crew and navy leaders. (Dugan 1965; Manwaring and Dobree 1935; Wintringham 1936) Melville thought navy ships were organized so as to produce conflicts and divisions of interest within the crew as a protection against mutiny. Marines have been openly used in this way. Their training encourages development of a separate group identity from sailors and they are assigned as police on the ships.

Today's militarists assume that there is a conflict of interest between EMs and officers and this is in part why they call for strong authority and punitive discipline. However this conflict, whatever it may be, is no longer obvious and the militarists do not specify it. A sailor on an aircraft carrier of today is not in much danger of life and limb. The work is hard with long hours and close quarters but the pay is good. The officers do have more inducements such as career promise, better salary and prestige. Their life is more comfortable than that of enlisted men, but the latter's situation is comfortable too, only more crowded with less privacy. Officers may have a career interest in the Navy which would lead them to work for a larger navy and be interested in being able to do war duty. Promotions increase during wars and in growth periods of the Navy, and war duty is essential for the higher promotions. The use of the Navy as national defense which would be in the interests of all personnel is not usually presented as an argument
for cooperation. There was an enormous effort to convince personnel of
the need for defense against communism but this argument is no longer very
popular and rather unrelated to current national policy. The Navy is now
used for showing force in disagreements with small nations, or in attacks
on them as in Vietnam. Navy writers also argue that the Navy has a role
in guarding commerce and shipment of oil. They think the Navy should be
superior to the USSR Navy in command of the seas. None of these navy uses
interests of junior officers or enlisted people to the navy mission.
(Proceedings, January 1973:15-64; October 1974:48-54; Klare 1972) There
is a conflict with their interests, however, or at least the interests of
the enlisted men. The long deployments around the world make for longer
working hours and longer time away from families. There is also concern
for seaworthiness of ships as regular repair schedules are not followed
in the Navy's effort to meet national policy demands for a worldwide
navy presence.

Several conflicts between officers and EMs can still be
identified. As officers try to win fleet competitions or personal
commendations they are likely to require extra work from sailors. The
EMs think needed repairs are sometimes avoided because the report of a
ship problem might harm the officer's career. There is another conflict
as militarist officers attempt to enforce deference etiquette which is
perceived by EMs as humiliating. Black EMs evidently feel the sharpest
conflicts, reporting that the administration of authority on the ships is
directly opposed to their interests. They feel they are used to do the
dirtiest work and then discriminated against in evaluations so that the
better jobs can be kept open for whites. When they complain they believe
they get more humiliating treatment and sometimes even extra punishment. Anti-war EMs and militarists recognize a political conflict of interest related to the role of the Navy in support of national policy. The resisters and militarists quote each other's statements to show this. The resisters point out that their actions are making it more difficult to control EMs. The militarists agree and see this as the beginning of the end of authority. (Armed Forces Journal, June 7, 1971)

From time-to-time enlisted people have attempted to organize in their own interests as civilian workers do in labor unions. All the military elite, managers and militarists, think this is inappropriate. They think EMs must be available for any and all assignment without the possibility of strike or delays from participation in decision making. Voluntary cooperation of enlisted people is not expected. The use of maritime unions to negotiate with sailors is not considered applicable to the military situation even though it is recognized as workable for civilian shipping companies. (Richardson 1970) This strong rejection of efforts of EMs to organize in their own interest indicates that managers as well as militarists suspect the self-interests of EMs are opposed to compliance with Navy authority. Active duty and retired officers are organized in professional societies and they do lobby for their interests. The official encouragement of these indicates that interests of officers and the Navy are thought to be congruent.

MANAGERIAL STYLES OF CONTROL

Individual career achievement is stressed in many ways. Navy recruiting literature promises job training for later civilian jobs as well as careers within the Navy. In all the recruiting literature career
training is used as a main appeal. There is ordinarily an additional statement about the good people with whom the new recruit will be working and another statement about adventure and travel. This promise of career advancement appears to be the managers' way of legitimizing their authority. It fits the managerial ideology of social interaction as commodity exchange, and the appeal to self-interested motives as a basis for involvement and compliance.

Their authority is also backed by general cooperation with their "paper manipulation". This cooperation is taken for granted, at least I found no reference to it or the possibility of people not cooperating. I am using "paper manipulation" to refer to control by manipulation of career possibilities via authorizations, examinations and payments by cheque. A local base CO or a ship's captain cannot themselves authorize promotions, transfers or retirements, prepare examinations or make out pay and allotment cheques. These are centrally controlled. Properly certified papers are accepted as an unchallengeable reality by military people and civilians. When mistakes are made, they may be appealed through the bureaucracy, but until another order or cheque comes through local action can not remedy them. These paper authorizations were used by the CNO and BUPERS to channel enlisted people's and officer's actions into desired behavior. When more applicants for a particular rate were needed special bonuses would become available and/or the requirements might be lowered. If militarist officers became a problem then promotion policy would penalize those with a militarist approach. Early retirements were forced on officers who did not receive promotions in a certain number of years, eliminating those who were
not ambitious or successful at getting recognition from their superiors. All of this was done without the necessity of face to face confrontation or resort to physical force.

Paper manipulation is much more difficult to fight than face to face authority and can be much stronger. Consider the situation of an officer who wished to continue in the Navy but receives his retirement papers and no longer receives active duty pay, or the EM who gets a punitive discharge, or the NCO who is passed over in promotions. Without the proper papers none of these people can get what they want. People around them are powerless to help. A personal physical attack or act of sabotage might be expressive but is not likely to be helpful in getting a change in the papers. Very high level officers or congressmen sometimes are able to intervene - if the applicant can get their attention and cooperation. Legal action has been helpful in a few cases. Of course this involves more paper work in an attempt to get the superior paper authorization of the courts. The regulations under which the original paper was issued might be changed by political action through the Congress, but this is a long way round and ordinarily even if ultimately successful comes too late to remedy the initial problem.

These paper authorizations are very effective in channeling actions of navy resisters as well as cooperators. Building a proper record is as important for the EM trying to get a Conscientious Objector discharge as it is for an NCO bucking for chief or a commander who wants to be an admiral or even the captain who may want to get rid
of his executive officer or any other subordinate. Navy people do learn ways to influence this paper work. When there are specific procedures required by regulation, these may be used against the bureaucracy to limit or delay actions or hold the bureaucracy to rules that are a burden. Crozier has discussed how regulations are often used by workers to gain more control over their situation (Crozier 1964). This was one of the major strategies of GI resisters and was aided by the counseling centers. It often helped individuals to have favorable outcomes to their transfers or discharges, but this was done only one case at a time. Paper manipulation is not rule by regulation it is rather rule by authorization. Many personnel decisions are made by unnamed committees within BUPERS. They can exercise discretion without the necessity of explanations to disappointed applicants. Individuals try to get the authorizations they want by careful attention to building their record and by applying for the choices available. Their actions become the behavior wanted by the managers.

According to the managerial ideology, command types of authority should be avoided in face-to-face relations. The approach recommends a very different style for instructions from superior to inferior. The following advice to officers from the handbook, Ship Organization and Personnel:

... assume the second division officer on the guided missile destroyer Pratt has noticed that the quarterdeck for which he is responsible could stand a little improvement. His Boatswain's Mate 2/C Harris is in charge of the quarterdeck. A good approach is: "Harris, this area is falling off a bit, let's bring the deck out a little brighter"...
If he wishes to make it a bit stronger, he can say: "Harris, the quarterdeck is not up to Pratt standards of appearance. If you cannot keep it up properly with the men you have, let me know and we'll look into a shift of work details here." If this does not get results he should either consider replacing petty officer Harris or assigning more men. (USNI 1972:32) (see appendix i for USNI references)

Teamwork is used as a metaphor for work relationships, this emphasizes shared purposes and a non-hierarchical organization. It also may transfer some of the positive cultural values of team sports to military work. Face-to-face relationships are occasions for manipulation in many counseling programs. There are special programs that offer drug, alcohol and career counseling as well as general psychiatric and religious counseling. There are other programs that bring small groups together in sensitivity sessions called group development. The programs attempt to define problems as individual or interpersonal and probably are meant to depoliticize discontent as well as to rehabilitate. The appropriate sociological name for this is probably "cooling the mark" (Goffman 1952). The GI movement people thought counseling, especially in the drug programs, was used to get information about individuals that could later be used in criminal actions or discharge procedures against them or their friends.

Intelligence agents are increasingly used on the ships, their presence has been announced in All Hands. This is a kind of spector of a face-to-face relationship. Since the identity of the agents is not known anyone may be suspected of being one. (Marx 1974) This can hardly be expected to build team spirit. It probably does worry NCOs and officers who may not know the identity of the agent. Any of their actions may be reported and criticized with a resulting mark on their records. Secret agents are a threat to anyone critical of managerial ideology.
To summarize, the social construction of authority on the ships has shifted from face-to-face command and obedience among leaders and followers to a much more complex situation. The control is now largely indirect and done by channeling of opportunities and threat via paper. Punishment as well as rewards may consist of paper messages which are palpable in their consequences. No one may be needed to administer the consequences, they may simply follow from the regular organization of the naval administrative process which is also consequential for similar process in the larger society. For instance, if a person is discharged they no longer receive pay. If the discharge was less than honorable this will be marked on the discharge papers. Civilian employers usually ask to see these papers. The failure to be hired by potential employers is not exactly administration of the punishment but it is nonetheless punitive in effect.

The work itself is so assigned and organized that face-to-face supervision is usually unnecessary. There are occasions for face-to-face interaction between EMs and NCOs in the ship living situation and during inspections. The relationship is often perceived as humiliating by EMs.

Formal judgment and punishment may occur but not in the work group. This takes place sometime after the alleged transgression at the executive officer's hearing and at Captain's Mast. If sent to the brig a sailor will again experience a face-to-face authority relationship with the guards. None of these interactions are likely to be related to the direct accomplishment of work. Counseling and group development programs offer an institutionalized pseudo-personal contact between the organization and EMs. These may have a cooling out or cooling down function,
but if so, this happens via persuasion or subtle threat, not through commands. The rationale for the maintenance of a formal deference etiquette between the men and officers is no longer plausible. The relationship can now be friendly without destroying the basis of obedience. The orders most often come now from levels above the sailor and his immediate supervisor, and they come as paper rather than as verbal orders delivered face-to-face. If the sailor objects to the order, the "brass" or Navy can be blamed, but the immediate supervisor is not directly responsible for work decisions.
PART TWO

CASE STUDIES

The case studies were initially planned around antiwar campaigns on three attack aircraft carriers, the USS Constellation, the USS Coral Sea and the USS Kitty Hawk from fall 1971 through winter 1972. I interviewed people involved in these movements and gathered their literature as well as news reports of the events from GI, underground, navy and regular press sources (see appendix i for a description of these sources). More material was available for events in the San Diego area due partly to a more adequate public library collection. In the San Diego library one of the daily newspapers was even indexed by the name of particular ships. The library also kept copies of the local underground paper, The Door. Little was available from the San Francisco library where no daily paper is indexed.

In addition there was not as much documentary material produced by the movement groups in the Bay Area. The Bay area people used a more informal approach to organizing and they tried to avoid publicity rather than use it as a tactic to get civilian support. There were news reports after an event but little during the campaigns. Consequently I found much more material about the Constellation and Kitty Hawk campaigns than about the Coral Sea. As I was in the process
of organizing this material in the fall of 1972 two major resistance events happened. These were racial resistance actions on the same two ships I had already been following, the *Kitty Hawk* and the *Constellation*. At about this same time the sabotage charges against Chenoweth of the *Ranger* became news and I was able to collect considerable material on this since by then I was receiving six of the GI and underground papers. The ephemeral nature of underground newspaper publishing and the lack of complete library collections make it difficult to find back copies. The newspaper people themselves usually do not have all or even many of their old editions on file. It is much easier to gather this kind of document on current events than to find reports for actions that happened a few months or a year or two earlier.

Following the racial incidents, national news services reported trouble within the naval command related to navy policy toward Blacks and dissenters. I was already aware of a command conflict over management ideologies from my reading of the military journals. I continued to gather this material. These journals are available in many libraries.

I arranged the news reports, articles and pamphlets chronologically within specific case histories and then read and re-read them as I tried out different interpretations of what was happening. The total 550 documents are too bulky to be reproduced here but in this section, part two, I have summarized the six major cases for which there was the most complete information. These are the anti-war
campaigns on the **Kitty Hawk** and the **Constellation**; the later racial incidents on these two ships; the charges, trial and movement support of Chenoweth on the **USS Ranger**; and finally, the admirals reaction against CNO Zumwalt and managerial policy.

These events happened in an historical context and in particular were related to the war in Vietnam, to actions on other ships, and to the peace movement. During 1969 several infantry units refused combat orders in Vietnam. Fragging of officers, fights, desertion and drug usage were also a problem for the U.S. military command. They decreased their use of ground troops and increased the air war. Many of the planes used in the air war were based on carriers off Vietnam. Such carriers had been used throughout the Vietnam war but now more of them were sent to the Western Pacific area and held there for longer and longer periods. There were fourteen Attack Carriers in the U.S. Navy and by fall of 1972 six of them were deployed off Vietnam. At any particular time, two or three carriers are undergoing regular repairs so six carriers represent half of the available Attack Carrier force.

In the spring of 1970 the civilian anti-war protest became a massive movement after four students were killed by national guardsmen on Kent State University campus in Ohio and civilians demonstrated in protest across the country. The following April and May mass demonstrations and disruptions were held at the nation's capitol and in cities across the country. The anti-war campaigns on the ships followed these events. The relationship of the six case histories to each other and to national events is shown in the following brief chronology of the period:
## CHRONOLOGY OF NAVY RESISTANCE 1971-73
*(Starred events are reported as part of the case histories)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month and Year</th>
<th>Ship Related Events</th>
<th>National Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1971</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May to October</td>
<td><em>San Diego Vote Campaign to keep the USS Constellation home. Nine crew members took sanctuary in local churches.</em></td>
<td>-Massive disruptions and anti-war demonstrations occurred in major cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td><strong>SOS campaign on the USS Coral Sea at Alameda. 300 sailors were rumored on Unauthorized Absence and three officers resigned as the ship left.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December to February</td>
<td><em>SOS campaign on the USS Kitty Hawk at San Diego. Nine remained in sanctuary when the ship left (including two from a support ship).</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1972</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>-USS Midway left Alameda as one sailor took sanctuary.</td>
<td>-Bombing of North Vietnam resumed from carrier based planes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mining of Haiphong harbor by Coral Sea planes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>-USS America sailed from Norfolk as the Coast Guard cleared protestors from the harbor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>-A million dollar fire occurred on the USS Forrestal at Norfolk and a sailor was arrested for sabotage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sabotage to a reduction gear of the USS Ranger delayed its departure three months.*
August
*The Navy arrested Seaman Chenoweth for the Ranger sabotage. GI movement people organized support for his defense.

September
-USS Enterprise left Alameda as anti-war civilians attempted to block Golden Gate with boats. The Navy discharged five sailors as SOS organizers.

October
*Over 200 were involved in a racial fight on the USS Kitty Hawk while the ship was in action off Vietnam. Forty-six sailors were injured, twenty-eight arrested.

-Four were injured in a racial fight on the oiler, Hassayampa while in the Phillipines.

*An admiral publicly warned of sabotage by dissidents and blamed Zumwalt's reforms in a retirement speech.

November
*Sit-down strikes involving up to 300 sailors occurred on the USS Constellation on training out of San Diego and at the dock.

*CNO Zumwalt and the Secretary of the Navy attacked top officers for failure to implement racial reforms.

*A group of admirals worked to have Zumwalt removed.

-A racial uprising occurred at the navy brig in Norfolk.

-Over 200 sailors were in a racial fight at Midway Island.

December

-The Democratic Party nominated anti-war candidate, McGovern.

-Bombing of North Vietnam was stopped.

-Bombing of North Vietnam was resumed.
1973

January  *Congressional investigation of racial incidents was completed. The Representatives found that the problem was the CNO's policy of "permissiveness".

April  *Trials of twenty-eight Kitty Hawk sailors ended. Seven remained in naval prisons.

May

June  *Chenoweth acquitted of Ranger sabotage.

July  -Two days of racial fighting occurred on the USS Roosevelt in the Caribbean Sea.

-Paris Peace Agreements were signed ending Vietnam War direct involvement.

-Watergate investigations began under newly appointed Attorney General, Elliot Richardson.
The five case histories were summarized from the reports of the various documents. In doing this I tried to select so that the variety of sources and interpretations of the whole corpus were represented. I have noted the differences in ideas of what happened as I recognized them. The case histories presented here are then not the original material from which I worked but summaries based on my interpretations of the documents.
In spring 1971 following the national peace movement demonstrations, the USS Constellation, an attack aircraft carrier, arrived in San Diego to prepare for another tour to Vietnam. The ship had been under repair in Bremerton, Washington, where a group of officers and enlisted men had organized a unit of the Concerned Officers Movement or COM. They had already planned and participated in a peace walk in Bremerton. San Diego anti-war people had also organized as Non Violent Action, NVA. They planned to support protest among the sailors on the carrier. They sent 2500 letters aboard telling the sailors that NVA hoped they would stay home rather than go on to the ship's sixth tour in Vietnam.

We are convinced that the coming WESTPAC deployment of the Connie will be harmful to everyone - to you, to us and to the people of Southeast Asia. The war in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos is far more devastating than most people realize.

(NVA April 1971,C-3 see appendix i for document references)

This letter arrived on the ship before it had docked in San Diego. (Later COM reported that the Captain had confiscated and destroyed almost all of the letters. They then called for a Navy Court of Inquiry and a U.S. Postal Service investigation.) The ship was met by U.S. Representative Ron Dellums and NVA people. Dellums talked to Blacks and anti-war crew members about discrimination and
political harassment on the ship. The Captain, according to The Door, the local underground newspaper, nervously chewed Tums. (Door April 14-18, 1971)

NVA and COM were soon cooperating. In May COM put out a small newspaper, Liberty Call. It reported how eleven hundred of the Connie crew had signed a petition to have the Jane Fonda anti-war show perform on the ship. The Captain refused permission to have the show aboard (pro-military entertainers had been hosted on the ship earlier) and he confiscated the petitions. The Fonda show was held in San Diego on May 15th, Armed Forces Day or "Armed Forces Day" as the anti-military people called it. Twenty-five hundred sailors and civilians attended. The daily newspaper, the San Diego Union reported the efforts to get the show on the ship. They also explained that COM was requesting a Naval Court of Inquiry into the earlier letter confiscation, they reported the Jane Fonda petition confiscation, protest of a new order of the captain banning non-approved literature and punishment on the ship of a COM member. This was reported without editorial comment. (San Diego Union June 7, 1971)

In June an informal meeting of about one hundred and fifty men was held on the ship to talk about racism, drugs and navy life in general. Someone suggested that they all use the Action Line and ask for peanut butter. The Action Line became jammed and they got peanut butter for supper. The executive officer then came on the ship's TV

3 Jane Fonda and other anti-war actors and entertainers had been traveling to military bases with their show. It was sponsored by the United States Servicemen's Fund, a nation-wide civilian and GI support group.
and warned that this was an organized attempt to jam the line and if this worked the group might escalate its demands. Several days later the group held another meeting and went over a number of grievances. The Captain called a meeting the following day, responded to the points, named four crewmen he claimed were responsible, and said they would be charged with sedition if the group met again. This was all gleefully reported in *The Door* as "The Great Peanut Butter Conspiracy". *The Door* noted that the Captain had since been called to Washington and that both the postal service and Navy were now investigating the Captain. (*Door* July 7-20, 1971)

By July many of the COM members had been transferred off the ship. *The Door* ran a long story "The Connie is No Lady" that reviewed the campaign. In the same issue *The Door* reported that peace people in San Diego were trying to stop funding for attack carriers. A bill was being prepared for Congress. Citizens were urged to realize that the Vietnam War was continuing by naval aircraft based on these carriers. A campaign to stop the Connie was presented as a symbolic way of gathering more civilian as well as GI support for ending the war. (*Door* July 21-Aug. 3, 1971)

In August a banner saying "Connie Stay Home For Peace" was flown over San Diego a number of times by a member of the Harbor Project, and ex-carrier pilot. The Harbor Project was the name of the combined effort of COM and NVA. They now decided on a vote campaign as their next effort to keep the Connie home. The campaign had encouragement from Joan Baez and her Institute for the Study of
Nonviolence and the active support of David Harris. Harris had been a leader in the draft resistance movement and was just out of jail for draft resistance at this time. (Door Aug. 18-Sept. 1, 1971)

There was an intensive campaign for the next six weeks. There were meetings, public picnics and rap sessions with Harris and military counselors. Bumper stickers and stick-on slogans were made available all over town. Some of these began showing up on the ship, even on the captain's door.

The Navy was also doing public relations. August fifteenth the ship hosted dependents for a day cruise and air show. Navy and veterans groups spoke out against the vote project considering it bizarre to allow military men to vote as to whether they would follow orders of the civilian government. (San Diego Union Aug. 29, 1971)

NVA handed out more leaflets emphasizing the validity of sailors expressing their own ideas about their military orders. Liberty Call carried statements by David Harris and two ex-officers which were representative of this literature.

The vote is an exercise in very simple and straightforward democracy. It is a common voice for people who have been denied a common voice in the ongoing process of government decisions. If it is really democracy the government is practicing and democracy the Navy is defending, then we expect they will recognize and be bound by the results of the vote. ....the vote will help us as a people begin to make decisions that have been out of our hands for much too long.

Dave Harris

...As a Naval aviator, I have flown from the decks of our carriers. Today, carriers are used, not to protect other naval vessels, but to attack targets on land. The most sophisticated of technological weapons are targeted at people, the people of underdeveloped countries. Right
now attack carriers are in the Gulf of Tonkin. Their planes are bombing people in our names. Do we want that bombing to continue?...Should the USS Constellation stay home?

John Huyler (former Navy Lt.)

We hold that the rights of free speech and dialogue is a CRUCIAL right that must be established before any other reform can be made possible. Admiral Zumwalt, the Chief of Naval Operations, has made it his policy to create channels, such as the ACTION LINE, for in-service members to air their grievances. It is the opinion of COM that although these channels are a step in the right direction, they should be expanded to include channels by which servicemen can form and express their views on community and national issues as well.... It is not enough that men be given the right to air petty grievances, such as lack of toilet paper in the heads, and be silenced on issues that concern them as individuals.

Paul Rogers (former Ensign on the Constellation) (Liberty Call, September 17-21, 1971)

The campaign gathered supporters with street dances and picnics. A small booklet was printed and circulated with personal statements by four enlisted men and officers on how they had come to realize that they could no longer participate in the war. Each of the four reported specific events that had influenced them to change. These varied from anti-war films to face-to-face contact with Vietnamese victims and wounded sailors. In each case they had come to realize how they themselves were involved in the destruction of people. (NVA 1971)

In September, a GI newspaper Up From The Bottom reported the campaign and also featured a report by a Connie wife about the problems she had in trying to visit her husband who was on the Connie on restriction. The tone of the paper was more bitter and informal than the NVA and COM materials. A "Lifer of the Month" was featured. The Connie wife said:
Don't get riled when you see a couple of lifers plus an officer and the Master at Arms at the quarterdeck, it takes their combined efforts for them to read an I.D. card and hassle every man. I noticed that, even tho the lifers tried, they couldn't smile, they've growled and frowned too much!

...I wish more dissatisfied wives of the P.O.W.s of the Constellation would get their shit together. We sure could make some noise! (UFTB September 1971)

The San Diego Union ran a long report of a crewman who had been confined to the brig for distributing leaflets on the ship while it was at sea on a training run. He was now fasting in protest over not being allowed to appeal the sentence. The Captain was reported as having asked the Navy to discharge him for drug use. NVA was reported as picketing the ship. (San Diego Union Sept. 2, 1971)

NVA leafleting and programs continued and the bi-weekly Door and daily newspaper San Diego Union continued coverage. The vote was to be taken September 17 to 21. Ballot boxes were manned by NVA volunteers (mostly young civilians) throughout the city. Three thousand ballots were mailed to specific sailors on the ship. The campaign was topped off with two Baez fold concerts and a rap session with Dave Harris. This was well publicized in movement and regular press media and by leafleting. GI newspapers around the country carried stories about the "Connie Stay Home" campaign.

The San Diego and Los Angeles newspapers interviewed the ship's captain, Gerhard, and he and the Air Force Commander of the Pacific Fleet issued statements that the Constellation would sail on schedule. Secretary of the Navy, Chafee, declared that the morale on the ship was high and that it was inappropriate for military men
to vote on their orders of a civilian government. (San Diego Union September 2, 1971)

During the days of the vote there were daily reports in the San Diego Union as well as continual broadsides, leafleting, folk concerts and street events by the project people. The San Diego Union was the first to announce the vote. Eighty-two per cent of the total 55,000 votes were for the Connie to stay home. Six hundred forty-six of the crew had voted, fifty-four per cent for staying home. (There were about 4500 officers and enlisted men aboard.) (San Diego Union September 23, 1971) NVA leaflets were soon out announcing and analyzing the vote.

A small counter-campaign was started by four women:

...to let the crew know not all of San Diego is apathetic, sitting back and doing nothing. We are extremely appalled at how much publicity and attention is being given to the vote.

(San Diego Union Sept. 21, 1971)

NVA had planned a full schedule of events as anti-climax for the last ten days between the vote and ship's sailing. Legal counseling was to be offered with trained military counselors and lawyers available. There were also to be pickets, vigils at the navy gates and a final candlelight vigil the night before the ship sailed. A peace fleet of small private boats were to gather in the harbor as a final protest when the ship sailed. September twenty-seventh the first counseling event was held. September twenty-eighth Captain Gerhard was hospitalized and a Captain Ward assumed command. The project people thought the strain of their campaign was responsible. (Harbor Project Sept. 1971, San Diego
September twenty-ninth four men publicly refused to return to their ship. They did this by taking sanctuary in a local Catholic Church and by issuing public statements of their objections to further military service (NVA 1971). Charlie Andrews' statement was similar to the others:

The USS Constellation under orders, not from the American people but a few very powerful politicians and military people, has taken the right over life and death. I refuse to take part in this murder. I am in sanctuary. I will not be forced to take part in this murder.

P.S. Thou must not kill. (NVA, 1971)

The four priests and a nun from the church also issued their own statement of reasons for offering sanctuary. (NVA, 1971) In a later interview the men said that they had been to several other churches with their request for sanctuary before they were accepted. (Door, Oct. 13-27, 1971)

The first day of sanctuary the ranking naval chaplain of the Naval District paid a friendly visit and was challenged by the men for his role in the military. (Door, Oct. 13-27, 1971)

The September thirtieth San Diego Union reported that there were now six men in sanctuary, two more had joined. The article quoted the men as aware that sanctuary was not legally recognized

---

4 Sanctuary had been used by military resisters since 1969. It was a symbolic revival of the medieval practise of church protection. Although church authority in the twentieth century does not protect against military and civilian police, it was used as a tactic for expressing conscientious objection and as a way of publicly illustrating a contradiction between military and religious values.
and that they expected to be arrested, tried and convicted for refusal to return to their ship. The same issue quoted the new commanding officer, Captain Ward, as saying he didn't detect anything alarming in the crew's behavior, but that there were many malcontents aboard. He thought this was about the usual percentage for any ship. He said the Navy handles them by waiting until they violate a regulation and then they would "end up in disciplinary status". (San Diego Union Sept. 30, 1971)

The Coast Guard published a warning to any people that might try to obstruct the ship's sailing October first. The ship sailed without incident but without three more sailors who had joined the other six in sanctuary. Some of them had been discussing this step for several days with small groups of other sailors. (Door, Oct. 13-27, 1971)

Early the next morning at 4:40 A.M. the sailors were arrested and flown to the ship. The captain was to decide what charges would be filed against them. The priests held a church prayer service that afternoon for the men. The sanctuary and arrests became national news. Detailed reports of the events and the men's own reports came later in local and national anti-war media. (These latter sources have delays between gathering news and publishing. Most are published bi-weekly or monthly.) Up From The Bottom reported the sanctuary and subsequent arrests but with a slight criticism of the tactic:

The Connie 9 were given a choice of either going to a
federal prison or to the floating prison they call the USS Constellation. All 9 chose to go back to that horrifying hell hole and work among humanoids.

Around 6:55 am the Connie 9 were on a plane headed back to the USS Constellation. Now that the Connie 9 are returned to a floating sexist, racist, dictatorship, they will be rechanneled to be robots and wind-up tin soldiers. This means that they will have a hard time regaining their positions as free speaking individuals.

Support is needed for these 9 individuals and all others who speak up for what they believe is right. The best thing you can do is set an example by your personal actions. Speaking up and voicing your opinions, get together with your friends and make the oppressors hear you out.

Always remember, that they can't close your mouth, they can't control your actions, they can't control your thinking. ALL POWER TO THE PEOPLE (UFTB Oct. 1971)

This statement also reflected a difference between the UFTB and the Harbor Project's rhetoric. In September an article about the Harbor Project in the Door had said:

The Desire of the project workers to relate to the various constituencies of the Vote on a "just folks" level is reflected by both the tone and content of the leaflets, radio, and TV spots. There is no use of the words "militarism", "racism," "sexism," "imperialism". Instead a conscious effort is being made to communicate with people in a personal, non-rhetorical style.

...The underlying assumptions of the Project—that the project workers, many with white middle class backgrounds, can relate to the people of San Diego on both a non-ideological and revolutionary level basis are seemingly radical assumptions within the radical-left movement. Revolutions have classically been related to working vs. ruling class struggle, or to the overthrow of colonial regimes by subjugated people. This assumption is articulated by David Harris when he says: "I think we are in the struggle for our own existence."

(Door Sept. 15-29, 1971)

This difference was partly one of tactics but also came from different analyses of the situation. The project people emphasized that it was the use of violence as a means that was wrong while the UFTB group cited exploitation and capitalism as
the basic problem. This difference did not become a public topic except for such slight references. Neither group made an issue of their differences and neither printed analyses of the war beyond the most simple broad statements.

When the Constellation reached Honolulu it was learned that the nine had been given one month brig sentences at Captain's Mast and were fasting in protest. (San Diego Union Oct. 12, 1971) By the end of the month one of the men had decided to cooperate with the Navy and so the group was reduced to the "Connie 8". The Navy enlistments of two of the men were almost up and they were flown back to the naval station at Treasure Island in San Francisco Bay where they were detained. They were able to talk to other movement EMs and help with the organizing of another campaign that had been inspired from the Connie vote.

This new effort became the (SOS could mean Stop Our Ship or Save Our Ship) SOS movement on the USS Coral Sea, another attack carrier. This ship was scheduled to leave the Bay Area in November for Vietnam. The new campaign differed from the Connie Vote in that there were more enlisted men involved in the early organizing and there was less initial publicity and involvement of the local civilian peace community. There was more of an anti-capitalist, anti-lifer emphasis in their literature and non-violence was not featured; however, there was a non-violent caucus within the organizing group. There was an attempt to use the method of public sanctuary again. The City of Berkeley and a dozen churches agreed
to offer sanctuary and counseling. Many sailors visited the churches and talked to supporters there, but none took sanctuary. This was partly due to differences within SOS on the question of sanctuary as a tactic. The disagreement did not become an open split. Publicly and in most of the reports all ship protest and resistance was referred to as part of the same movement. Later SOS became the symbol for many other anti-war events sponsored by various groups.

There were finally several SOS rallies with sailors and civilians attending. At one, three young officers resigned their commissions to loud acclaim. After a trial run the Coral Sea came back into harbor through the Golden Gate bridge. While supporters waved peace banners from the bridge, seventy sailors on the flight deck formed themselves into an SOS. A final huge demonstration was held November twelfth when the ship sailed from Alameda. National and international news services carried reports that up to two hundred fifty sailors had failed to return to the ship.

(Berkeley Barb Nov. 12-18, 1971)

While this campaign was underway the five additional Constellation prisoners were flown into the Treasure Island Naval Base and held in detention. Their legal counselors found it difficult to talk to them without Navy interference. Congressman Dellums appointed one of the Harbor Project people as his aide who was then allowed to visit and report on the treatment of the men. Dellums continued to push the Navy for constitutional treatment of the prisoners. They were given General Discharges December
sixth and there were celebrations in the Bay area and a later reunion in San Diego. The discharge was billed as a success by the underground and GI papers. The eight could have been tried at a court martial and if found guilty been given sentences of several years in prison. (Door Dec. 2-23, 1971)

UFTB reported the outcome with mild approval in an article titled "Connie 8 Skate". It ended, "All power to the man or woman who gets out of the service no matter what the reason is". (UFTB Jan. 1972) The military editor of the San Diego Union complained about the general discharges under honorable conditions. He felt the veterans benefits for which they were now eligible were not deserved. He noted that the discharges were decided by a BUPERS board and issued in the Chief of Naval Personnel's name. (San Diego Union Dec. 16, 1971)

Several of the eight resisters remained in San Diego and worked with the Harbor Project which now was focusing on another carrier, the USS Kitty Hawk and its planned departure in March. There were also other efforts related to different ships. In January a sailor from the USS Hancock took sanctuary.

The eight did not go to Vietnam but the USS Constellation did with almost all of the crew aboard. The planes immediately entered actively into the bombing of Vietnam. A San Diego officer's wife received a telegram from her husband, a flyer. He had shot down a MIG. "I'm terribly proud of him," she told a reporter. (San Diego Union Jan. 21, 1972) And so the eight month campaign -
although it had received the participation of some of the sailors and officers, the attention of the whole crew, and national publicity, and also forced the Navy to recognize it and react publicly to it - had not managed to stop or even delay the movement and use of the ship.

In January The Door reported that there was trouble on the Connie. They had received letters saying the ship would return early because of antiwar sentiment and poor morale. (Door Jan. 13-27, 1972) Months later after the ships return and the November strike, the Captain reported that there had been many instances of sabotage at sea and that three suspected saboteurs had been taken off the ship while in Asia. He also said he had uncovered a plot of enlisted men to lie down on the flight deck to prevent planes from leaving. None of this was reported at the time. (Associated Press, Nov. 15, 1972)

A plan to boost ship morale was also attempted in January. Captain Ward's wife, at home in San Diego, organized a tour for wives to meet the ship when it was to be in Hong Kong for eight days of rest and recreation. This plan received considerable publicity. Two hundred fifty wives with some other relatives and children paid for their tickets and made the trip, arriving February fourth. Local papers in the U.S. featured their respective hometown boys' reunion with their wives. A Seattle article pictured a Black petty officer as he greeted his Seattle wife and baby. The message seemed to be that all was well
on the Connie, particularly with Blacks. The article implied that
the Navy had sponsored the whole trip, but the cost was actually
paid by the wives themselves. The paper did not follow the story
to its frustrating end. The visit was interrupted without notice
after less than four days. The ship had been ordered back to duty
in Vietnam for a massive air strike. When the unhappy wives re­
turned to San Diego they were interviewed by the San Diego Union.
Reactions ranged from anger expressed by several enlisted men's
wives to dutiful acceptance of the navy way by an officer's wife.
(San Diego Union Feb. 12, 1972, Seattle Times Feb. 4, 1972)

Several months passed without reports and the ship was
expected back in April. Out of town families had started to
arrange for housing in San Diego. The San Diego symphony con­
sidered playing a major concert on the flight deck as a welcome
when the ship returned. This was protested by the Harbor Project
and other peace groups and the plan was dropped. (San Diego Union
April 1, 1972) On April third when the Connie was near Japan on
its planned return home, the Navy suddenly announced that it would
instead return to "Yankee Station" for more bombing of Vietnam.
(San Diego Union April 6, 1972) The Navy attempted to notify the
many dependents who were on their way to San Diego. It was almost
three months later that the carrier finally did return to San Diego
on July first 1972. It had been gone a total of nine months.

The Harbor Project people greeted the returning sailors with
literature that emphasized the destruction caused by their mission.
Should the USS Constellation have stayed home? Was it worth the stereo you wanted to pick up clean? Was it worth the 9 months of loneliness and cramped living?...was it worth the incredible suffering rained upon Vietnamese children, women and men? (Harbor Project, July 1972)

They also invited enlisted men to their storefront bookstore "Second Thoughts" where counseling as well as books were available. They referred to their group as "San Diego Concerned Military".

Up From The Bottom also greeted the returning sailors but with an article that carefully rationalized their participation in the Vietnam war, explaining that they had little choice and were themselves victimized by the Navy. They were invited to UFTB's counseling center in downtown San Diego and promised:

full support of resources and energy to any effort by Connie crewmen and wives to organize for legal rights, against another WESPAC deployment or any other struggle against the brass in which you can use our aid. We're here to help all people in the military gain a decent way of life free from harassment, coercion and oppression. (UFTB July 1972)

The Door reported the return of the ship emphasizing its destructive role in IndoChina but without criticizing the crew. (Door July 7-20, 1972)

Immediate organizing was not possible as men were given the usual thirty days leave followed by thirty days light duty as the ship was under repairs. At the same time about one third of the crew were replaced as part of the ordinary rotations for some and end of enlistment for others. By October one fifth of the crew were not new, not only to the ship but to the Navy. The movement papers did not report contact with the reconstituted crew.
The peace community and underground press were occupied this summer and fall 1972 with a campaign to get the question of the Air War on the California ballot and with the presidential campaign of Senator George McGovern who was running as an anti-war candidate. *Up From The Bottom* had continued to follow Navy news but little was reported from San Diego and nothing from the *Constellation*. The Harbor Project was cooperating with EMs on the USS *Kitty Hawk*. The *Kitty Hawk* was then in WESPAC and the Harbor Project helped by printing a newspaper written by men on the ship.

During this summer from one to eleven men took sanctuary from three carriers in the San Francisco Bay area and extensive sabotage was reported on the USS *Ranger* at Alameda and on the USS *Forrestal* on the East Coast.

The account of the USS *Constellation* will be interrupted here to follow the *Kitty Hawk* story.
While the Constellation Vote was being taken the USS Kitty Hawk, another attack carrier was beginning preparations for sea trials for a March 1972 deployment to Vietnam. The ship had been in port since July. The crew had been on the customary months leave and were back by the time of the September Connie Vote campaign and October sanctuary events. They also probably knew something about the SOS movement on the Coral Sea in the Bay Area. The Coral Sea had sailed for Vietnam November twelfth amid protest and national publicity as discussed earlier.

In December some Kitty Hawk crewmen joined with the Harbor Project to publish a newsletter called Kitty Litter. Harbor Project now had five ex-Navy men including two of the "Connie 8" and a young woman on its volunteer staff. This newsletter differed from their earlier Liberty Call by discussing more of the specific problems of enlisted men and using EM terms such as "lifer". There was now more economic analysis of the war and less emphasis on suffering of the Vietnamese. The first edition reviewed the Connie and Coral Sea anti-war campaigns. At least two hundred copies were mailed to the ship and four thousand others distributed in the San
Diego area. The copies sent aboard ship were addressed to individuals who had been asked if they were willing to be sent the paper. The sailor organizers said that they went up and down the chow lines and noted those with slightly longer hair and asked them for their names to receive the paper. The paper staff thought that more people would read the paper if there were limited copies available than if they had sent many copies to the ship.

In addition to reports of anti-war movements on other ships the first issue had news about racism at Camp Pendleton, counseling information about Captain's Mast hearings, comment on the difficult situation of enlisted men, explanations of GI free speech rights, and comment on automated warfare in Indochina. One article that invited crew members to write for the papers was assigned with the sailor's name, Steve Harris, and he had added "During working hours you can find me cleaning the head at frame 03-100/104 6L." (Kitty Litter Nov. 1971)

Up From The Bottom also had a letter signed by Kitty Hawk crew member, Jerry Cich, titled "Stop the Shitty Kitty". He said he had heard that there might be a campaign similar to the Connie vote or the campaign to stop the Coral Sea or the Kitty Hawk. He hoped it would be more like the SOS campaign and that enlisted people would be the main ones to organize it. Enlisted men were invited to come by the Center for Servicemen's Rights (sponsors of UFTB) to talk with him about it. (UFTB Nov.-Dec. 1971) The same issue featured the XO (Executive Officer) of the Kitty Hawk as the
"Lifer of the Month" because of his harassments over haircuts. Haircut problems were reported again in the following issue. The CO, Captain Oberg, had liberalized haircuts, but at the same time specifically not allowed braiding of hair. The paper charged that since this only affected Blacks it was racism. (UFTB, Jan. 1972)

By the second issues of both Kitty Litter and UFTB both sailors who had signed their names to articles had been taken off the ship. Harris was given an honorable discharge as a Conscientious Objector and Cich was transferred. Cich wrote an article protesting the transfer and asked again for an SOS type campaign on the Kitty Hawk. He also spoke against the war and the Navy's methods of job assignment and about the lack of full information for enlisted people when they are recruited. (UFTB Jan. 1972) Harbor Project people told me that such discharges and transfers were commonly used at this time to remove organizers. One outspoken person might not be removed but as others seemed to be influenced, action was taken. According to them, from thirty to forty-five people were transferred or discharged during each ship campaign.

This second issue of Kitty Litter had a picture of the triumphant Connie eight on the cover waving their discharges and captioned "WE WON". There was a full report inside and stories of protest continuing on the Coral Sea and the Enterprise, the Navy's only atomic powered attack carrier. Five hundred sailors on the Enterprise had signed a petition against the war. Senator McGovern was quoted by Kitty Litter as saying America's bombing
of peasants was barbaric. One article attacked the steward system whereby officers have servants. The article explained how Filipino nationals were recruited for this job. The article was headed "institutional racism". Haircuts were still a problem. Harassment by lifers was explained as the lifer's way of keeping the men from questioning any orders or from thinking about what they were doing. To prevent thinking, an environment of fear was necessary and so harassment on petty matters was used. One filler added "Thinking is Cancer to an Aircraft Carrier". (Kitty Litter Jan. 1972) There were analyses of the POW issue and of the Navy's use of the USS Enterprise in the Indian Ocean to threaten India during the Pakistan-Bangladesh war. The role of attack carriers was explained as only for support to counter-revolutionary movements in non-industrial nations. An airman at the Nevada base of the airwing wrote that Captain Oberg had used the ship's intercom to denounce Kitty Litter people as irresponsible dupes. Another article said that Kitty Litter had been praised by many people while they were at the Nevada base. In February the third issue of Kitty Litter had a letter from a sailor on the Coral Sea:

Dear John,

Well, I thought I would write to you and tell you what I am doing now. I am aboard the USS Coral Sea off the coast of you know where! It took more guts than I had to go to jail rather than go here. I think perhaps I wasn't as I thought I was.

I think the ship is the one responsible for the children being killed. The crazy mothers are bombing what they can't see. All they do is fly over land, go to where they think they are supposed to be and drop their bombs. There are so many clouds that they can't see what they're bombing, so
they don't know if it is a fuel depot or a school.
The morale is really bad. I think hardly anybody wanted
to come over here. Now they realize it and can't do anything
about it. The officers aboard that let anybody know that
they were members of COM all got general discharges or
transferred. Us enlisted men just get worse jobs. I had
to go captain's mast cause I wouldn't go on a bomb working
party. They about hung me but George got me out of it so
I don't have anymore of that shit.
Well, I better go before you fall asleep reading this.
The next letter will have combat pay so you can give it to
COM & NVA. Maybe they can use it. See ya later.
Love & Peace, Mark  (Kitty Litter, Feb. 1972)

A veteran of a Kitty Hawk WESPAC tour of 1966 had visited San Diego
and his story of how he had fasted for fifty-one days while trying
to get a discharge was featured as an anti-military action. The
caste system was protested in another article:

...Every time an enlisted man salutes only because it is
required, he gives himself the finger; every time he says
sir to an officer he does not respect, he calls himself
"scum"... It is argued that officers have earned their
privileges. Can any man earn the right to degrade another
as a social inferior?... The ultimate damage of the need­
less military class discrimination is to us all as human
beings. We are prevented from relating as a person, each
of importance in his own right...

A similar theme was continued in another article in which individual
responsibility was stressed in order to remain a person and a
"brother" of others. The alternative was mindless obedience or
playing it cool in the Navy and thus becoming a "non-person", that
is, simply subordinate or superior to others. Another article
explained the enlisted men's right to write to congressmen and told
them how to go about it. Senatorial opposition to North Vietnam
bombing was covered and details given of a medical aid program in
Vietnam that was helping war injured children. There were illus-
tions and comics. Chaplains were caricatured by a leering cartoon of a chaplain with these comments:

This is Chaplain Luther. Chaplain Luther is a clergyman in uniform on your ship to help you. He will help you with personal problems as well as spiritual ones. Do you spiritually or morally object to killing? Are you concerned with sayings from the Bible like "thou shalt not kill"? Well have no worries because Chaplain Luther will show you a BUPERS instruction that says it's O.K. (Kitty Litter Feb. 1972)

It was rumored that the Hawk might leave a month early. Resistance people thought the Navy was trying to avoid their campaign. When the Navy finally announced the early departure they said the Kitty Hawk was needed to relieve other carriers off Vietnam.

A special edition of Kitty Litter came out almost on the eve of departure with a story of two Kitty Hawk crewmen who were already taking sanctuary at the Church of the Brethren in San Diego. The church issued a statement explaining their support as based on belief in freedom of worship and freedom of conscience. A Joan Baez concert for Kitty Hawk crewmen was announced to be held at a local park. There would also be lawyers and counselors for advice.

A more insistent anti-war statement was included this time.

Think About It!! People Are Dying!! ... The Kitty Hawk will kill thousands of people on this deployment. ... We're all prisoners of war! If you're not a prisoner of war why are you going to sail with the stupid ship in a day or two? THINK ABOUT IT!

(Kitty Litter Feb. 15, 1972)

There was also an article by a Connie wife who had flown to Hong Kong to meet her husband and been bitterly disappointed when the Navy had suddenly ordered the ship back to duty.

If I could see a valid purpose, maybe these separations would
be more bearable. But virtually no one believes in this war any more. The ship's mission is one of unjustifiable killing and destruction... sometime, Navy wives will have the courage and honesty to voice their real feelings and opinions. The Navy has already punished me in the worst possible way— they've taken my husband away. (Kitty Litter, Feb. 15, 1972)

As the ship sailed the seventeenth of February it left nine men behind, five more had joined the first two. Two other sailors from the oiler Mispillion also joined. The oiler was one of the ships that accompanied the Kitty Hawk. These sanctuary events were followed closely by daily reports in the San Diego Union and they were later reported in the GI and underground press. (San Diego Union Feb. 17, 1972)

The sailors were arrested and all nine flown to the Kitty Hawk at sea for hearings at Captain's Mast. The seven Kitty Hawk men were given thirty days in the brig and half pay for two months on a charge of Unauthorized Absence. The two crew-men from the Mispillion were returned to their ship for mast. (San Diego Union Feb. 1972)

The March fifteenth issue of Kitty Litter went to the ship at sea. It featured the sanctuary story and emphasized that the men were now aboard and were mistreated by the marines guarding the brig. The story of the specific abuses to the sailors was carried in national peace journals and readers were asked to write protest letters to the Captain. The March Kitty Litter had other articles which reported organizing aboard the Coral Sea, then on duty off Vietnam, and protests from the airwing of the carrier USS
Midway. A sailor from the Midway who had taken sanctuary was reported as honorably discharged. The paper printed a telegram from Senator McGovern to "concerned Kitty Hawk crewmen". He said he shared their objection to the war and pledged to continue to work for U.S. withdrawal from Indochina. A different article complained about the willingness of Congress to vote money for the war. It also listed names of senators that were interested in the rights of servicemen and might take action if complaints were sent to them. Counseling centers in the Phillipines and Japan were listed. There were pictures of Vietnamese victims of the bombing and several cartoons with cynical remarks about corpsmen and recruiters. (Kitty Litter March 1972)

Back in San Diego, The Door ran a long article on the specific Kitty Hawk crewmen who took sanctuary and on sanctuary as a way of resistance. Some of the ministers and priests had found that their superiors did not support them or their congregations objected to the style of life of the sailors and their friends. Commonly in the sanctuary situation supporters of the men would stay at the churches night and day since it was never known when the arrests would occur. A priest at the Catholic church that had kept the Connie nine in sanctuary said that there was somewhat of a problem because of FBI charges about the immorality of the group. The FBI had taken pictures of the emerging young men and women as they crawled out of their sleeping bags at 4:30 am. (Door, Feb. 24-Mar. 9, 1972) Sanctuary brought civilian peace people and re-
sisting sailors into very close contact. Usually this became a learning situation for the older peace people and the sailors and their friends were treated with respect. Around the country in sanctuary events there were a few difficult days while those of the local peace community who personally held strict rules on liquor, dope, smoking, sex and language, adjusted.

Sanctuary as a tactic ran into another kind of trouble on the ship. A special news release came from Harbor Project countering charges of Captain Oberg that the project had planned to use the sailors for political gains at the Republican convention. (The convention was then scheduled for San Diego, later it was changed to Miami.) The article claimed that it was Oberg who was trying to deceive the men as the Navy was trying to deceive the country. (Kitty Litter March 1972) The May Kitty Litter reported that one of the Kitty Hawk seven had been given a second thirty days for hiding aboard ship for over twenty-four hours and was given an administrative discharge. This was the last reference to the sanctuary group in the paper. Harbor Project people thought that publicity would hinder the processing of discharges for the men. They were particularly mindful of avoiding use of the men's situation for anti-war publicity without their active cooperation. So this time there was no later report of "we've won". (Kitty Litter May 1972)

There was an official daily newsletter aboard the Kitty Hawk, an eight page mimeograph called the Kitty Hawk Flyer. Its
content was quite different from the GI papers. A sailor had sent four copies from March to April to the Harbor Project. The sailor had underlined certain items and added a few of his own comments. There was news of daily events such as movies to be shown and sea meetings with other ships for supply and refueling. There were reports of air accidents and recoveries of pilots. There were brief news reports from the United States. Several articles gave warnings about drugs and alcohol in a "buddy" tone. There was also information about applying for higher rates and human relations stories about several individual crewmen.

One article explained why punishments at Mast might seem inconsistent. It told how past disciplinary record, job performance and overall attitude were considered with the "fact that good order and discipline must be maintained on board Kitty Hawk if we are to function as an effective team." These words had been underlined by the sailor. In the margin he had written "right on cap". (Kitty Hawk Flyer, Mar. 16, 1972) In an adjacent column there was an article explaining that sensitivity was needed to end racism in the Navy and that people should be treated as individuals. The conflict between the way Mast punishments are decided and the goal of treating people as individuals was evidently not apparent to the editors or the captain. It was a complaint of EMs especially Black sailors.

The sailor had checked a half page article "chain of command: Necessary or Not". It explained "the chain of command
was not designed as harassment, but as military necessity and then
gave a few reasons why it was necessary. It ended "Unfortunately
there will always be the disgruntled and discouraged men who have
had their chits recommended for disapproval somewhere along the
line, but remember: there is always a reason." (Kitty Hawk Flyer
April 4, 1972) In the April seventh edition the sailor wrote over
an article "take a good hit before reading". It was titled "Commander
Task Force 77 Message on Vietnam" and had been sent throughout the
task force. It explained that a crucial battle was shaping up and
that:

We are assembling the largest carrier task force of this conflict
and have been given the necessary operational authorities to
effectively use it; all we need is a little good weather and
the best effort of every man jack in the force and we can turn
the tide of battle to ensure the South Vietnamese victory, thus
enabling them to exercise the right of self-determination. In
short, the chips are down, the stakes are high, so let's play
the game to the best of our ability. (Kitty Hawk Flyer, April 7,1972)

Adjacent to this article was a picture of a Commander who had been shot
down and rescued. The sailor had commented "almost lost 2 in one month!"

The April eighth issue featured details of an Alpha Strike
(bombing of North Vietnam). It also noted that the Constellation had
just rejoined the Kitty Hawk, Coral Sea and Hancock who were now all
"on the line". (Kitty Hawk Flyer, April 8, 1972) There was an announce-
ment of a recruiting program in which selected re-enlistees and boot
camp graduates would visit their home town high schools. The sailor
noted "more high school talks by us". A poem "The Cocky Hawkers" by
a crewmember told of how "charlie was fighting a fight that can't be
won, for one of the teams which are his stalkers, is the crew of the Kitty Hawk, called the Cocky Hawkers”. By this the sailor had written "ain't this cute?" He had underlined phrases in a column "What's going on" as follows:

...if you're interested in whether there is really a war going on, stroll up to the flight deck some night after flight ops secures and watch—We are now close enough that the flashes of the bombs and an occasional sound can be heard; if you're really lucky, you may be able to see a flare or two...  (Kitty Hawk Flyer April 9, 1972)

The May issue of Kitty Litter contrasted with the Flyer. It announced the opening of Harbor Project's storefront bookstore, Second Thoughts. There was a long article on President Nixon, the war, and the election campaign ending with "Ask yourselves, is all this killing and violence worth it? Is this man worth a damn?"

Two excerpts from Kitty Hawk crewmen's letters showed that some men were asking themselves very serious questions:

...my soul was giving me a headache yesterday I sat down and started to think about what I was doing. I feel now that there is no way out, except to revolt against the system totally. I believe the Navy is using their CO gimic to contradict its own applicants. What I mean is, While you wait for your C.O. papers you are still very much supporting the war. There are not exceptions to the rule; even the most trivial jobs are essential to the operation of War Ships etc. They wouldn't have so-called trivial jobs if they weren't needed. It is also my belief that the Navy is using mind bending tactics to deter the thinking man's mind. As time drags on the edge on everyone's spirit seems to be only fair. There is a definite drop in morale. The reason being; there is not an horizon in view.

Dear Concerned Military,

...My case is by far not unique among sailors serving in WesPac, but perhaps what I say will help others.

Until about the first of March I was a member of the ships Master At Arms force, a job I was given without my choice or consent. My sole purpose was petty harassment (haircuts, uniform
regs, keeping the enlisted rabble from officers country), a job I could not bring myself to do. For this reason many times I received threats, harassment, and later expulsion from the force (much to my pleasure). During my two month stay on the force I experienced, first hand, most of the wrong things that in my three and one half years in the Navy I tended to overlook; things that I now realize are the basic problems with the military.

One instance that sticks in my mind (one that caused me much mental anguish) occurred shortly before we reached the P.I., about the end of February. A man was brought up to the MAA office. He was circulating an open letter to Senator McGovern protesting the Kitty Hawk's involvement in the war in Vietnam. The lifers had a field day trying to verbally rip him and his letter to pieces (harassment, threats, the whole bit). I was told to escort him to the XO for an informal inquiry, which turned out to be another threat session, only at a higher level. I, being very much opposed to this war and in support of the man's right to his letter, stated my feelings to the XO. The XO said he was not there to argue the morality of the war (he gave me the feeling he could really care less), that the issue was the letter and the damages it could do to him and the captain. He said if we continued to circulate the letter he would have to find a legal way to stop us.

At this time the letter is no longer being circulated. Along with 120 signatures of supporters, it has been sent to Senator McGovern. The consequences of my involvement: I was in danger of losing my security clearance. For now I have been allowed to keep it, as long as I do nothing to "jeopardize (sic) the national security." I am fairly certain however, that by writing letters to Senator McGovern and you, I will eventually lose it, though I do not see how writing letters protesting the war and military injustice breaks security. My letter may not do me much good, but perhaps they will help a fellow shipmate in his personal fight against this war and military injustice.

(Kitty Litter, May 1972)

The same issue of Kitty Litter had an analysis of the U.S. role in IndoChina. It emphasized the popular basis of the revolt against the US supported South Vietnamese government. The seven point peace plan proposed by the People's Republic of Vietnam was presented on a full page. The issue also told of how sailors in
New Jersey had jumped overboard to join a canoe flotilla protesting the sailing of their ammunition ship, the *Nitro*. Anti-war comics filled out the edition.

Election campaign material in the August issue took up more space than reports from the ship; six pages related to the McGovern campaign and analysis of the war, as against one of ship news, one on availability of legal counseling materials, and a poem. In the ship news Captain Townsend had replaced Oberg. Townsend was thought to be less available to the crew than the former CO. His punishments at Mast were criticized:

Captain Townsend has shown himself to be one of the original "law 'n order kids", both at mast and on the IMC. He has imposed such arcane and ridiculous punishments as 3 days' bread and water for such tiny and meaningless "crimes" as unauthorized absence. In two consecutive masts, Captain Townsend has put several black men into the brig for fighting with white men, while dismissing "with a warning" a white man who spoke in a demeaning manner to a black man on board, as well as many white men....

...He has relaxed the haircut regulations on the ship (much to the chagrin of Kitty Hawk's number one jingo, Morris Peelle) and said people can have their hair as they want, within reason, as long as it's neatly combed and not "fuzzy". After this incident of blatant racism, he spent several hours talking to black sailors on the forecastle, finally adopting at least one of their suggestions, the formation of a Human Resources Council to replace the old token Minority Affairs Committee.

(Kitty Litter Aug. 1972)

There also was a brief but eloquent poem from a Kitty Hawk crewmember.

It read:

A ghost ship..............
Drifting in the timeless void..............
Cast off by phobias and fears
Of the self,
Not of others,
A grave disaster has taken place,
We've cut our throat.............it seems.
Painting the sun black
Is hardly a game.

This was the last issue of Kitty Litter. Some of the harbor project people became more involved in McGovern's presidential campaign. The correspondents on the ship may have been transferred. The Captain later reported having transferred "dissidents". September Up Against The Bulkhead, a Bay Area GI protest paper (not to be confused with Up From The Bottom from San Diego), printed a letter from a Kitty Hawk crewman offering to do some articles against the war. (Up Against The Bulkhead Sept. 1972) There was also a letter printed in Camp News that had originally been sent to the Harbor Project. (Camp News is a national GI protest paper) It told of extended time "on the line" because of a fire on another carrier which was rumored as sabotage. Finally the Kitty Hawk itself had to come in to the Phillipines for repair:

We had five main machinery room fires in seven days, oil fires that could have been very bad. Right now we have only one of four engines and three of eight electrical generators—all of the rest of them are fucked up in one way or another. Number 4 drive shaft coming out of #4 Main lost some bearings and developed a fore and aft movement of about 2' above the waterline. We're not going anywhere for awhile. The Oriskany is in Yokuska, Japan, for extensive structural repair....... (Camp News Sept. 15, 1972)

In the same issue of Camp News two officers from the Kitty Hawk, one a pilot and one a bombadier were reported as having turned in their wings as protest against the war. Camp News had picked this up from a GI paper from the Phillipines, Seasick.
Chapter Nine

USS RANGER IS DISABLED BY SABOTAGE
And an Enlisted Man Charged, Tried and Acquitted
July 1972 to May 1973

In the summer of 1972 many instances of sabotage were reported on navy aircraft carriers. On the USS Forrestal and the USS Ranger sabotage resulted in delays in sailing and in one half to three million dollars in repairs. August seventh the navy announced that they had arrested a fireman for allegedly throwing nuts and bolts into the huge reduction gears on the main shaft to the Ranger's boiler the month before. One gear was to be replaced at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. The ship would be delayed in sailing to Vietnam by several months. (UFTB Aug. Sept. 1972) September eighth the Berkeley Barb reported that the arrested fireman was Patrick Chenoweth and that he was being held incommunicado at Treasure Island Naval Base. The article cheered Chenoweth assuming he was guilty. The writer was pleased with the sabotage because of its expense to the navy and the delay in the ships scheduled departure for Vietnam. They also noted that one of the charges against Chenoweth was an unusual one "sabotage in time of war'. (The Vietnam War was never officially declared so wartime law did not come into effect.)

A New York Times article November sixth noted that the sabotage
had caused a three and one-half months delay in the ships sailing and that a fireman had been charged with "sabotage in time of war" as well as "destruction of government property". This was the first sabotage trial in the Vietnam war. The same article said that Eric Seitz, Chenoweth's attorney, said that fifteen other sabotage acts had been found by the naval investigation service and that more acts had continued after Chenoweth's arrest. The article described the sabotage as the insertion of a paint scraper and two metal studs into one of the gears. Other sabotage was also detailed, "dismantling of valves, plugging of fire hoses, destruction of oil pressure gauges...fouling fresh water supply, fires, a bomb threat, slashed wires, and oil drainage".

An SOS movement was reported on the ship, SOS stickers were showing up throughout the ship and sometimes on damaged equipment. The articles also reviewed the racial incidents on the Kitty Hawk and Hassayampa and fires and explosions on other ships. (The Constellation strike had not been reported as it was still in progress at this time.) The Chief of Naval Operations was reported as sending out "tough" new orders to commanders to improve conditions for Blacks. The Secretary of the Navy had asked a staff meeting of admirals for their advice on how to stop the sabotage. October thirty-first a retiring admiral had given a speech warning about the dangerous trends in the Navy, especially sabotage. The sabotage was thought to be linked to the SOS movement and to drug usage but not to racial tension. (New York Times, Nov. 6, 1972)
The **Berkeley Barb** of November tenth through sixteenth carried a long article in which it now emphasized the lack of evidence against Chenoweth. The case consisted of the words of three witnesses who had supposedly heard Chenoweth say he was responsible. The continuing sabotage aboard the **Ranger** was cited to strengthen Chenoweth's case. His attorney Eric Seitz, was described as being a specialist in military law with the National Lawyers Guild. He planned to challenge the legality of the Vietnam war on the basis of the Navy charge of "sabotage in time of war".

"Our theory," Seitz told Barb, 'is that there's so much of this going on now, and its all so serious, they're so deeply worried and frustrated, that they're going to fasten on anybody they can find.

The fact that they've tacked on these charges (those making the alleged offenses "wartime" offenses) is simply unbelievable, a pure case of overreaction; and the reason their over-reacting is they're so frightened of what's happening. Ordinarily, nobody in his right mind would take a case with this kind of evidence to trial.' (Berkeley Barb Nov. 10-16, 1972)

The next week the **Barb** reported that the Navy might move the trial to the Phillipines to be nearer the ship. (The **Ranger** had sailed November twenty-second) The **Barb** thought this was to allow harassment of the defense staff by the Phillipine government and also remove the trial from the view of the American public. (Berkeley Barb Nov. 17-23, 1972)

Civilian courts became involved in the trial as Seitz was able to get a hearing in Federal Court on the question of pre-trial confinement. Judge Peckham, the Federal District Court Judge, gave the Navy ten days to hold a hearing on relaxation of custody or said that he would hold it himself. The judge also ordered the Navy to stop censoring
Chenoweth's mail and to provide for confidential conferences for Seitz with his client. (Berkeley Barb Nov. 24-30, 1972)

Pretrial hearings in military court continued as Seitz argued various motions including one to have the jury chosen at random as civilian juries are, rather than handpicked by the base commander. This was denied. The Navy did not hold hearings on pre-trial confinement and so Judge Peckham held his own hearing. He ruled against pre-trial release because of the "seriousness of the offense". (Berkeley Barb Dec. 1-7, 1972) The defense planned to take this to the US Court of Appeals. (Berkeley Barb Dec. 9-14, 1972)

In early January 1973 the Navy judge, Captain Keyes, ordered the trial moved to the Subic Bay Naval Base in the Phillipines where three of the prosecution witnesses were aboard the Ranger. The Berkeley Barb explained in detail how this threatened the defense staff. The Phillipines government had previously raided and then shut down the National Lawyers Guild Center in Subic Bay. Legal workers had been charged with subversion against the Marcos Government and one of the Guild attorneys was still in jail there. He had been arrested after being turned over to the Phillipine government by the U.S. Navy. (Berkeley Barb Jan. 12-18, 1973) Congressman Dellums immediately protested to Admiral Zumwalt on the basis of denial of the defendants right to counsel. He also noted that the trial would remove the Navy's actions from the public. Seitz began another series of appeals. He started with the Military Court of Appeal and then went to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The
military judge, Keyes, had also pronounced on the question of whether the Vietnam war was war. He said that it was. This confirmed the possibility of the sentence for sabotage being as much as thirty years. This also limited the defense plans. (Berkeley Barb Jan. 12-18, 1973) February fifteenth Up From The Bottom interpreted the trial action:

Pat is being used as a scapegoat for all of the sabotage that is happening on all U.S. ships across the world. The Navy is choosing to send one man to jail rather than take care of the sources of the anger and frustration felt by everyone in the Navy and all services, racial oppression, horrendous living conditions, 12 hour working days, lack of constitutional rights, military involvement in other countries and a multitude of others.

Pat needs our support. (UFTB Feb. 15, 1973)

In March the Los Angeles Free Press devoted four full pages to a detailed history of the sabotage, the trial, the resistance movement in the Navy and Zumwalt's reforms. The article commented on the tactics of the "anti-imperialists" defending Chenoweth:

Within this framework, it would not be in Chenoweth's best interests to say that he did, in fact, disable the Ranger, but that his act could be justified in terms of Vietnamese lives saved, or in the context of the fundamental rights and wrongs of the Indochina war.

Therefore the defense holds that Pat Chenoweth is being framed. Which may be true.

From anyone's viewpoint, the disabling of the Ranger was an act of significance... In three months, planes flying from the boat can deliver over 30 million rounds of explosives to neighborhoods where peasants and guerrilla fighters live.

The United States owns only 14 such attack carriers. Because of necessary repairs and commitments elsewhere, a maximum of about eight have been available to pulverize Vietnam at any given moment.

A difference of three carrier months is therefore a matter
of material interest to all parties.

The article went on with a friendly biography of Chenoweth noting among other comments that:

...like any enlisted Navy man, he has spent a lot of time holding his round white sailor hat in his hand while indoors, which gives him a deferential appearance. But if his uniform makes him look humble and military, the impression is offset by his haircut. He slicks his hair straight back from his forehead in the manner of big city stone grease, son of rebel without a cause. It is clearly not the style of a lifer, or an Ivy Leaguer either.

The article reported that over one thousand people had attended a Free Chenoweth rally led by Jane Fonda on January twenty-second - sponsored by the Free Chenoweth committee. (LAFreep March 9, 1973)

More details of the sabotage were given than I had found in any other source. According to this report while the ship was still in Alameda an officer had discovered a machinery room hatch open and followed this up to find a paint scraper in the oil sludge beneath the reduction gears. This was taken out and the next day the ship engines were started. A loud noise came from the gears. One engine was then shut down and the ship continued its training mission on three engines. Several weeks later when the gears were finally examined, it was found that several bolts had irreparably damaged the large reduction gear.

It was during this training cruise that a naval intelligence agent, a sailor, heard Chenoweth say to a buddy "that was me, yeah, I really messed those gears up. Sorry I fucked you guys up". This report plus a similar one from another buddy, Bailey, were the
entire basis of the Navy's case. (LAFreep March 9, 1973)

The appeals against moving the trial to the Phillipines failed even though they had been carried as high as Supreme Court Justice Douglas. However, a Federal Judge held that the Navy must guarantee the safety of the attorney and his staff and also be responsible for transportation costs of the defense.

The trial was set for mid-April in the Phillipines when the military judge, Captain Keyes, suddenly became ill. The trial was postponed to early May and a new judge flown in from Hawaii. (Camp News May 15, 1973) By this time the Ranger was preparing to leave its WESPAC duty to return to Alameda. (Formal American military involvement in the Vietnam war had ended three months earlier.) The new judge decided to hold the trial in San Francisco, after all.

The trial began June fourth. The first prosecution witness, Bailey, was to testify that Chenoweth had admitted the sabotage, but to the courts and prosecutions surprise, he refused to testify on the basis of his fifth amendment rights not to incriminate himself. The following day under considerable pressure from the judge, he was given immunity and did testify. Under cross-examination inconsistencies were brought out in dates of conversations. Seitz told the military panel that the Navy intelligence agents had coached the witness and that the Navy was also pressuring him. (UPI June 6, 1973, Berkeley Barb June 8-14, 1973) After three hours deliberation the military jury found Chenoweth innocent! National news services carried the
story complete with a recapitulation of events, a reminder that Chenoweth had been in jail ten months and a quote of part of Chenoweth's statement to the press.

At a time in history when the US military is the major genocidal force around the globe, it is particularly gratifying not only to be free but to have beaten the Navy in its attempt to frame me. (UPI June 13, 1973)

Chenoweth was given duty at a local base, then immediately ordered to three weeks leave followed by an honorable discharge one year early. (Berkeley Barb June 15-21, 1973, June 22-28, 1973)

Camp News reported that sabotage continued on many ships. Another sailor had been charged with a fire on the Coral Sea and was in the Treasure Island brig. The paper commented:

...the growing attack from within is an unexpected complication that will have to be faced. In the words of a sailor from the CORAL SEA 'sabotage will become as American as apple pie'. (Camp News July 15, 1973, F-21)
Chapter Ten

OVER 200 FIGHT ABOARD THE USS KITTY HAWK
OCTOBER 1972

On October twelfth 1972 while the Kitty Hawk was in action off Vietnam over two hundred Black and white sailors and marines fought throughout the ship for five hours. Wire services carried the story internationally. The reports said that forty-six had been injured and three of these so badly that they had to be evacuated from the ship by helicopter. First reports called it a racial "tiff" or "fight" later it was referred to as a riot. (Seattle P.I. Oct. 14, 1972; Seattle Times, Dec. 27, 1972) As several weeks went by the story began to be filled out or rather the several different stories were filled out. For events preceding the uprising and during the fighting there are piecemeal accounts. There were actions at a number of places throughout the ship. Interpretations differed but few were contradictory. Later reports came out in the underground GI press and from the Black Servicemen's Caucus, a new organization in San Diego, and also from the congressional investigation.

By the beginning of October the Kitty Hawk had been away for seven and one-half months. Most of that time was spent "on the line" with twelve to eighteen hours work daily for the crew. The ship had been expected to return home soon but instead orders were to return for more duty at "Yankee Station". Racial tensions were
The ship was in Subic Bay for a week's rest and recreation when there was some disturbance ashore. UFTB reported that a Black sailor had been stabbed in the EM club and the marine riot squad called. They came and used tear gas and the fight intensified. The Door was told that a white sailor paid Filipino nationals to attack Blacks indiscriminately and that five Blacks were slashed and stabbed. (UFTB Dec. 15, 1972; The Door Jan. 10-24, 1972) The Congressional report says that there was a fight at the enlisted men's club. They were not sure what happened but were willing to jump to conclusions:

On the tenth of October, a fight occurred at the enlisted men's club at Subic Bay. While it cannot be unequivocally established that Kitty Hawk personnel participated in the fight, circumstantial evidence tends to support the conclusion that some of the ship's black sailors were involved since 15 young blacks returned to the ship on the run and in a very disheveled condition at about the time the fight at the club was brought under control.

The following morning the ship returned to combat, conducting air operations from 1 to 6 pm... At approximately 7 pm, on October 12th, 1972, the ship's investigator called a black sailor to his office for questioning about his activities in Subic Bay. He was accompanied by nine other black men. They were belligerent, loud, and used abusive language. Those accompanying him were not allowed to sit on the investigation. The sailor was apprised of his rights, refused to make a statement and was allowed to leave... (HASC Jan. 2, 1973, p.17674)

In referring to this questioning on the ship, Blacks report that it was initiated by them to get action against the person who had hired the attackers. They said that only Black sailors were called in for questioning and that charges were not filed against the white sailor they had accused until a month later and later were dismissed. That
evening about twenty-five Blacks gathered to talk about this with the captain. He told them they could meet and talk together as long as it was a peaceful gathering. (The Door Jan. 10-24, 1973; About Face Dec. 1972)

Blacks had a number of complaints before this shore incident. They considered job assignments discriminatory and thought they received stiffer penalties at Mast than whites. Blacks were not allowed to give the power salute or their handshake, the dap. No more than three Blacks were allowed to sit together in the mess hall or congregate anywhere else. Billeting was done in such a way that no more than two Blacks were bunked in the same area - and it was against the standing rules to enter other berthing spaces so that Blacks were not able to visit their friends. (Door Jan. 10-24, 1973) The House Armed Services Committee report does not mention any instance of racism and further denies that any exists (HASC, p.17685).

As Blacks gathered that evening on the mess deck, marines were called out by a mess cook who said he had been attacked. When they arrived, one marine corporal either drew or attempted to draw his gun. The XO appeared, he was Commander Cloud, a Black man himself. He ordered the marines to withdraw. He and a white master chief stayed with the sailors (pp.17674-5). (Cloud had been appointed sometime after June fifth when Townsend had been appointed Captain, at that time the old XO, Peelle, had been on duty.)

Cloud spoke to the sailors who were very angry. Behind him,
the CO, Captain Townsend, had entered the space but Cloud did not know this. After listening and noting the angry feeling of the Blacks, Captain Townsend left without speaking to his executive officer who had not seen him. The captain then alerted the marines and ordered them to put more guards on the hanger deck and to break up any group of three or more sailors on the deck. The XO did not know of this order and continued to talk with the men on the messdeck for an hour. By then he felt the incident was over. The meeting broke up and most left via the hanger decks. They were instantly confronted by an advancing line of twenty-six marine guards (p.17675).

The marines moved toward them to contain them in the after end of the deck. As the marines began to make arrests some of the Blacks picked up available hardware and fought back. The Captain appeared on the scene and attempted to calm the situation. The XO also arrived but then left as he was informed of an injury below. Evidently the marine attack had been seen by other Black sailors from the meeting who now ran through the ship waking Blacks and yelling "they're killing our brothers". The Congressional report, after reporting the command mix-up quoted Blacks as also yelling "kill the white trash, kill, kill" and "kill the son of a bitch". Whites were not quoted. From this time on for four or five hours there were a number of fights at various places on the ship (pp. 17675-6). The ship's dispensary was soon filled with the wounded and more confrontations occurred there as it appeared that whites
were being treated first. GI reports and the congressional study are contradictory on what happened in the dispensary. The stories vary from only whites getting care to Blacks demanding they be treated first. (HASC p.17676; Berkeley Barb Jan. 4, 1973; UFTB Feb. 15, 1973)

The confusion in command continued as the XO was told that the CO had been injured or killed. The XO then made an announcement over the ship's PA System ordering the Blacks to the After Messdeck and marines to the Fo'c'sle. The captain however, was alive and well, he was on the hanger deck talking to a small number of Black sailors who were part of the original group attacked by the marines. The captain heard the XO's orders and went to the closest microphone and countered them, ordering everyone to return to normal duties. These contradictory orders alerted more of the crew that there was trouble aboard. Blacks now began gathering at the Fo'c'sle. XO Cloud met them and talked with them for several hours after which they returned to their compartments thus ending the event (HASC p.17676).

No arrests were made at first although there were at least forty-six injured. Senior petty officers and commissioned officers did extra night patrol in the berthing areas. The ship continued on its bombing mission. Two weeks later when the ship pulled into Subic Bay in the Phillipines, twenty-one Blacks were arrested and flown back to the U.S. for trial. Five other Blacks were to be tried on the ship. Later one white man was charged. (HASC pp.17675-6,
Congressman Dellums together with three other senators and representatives and the Mayor of Berkeley asked the Navy to investigate. (Berkeley Barb Dec. 1-7, 1972) The House Armed Services Sub-committee did an investigation but Dellums was not appointed to the sub-committee even though he was the only Black member of the Armed Services Committee.

The Navy trials took over five months. The defense was supported by the San Diego Black Servicemen's Caucus, the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Early in the trials the defense was able to show how a Navy witness had lied and to challenge a number of other irregularities, for instance the white enlisted prosecution witnesses had been assigned to duty station in the legal office where the case was being prepared. The ACLU charged that due process had been denied. Several of the harsher sentences were then withdrawn, but the trials continued. The only white defendant was acquitted as were three Blacks. Charges were dropped for five others. Fourteen were found guilty of assault and four of rioting. By this time many had already served five months in the brig. Several of those who had had charges dropped could not be freed because they had been cited with new charges of contempt from alleged misconduct in the brig. Although by the dropping of the first charges it was admitted that they shouldn't have been held at all, these secondary charges were honored and sentences given.

The trials were all well publicized in local and national newspapers and the GI and underground press January through May 1973.
The question of charges as well as prosecution of the case was evidently very political, Camp News quoted New York Times report of the view of a Navy captain:

You call it a riot, you say that the charges were too harsh. Well, you know what the people out here are saying, the retired Navy men you meet on the golf course? They're not talking riot, they call it mutiny. They say they should have been charged with mutiny."

Camp News commented that even riot charges had not held up in court. (Camp News May 15, 1973)

The House Armed Services Sub-committee investigated the Kitty Hawk incident and the later Constellation strike. They gathered testimony from officers and a few enlisted men, but none of the Blacks who had been involved in the fights. The sub-committee reported that there was no racism aboard the Kitty Hawk and that the problem resulted from recruitment of low intelligence Blacks who had not been given adequate training. Zumwalt's program of "permissiveness" had, according to the report, robbed midmanagement of their authority. They did admit that some Blacks thought the Navy was discriminatory but they added that this was misperception. In any case, even perception of racism was considered irrelevent since:

The subcommittee has been unable to determine any precipitating cause for the rampage aboard the USS Kitty Hawk. Not only was there not one case wherein racial discrimination could be pinpointed, but there is no evidence which indicated that the blacks who participated in that incident perceived racial discrimination, either in general or in any specific, of such a nature as to justify belief that violent reaction was required. (HASC 17668)
The Congressional report was greeted as an incredible white-wash by the underground and GI press and to some extent the regular press. (The reception of the report will be considered in more detail in the report of the Connie Strike.) The story of the mixup of command detailed in the congressional report had also been noted in the GI reports. Neither the report nor the GI articles picked up the possibility that the captain did not trust his Black executive officer. The committee evidently did not even consider the command mixup important. This is puzzling because in the HASC version it is the captain's inconsistent commands that precipitated the fighting.

After returning home and undergoing drydock repairs the Kitty Hawk left again for Vietnam in late November 1973 under a new captain. The Indochina war had been officially over since January. In December when the ship was in the Phillipines fire was reported in the engine room. Six men were killed and thirty-eight injured. Up From The Bottom printed a letter from a Kitty Hawk sailor about unsafe conditions on the ship. The letter had been received prior to the fire. In an accompanying article UFTB blamed the accident on the unsafe conditions of the ship and noted that this was typical of conditions throughout the fleet. They charged that even in September when the ship was inspected in Hawaii it had been found unsafe. (UFTB, December 15-January 15, 1974) The six men killed were apprentices or non-rated firemen and all under twenty-one. At least one sailor was only seventeen. None of them could have received very much training. The Navy awarded the men bravery citations posthumously and claimed that they had willingly stayed in the
compartment to fight the fire. (Navy Times, April 10, 1974:23) UFTB pointed out that the regular firefighting policy is always to lock the hatch without waiting to evacuate firemen. They noted that all of the bodies were found by the hatch where they must have been waiting for it to be opened - not fighting the fire. (UFTB, May 15-June 15, 1974)
Chapter Eleven

130 BLACK SAILORS STRIKE TWICE ON THE USS CONSTELLATION

NOVEMBER 1972

The first news of the fight on the Kitty Hawk had reached San Diego by October fourteenth 1972. The crew of the Constellation had many opportunities to hear about it as they were in and out of port on training cruises. Associated Press and United Press International carried news of the Kitty Hawk throughout the eighteenth. Three weeks later, November fifth, the Connie made headlines when one hundred thirty sailors were put off the ship because of an earlier strike at sea on November third and fourth (Seattle, Channel 7 TV Nov. 5, 1972, A.P. Nov. 5, 1972) Information about this and subsequent events came out over the the next three months from many sources. Explanations varied but there was considerable agreement about the sequence of events.

The Connie started sea trials on October fourth. By October seventeenth Blacks were meeting informally to talk about their grievances. The usual place was the after mess decks called the "sidewalk cafe". The executive officer attended the meeting on the eighteenth. Other meetings followed, sanctioned as official human relations discussions. The executive officer or other officers were in attendance. The Black sailors decided to document their perceptions of prejudice. They appointed representatives to examine records of non-judicial
punishment to check for racial bias.

The ship had returned to port and then left again several days later on October thirtieth. At sea on October thirty-first, division officers were asked by Captain Ward to find two hundred fifty volunteers for shore duty. According to the captain this was to make room for the air personnel coming aboard. According to some of the crew it was to get rid of dissidents and protestors on the ship. This was talked about throughout the ship. Considerable uneasiness was felt among Blacks that they would be targeted for shore duty and then receive less than a full honorable discharge. Administrative discharges can be given as Honorable, General or Undesirable. Bad Conduct and Dishonorable discharges are only given by courts. Any discharge other than honorable has great disadvantages that follow the sailor back into civilian life. It is difficult, sometimes impossible to get civilian jobs with one of these discharges in your background. The undesirable, bad conduct and dishonorable discharges mean the loss of most veterans benefits. Even an honorable discharge may have a code number which shows that it was for "convenience of the government". An employer who knows what these numbers mean and many do, might not hire someone in this category. (Door Nov. 17-Dec. 1, 1972)

Blacks had already noted that they were more likely to get lower scores on entrance tests and more unskilled duty assignments. Their superior senior petty officers were more likely to give them lower marks on their performance evaluations. All these in turn led
to more citations of misconduct, more Captain's Mast hearings with more severe sentences than whites. This record of Masts and punishments along with performance comments from the supervisors and entrance examinations could all be used to justify a punitive administrative discharge. There were three hundred fifty Black crewmen on the Connie and very few Black petty officers. There were no Black officers. The number of people aboard was about forty-five hundred.

These grievances were formalized at a November first meeting. On November second it was learned that six men, all Black, had been asked to sign for administrative discharges. This was in spite of the good service record of several. The administrative discharges were based on their original GCT scores (military IQ tests) and service records. Blacks were outraged. If the men had scored high enough to get in the Navy, the same score should hardly be used for justification to throw them out, particularly without an honorable discharge. (Door Nov. 17-Dec. 1, 1972) This same incident was explained differently by the congressional sub-committee. They reported that the Captain had identified fifteen sailors as agitators and had asked that their records be reviewed to see if administrative discharges would be possible. (HASC p.17677)

By the morning of November third people were already gathering on the forward mess deck to talk about this. The executive officer met with them and was asked to announce over the PA system that he had agreed to stop giving administrative discharges. Instead he circulated a flyer around the ship that said this. It also announced an
open meeting of the human resources council for 9P.M. (HASC p.17678)
The morning meeting continued. By noon the group had grown large
enough that it was called a sit-in by the executive officer. The
men were ordered out and regrouped on the main mess deck. Marines
were ordered to the area, but the Chief Master at Arms decided this
was unnecessary and they were pulled back. Fifty to two hundred
fifty men had gathered at this time and the ship's human relations
council members continued to meet with them. The regular meeting
convened at 9pm and the human relations counselors remained until
midnight. (HASC p.17678)

As the meeting went on the men asked to have the Captain
talk to them and sent a human relations counselor to see him.
Captain Ward refused. The group then elected three representatives
to go to him. The captain talked to them briefly then ordered
them out. He was later asked by other representatives a third time
and refused. By the time of the last refusal it was past midnight
and the group in the mess had grown to over three hundred. Armed
marines appeared again, together with senior personnel and they
surrounded the area. The sailors were asked to leave, but not
formally ordered, and one hundred fifty left. Food and blankets
were passed out among the remainder. There was a feeling of exulta-
tion as they realized they had taken over the main mess deck. (Door

At this same time there was considerable consultation between
the Captain and his superiors in the navy chain of command. The Pacific
Fleet Commander, Vice Admiral Walker had probably visited the ship by helicopter. At 4 A.M. an All Hands muster was called on the flight deck. The sit-down sailors stayed where they were. It was announced that the ship had developed problems with their drinking water and would be returning to San Diego. The ship docked there at 9 A.M. The captain then did meet briefly with the striking sailors and told them they would be put ashore as a beach detachment to discuss their grievances. They went ashore, there were no reports of resistance. Later the captain reported to the congressional committee that he had refused the requests of his superiors to keep the men aboard. One hundred thirty-two sailors left the ship. (HASC p.17679) The shore group included eight white sailors whose role was not clear. One of them later said that he was put ashore with the others although he had not been part of the mess deck strike. He had previously applied for a discharge as a conscientious objector. He felt that he and the other whites were used to make it look as if it was not a racial incident. (UFTB April 1973) This was also the claim of GI papers and the San Diego support group, the Black Servicemen's Caucus.

The men were taken to North Island Naval Station as a beach detachment and spent the next several days discussing their situation with a LCDR Collins who was the Naval Air Force Pacific Fleet's Public Affairs Officer. This time was reported as regular duty in the EMs service records. The men had been put ashore on Saturday, November fourth. Their ship left the fifth and returned unexpectedly the seventh. A jet plane was over the side. The Captain said this was the reason
for the return, the sailors were skeptical. They thought the Navy had ordered the Captain back to talk to them. That same day the ship left and again returned. This time, according to the congressional committee it was by order of the fleet commander that the captain talk to the men. He did meet with them on Wednesday, the eighth. The men asked that previous administrative discharges and Captain's Mast sentences be reviewed and that they be given amnesty for their strike. The sailors claimed that they did not get a firm promise. The sub-committee report says that the Captain had agreed to a sentence review but had put some conditions on amnesty (p.17679). The Captain ordered them to report the following morning at 8 A.M. after overnight liberty.

At 7:30 A.M. November ninth, one hundred twenty-nine men assembled and told officers they would not board. The Captain did not confront the men with a direct order beyond the one he had given the night before. At 8 A.M. they held their own muster and saluted the flag! They said this was to show that they were still part of the U.S.Navy and that their protest was only against specific racial abuses. The congressional study says they were "allegedly acting on advice from an unidentified high level source in the Pentagon" (p.17679). The sailors continued to ask for amnesty, investigation of Captain's Mast and investigation of administrative discharges on the ship.

At first, several officers mingled with the group and tried to talk with them, but the sailors asked them to leave and they did. The men sat down and waited. During this time Captain Ward talked
with civilian representatives of the sailors and also had telephone consultations with CNO Zumwalt. He also consulted the Secretary of the Navy, Warner. Finally at 2 p.m. after six hours of the dock sit-in the sailors were told they would not be ordered to the ship and that Captain Ward would arrange for their transfers. The men felt they had won this round (Door Nov. 17-Dec. 1, 1972). They joyfully boarded buses back to North Island Naval Station where they were expected to continue the discussion of their grievances. However they found on arriving that one third had been bussed to Mirimar Naval Station and another third to Imperial Naval Air Station (Berkeley Barb Nov. 17-23, 1972).

That was the end of the strike. One hundred twenty-three of the men were tried for being on Unauthorized Absence for six hours. Captain's Mast hearings were held for a few men at a time. They were fined twenty-five dollars and some may have been reduced in grade. Twenty-nine were discharged. They probably received general discharges although this is not clear. There was agreement in most reports that the punishments were mild and that racism did exist in the Navy. (Berkeley Barb, UPI Nov. 10, 1972, Los Angeles Times Nov. 23, 1972)

November tenth Admiral Zumwalt made national news by telling a group of admirals and marine generals that the incidents on the Kitty Hawk, the Hassayampa and the Constellation were all due to failure of commanders to implement his racial reforms (New York Times Nov. 12, 1972). Many admirals and commanders and even middle management people reacted to this with anger and action. The story of this
resistance will be considered for itself as the sixth case history. The congressional study was done as part of this top level resistance to Zumwalt and his managerial program. The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Rep. Hebert, suspected that the problem was not racism but a breakdown in discipline and set up a committee to investigate. According to him it was Zumwalt's fault for his policy of permissiveness rather than genuine Black grievances. (Seattle P.I. Nov. 14, 1972)

The sub-committee announced most of their conclusions before they had finished the investigation. Zumwalt's reforms, permissiveness and especially the initiation of Human Relations Councils were cited as the underlying causes. The Human Relations Councils were attacked because they were thought to "short circuit" the chain of command. They felt all of these influences had led to a lack of discipline resulting in the disturbances. As in the case of the Kitty Hawk, they could find no evidence of racism.

The actual testimony was not made public, but the committee published a summary of events with recommendations for the future. This is the report cited as HASC. They said that the sit downs had been led by a small group of agitators. "Fifteen agitators orchestrated the whole affair" (p.17685). On another page they said twenty to twenty-five men were responsible (p.17668). Neither statement was further elaborated by specific findings or identification of agitators. They pointed out that young Black recruits were easily led and that the general attitude of Blacks was partly to blame (p. 17685).
Time Magazine was critical of the sub-committee hearings and called them an attack on Admiral Zumwalt and his program (Nov. 27, 1972). The officers' journal Proceedings reported the findings in April 1973 under a headline "Hill Unit Cites Permissiveness in Incidents on Navy Carriers". The article consisted of a quote of a Washington Post article of January twenty-fourth. The Post article summarized the findings, quoted some of the statements about the problem of permissiveness, but did not editorialize beyond this selection.

Movement coverage of the Constellation events had seldom used the word mutiny to describe the strike. The Berkeley Barb did use the term once and then in quotes, although it was a headline. In the article itself sit-in was used. The Door and Up From The Bottom in San Diego were cautious. They referred to the actions as "refused to board," "mass demonstration," "seized the main mess," "sit-in," and "stood up against the Navy". The regular press used "sit-down," "refused to board" but mutiny only in the context of quoting the Captain when he stated that he had not given the men a direct order to avoid the possibility of mutiny (UPI, AP, November 24, 1972).

The subcommittee's report freely used mutiny, for instance, "engaged in mutiny or a 'sit-down' strike." They also used "refused to move" and "refused to board." According to the UCMJ a person is guilty of mutiny if he or she:

... with intent to usurp or override lawful military authority, refuses, in concert with any other person, to obey orders or otherwise to do his duty or creates any violence or disturbance. (Section 894, Article 94)

The punishment for mutiny is "death or such other punishment as a court-martial shall direct."
As it happened these events mutinous or otherwise, lost their newsworthiness and the ship left for a seventh deployment to Southeast Asia on January fifth 1973. It was to join in the heaviest bombing in the war. About one hundred protestors, civilians and EMs, held a vigil as the ship left. The one hundred and twenty-nine strikers, sit-downers or mutineers whichever they were, were not on board (UFTB, February 15, 1973).

Ten months later the Connie was again in port in San Diego with a new captain. Up From The Bottom reported more EM harassment and a public relations effort on the ship:

How hypocritical it was to see the publicity the Constellation made out of giving blood for a little boy whose blood won't clot. They made sure it got on TV and in the papers, showing what its men were doing for this boy.

A short time later, they were treating these men like school children. Remember the old hall passes? On the Constellation, they're making the men get walking chits to get off the ship during working hours. To get off in civies during those hours you need to show a liberty chit at the brow. ... They show what dimwits the CO and XO of the ship are. Perhaps they enjoy pushing people into having sitdowns or riots. Keep it up, and it will happen, Captain Speer. (UFTB, December 1973)
Insurrection and sabotage at sea have touched off insurrections and sabotage of a different kind ashore. . . . Armed with the ammunition provided by the race riots and sabotage, many admirals have shown their own lack of discipline by campaigning for Zumwalt's ouster.

Some have made late night phone calls to Pentagon correspondents. Administration officials and politicians have been cornered at cocktail parties. (Time Magazine, November 27, 1972:20)

A year and a half later when Zumwalt was getting ready to retire after his full term, a New York Times staff writer commented: "Zumwalt is probably the only chief of naval operations in history who had a group of retired admirals try to unseat him in midterm". (Seattle P.I., May 19, 1974) The admirals revolt had a history beginning with Zumwalt's appointment as CNO in 1970. He was recommended by Secretary of the Navy, John Chafee, and officially appointed by President Nixon. Thirty-three senior admirals were passed over to pick Zumwalt, the youngest CNO ever to hold that office. He was forty-nine.

Zumwalt began his term with plans to increase reenlistment rates or "retention" as this is referred to by navy officers. He accordingly issued orders which he thought would make navy life more attractive or at least less humiliating to EMs. He called this his "people program" and personalized his orders as Z-grams. Military journals carried stories of how Zumwalt was trying to build a "mod" navy. One
chief thought that authority was being taken away from NCOs and thus was forcing them to be "nice guys". A nice guy was one who instead of commanding men tried to please them (All Hands Sept. 1970). Other writers noted that the living conditions on ships were getting to be too soft and life in shore barracks too easy. (Z-grams 35, Sept. 1970, had permitted beer in senior enlisted barracks.)

Z-gram 57 was issued November tenth 1970. This was aimed at "chicken regulations". These were regulations that were notorious for their use by chiefs to harass EMs. The most controversial aspects of Z-gram 57 were its liberalization of hair and beard styles and its relaxation of the rules for occasions where working dungarees could be worn. By January twenty-first 1971, less than two months later, Z-gram 57 had been drastically amended. Its provisions for freedom of hairstyle and wearing of working uniforms had been revised.

This was reported in All Hands with a short explanation:

As a result of field trips, personal contacts and correspondence with Navymen, the Chief of Naval Operations had issued further clarifying changes to official Navy policy in two areas — hair grooming and uniforms. (March 1971, p.32)

Explicit reasons for the change were guessed at in editorial comment in the Armed Forces Journal:

Navy Secretary John Chafee and Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Admiral Elmo Zumwalt are feeling the kick of an admirals' backlash that has been gathering steam ever since November, when Zumwalt unveiled his concept of an all-dungaree, mod-hair-style new Navy where anything goes.

5 Two years later the order allowing dungarees to be worn off duty was cancelled entirely. (All Hands March 1973) Hair and beard rules were limited again in April (Navy Times April 25, 1973).
At the Commanders-in-Chief conference held here in mid-January, Zumwalt's assembled four-star admirals - the top eight officers under his command - told him bluntly that the Navy had gone overboard on relaxation of discipline.

The admirals also reported that Zumwalt's free-and-easy concession of privileges to young boot seamen had aroused bitter complaint among the mid-level petty officers and chiefs (in essence, the hard-hats of the Navy) who had worked long years to earn just such privileges as are now being extended to all hands.

"The whole middle level of leadership on whom we have to depend - both officers and petty officers", said one admiral, soon after the conference, "is simply being bypassed, and they resent it". (AFJ March 15, 1971, p.17)

The events leading up to this resistance were described also. December fifth, Admiral Hyland, the Fleet Commander of the Pacific, had retired with a warning speech:

How far can we permit absolute freedom of speech, deportment and dress, and still hang onto that indispensable element of discipline?

Such freedoms, have always been set in abeyance by men in uniform. It is necessary that they forego some of them to protect the freedom of all. (AFJ, p.17)

Zumwalt compromised by revising his order, but according to the Armed Forces Journal, he also took counter measures. His "up or out" policy, as it applied to admirals, could remove some of his critics from the active Navy.

Senior flag officers are asking if youthful (for the post) CNO Zumwalt may not be feeling ill at ease in the continued presence on active duty of so many officers his senior in age and once his seniors in rank. This, they say, is the upshot of the recent memo to all flag officers on continuation/retirement policy.

The embittered admirals say the Navy is forcing flag officers into early retirement both by establishing and adhering to arbitrary plucking board percentages and by personal letters from CNO when they reach around age 58... (AFJ Mar. 15, 1971)
A year later only four of the seven full admirals remained on active duty. Zumwalt also tried conciliation with a letter to retired officers explaining his program in terms of need for retention. (AFJ Mar. 15, 1971) In January 1972, Armed Forces Journal published an interview with the Admiral. To the question "what was the most difficult aspect of your job," he answered:

...getting anything done. There are so many checks and balances in any bureaucratic government - and here this is not ideological but I think it's even more true of the communist or dictatorial government than with a democratic government, but just the sheer bureaucracy of modern government makes it difficult to get business done quickly.

What surprised him most in his new job was:

...the discovery that, despite the fact that a decision may have been made by me within the Navy, we still find occasionally that we have to sell the idea to the action officer! In short, the "system" is sometimes such that the word doesn't always get to the guy who has to implement the decision. (AFJ Jan. 1972)

And so the Admiral came to recognize that his power was limited. However he continued to press for changes in other areas, especially race relations, until the fall of 1972 and the occasions of the Constellation strike and Kitty Hawk fight and a second much more stubborn resistance by his admirals.

As manning the Navy became a problem in the 1970s and the draft was to end, the Navy expected to recruit a higher percentage of Blacks as a consequence of the limited opportunities offered to Black people in civilian life. There was also a special military civilian rehabilitation program "project 100,000" aimed at poorly educated people which included many Blacks. The Navy had a rep-
utation as being racist but in spite of this Zumwalt hoped to somehow make Blacks feel welcome. Race Relations Assistants were assigned to all commands as a first effort. He also asked the recreational planners to use programming of interest to Blacks and asked the canteen managers to stock items and magazines of use and interest to Blacks. Barbers were to learn how to cut the Navy version of a "natural". An Affirmative Action policy was instituted and it was used to promote a few Blacks already in high positions, to higher status. This evidently had little effect on the situation of most Blacks.

The Kitty Hawk fight in October 1972 brought national attention to the issue and alarmed the Navy. The evening of November third the first sit-in of the Connie Strike began. On November fourth an order went out to fleet commanders to take definite measures to get rid of racism in their commands.

...chief of naval operations approved an unprecedented order telling all commands that in effect, their careers may depend on how quickly they move to improve conditions for the growing numbers of blacks in the fleet. (NY Times Nov. 6, 1972)

Following the end of the Constellation Strike the next week on November tenth Zumwalt called eighty of his admirals and marine generals together and angrily criticized them for not following his orders. According to the news report he told them that the incidents were:

'clearly due to failure of commands to implement' new racial programs 'with a whole heart'. He instructed the Navy's high command to 'seek out and take appropriate action, either punitive or administrative' against those who engage in or condone discriminatory practices or who have 'violated either the spirit or the letter of our equal opportunity program'.
...Minority affairs assistants appointed to deal with racial problems afloat and ashore, have been 'effectively hamstrung' in too many cases he said...'I am speaking to you and through you to the Navy's entire command structure to emphasize again that this issue of discrimination must be faced openly and fully'.

(New York Times Nov. 12, 1972)

It was after this lecture that the admirals mutiny began. Exactly what happened in the inner circles is not available information, however one mode of action used by both sides was to give information to the media. There were reports of an attempt to get rid of Zumwalt, his "permissiveness" and his race relations programs. The CNO's speech to the admirals had become immediate news. Reporters rushed to interview him. They asked how he intended to enforce his policy toward commanders who failed to carry out his programs "with a whole heart":

We will insist that the selection boards pay great attention to a man's performance in this area, and those who are not really fully conscious of the need for absolute and total equality will, over time, be weeded out in the Navy's selection system.

(A.P. Nov. 12, 1972)

He also said that the Inspector General would have his office make spot checks as well as other investigations to follow up on two hundred different equal-opportunity programs.

Zumwalt evidently had the support of the two people most needed for these two enforcement procedures and by July had added a third. One was the head of BUPERS, Vice-Admiral David Bagley and the other was the Inspector General of the Navy, Vice-Admiral Means Johnston. In July, a new Vice-CNO, Admiral Hollowell was to take
He had been appointed prior to January 1973.

The next visible step in Zumwalt's defense was a statement released from "Navy officials" that showed how discipline had improved dramatically since Zumwalt had taken command. (UPI, November 19, 1972) The following action was more of a compromise with his critics. He issued Z-gram 117 specifically to young enlisted men on November fourteenth and demanded strict obedience under threat of punishment:

This self-discipline and subordination of self for the good of all is absolutely mandatory for any organization, civilian or military, to function properly. It cannot be any other way. . . . I am aware of the extra hours worked and the overlong deployments experienced by many; but the Navy is no different than any other institution in that it requires complete and total obedience. It can be no other way. (All Hands, December 1972)

Reporters began asking other officers and enlisted men their opinions.

Drew Middleton reported for the New York Times:

The consensus in more than a score of interviews was that the admiral had gone too far, too fast in attempting to lead a traditionalist, semi-isolated officer corps into new relationships between commander and commanded. Resistance developed, a retired admiral said, because officers believed Zumwalt's directives led to breaks in the chain of command.

. . . . Many interviewed in Washington and at Navy bases were outspokenly critical of Zumwalt's policies, but they refused to
allow the use of their names. All felt that the racial issue,
dramatized by the refusal earlier this month of 123 blacks to
report for duty aboard the carrier USS Constellation, was only
a symptom of a general malaise.
...'I don't say they're dumb', said a commander, 'but they
haven't got the education to handle most equipment. You can't
turn over a machine worth a quarter of a million bucks to some
sailor, white or black, who's liable to ruin it through ignor­
ance. ...'The thing we have to avoid at all costs, 'one retired
admiral said, 'is promoting them just because they're black.
They have to be capable. Too many lives depend on them in
peace as well as war.'  
(New York Times Nov. 22, 1972)

In San Diego, the LA Times and Washington Press services interviewed
enlisted people. The EMs claimed the petty officers, especially the
older career men would often ignore the Z-grams and that this was the
problem on the ships. The Black enlisted men generally supported the
Connie protest, one estimated that seventy-five per cent of the racial
discriminations in the Navy result from the actions of petty officers.
They said they had experienced the same problems that were complained
of on the Connie and would probably have joined them if it had happen­
ed on their ships. White EMs were not unanimous in support of the
Connie strikers. Some thought the trouble was the fault of Blacks.
(Los Angeles Times Nov. 23, 1972)

The counter attack had already begun. November fourteenth,
the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee announced an in­
vestigation. Floyd Hicks, a conservative from Washington state was
appointed sub-committee chairman, and as was noted in this paper
already, Ron Dellums, the only Black on the committee, was not allowed
to join. Time Magazine reported that some admirals were trying to
get Zumwalt removed:
Some have made late-night phone calls to Pentagon correspondents. Administration officials and politicians have been cornered at cocktail parties. The message is the same: Zumwalt has gone too far. One of his critics is Admiral Isaac Kidd, 53, thought to be the most likely man to replace Zumwalt. Even Secretary of the Navy John Warner threw out hints that he was not altogether pleased with the direction in which Zumwalt was heading. ... Warner admitted that he was 'under a great deal of pressure' from Zumwalt's critics.

_Time Magazine_ itself, backed Zumwalt strongly:

If he is replaced or even hobbled in his revolutionary shakeup of the Navy, it could well signal an end to the attempts to humanize all three services. (_Time Magazine_ Nov. 27, 1972)

Admiral Kidd, mentioned in the above article, was the Chief of Naval Material. This position is considered second in importance to the CNO. The Chief of Material has direct access to the Secretary of the Navy in an advisory capacity.

The House sub-committee began hearings in Washington and Chairman Hicks told reporters after the first session:

We cannot overlook the possibility that there may exist at this time an environment of - for lack of a better word - permissiveness - wherein all that is needed is a catalyst. (_A.P. Nov. 25, 1972_)

Zumwalt testified to the committee and denied that there was permissiveness in the Navy. The sub-committee was widely recognized as out to stop Zumwalt and his programs rather than to investigate racism in the Navy. When the sub-committee hearings moved to San Diego, the officers on the _Connie_ and _Kitty Hawk_ were questioned. A few enlisted men from the _Connie_ testified but none from the _Kitty Hawk_. (Some had been asked but because of their impending court martials and their distrust of the committee, they refused.) An _Associated Press_ reporter quoted one _Connie_ EM who had testified:
They asked me questions about why I disobeyed a basic order and why I joined the protest, but they didn't address themselves to the central problems of discrimination and inferior job assignments for blacks aboard the ship. (A.P, November 25, 1972)

The subcommittee report was completed January second 1973. Its primary findings were that there was indeed "permissiveness" in the Navy and that there were no instances of racial discrimination. They felt the disturbances resulted from misunderstandings of Blacks, a few "skilled agitators" and the weakened mid-management. Mid-management had been weakened by the use of the race relations councils and by the relaxed hair and uniform standards. They found Black unity divisive within the Navy and recommended that gestures such as "passing the power" and the Black hand shake be discouraged. The sub-committee report asked for more training for both recruits and mid-management and for an increase in police on the ships and more selectivity in recruitment of EMs. They discussed the CNOs rebuke of his staff and said "the subcommittee regrets that the tradition of not criticizing seniors in front of their subordinates was ignored in this case" (HASC, January 2, 1973:17668-70). Camp News carried its own story of the report under the heading "Fleet Racism White-wash" (February 15, 1973). Proceedings reprinted a report by the Washington Post which included a paragraph about Zumwalt's claim that permissiveness did not exist and also that sailors had charged that "unwritten orders" against Blacks existed on the Kitty Hawk.

Zumwalt remained the occupant of the Chief of Naval
Operations office, but month by month announcements came of new regulations and programs that were consistent with the sub-committee recommendations. December twenty-sixth 1972, Zumwalt asked his commands to give administrative discharges to those who they thought were potential troublemakers. Three thousand were discharged by February ninth 1973. Thirteen percent of those discharged were Blacks compared to six percent Blacks in the Navy (Camp News Feb. 15, 1973). On January fifteenth 1973, the permission to wear dungarees off duty was withdrawn (All Hands March 1973). In April beard and hair regulations were again tightened (Navy Times April 25, 1973). A new form of verbal and written address for petty officers was instituted in May. Instead of calling a second class petty officer, Brown, for instance, he was now to be referred to as "Petty Officer Brown". Chiefs at the E-7 level continued to be addressed as Chief but E-8s and E-9s were now to be called "Senior Chief Brown" and "Master Chief Jones" (All Hands May 1973). A new rating of Master-at-Arms was announced in June. The MAA was to assist in law enforcement at sea and on shore (All Hands June 1973). A chart showing the advantages and disadvantages of the five types of discharges, honorable to dishonorable was included in All Hands in August. There were many differences particularly in veterans benefits. The same issue announced that twenty-eight teams of handlers and dogs had been added to the Navy as drug detectors and one hundred as Alcohol Abuse Counselors. In September initial training in boot camp was increased from seven and a half to nine
weeks to allow more time in learning military discipline and navy customs and courtesy.

Efforts at improving race relations continued but without charges of disobedience and lack of good will of officers and NCOs. In January 1973 the opening of four Human Resource Centers for the "management of people" was announced in All Hands. These offered a number of services to commanding officers under the topics of race relations, command development, intercultural relations, drug and alcohol education and alcoholic rehabilitation. The next fall, November 1973, the aircraft carrier USS Forrestal was pointed to as an example of how a Human Resource Council Center could help a ship's command in race relations. The ship's TV and newspaper regularly used material about Blacks and other minorities. There was an opportunity to talk by telephone directly to the Captain on a "Questions to the Captain" telephone. There was a "hotline" which was a twenty-four hour telephone recorder system. Seminars were the main part of the program. "Awareness" sessions of eighteen participants were used to share information of backgrounds of different cultural and racial personnel. "Upward" classes were used to talk about the present situation of each. These groups were led by facilitators and seemed to be similar to the T groups, confrontation, sensitivity and reality therapy groups that were popular among civilians. In addition to these programs there were special days when most of the crew were involved in "rap" sessions (All Hands November 1973). The alcohol and drug centers were reported as heavily used. Command Development
was defined as similar to organizational development programs in civilian industry. Civilian advisors were used as part of the staff. Educational material was also presented directly in All Hands by feature articles on Blacks who had done well in the U.S. Navy and on Black history.

The success of these programs was questioned by the GI press. They noted that discrimination continued and that most and sometimes all of the men in the brigs were Black (Camp News May 15, 1973). The treatment of Kitty Hawk Blacks who were on trial was seen as discriminatory. The new hair regulations also specifically banned several styles of Black haircut and grooming. Incidents of racial fights continued to be reported.

Civilian pressure through the Congress and the courts liberalized navy regulations slightly. Summary Court Martials came to include the right to an attorney and to appeals (Camp News May and June 1973). The Navy, presumably with the CNO's cooperation, fought these through courts and then didn't comply until forced by special court orders. Use of code numbers showing negative reasons for discharge on terminal papers was finally given up under Congressional pressure. The Navy then introduced a new system only slightly less punitive (Navy Times April 10, 1974).

By June 1974 when Zumwalt's term expired (it was reported as non-renewable) he was succeeded by his Vice-Chief, Hollowell. Zumwalt said that he had personally chosen him. The new second in command was Ward Bagley whose older brother, David, remained the
chief of BUPERS. Admiral Kidd who had been reported as a principal insurgent still remained as Chief of Material. He had been a full admiral during this whole period. A new Secretary of the Navy was named. Warner had resigned to accept a prestigious appointment to head the American Bi-Centennial Commission. The new Navy Secretary, Middendorf, had been promoted from Under Secretary. No shift of factions was apparent.

As Zumwalt retired he was still making headlines. This time for his "hawkish views" on military policy. He advocated increased naval strength and raised alarms about the alleged U.S. loss of control of the sea. He wanted to increase use of small attack ships instead of relying heavily on attack carriers as the Navy has in the immediate past. His positions on military strategy and particular combat systems may very well have been applauded by different alignments of military and governmental people than were his personnel policies. In any case his support as CNO was related to more than reaction to his race relations policies and Z-gram orders. On retirement he was interviewed on a national TV program, "Meet the Press", June 30, 1974. Most questions were on his outspoken views on navy strength, but when asked about the Kitty Hawk fight, he said, "it arrived later than I had anticipated". His astute public relations ability have led several commentators to predict that he may run for public office as a civilian.

Zumwalt survived his admirals revolt but at the cost of some of his program and by avoiding public reprimands to his officers
for their disobedience. The admirals revolt had an impact on navy policy but did not completely upset the reforms or the regime. The admirals did not suffer formal punishment or formal charges but some of their careers may have been affected. None were rewarded by promotion to a full admiralty that year.
PART THREE

THE IMPACT OF RESISTANCE ON AUTHORITY

The outstanding lesson of the case histories is that authority was constructed in such a way that the movements had little impact on its effectiveness. The case histories make different aspects of this apparent. The anti-war movement in various ways presented a direct challenge to the authority of the Navy, yet, as we shall see, their methods of working within legal and administrative processes and their lack of success in developing widespread resistance in the Navy limited their ability to interfere with managerial methods of control (Chapter Thirteen). The Black movement on the other hand presented a much more critical challenge to managerial control both because it developed as a potential for widespread group action and because it directly challenged the legitimacy of managerial authority (Chapter Fourteen). In Chapter Fifteen we will look at some of the differences between the anti-war movement and the Black movement with respect to the bases of the movements and the ways in which resistance was developed differently because of differences in how people were involved and of differences in the interpretative processes which defined the movements.

The resistance actions did not noticeably interfere with the war but they did precipitate an organization crisis at the top levels as militarists and managers squared off. This conflict may have had more
potential for interruption of the war work than the direct resistance. The top level fight took up considerable energies of many people as they tried to stop each other from undermining their respective authority practices. In the final chapter in this section we will learn something about the ways in which these movements had repercussions within the organization, in the responses that were made, and how those responses themselves were reacted to by other sections of the naval organization.
Chapter Thirteen

THE ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT AND
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MANAGERIAL METHODS OF CONTROL

Lack of success in breaking down authority structures was most noticeable in the case of the anti-war movement. The NVA people put months of dedicated organization work into their Connie Vote campaign and were backed by a popular civilian peace movement, prominent political figures and even entertainment stars. In spite of this there were virtually no direct effects on navy plans or navy authority. Indirectly their actions probably did add to the strength of the civilian peace movement but this was not their primary purpose. Their purpose was to publicize their own refusal to participate, with the hope that enough others would follow their example that there would not be enough manpower available to run the ship. They had a well documented analysis of how military, government and industrial elites profited from the war; however, there was no connection to a strategy in which the tactic of war-refusal fitted.

Other anti-war people such as the UFTB staff in San Diego and the Coral Sea SOS organizers in the Bay Area used a slightly more sophisticated strategy. They supported the widespread anti-authoritarian actions of EMs and led them in denouncing lifers and the humiliations of navy life. Sailors did become more "uppity," more difficult to control in exact dress and posture, but they continued to do navy work. This would have made sense as resistance if the command model of authority had been accurate, but as we have seen (Part One) it was not.
The libertarian analysis identified the "battle line" as being in the face-to-face confrontations very much as Melville had in 1843. They publicized instances of abuse of authority and of the success of EMs in challenging it as a way of establishing a general anti-military consciousness among EMs. This was not tied into any analysis as to how this would affect the complex organization of ships in 1972. There seemed to be an unexamined assumption that direct individual challenges to authority in face-to-face situations would lead to immobilization of the ships.

The non-violent resisters went further in their challenge to naval authority than disobedience or lack of respect in face-to-face situations. They refused on grounds of conscience to continue work in the Navy. By doing this with the use of church sanctuary they also managed to get excellent publicity for the civilian peace movement. Civilians in the peace movement became supportive of UAs and deserters as well as the sailors who resisted openly. The documentary material does not pick up the emotional feeling of the civilian supporters or GI activists. One organizer of the Coral Sea campaign told me "those were very unusual times, civilians took more chances, put more on the line than they had ever even considered doing before. It was extremely exciting." This new solidarity between civilians and peace movement people (the solidarity resulted from many other GI actions in addition to the case histories) helped in the growing movement to end the Vietnam war.

The impact of the peace campaign on the ships was energizing for the civilian peace movement but it did not seem to even slow down the use of the carriers and the progress of the war. Individuals did refuse
orders, they did refuse to return to the ship and were followed by a few others. In each case of sanctuary the original refusers were joined by six or seven more. A few EMs who reported to the ship said that they were sympathetic. If they later resisted on the ship it did not appear to be consequential for the ship's work.

The Navy was able to absorb both the NVA and the more political UFTB approach by its actual methods of control which were by paper manipulation, contractual promises of good pay, selected discharge of agitators, surveillance and by their ordinary procedures for the organization and direction of work. Both groups of war resisters lacked an analysis of how it happened that the Navy's ability to get cooperation remained superior to both the NVAs anguished appeals to EMs to take responsibility for their complicity in the war and UFTBs attacks and ridicule against lifers and the navy way. Militarists were alarmed by the symbolic rejection of authority and this did cause some problems within the Navy as the militarists and the managers sparred, but it did not seem to impede the navy's part in the war.

There is a difference between condemning the Navy as exploitive or immoral and challenging the legitimacy of its authority. The anti-war people spoke out strongly against what the Navy did and how they did it, but their practical actions as they refused orders were done with careful obedience to navy regulations and the military and civilian law that has institutionalized conscientious objection (Sherill 1970). A major tactic of both NVA and UFTB groups was to provide legal counseling service to EMS. This served to strengthen the legitimacy of navy authority even as it withdrew one or another individual sailor from the Navy. It did keep a positive connection between EMs and movement people.
The managers dealt with anti-war and anti-militarist actions on several levels. They avoided any overt acknowledgement of resistance or of libertarian criticisms. The situation was referred to as "turbulence" in the fleet. The EM argument not having been recognized did not have to be dealt with. Paper manipulation was their major tactic. As EMs or young officers were thought to be doing organizing and gaining any following they would be transferred or discharged quietly. Counseling programs, investigation and direct police surveillance were also increased.

When the anti-war sailors applied for conscientious objector status they followed the paper procedures established by the military. As more people applied for this status and as court cases developed, the procedures were increasingly formalized and widely recognized by navy officials. The steps for getting conscientious objector status usually involved disobedience to orders followed by a sentence at Mast of one or more months in the brig. The paper history of this entire application, order refusal and acceptance of punishment were all necessary for the final authorized discharge. The conscientious objectors were thus very obedient as they followed the forms. This legitimized the navy procedures. The managerial top command did not object to these people leaving the Navy. It actually saved them the trouble of identifying "troublemakers. They did not, however, want leaving the Navy with an honorable discharge to be so easy that it would become popular.

The anti-war campaigns of the Constellation and Kitty Hawk were a concern to managers as poor public relations. They were not a serious challenge to navy work. The EMs who took sanctuary did this as a way of pointing out the immorality of the Vietnam war and as one way to build an
appropriate record for a conscientious objector discharge. It was not used to actually challenge navy authority as the dockside muster of the Black 
Connie strikers later had. Within the church sanctuary, resisters and 
supporters shared the expectation that the Navy would arrest the resisters, 
that they would serve jail sentences and eventually be discharged. The 
sanctuary tactic expressed religious support of the rights of conscience, 
it was not a rejection of military authority but a way of dramatizing and 
demonstrating the sincerity of the individual resister. The church 
statements did not denounce military authority, although they criticized 
the war. The non-violent resisters and the church acknowledged the 
authority of the military. They only asked that consideration be given to 
the person's sincere beliefs. This in itself was not a challenge that was 
likely to worry the managers. The greater number of people who frequently 
gone UA or deserted altogether may have been more difficult as a practical 
problem and a challenge to legitimacy.

Movement EMs debated these tactics. Going UA rather than taking 
sanctuary was encouraged in the SOS campaign on the USS Coral Sea in the 
San Francisco Bay Area. Sanctuary offered good publicity but later the 
arrests and final disposal of the EMs could be manipulated for the Navy's 
benefit. This happened to the Kitty Hawk resisters when Navy negotiations 
convinced the sailors and Harbor Project people to drop publicity. Large 
numbers of UAs might interfere with ship movement, but an excess number of 
men are assigned to ships and in addition extra personnel can be quickly 
brought from shore bases and other ships in the harbor. The loss of the 
most dissatisfied of the crew might be a help to navy work. Movement 
reports about the number who do not return to leave with a ship may not be
credited by the regular newspapers. It was impossible for the movement people to know the exact total of UAs in the Coral Sea campaign. The SOS people thought two hundred fifty had failed to return, the Navy reported what they said were the usual number, thirty five (UA Bulkhead, November 1971). Sailors on the ship would have certainly noticed if any of their buddies were missing, but they did not have communication networks across the ship to add this up to a total trend.

The increase in sabotage was a serious concern of both militarists and managers as a challenge to authority. The actual damage of sabotage is not the essential problem although damage is expensive for the Navy and the Ranger sabotage delayed the ship for three months. The Navy is ideally set up for repair as part of its shore establishment. Damage is expected in time of war and the Navy is well prepared to handle it. The initial charges against Chenoweth and the Navy publicity about the trial indicated that they thought it was part of an organized resistance movement; however, it is unlikely that the EMs who were openly speaking against the war and organizing against it were involved in sabotage. They were under considerable surveillance and they knew it (Marx 1974). Nevertheless the anti-war movement people supported Chenoweth and publicized the case in the movement papers. The case was also picked up in the regular news media. Publicity about the Navy's concern did political work for resisters, to some extent it actually substituted for solidarity, that is, it gave the impression of many actions in solidarity. The Navy not only failed to convict Chenoweth but gave the press this opportunity to discuss the popularity of sabotage during the eleven months Chenoweth was in jail. The managerial method of handling such situations is now to avoid publicity
and increase preventive measures such as administrative discharges of the dissatisfied and surveillance.

In spite of the successful defense of Chenoweth and resulting publicity and the many individual instances of resistance, the anti-war movement was not successful in bringing about a general withdrawal of cooperation with naval authority on the part of EMs. The movement had hoped for a widespread response to their campaigns, as a result both of their appeal to conscience through the publicized actions of individuals and their attack on the command face-to-face relations of authority which the libertarian view identified as an infringement on personal liberties.

In the absence of a generalized withdrawal of cooperation with authority, their methods of working within legal and administrative channels made them more easily controlled by the use of managerial kinds of methods. The navy managers developed an administrative procedure for handling those who objected on grounds of conscience which was effective in avoiding adverse publicity and at the same time was a means of getting rid of potential sources of trouble. Similarly the methods of action chosen by the anti-war movement made it generally easy for the navy "authorities" to identify "trouble-makers" and to shift them around without risking the reaction of a solidary group. Through their control of channels of communication they could prevent any effective feedback to the resisters and hence they could isolate potential sources of trouble within the ships.
Chapter Fourteen

BLACK RESISTANCE: A PRACTICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL THREAT TO MANAGERIAL AUTHORITY

The movement among Blacks presented a much more serious challenge to naval authority and particularly to managerial forms of control. It was much less readily handled by 'managerial' strategies than the anti-war movement. It took the form of a direct withdrawal of cooperation of a kind that the anti-war movement would have liked to achieve but never could. Black resistance did actually threaten naval authority directly and the Navy found it necessary to modify its plans for ship movement as a result. A group of angry men occupying an area of the ship and refusing to move did interrupt work and could not be dealt with by paper manipulation or individual counseling. The fight on the Kitty Hawk was another situation beyond managerial control. The use of a parallel structure of legitimacy in the dockside strike of the Connie sailors, when the Blacks held their own muster and flag salute was even more challenging.

Furthermore, the charge of racism in career administration was a direct denial of managerial legitimacy. The managerial promise of career opportunity was not simply one among many rewards offered by the managerial system of control. It was its basis. The contingencies of career were what they manipulated. Their ability to deliver job training or a career in the Navy in relation to performance in the job in a fair and rational way was the basis of their legitimacy. As Blacks openly and with much publicity insisted that they had not shared this opportunity managerial legitimacy was brought into question. Blacks accounted for
over twelve percent of new recruits. The situation was not likely to go away. The CNO and his managers found that this problem was impossible to solve completely and almost impossible to ameliorate as the militarist officers continued to act so as to increase black experience of racism.

It was not only militarist racism that Blacks protested. Managerial use of centralized bureaucracy, especially their paper manipulation, created widespread dissatisfaction among navy personnel including Blacks. The managerial administrative discharge policy was the initial complaint in the Connie strike. The Captain was certainly following managerial policy when he decided to discharge some of the Blacks on the ship. His lack of sensitivity to Black interpretations of this might be blamed on a militarist outlook but it was higher managerial policy that was responsible for the Captain's discharging of dissidents.

The Black analysis of their situation did not attend to face-to-face situations but indicted the whole process of assignment, promotion, punishment and discharge. The process was what they wanted reviewed as they sat in on the Constellation's main mess decks. The managerial policy of assignment, promotion and discharge did result in a general disadvantage to Blacks. The Black analysis fitted. The charges of discrimination had the effect of challenging the Navy managers' ability to fulfill their promises of equality.

The Black resistance cases had each taken only a brief organizing effort but the solidarity of the resisters as they acted with indignation and assurance that the Navy was wrong and they were right was genuinely frightening to the navy managers. It challenged a legitimacy based on ability to offer job opportunities and to offer them without regard to race.
Black uprisings were potentialities throughout the Navy. Of the two Black resistance events the unorganized fight on the *Kitty Hawk* was less of a problem for the managers. A riot or fight is dangerous to the ship while it is happening, but when it is over it can be used as evidence of irresponsibility and aggression of resisters. Punishment of the rioters can be justified on the basis of cultural values of order. The strikes on the *Constellation* were quite different even though the original complaints were similar. The Black strikers were sure of what they were doing, they were not reacting out of terror as on the *Kitty Hawk*. They felt that as soon as proper higher authorities were called in they would be shown to be right. They maintained order as they used the approved civilian tactic of the sit-down strike. This was an immediate challenge to the authority of the Captain and the ship's officers.

The Black sailors' analysis of their situation was accurate, the Navy was guilty of institutional racism and their demands that it be corrected were directed at the actual location of the problem. The measures available within the managerial system of authority when they were used in this situation to attempt to restore naval control were likely to confirm the Black critique of the navy as discriminating against them. Direct measures of control of the kind that the militarist ideology would recommend tended to result in exacerbating the situation. The response to correcting the situation directly by meeting Black demands for the elimination of racism in the Navy was made difficult both because of potential resistance to such changes from white sailors but also because of the position of the militarists on racism. The managerial method of
handling the situation after some of the earlier measures of direct repression had been shown to create more trouble than they solved, was to handle the immediate situation by promises, not threats, and then to divide the group up which weakened their solidarity and broke down their organization. Their solidarity was further weakened by separate trials and mild punishments. The latter also have less grounds for reactions from the Black movement in the community.

The event was controlled but the example continues to worry the Navy. The potentiality for active Black resistance still exists. It is a very difficult problem because its solution would require control over militarist officers and basic changes in U.S. society. Managers are attempting to get this control but considering the dimensions of the problem they aren't likely to be successful. The militarist officers did not invent institutional racism nor do they produce it independently.

Racism itself cannot be simply obliterated from the Navy by paper manipulation or by educational programs or group social psychological therapy. It is integrated in the U.S. civilian economic and social system. The dissident admirals found enthusiastic political support in the House Armed Services Committee. Preventing Blacks from getting political power is a matter of economic interest in the home states of some of these politicians. Blacks are also used as scapegoats for the middle-class whites' anger and fears about deteriorating urban areas. Many northern as well as southern politicians hold their office on the basis of support from anti-poor interests. (Piven and Cloward 1971) Many of these are also anti-Black. (Lauter and Howe 1971) In the past the Navy has been somewhat more racist than the general society, it is not likely to be allowed to become very much less, as the CNO found out.
Black consciousness includes an accurate analysis of their situation. Their anger cannot be deflected onto mid-management lifers. The managerial programs of paper manipulation of militarists, selective promotion of Blacks and psychological persuasion may remove some of the tension points but racism also operates through class discrimination. Class discrimination is built into US Navy organization as it is built into United States society and yet this is not recognized by managerial or American ideology and so cannot be dealt with for itself. As more Blacks are at the bottom as poorly schooled recruits they will experience the feelings of exploitation and humiliation that poor white EMs do. This is interpreted as white oppression of Blacks. More Blacks will continue to receive administrative discharges. People at the bottom will continue to be exploited and to feel that they are. Inasmuch as this is seen as discrimination, Blacks will continue to join together to act against it. They have the solidarity to do this effectively, that is, to actually interfere with navy work. Michael Klare is probably right in his prediction that as United States foreign policy continues to require a large navy, racial strikes and fights will continue (Klare 1974).
Chapter Fifteen

THE INTERPRETATIVE BASES OF SOLIDARIETY:
CONSCIOUSNESS AND CONSCIENCE

As we have seen, the Black movement was more effective than the anti-war movement in developing resistance to naval authority. Among Black sailors, the formation of group solidarity appears to have been an important aspect of their effectiveness. The anti-war movement did not succeed in creating this. In this chapter we will look at differences between the two movements with respect to how in-group interpretations were developed and shared and the relation of in-group interpretations to how collective action could be mobilized.

Both movements shared problems of organizing presented by the way in which EMs were dispersed throughout the ship as well as on different ships with little opportunity for contact. As we have seen in Part One communications were controlled by the naval authorities and there was continuous surveillance and active repression of potential trouble. Oberschall has noted that masses of people when reacting to situations so oppressive that organization is prevented, rely on their common culture and on their solidarity because of their sense of a common fate (Oberschall 1973:317). This suggests a difference between the two movements which goes beyond the fact that in Black actions there was a direct appeal to their own interests whereas the anti-war movement involved an appeal of broad concerns for other people. It suggests the importance of the interpretative base as crucial for interaction in the confrontations themselves and for how these confrontations were organized and developed.
Roberta Ash in her model of movement action has stressed the need to investigate the link between shared conditions and the emergence of collective actions. The existence of common interests is not enough to account for the emergence of group action. According to her this connection involves individual experience formulated in a shared interpretation of a situation common to members of the group. The effectiveness of the Black movement in mobilizing in a highly controlled and repressive context can be understood in these terms. (Ash 1972)

In the Black actions, meetings preceded the confrontations by only a few days in one case and two weeks in the other. Black EMs already shared "Black experience" as civilians and the experience of having believed recruiters when they promised equal opportunities in the Navy and later disappointment. When use of Black power gestures and Black haircuts were outlawed their indignation was shared. It was not necessary for them to talk to each other to find this out. Their recognition of their common situation included recognition of common understanding. As the stories of the shore fight of the *Kitty Hawk* and the punitive discharges of the *Constellation* reached Blacks, there was one response, anger. Neither long discussions, social gatherings, charismatic leadership nor persuasive argument were needed for action. The only question was what to do. On the *Kitty Hawk* even this was not a question. The situation was perceived as attack, and self-defense was the common response.

What the Blacks did do in both events was to create mutinous situations unprecedented in American naval history. The Navy was able to gain control but not until some hours and days of delicate management. I think this ability of Blacks to act together rested on the solidarity of
common understanding as well as shared identity. "Consciousness raising" occurs during recruitment to identity movements and may take considerable time, but once the new movement paradigm replaces the established ideology, the pieces fall into place. New situations can be correctly interpreted from the new view without consultation with other members. Brother-sisterhood can be established by simply recognizing each other as group members.

In addition to sharing the interpretative base Blacks shared an ease of visual identity. Although not all Blacks have tan, brown or black skin, many do. Recognition of each other by skin color, hair or style of language and movement was often possible. This was enough to indicate a shared outlook without the necessity of knowing the individual personally. It was not as easy for the anti-war EMs to identify each other. The hair codes were relaxed on the USS Coral Sea and EMs there were able to use hair as a clue to libertarian attitudes. The activist EMs would walk up and down the chow line and give out their literature to those with longer hair. The wearing of a uniform, in a uniform way, works as it was probably intended. It identifies the wearers as each the same and masks any subdivisions within the group. The darker skin of most Blacks subverts this. German sailors in the mutinies at the end of the First World War wore strands of red thread to identify those who were with the mutiny. These could be removed quickly if unsympathetic people approached. (Schubert and Langhorne 1933)

Blacks saw themselves as in a common situation of threat or indignity with other Blacks. Ships rules singled them out and gave them common cause as Blacks - as in the rule against over three Blacks walking
together. This common situation was also evocative of considerable emotion, of anger or fear. In the Kitty Hawk events shared indignation was increased by the story about Blacks being attacked on shore leave in the Phillipines followed by the unsuccessful meetings on the ship. As they left the last meeting they thought they were being attacked by the marines. Their immediate common response was self-defense of themselves and other Blacks. The shout of "they're killing our brothers" and the actions of initiating some of the fighting on lower decks is not surprising.

The Connie strikes developed over a slightly longer period. There was concern about the future of Blacks on the ship because of the rumor of the discharges of Blacks. When the captain refused repeatedly to talk with the group they felt there was nothing else to do but stand firm or their situations would get worse. The dockside sit-down was a final effort to stay together using their combined power to keep reprisals from being given, as well as to continue the attempt to redress their original grievances. Through these strikes the level of anger and indignation was very high. A white ex-sailor told me of how he was assigned to assist in the navy investigation following the strike. He talked with some of the Black sailors, they were still deeply angry and he himself was very shaken by their emotion.

This form of shared interpretation was not available to anti-war sailors. The anti-war position had not developed as part of a common civilian experience or even identical military experience. There were some shared elements as a positive expectation of life in the Navy was followed by disappointment as military purposes and methods were encountered. The content of the expectations and the later re-orientation varied. There was a shared anti-military view but this was not interpreted
as fundamental to their own life situations. The anti-war perspective centered on a concern for the people who were suffering and dying in Vietnam. Action was based on a reluctance to join in further complicity in harming them. To get to this understanding considerable thinking was needed as well as some idea of connections from daily navy assignments to the bombing of people. It involved imaginative participation in others' oppression. The final understandings were therefore more varied than positions based on a common and direct personal experience.

In the peace actions, activists were also aware of some oppression of themselves, but this was a consequence of their organizing and they didn't feel that it was extremely unfair. They protested their treatment and often took legal action on the basis of their constitutional rights but they were not indignant nor surprised when the Navy made counter-moves. There was even a minor sense of triumph because the Navy had noticed and been annoyed with their actions. Those people who had developed opposition to the war and were taking serious resistance actions had often gone through a period of emotional anguish as they reached their decisions to act. But by the time of actual confrontation this was usually under control. They were more likely to meet the events with a sense of tragedy than of anger. The activists did not respond to attempts to control the movement with greater indignation and anger as did the Blacks. Nor was there a basis for a widespread response of indignation among EMs.

The Kitty Hawk and Constellation anti-war campaigns involved organization, literature distributions, extensive press coverage, social events and morale building occasions. The vote from the sailors on the Constellation was slightly over half for staying home. Only twenty-two
percent of the sailors had voted. The nine who took sanctuary from the Constellation were one-third of one percent of the crew. Even a smaller percentage took sanctuary from the Kitty Hawk, seven of approximately three thousand enlisted men. (The two others with them were from the USS Mispillion.) In similar actions on other carriers from one to ten publicly refused to return to their ships. The low numbers may indicate the limit of anti-war commitment available among sailors at that time. However, to activate this small resistance it had been necessary to do continual organizing, individual counseling and building of community support. There were occasions when large numbers of the anti-war people came together but the situations did not develop into resistance. Even when arrests were made at the sanctuary sites there was no more than symbolic resistance. An appeal to conscience does not seem to be an adequate base for the social interaction needed in mass resistance confrontations.  

The link between shared conditions and the emergence of collective actions can now be filled in. Actual shared conditions become group experience when individuals use the same interpretative mode and at the same time are conscious of their identity with each other. If they interpret their conditions as oppression this base prepares the members for joint action. An opponent's moves perceived as threatening may then result in the very rapid and apparently spontaneous development of collective action. Mass actions of high commitment and unanimity can arise without extensive prior organization or hierarchy of authority, as in the Constellation strikes and the Kitty Hawk fight.

7 The civilian street confrontations of the draft resistance movement and youth peace movement involved an interpretive base of both conscience and consciousness and they also were preceded by extensive planning and organization. I don't think they are a clear case against this statement.
Not all social movements have this basis for solidarity. The anti-war movement is a type which emerges when individuals interpret others' rather than their own conditions as oppressive and come to define their own responsibility for this in a shared analysis. This base may prepare the members for action as individuals on the basis of individual conscience, but cooperative action can only be taken if social interaction continually verifying the mutuality of their understandings is available. This was the case of the anti-war movement based on conscience. It is a type of movement which is much more dependent on openness and accessibility of channels of communication between members.
Chapter Sixteen

MANAGERIAL CRISIS: RESISTANCE AMONG ENLISTED MEN

PRECIPITATES CONFLICT BETWEEN 'MANAGERS' AND 'MILITARISTS'

Neither the anti-war movement nor the Black movement were effective in breaking down or changing the authority structure of the Navy as a direct consequence of their actions. They did, however, have an indirect effect on the internal structure of authority within the naval hierarchy which brought about the challenge to Zumwalt's authority described in the case studies as the "Admirals Reaction". This effect of the movements came about through the interaction of public pressures created by the movement actions; the response of the 'managerial' policy makers to this pressure; its effects on the bases of authority of those who actually relied on their authority for the day-to-day work of running the Navy, in particular the NCOs; and the response of militarist officers and NCOs to this threat both to their authority, and, as they saw it, to the Navy.

Both Black and anti-war movement actions drew public attention to aspects of the workings of the Navy. This resulted in public pressures, in the press, on the Congress and in the courts which called into question the constitutionality of the Navy's judicial system. Public pressure came at a time when the Navy was concerned to change its bases of recruitment and to emphasize working in the Navy as fundamentally similar to employment in a civilian organization with the additional advantages of opportunities for training and advancement. The libertarian critique made both by Black leaders and by supporters of the anti-war movement challenged this view of
the Navy and brought out the continued existence of a racial caste system and patterns of authority relations of a traditional kind which were represented as infringing on the individual's constitutional rights, that is, their guaranteed rights as citizens (Finn 1971). Navy recruitment also fell off and the percentage of trained personnel willing to re-enlist decreased alarmingly. Shortages of new recruits were filled by the draft but there was no similar force for re-enlistments.

Zumwalt's response was to take steps, among them his Z-Grams, to bring naval practices more into line with standards implied by these public criticisms. The Z-Gram reforms were not intended to encourage political expression among Enlisted Men nor to make real changes in the naval hierarchy. They did allow more space for personal action. They permitted a wider range of personal styles of dress and they promoted the managerial modes of interpersonal exercise of authority stressing cooperation and teamwork rather than command and obedience. Zumwalt himself set an example through his policy of making personal appearances. Several Z-Grams were explicitly directed against racist practices. The managerial strategy for dealing with 'turbulence' in the Fleet dealt directly with movement actions by administrative methods and indirectly by attempting to reduce racist practices of the Navy and by limiting the militarist practices of authority that had been identified as most objectionable.

These policies created problems with the traditional practices of authority within the Navy. The NCOs were in the position where there was the most pinch. They were responsible for seeing that their crews were prepared for inspections and that the many exact regulations were conformed to as well as for the routine coordination of day-to-day work
on board ship. Under the Z-Gram program they were held responsible for carrying out these responsibilities and at the same time avoiding infringement of the civil liberties of enlisted men. They were the last link in an authoritarian system. They passed on unwelcome orders that had been decided from above for reasons unrelated to the immediate interests of the work crew. They were responsible for seeing that the work and the sailors' personal living arrangements were carried out according to precise navy regulations. In doing so they depended upon their authority in face-to-face command relations. They depended upon authority of the militaristic type which meant that whether they chose to use this style or not, they could issue commands and expect them to be obeyed or take punitive action if they were not. This authority depended on the support of the naval hierarchy. Zumwalt's policies threatened to deprive them of this support. They were still expected to see that the work got done and that navy routines and regulations were conformed to, but they were expected to do so without infringing the rights of the EMs. They could not count on the support of the naval hierarchy if they used authority practices which were not in agreement with official policies.

Militarist officers and NCOs came together in support of the militarist view of naval authority. Both were alarmed at the occasional rudeness, grudging cooperation and frequent infraction of minor rules of etiquette as well as at the direct anti-war actions. When a sailor failed to salute, they viewed their authority as under attack. They did not distinguish between anti-militarists, anti-war people, pro-communist, Black power activists or foreign agents. These were all considered 'subversive agents' or easily led 'dupes'. Their ideology of authority
prescribed immediate and forceful action in response to these threats. When Zumwalt's policies prevented these responses, he and the managerial position he represented came to be seen as a serious threat to naval authority in terms of the militarist ideology.

Black uprisings of themselves were not seen by militarists as a direct challenge to the bases of naval authority. The militarist ideology does recognize this kind of threat, but there are prescribed responses to it. The really serious problem was the managerial leadership which prevented the punitive action which militarists saw as essential to preserving authority. They thought that the events were evidence for their prediction of the danger of the "permissiveness" of managerial leadership. They believed their own "get tough" solutions would have worked both as prevention as well as control. Because they were not in complete charge, they were saved a test of this. Failures at ship level could be blamed on their hands being tied by higher managerial authority. For example, the Captain's commands that precipitated the Kitty Hawk fight conformed to the militarist prescriptions for responses to non-compliance of a number of men. The appropriateness of this action was not called into question by the militarists. The congressional sub-committee report which took a generally militarist position documents the disruptive effects of the Captain's orders that contradicted the Executive Officer but raises no question about the correctness of these orders (HASC 1973:17674-17676). The handling of the racial incident in the Philippines and the restriction of Black expression of solidarity on the ship were not questioned. The militarist ideology did not recognize a valid basis for Black solidarity or a problem of injustices in how Blacks were treated in the Navy, or how
militarists' measures themselves, such as the order for the marines to advance, could directly add to the crisis of confrontation in such a context. The Captain's action would be seen in the terms of the militarist ideology as entirely in keeping with proper procedures for maintaining control. They would have no explanatory value for the resulting fights.

The militarist ideology identified the crucial threat to authority not in the confrontations themselves, nor in the role that militarist measures played in them, but in Zumwalt's policy of "permissiveness" in handling them. This was the basis of militarist resistance to the CNO's authority. The concerns about handling of movement actions and about how the reforms limited the NCOs and ships officers' authority and undercut their chain of command came together in generalized resistance among NCOs and officers. They complained and they obstructed orders. At the higher levels of the hierarchy, militarist admirals sought support within Congress and elsewhere outside the Navy. The CNO was surprised.

Zumwalt could understand how enlisted people were reluctant to follow orders they considered harassing, but he was surprised when NCOs, ships officers and finally his top level admirals resisted. He had evidently thought his authority would be sufficient to get their compliance as it probably had been in other areas. Zumwalt must not have correctly assessed the depth of militarist opposition, their support within the Navy or their political power outside. He must not have recognized that the reforms as they limited lower officers' and NCOs discretion also limited their authority. He acted as though their failure to implement his
commands was simple insubordination. Obedience to orders is expected by managerial officers even though it is to be presented by the subordinate as if it was voluntary as in team cooperation. As Zumwalt proceeded with his race relations reforms he became angry at the lack of understanding of the necessity for change and both puzzled and angry at the militarists' insubordination.

The Kitty Hawk fight and the Constellation strikes had alarmed the CNO and his managerial group. These events encouraged them in their view of the absolute necessity of eliminating racism. Zumwalt took the step of a public attack on his top militarist officers. This violated a major principle of militarist authority which requires maintaining a common front of support and agreement and reserving criticism for behind the scenes. Authority in terms of the militarist ideology is seen to depend upon this and to be undermined when a superordinate publicly criticizes a subordinate in the line of command. The line of command upon which Zumwalt depended for the effectiveness of his orders became in this situation a basis for opposition. Zumwalt was attacked with righteous indignation by the mutinous admirals.

The CNO fought this with managerial methods. He compromised with his dissident admirals by a public semi-retraction but he also used his power to punish via paper manipulation. Through BUPERS those that cooperated could be promoted and the resisting admirals could be bypassed for promotion and in some cases, retired early. He increased surveillance of management openly by direct supervision in the Inspector General reviews and covertly by secret agents of the Naval Intelligence Service (All Hands, February 1974).
Controversy was observable in national media stories that identified the CNO as the hero. Even the GI press reported that the CNO had attempted humanistic reforms. The congressional sub-committee report was of another opinion. There was undoubtedly much other infighting submerged well below the level of media reports. As the months went along the militarist recommendations of the subcommittee were implemented. The admirals revolt turned policy back to the "navy way" the managers had tried to move beyond; however, the managers still held the authorized positions for initiating action.

The practical results of this internal fight in terms of navy wide insecurity of NCOs and officers and the effects of this on their work have not been assessed. This must have been considerable and tension continues. The basic cause of these tensions was the resistance actions of EMs even though they had produced this effect quite unintentionally.

At the top, admirals limited each other's authority by their direct attack on or even sabotage of each other's careers: on the ships, officers could not be assured their orders would be backed. The changes in the Captain's orders during the Constellation strike is one example. The earlier Connie vote campaign that resulted in having the Captain report to Washington may also have been responsible for his transfer on the eve of the ship's departure. The very militarist judge in the Ranger sabotage trial was finally pulled out on the excuse of illness and another milder person filled his place. The actual reasons for these transfers are not available information, but there were many reports of the concern officers felt for their navy careers in the likelihood that they too would have to deal with resistance. Whichever tack they might take they would be subject to criticism by some superior.
This points to another way in which authority construction may be undermined which is not by withdrawal of participation in the social construction of authority by subordinates, but by uncertainty about the legitimacy and bases of authority among those who are expected to exercise it. This was the indirect impact of the anti-war and Black movements on the naval hierarchy through public reactions and the responses dictated by the managerial approach to them.
This study has investigated the resistance actions and the practical effects on military authority of five events of group resistance aboard United States Navy ships in 1971 and 1972. The events happened in the final years of the Vietnam war and included anti-war campaigns on the USS Constellation and the USS Kitty Hawk, sabotage on the USS Ranger, a fight of more than 200 Black and white sailors on the USS Kitty Hawk off Vietnam, and a strike of 130 Black sailors on the USS Constellation.

The social construction of authority, that is, the way that authority was produced, strengthened or weakened by participants, was taken as a problematic. Published accounts by members of the varied groups involved were the primary sources of information. These accounts appeared in officers' professional journals, navy and civilian news media, GI underground newspapers, campaign literature and in the report of a congressional investigation.

Officers' accounts used one of two available ideologies. Each ideology included assumptions about the practical actions necessary for the exercise of authority and justifications about the right to demand compliance. One was the classical militarist perspective and the other was the managerial ideology of civilian corporate society. The militarist ideology assumed that authority was manifested by an inferior's exact obedience to a superior's commands in a formal face-to-face setting such as the social and technological setting of old navy sailing ships. The managerial ideology identified authority as the administration of institutional processes so that they resulted in compliance of personnel.
The resisting sailors criticized elements of both ideologies but held parallel ideas with the two models of how authority works. The Black movement analysis of institutional racism was similar to the managerial model of authority as institutional process while the anti-war sailors' libertarian critique of the military assumed that authority depended on obedience to face-to-face commands. The use of the institutional or the command model led to different tactics and to varying awareness of threat.

An account by Herman Melville of shipboard life in the Navy in the early nineteenth century provided a description of an organization and technology to which the militarist form of authority was integral. Contemporary naval organization and technology was shown to be very different. Ship organization today is based on a complex technology including automated machinery and is embedded in an extensive bureaucratic apparatus. The routine operations of a large aircraft carrier are carried on and coordinated in large part by automatic processes. The command-obedience face-to-face relationships of militarist authority are no longer the central processes involved in operation of the ship. The authority of the naval hierarchy and the overall coordination of naval work depends to a considerable extent on the institutional model of authority which is represented in the managerial ideology. "Paper manipulation" becomes the major means of securing conformity.

The course and consequences of the cases of resistance must be understood both in terms of the ideologies which guided them and identified the key aspects of authority in the actions taken, and in terms of the organizational context of authority relations.
The immediate result of the resistance events was a high level conflict between managerial and militarist officers. Militarist officers were alarmed at the "permissiveness" of the managers and tried to oust the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Zumwalt. The strike of the Black movement sailors was a more effective challenge to authority than the anti-war resistance, partly because the institutional analysis of the Black sailors challenged the legitimacy of navy authority. Their position could be changed into practical action quickly because Black sailors shared a remarkable solidarity in commitment and understanding that obviated extensive planning or formal organization of resistance. Further, their experience of discrimination continued in spite of certain reform efforts by managerial officers. This guaranteed a readiness to resist.

The atomization of personnel by the technical requirements for the division of labor and the militarist maintenance of oppositions between officers, NCOs and enlisted men made cooperation in resistance difficult, but at the same time produced anti-military solidarity among enlisted people. Government use of the Navy added to this by demands for long deployments at sea and by the unpopularity of the Vietnam war. The ability of the Navy to continue with its work in spite of the serious disagreements within officers' ranks, widespread disaffection of enlisted people and the specific resistance events was due chiefly to institutional channeling by manipulation of career opportunity. This was backed by US government funding of relatively high pay levels for officers and enlisted people. In general we must conclude that the authority organization of the US Navy proved extremely resilient and resistant to efforts at change. Its organization had a durability and power that seemed to outweigh completely the direct action of resistance.
We have noted the differences in effectiveness and organization of the Black and anti-war movements in chapters thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen. The impact of resistance on authority relations in the Navy must also be understood in terms of the tactics adopted by these movements. Their tactics were worked out in terms of their respective models of the construction of authority in the Navy and its relevance to their objectives. The Black movement's methods of resistance appeared to be relatively accurate in their appraisal of naval authority. The anti-war sailors' conception of authority as obedience to commands in face-to-face setting was not. The Navy anti-war people did not attend to the difference between their work situation and that of enlisted people on the old sailing ships or even of their difference from soldiers in the contemporary infantry in combat in Vietnam. In the contemporary Navy, as we have seen, tactics based on this face-to-face command model had little impact on the maintenance of authority. The effects of actions depends instead on the relevance of the specific tactic to the actual way that authority is constructed.

The anti-war people capitalized on the widespread EM anti-lifer sentiments and tried to build on these to develop a stronger anti-military consciousness among EMs (see Chapter Four and the Case Studies). Militarists and libertarians both reported an increase in this anti-military consciousness and in "uppity" actions, but this did not become obstructive of navy authority. Lifers are used as buffers between higher management and sailors. No effort was made by the anti-war movement to gain the support of the 'lifers' for their opposition to participation in the Vietnam war. That may not have been a realistic possibility in any
case, but it was never tried. Instead the anti-war tactics helped to create opposition to the NCOs which appeared in the increased "uppityness" of EMs. They contributed to the support which NCOs gave to the militarist position.

Furthermore, the anti-war movement in many ways worked within the managerial framework and directly recognized the legitimacy of its methods of exercising authority. Every anti-war movement group whether they used non-violent methods or a more political approach always provided GI counseling as a major part of their work. This was backed by services of attorneys and was cooperatively organized nation-wide with regular updating of materials, counselor training workshops and bulletins on court decisions (see Chapter Four). The services were widely used and the resulting court cases did make for specific adjustments in administrative procedures in the military including the Navy. Militarists were alarmed by the proliferation of "sea lawyers" but the top level managers were able to accommodate their regulations and procedures to court decisions without loss of authority to direct navy work. The GI counselors advice to EMs upheld legitimacy of the Navy as they explained how to carefully follow and use regulations and court decisions for the sailor's own benefit. Anti-war people hoped that as it became possible for EMs to get out of the services without heavy punishment more of them would choose to do this. There was an increase in discharges; however, this was not a problem for the Navy who themselves used discharge of the dissatisfied as prevention of "turbulence." Thus in different ways the tactics of the anti-war movement tended to consolidate naval authority rather than produce a general disaffection. The navy developed more adequate means of dealing with the
problem of "turbulence" almost in cooperation with the anti-war movement. At the same time the movement's attack on the face-to-face authority of the NCOs served to build up support for the militarist version of authority.

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION RECONSIDERED

In the Introduction the question of the individual's relationship to contemporary large formal organizations was raised. It is now appropriate to consider whether this study of navy authority helped illuminate this more general problem. Specific practical conclusions of how this worked in the Navy have been given. The authority organization of the US Navy certainly proved resistant to efforts at change. However, this study shows more than that it is difficult for lower level participants in formal organizations to initiate change, it calls attention to the necessity of understanding the practical dynamics of authority construction. The connection between potential social change and what obstructs it within a large formal organization may involve many people whose actions support the ongoing situation. It is not enough to identify these actions. The ideologies with which people justify their positions and frame their ideas of what is going on are also necessary for understanding how it is all held together. Even this is not enough, the actual technical organization of the work and the identification of background supports for compliance must also be considered. As this is done the relatively powerless position of the lower level participants will probably become apparent; however, to the extent that the analysis is understood by them, they will have more power than they had without this knowledge because they will know which of their possible actions has more likelihood of practical effects.
The tremendous weight of governments and large formal organizations as against individuals has led some sociologists to dismiss the social construction approach as inadequate (McNall, Johnson and Grabiner 1975). Rather what should be dismissed is face-to-face negotiation as the model for the way that society is maintained and change produced. It is certainly people who by their actions create history, what these actions are however is not obvious. In the case histories, recognizable face-to-face actions happened as when there was a strike or fight or when a person was charged and tried for a crime, but there were also written instructions, orders, authorizations, regulations and publicity that extended this. These paper negotiations were more decisive than face-to-face encounters. The social construction approach at first seems bound within a face-to-face model; however, in following out the reports of the written documents the mechanisms of institutional control became visible. The documents also brought in information about the ideologies through which action was planned and interpreted, about the perceived power bases of the different participants and located the situation in an historical time and place. The social construction approach then can be used to study institutional and class phenomena if it is fully used (Morris 1975). It is only when we limit our attention to face-to-face interaction that the background factors escape us. When we become interested in the accounts the participants make for each other we bring in the actual on-going constructing of a relation to the world beyond the face-to-face setting (Smith 1973). Social construction is only inadequate as an approach if we fail to extend it to include the things that are constructed, for instance, records, authorizations, publicity, formal organization, the processes of organization and their intersection with the society at large.
There have been few sociological studies which have examined organizational processes from the perspective of problems of worker initiated actions. Mouzelis has called attention to this omission of large areas of human action (1968). Organization theorists have concentrated instead on problems defined from the perspective of management. The effectiveness of managerial control in increasing production or profit is taken as the central problem. Little attention if any has been given to issues arising from the position of workers. The social construction approach focuses upon how individuals in their action and interaction create organized processes. It offers an approach which focuses on organization as something which is brought into being by the actions of participants. Crozier has a useful metaphor to show how organization theorists have failed to recognize the full humanness of all participants:

The classic rationalists did not consider the members of an organization as human beings, but just as other cogs in the machine. For them, workers were only hands. The human relations approach has shown how incomplete such a rationale was. It has also made it possible to consider workers as creatures of feeling, who are moved by the impact of the so-called rational decisions taken above them, and will react to them. A human being, however, does not have only a hand and a heart. He also has a head, which means that he is free to decide and to play his own game . . . (Crozier 1964: 149).

In this study, political consciousness and action of the members went beyond that observed by Crozier. In addition to hands, hearts and heads, members had brothers and sisters and friends - to continue Crozier's metaphor. EMs as well as admirals depended on each other and on outside support for their negotiation within the Navy.

When sociologists have considered human actions as producing historical events they have used concepts such as social forces and social
structure to explain the strength and stubbornness of the social situation surrounding any particular participants. I don't object to these formulations for many purposes, but they are not adequate for understanding how partly intended social change such as reform and revolutions happen. They mystify rather than elucidate. The social activities, whatever they are that make up what is meant by social forces, must go on through individuals as they act with and against each other and as they limit and are limited by physical and technological circumstances. This is enormously difficult to think about only partly because it is a mixture of so many events and relationships. The real difficulty is that we have never adequately abstracted the fundamentals of what is going on.

There is an ideological basis for our inattention to how events happen, how control is maintained, resisted and new forms developed. Workers in Industrial societies are thought to be incapable of independent action and therefore of responsibility. In bureaucratic organizations people from the bottom to the top levels explain their actions as "I am only taking orders" or "I just work here." The purposes of the organization including any injustices in its methods are ruled out as beyond the effective concern of workers; the same workers who accomplish the organizational purposes by using the prescribed methods.

This study has used a different approach, it has been assumed that workers are involved in producing the organization of which they are part. The practical way that this happens in the Navy is intricate. The anti-war EMs and Black movement sailors did participate in the construction of authority, but often in unintended ways and under constraints of technological controls, paper manipulations, opportunity channeling and divisive organization all backed by the economic resources of the United States.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials Used as Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NVA</td>
<td>THE HARBOR PROJECT Non Violent Action (NVA) and Concerned Officers Movement (COM) joined together as the Harbor Project. They maintained a house in San Diego where meetings were held, some of their subsistence workers lived there and they published two undergroup GI newsletters: <strong>Liberty Call</strong> was done with the help of active duty people in San Diego, especially those on the USS Constellation. <strong>Kitty Litter</strong> was produced by men on the Kitty Hawk with the help of Harbor House people. When at sea, the sailors would send their copy to Harbor House where the paper was mimeod and sent back to subscribers on the ship. Leaflets, campaign pamphlets and &quot;stick 'em and lick 'ems&quot; were published under the names of NVA, COM and Harbor Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Litter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. H. Flyer

Kitty HAWK FLYER This newsletter was printed daily aboard the USS Kitty Hawk as part of the official communication plan of the ship. The six copies that I used were from March and April 1972. They were marked with comments and underlines by a sailor on the Hawk who had sent them to the harbor projects.
UP FROM THE BOTTOM  The Center for Servicemen's Rights in downtown San Diego published this Navy underground paper Up From The Bottom or UFTB. Active duty people, ex GIs and civilians wrote the articles. It carried news from the ships in the San Diego area and some reports of civilian movement programs. The Center provided military counseling and legal aid related to civil liberty and discharge problems of EMs.

THE DOOR  The Door is a bi-weekly underground paper in San Diego. It features movement events, occasional local political exposes, GI news, reviews of local rock concerts and announcements of entertainment and political events. San Diego library files the Door in its periodicals collection.

The San Diego Union is one of the daily papers in San Diego. The other paper is owned by the same publisher and prints similar news. The San Diego Public Library indexes the Union even by references to individual ships, they carry the copies in microfilm.

SOS NEWSLETTER, Stop Our Ship or SOS is used as an organizing name by several GI groups. Initially it referred to the people working together on the Coral Sea campaign. They published letters from the ship at sea and general GI news as well as produced leaflets for San Francisco area ship campaigns.
PNS  PACIFIC NEWS SERVICE  Pacific News Service, PNS, provides a professional news service for the Pacific area. Their releases are used by subscriber newspapers locally and around the world. They gave me their copy of news releases. News from their correspondent in the Phillipines was my main source for events in WESPAC. (Western Pacific)

UA Bulkhead  UP AGAINST THE BULKHEAD  Up Against the Bulkhead, UATB, is a bay area underground navy paper. It carries GI national and local news.

NOMLAC  CCCO NEWSLETTER AND NOMLAC  The West Coast office of the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, CCCO, publishes a Newsletter on Military Law and Counseling, NOMLAC. The national CCCO office publishes another newsletter. These both summarize recent cases and changes in law and regulations. CCCO has a center for military and draft counseling in San Francisco and provides training and information to counselors on the West Coast.

AFSC  AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE  The American Friends Service Committee, A Quaker Organization, sponsors work with GIs and helps organize civilian SOS groups in addition to its other community programs. Their office in the Bay Area supplied me pamphlets and leaflets used in 1971 and '72 in the Coral Sea, the Midway and the Enterprise campaigns.
TURNING THE REGS AROUND  This is a small booklet published by the Turning The Regs Around Committee. It is a GI movement book of advice of how to use the Uniform Code of Military Justice in defense and organizing. It quotes large sections from the UCMJ. Published in the bay area.

THE BERKELEY BARB & LOS ANGELES FREE PRESS are two original underground papers in California. They continue to publish hip articles and cover some movement events especially GI resistance. They also feature extensive reviews of local entertainment and carry commercial advertisements for the many sex services in their respective areas.

CAMP NEWS is a Chicago GI paper that gives comprehensive coverage of the GI movement internationally.

ABOUT FACE is the newsletter of the United States Service-men's Fund. The USSF solicits funds from civilians who wish to support the GI movement and partially supports GI papers and coffee houses and other small community resistance projects.

WIN is a newsletter of peace activists and alternative life style people. It is published by its staff collective and the War Resisters League. It has been bi-weekly until 1973 when it became weekly.
AMERICAN REPORT was the monthly journal of the Committee of Clergy and Laymen Concerned about the Vietnam War. It has professional coverage of national and international events.

CONGRESSIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT "Report by the Special Subcommittee on Disciplinary Problems in the US Navy of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Ninety Second Congress, Second Session, January 2, 1973." This is the report of the Kitty Hawk riot and the Constellation strike.

DAILY NEWSPAPERS AND WEEKLY JOURNALS Daily papers in the San Francisco and Seattle area were often used. The national weekly journals TIME and NEWSWEEK were also used as was THE NATION a journal of liberal opinion.

PROCEEDINGS The United States Naval Institute is the professional society for Naval Officers. They publish a monthly magazine Proceedings which carries articles on current events, naval history, technical changes, and comments on naval and national policy and strategy. They publish books and manuals as well.

NAVY MANUALS Many of the regular books and instruction manuals recommended and/or officially used by the Navy
are published by the United States Naval Institute, USNI.

The following were used in this study:

1964 Johnson, Florence R., *Welcome Aboard*

1966 Cope, Harley F. and Bucknell, Howard, *Command at Sea*

1968 USNI, *Blue Jackets Manual*

1971 USNI, *Watch Officers Guide*

1971 Noel Jr., John V. and Beach, Edward L., *Naval Terms Dictionary*

1972 USNI, *Ship Organization and Personnel*

ALL HANDS. This is the monthly glossy magazine of the Naval Bureau of Personnel, BUPERS. It contains illustrated human interest stories of naval personnel and their families and announcements of changes in regulations. It also has departments for answering questions on promotions, transfers, retirement, reenlistment and discharge.

NAVY TIMES. This is a weekly official Navy newspaper.

ARMED FORCES JOURNAL and ORDNANCE. These are semi-official military professional journals for officers. Their content is similar to *Proceedings*.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice, the current military criminal law and procedures first approved by Congress in 1950 and amended in 1956 and 1968.
White Jacket was published in 1850. I used the 1970 Northwestern Newberry Edition as my basic text. Other sources were as follows:


MELVILLE'S SOURCES FOR WHITE JACKET

In addition to his own experiences on the USS United States in 1843 and 1844, Melville drew on the works of others. The principal sources according to research of Howard Vincent and Willard Thorp were:

Ames, Nathaniel; A Mariner's Sketches, Providence, RI, 1831.

A British Seaman, Life on Board a Man-of-War, Blackie, Fullerton & Company, Glasgow, 1829.

Leech, Samuel, Thirty Years From Home: A Voice From the Main Deck, being the Experience of Samuel Leech, who was for six years in the British and American Navies, was captured in the British Frigate Macedonia: Afterwards entered the American Navy, and was taken in the United States brig Syren, by the British ship Medway, Charles Tappon, Boston, 1843.

Martingale, Hawser (John Sherbourne Sleeper), *Tales of the Ocean*, Boston, 1842.

SAN DIEGO  I visited the Harbor Project in April and May 1972 and interviewed ex-service people and civilians working with Harbor Project. I attended several of their meetings including one at their bookstore, Second Thoughts. I also visited the Center for Servicemen's Rights and talked with several of their counselors and organizers.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA  In October 71 and May 72 I had long discussions with peace program staff of the AFSC. I visited Pacific News Service and talked with their news staff who publish SOS. I also talked and corresponded with several other SOS workers including a leader of the non-violent caucus within SOS. I have also spent many hours talking with draft and military counselors from San Francisco CCCO during their visits to the Northwest.

EVERETT, WASHINGTON  As a community college instructor since 1963 I have had class discussions, role playing and personal conversation with navy veterans. Many of the veterans had been on carrier duty including duty on three of the ships considered in this study. Most had only spent one tour of duty in the Navy, but occasional students have been lifers. Community college students are usually from working or lower middle class families. They are usually not social activists although veterans since 1969 have had very strong anti-military attitudes. I consider this student source to be more representative of EM opinion than the peace activists.
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON  I participated in a GI peace march at Whidbey Island Naval Air Station in July 1972. I was able to talk with many of the marine and navy demonstrators. I had been invited as the acting Peace Secretary for the Northwest Regional office of the American Friends Service Committee, AFSC. In earlier work I had chaired AFSCs draft and military counseling committee from 1967 to 1970. This involved attendance at legal and counseling workshops, at court martials and participation in support programs for particular service people including two instances of sanctuary. In all of these I spent considerable time talking to the service people involved.

PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD at BREMERTON, WASHINGTON  I once worked for a year and a half as a sub-professional draftsman at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in the Design Division for Damage Control and Ordnance Design. This occasionally involved going aboard ships to check plans. I did become familiar with the physical feeling and actual appearance of the interiors of many ships including aircraft carriers.