

Families Acting as ‘Semi-Concerned Persons’ to Protect Soldiers

Hiromi ICHIKAWA
Imabari Meitoku Junior College

Every security policy needs people who not only make the decision to conduct a mission, but also people who will, in the end, carry out its missions. Those people are often soldiers and are calculated as part of the cost of the “wear-out rate” of each military operation. In all military actions, there is a consumption of lives where a certain number of soldiers will be ‘worn-out’ or die in the line of duty. The soldier’s risk of becoming ‘worn-out’ is offset by the belief of becoming a “hero”. Soldiers kill the “enemy” and cause fatalities to the people in and around the battlefield. At the same time, soldiers themselves are exposed to the fear of being wounded or being killed. Soldiers deprive people of their lives but also can be deprived of their own. Being forced to kill or be killed, they exert various influences on the people they are close with. No security policy calculates these people in its ‘wear-out’ rate.

Since the US military invaded Iraq on the 20th of March in 2003, a minimum of 60,411 to a maximum of 66,280 civilians have been killedⁱ. The number of soldiers that have died is 15,477 in the 4 years since the beginning of the war. It includes 12,000 Iraqi police and security and 3,220 US soldiersⁱⁱ. In total, at least 76,000 people have lost their lives. Many more have had to witness their loved ones suffer, be wounded, or be killed.

In this article, I will focus on the family members of soldiers in Iraq. They are considered semi-concerned persons because although they are not directly involved in the war, they become involved due to their loved ones being in the military. Family has been used as a symbol to mobilize people to war. Soldiers are needed to accomplish a country’s security policy. People are deeply affected when their loved ones are in the military. Because their loved ones are at war, families become concerned with public policies which could put their loved ones in danger. In this time of the war on terror, family members of soldiers often mediate between the soldiers and society because the soldiers are not free to speak and act outside the military. Furthermore, many families

not only act as mediators, but they also try to protect their loved ones by attempting to bring them back from the battlefield in Iraq.

1. Soldier's Family as a Passive "Semi-concerned Person"

1.1. Family Is to Be Protected by Soldiers

Hero = soldiers who defend the State and family

Semi-hero = family members who have loved ones in military

Family is important both for the State and each soldier. Family supplies the soldiers that the State needs to carry out a war. The State calls people to join the military forces "in order to defend their loved ones" and honor soldiers as "heroes" who fight for the State risking their own lives. A soldier as a "hero" is a means to convince the family of the logic of war. Families are the means to justify sending people to war.

When a soldier is killed in action, the State praises him/her as a hero with a memorial service and monument which assumes to help family members accept the death of their loved ones with dignity. These measures are necessary so that family members do not criticize the State which has "consumed" the lives of their loved ones. Families are expected to accept the "ultimate sacrifice" of their loved one's death or to be proud of their loved one's and their own "honorable devotion" to the State.

The image of the family needing to be defended is easy to accept, because this image lets soldiers be persuaded to go to war. This kind of family image encourages soldiers to risk their lives. To die protecting one's family is much more concrete than to die for "democracy" or to "bring down a dictatorship". Even when public opinion is divided over these causes, or even when a soldier holds doubt about the war, this kind of family image provides a concrete reason to go to warⁱⁱⁱ. Family is used as rhetoric to portray the victims i.e. the soldiers who will lose their lives, as heroes.

1.2. Mutual Aid Organizations Created by Family Members

The history of organizations created by people who are faithful to the image of "family needing to be protected" is relatively long. During World War I, Grace Seibold, whose son George Vaughn Seibold enlisted in the army in 1917, used to visit hospitals looking for her son. Yet, even after she received the notification of her son's death, she kept visiting hospitals hoping that her son might return. When her son's death was confirmed, she began to care for soldiers in the hospitals together with other mothers who had lost

their sons. This was the forerunner of mutual aid organizations of family members such as “American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.^{iv}” which was established by 25 family members in 1928. This organization of mothers was rooted sadness, anger and a sense of loss, which are all too heavy to bear alone.

In order to convert the sorrows of mothers into pride and to portray victims as heroes, the State came to support these organizations. On 23rd of June 1936, the House of Representatives resolved to make the last Sunday of September Gold Star Mother’s Day. On that day, the government hung national flags from the all government buildings to show love to mothers who had lost their sons in war. President George W. Bush also has made a statement on that day^v.

American Gold Star Mothers, Inc. does not engage in political or lobbying activities, but the organization supports the US military. In addition to providing support and assistance to Gold Star mothers, their aims are to: inspire respect for the Stars and Stripes, the US national flag, among the youth of Americans; maintain true allegiance to the USA; perpetuate the memory of those whose lives were sacrificed in wars. It maintains allegiance to the US and receives support from the military. One of its purposes is to teach a sense of individual obligation to the community.

Conditions of membership are strictly enforced. Natural mothers, who are citizens of the USA or of the Territorial and Insular Possessions of the USA, whose sons and daughters served and died in the line of duty in the Armed Forces of USA and its Allies, or died as a result of injuries sustained during such service, are eligible for membership. Adoptive mothers and stepmothers who reared the child from the age of five years and whose natural mother is deceased, are also eligible under the above conditions.

Other organizations created by military families include mothers who now have, or have had, children serving in the military, and have organized Blue Star Mothers of America^{vi}. Members support each other and their children while promoting patriotism. Its history began in 1942. Mothers volunteered to work in hospitals, train stations, and packed care packages for soldiers. At that time, these activities were a working part of homeland security.

Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.^{vii} was founded in 1945. Members are wives whose spouses have died while on active duty in the US Armed Forces or died from a

service-related disability. This organization provides information about pension or other benefits to members.

In order to unite and support sons, daughters and other family members of the Vietnam War, Sons and Daughters In Touch^{viii} was founded in 1990. It is estimated that more than one-third of soldiers who died in Vietnam War were fathers. At least 20,000 children lost their fathers. Their fathers died in a “failed and wrong war” and have never been praised as Heroes. They were even criticized as “baby-killers” or having numerous addictions. Therefore, these family members had been not able to talk about their experiences, pain, anger and guilt. It took more than a quarter century to pay tribute to their fathers publicly. They held “Proud to Remember” Father’s Day in 1992.

These families willingly accept the image of “brave soldiers” and “heroes who sacrifice their lives to defend the State and family”. Although these organizations are run by family members, they are not independent from the military and the State. They strengthen the image of “soldier needing to defend family”. The soldiers are brave and sacrifice themselves to defend their families and keep the country safe, free and democratic. Families try to remember their loved one’s death as divine and honorable. They are proud to endure the “ultimate sacrifice” without holding any doubt about war and its cause. This way of thinking is in accordance with policies to mobilize families.

2. Families Are not Protected

Soldier = Policy executer in the end / object of wear-out rate

Family = unaccounted object of the wear-out rate/ semi-concerned person

In any military action, soldiers are always consumed as part of the ‘worn-out rate’. In a way soldiers are treated like articles of consumption.^{ix}

In March 2007, the Washington Post reported the miserable situation of Veteran’s hospitals. The soldiers who get injured in Iraq and Afghanistan are evacuated to Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Those soldiers suffer from brain injuries, severed arms and legs, organ and back damage, and various degree of post-traumatic stress. The rooms of these veterans were found with mouse droppings, dead cockroaches, stained carpets, cheap mattresses. They also face bureaucratic difficulties to receive treatments^x.

Inflation adjusted spending for Veterans Affairs Department mental health services declined by 25% between 1997-2004, and numerous experts have expressed

concern about the system's capabilities to care for the full spectrum of readjustment needs, including mental health, of the newest generation of U.S. veterans. According to a 2007 National Alliance to End Homelessness report, 25% of America's homeless are veterans. Of all homeless veterans, 76% suffer from drug, alcohol, or mental health problems^{xi}. Veterans are not treated with respect by the State, even though they fought for the State risking their lives.

Being forced to expose themselves to the harsh situations of attacking or being attacked, soldiers have a devastating effect on the people they are most intimate with.

2.1. Separation from Family

While soldiers are in the battlefield, they are separated from their loved ones. Separation causes serious problems, especially to their partners and children^{xii}. One study conducted by the US Army found that about 20% marriages fall apart within 2 years when one spouse has been sent off the war. Since then, the Army has tried to reduce the divorce rate by providing "marriage enrichment programs"^{xiii}. However maintaining partner relationships does not prevent them from facing various problems^{xiv}.

Children are most affected by stresses. Even among military families, where the father or mother is routinely deployed, the absence means a big change in the children's environment and daily lives. It is quite important for children not to be separated from their families. Infant and pre-school children especially feel great stress. Some become mentally unstable and cry for long periods. Their daily schedule is also forced to change because of a parent's absence^{xv}. Pre-school children tend to feel guilty about their parent's absence. Children who are at the age of developing their personalities are particularly influenced.

During the Gulf War, 23,000 single parent military families were confronted with deployment. It is estimated that nearly 32,000 children were affected by the deployment of single parents^{xvi}. There were even families in which both parents served in the military and were sent overseas, forcing them to leave their children under the care of a primary caretaker who, in many cases, was not familiar to the children^{xvii}.

2.2. Death of Loved Ones

When a family member is killed or injured as a soldier, family life can no longer

continue as before. Money becomes a struggle. In cases that the soldier was the main provider, the remaining family members face immediate poverty^{xviii}.

In some cases, children lose their parent. A continuing study of 25 Israeli children who lost their father to military action when they were 2-10 years of age indicates the sustained effect of parental death on the psychological health of these children. 50% of these children continued to have significant behavioral and emotional problems 3-5 years after the father's death^{xix}. It is undeniable that military family children feel the threat of war and that affects them significantly^{xx}.

2.3. Difficulties Living with Soldiers

In addition, when a soldier does come home "safe" from the battlefield, he/she is often not able to communicate well with the family^{xxi}. It is generally very difficult for both the soldier and family members to share the extreme experiences of war.

The harsh experiences of military action can affect the relationship of the family and cause domestic violence^{xxii}. In 2002 four army wives were murdered allegedly by their husbands at Fort Bragg in North California^{xxiii}. According to one survey, the probability of severe aggression against a spouse increased for soldiers who had deployed in the previous year compared with soldiers who had not deployed. It is not solely the fact of deployment that is associated with severe spousal aggression, but the longer the deployment, the more likely severe spousal aggression becomes^{xxiv}.

2.4. Post Traumatic Stress Disorder

Many symptoms of PTSD carry the potential to have a negative impact on the relationships of the traumatized individual. Feelings of detachment from others, restricted range of affect, and outbursts of anger may interfere with establishing and maintaining intimacy, harmony, and commitment in relationships with others^{xxv}. PTSD affects not only the veteran, but also members of the family. In cases of Vietnam veterans suffering post traumatic stress, they tend to have multiple problems, such as divorce or domestic violence.^{xxvi} Living with a veteran who suffers from PTSD may often be accompanied by increased levels of psychopathology and social dysfunction among wives.

Veterans with PTSD tend to withdraw from their children and be overcritical of

them. The disinterest, detachment, and emotional unavailability that characterize emotional numbing may diminish a parent's ability and willingness to seek out, engage in, and enjoy interactions with his/her children, leading to poorer relationship quality^{xxvii}. Children of PTSD fathers were generally rated as significantly more likely to exhibit an inadequate level of self-control resulting in various externalizing problem behaviors such as aggression, hyperactivity and delinquency. These children were perceived as having difficulty establishing and maintaining friendships^{xxviii}.

In secondary traumatization, the child, in some manner, relives his father's traumatic war experiences or becomes obsessed with the war-related issues which trouble and concern the veteran. In case of a Vietnam veteran's family, the child may have nightmares about Vietnam or combat, or worry a great deal about death and injury^{xxix}. In a Vet Center counselor survey, the most commonly reported problems for children of Vietnam veterans were low self-esteem, aggressiveness, developmental difficulties, impaired social relationships and symptoms mirroring those of the veteran. One study has shown a significant, direct relationship between participation of veterans in abusive violence during the Vietnam conflict and behavioral disturbances in their children some 15-20 years later^{xxx}. Children often blame themselves for their father's unhappiness.

Soldiers could inflict enormous damage to people on the side of the 'enemy'. Killing the 'enemy' is expected, but could still have a profound psychological effect on the soldiers themselves. Participation in conventional warfare, although frequently horrific, is buffered by a time-honored tradition of martial honor, pride, and legitimacy that is stripped away by unsanctioned violence against prisoners of war or non-combatants, especially children. Committing such atrocities could affect the soldiers even further. Clinical studies suggest that participation in abusive violence can be associated with especially virulent forms of PTSD involving intense self hatred and loathing, and a profoundly impaired capacity to form trusting, positive relationships^{xxxi}.

The wounds received in the battlefield continue to hurt beyond the battlefield. It is clear that the wounds torment not only soldiers but also their loved ones continuously. Families are not protected by soldiers but they suffer in various ways.

For a long time, the military had not paid much attention to soldiers' families. The army was constituted of single young men. This situation changed in the age of

“total war”. Through conscription, men with wives and children were also mobilized. In the United States, the number of soldiers increased even after the abolition of conscription. As a result, by 1960, military dependents outnumbered active-duty soldiers. In the 1980s, children of military families numbered 2.1 million (90% of them were 13 years old or younger) and 3.36 million in the 1990s. There are an increasing number of single parents, military mothers, and families where both parents are service members. The US military began to be concerned about military families in the 1970s^{xxxii}.

Growing concerns about families, the increasing numbers of single parents, and dual-military parents led to the establishment in 1984 of the United States Army Community and Family Support Center (ACFSC)^{xxxiii}. The aim is to assist commanders to improve the quality of life for army families, yet the intention of these measures by the military was for good combat performance. As Army Chief of Staff General John Wickham’s 1983 “White Paper” emphasized, “the well being of the family unit directly impacts on the soldiers’ readiness, retention, and overall effectiveness”^{xxxiv}.

3. Soldier’s Family as Active “Semi-Concerned Persons”

Soldier = consumed loved ones

Family = protecting soldiers

Soldiers cannot speak or act freely because of strict military code. When they live within a base, they are isolated from civilian society and have few chances to be active in the civilian community^{xxxv}. When soldiers are deployed in foreign countries, they have little access to homeland society. When soldiers are killed or severely injured, they are no longer capable to speak out or act in the society. On the contrary, family members of soldiers enjoy safety and freedom, and have the opportunity to take a wide range of actions, which are not allowed to soldiers. Therefore, families are able to be a mediator between soldiers (= concerned persons) and society. They offer information to both soldiers and society and enhance communication between them. They can also play the role of spokesperson for soldiers who are not free to speak out. Families are not only “mediator” or “spokesperson”, but they also act to protect soldiers.

As semi-concerned persons, many family members worry about the safety of their loved ones who are in dangerous situations. In some cases, they may even be more

concerned about the soldier's situation than the soldier themselves. These families cannot help but be interested in war more than other people. They hear stories of the war from soldiers directly and get information not dependent on mass media. What is especially important is that their loved ones are concerned persons due to their direct involvement. The war is never a far away event but a real concern accompanied with fears and anxieties. If a soldier dies, "the concerned person" doesn't exist any longer. However, the family, as a semi-concerned person, will mourn the death of their loved one throughout their lives.

In society, it is crucial that families, who have lost their loved ones in the war, are considered 'semi-heroes' who bear the ultimate sacrifice. The State and the military have to honor fallen soldiers and should respect their families. Cindy Sheehan lost her 24 year-old son Casey Sheehan, who was killed in Sadr City in Iraq 4th of April 2004. She wanted to meet the President and to ask him directly why her son had to die, but the President did not accept her wish. She criticized the President saying that "I ... find it ironic that if I were a wealthy Republican who had donated large sums of money for the "re"-election of the President, I could have had access to all the big wigs at the lavish parties—but I, whose son paid the ultimate price of his precious life to the country, can't even get within a half of mile from the man who sent him to die^{xxxvi}. Cindy Sheehan attracted worldwide attention with her 26-day vigil outside Bush's Texas ranch with more than 2000 people. She has become a symbol for anti-war mothers.

3.1. Families' Activities to Protect Soldiers

Since the Iraq War started, families, acting as semi-concerned persons, have begun to actively campaign to protect soldiers^{xxxvii}. Unable to physically protect them, these families work to either bring their loved ones back from the battlefield or prevent them from being deployed.

Military Families Speak Out is an organization of people who are opposed to the war in Iraq and who have relatives or loved ones in the military. It was founded in November 2002 and has contact with military families throughout the United States, and in other countries around the world. They emphasize their character as "semi-concerned persons". "As people with family members and loved ones in the military, we have both a special need and a unique role to play in speaking out against

war in Iraq. It is our loved ones who are, or have been, or will be on the battlefield. It is our loved ones who are risking injury and death. It is our loved ones who are returning scarred from their experiences. It is our loved ones who will have to live with the injuries and deaths among innocent Iraqi civilians”^{xxxviii}.

Cindy Sheehan and other families, who have lost loved ones, have founded Gold Star Families for Peace in 2005. It is a part support group and part activist organization. They say they support soldiers because their mission is speak out to help bring them home and minimize the human cost of war. For Sheehan, to make her son’s death meaningful is to end the war^{xxxix}.

What is common in these movements is not only the desire to protect their own family members, but also to feel sympathy for the Iraqi people, who see the same sorrow. Many Iraqi families have lost their loved ones in the war without great cause. Whether they are considered “enemy” or “friend” is irrelevant. Some of these military families feel a sense of unity with the Iraqi people because they have both lost loved ones and know the grief to lose someone irreplaceable. Based on these feelings of sympathy and unity, families take action. Fernando Suarez del Solar lost his son, Jesus, a lance corporal in the US Marines, in 2003 during the invasion of Iraq. He with his wife and two other families who lost loved ones in Iraq, as well as a woman who lost her son in the September 11 2001 terrorist attacks, went to Jordan to bring medicine for Iraqi children sponsored by the human rights groups. They met Iraqis who have lost relatives to the violence. Suarez said, ”I understand we are united here in our grief”^{xl}.

Members of Gold Star Mothers, Blue Star Mothers, Gold Star Wives, and Sons and Daughters In Touch and also members of Gold Star Families, and Military Families Speak Out, they all care about their soldiers. Both types of groups try to cope with their sadness, sorrow, and sense of loss by giving support. They are both active to help others as semi-concerned persons. The difference between these two sets of groups is whether they think independently from the military and the State. One is proud to be considered semi-hero, believes in the cause of war and accepts the distinction between “friend” and “enemy” decided by the State. The other thinks the image of soldier as hero and family as semi-hero is a fiction created by the State.

3.2. Background of the Emerging Active Family

It was not until the Iraq War, that families began to act independently from the military. There are 4 factors why this occurred.

First, since the abolition of conscription, the Iraq war is the first war which has lasted over a long period. During the Vietnam War, there were anti-war movements where soldiers themselves took part. Soldiers' wives and parents also played a certain role among those activities, but they did not act independently from soldiers. Under the draft system, soldiers were able to challenge the army. But now, since the draft system no longer exists, all soldiers are voluntary. They sign contracts and join the army. This fact makes it difficult to participate in anti-war activity.

However, the length of enlistment is not definite and limited. The military can extend it and actually prolong the service period. For soldiers and families, this is a kind of enforcement to serve in the military, even against their will.

Many National Guard^{xli} soldiers are deployed to Iraq. The National Guard has seldom been mobilized to foreign countries. The last time they were mobilized to war in a foreign country was in World War II. Many people enlisted in the National Guard thought that they were trained for and would be mobilized in cases such as natural disasters. They did not imagine going to war in Iraq.

Second, images of "soldiers as heroes protecting their family" and "family as a symbol to be protected" are no longer available in this age of the "war on terror". Unlike wars between countries, there is no declaration of war. It is not clear who the "enemies" are. In Iraq, many people regard the US Army as the "enemy". US soldiers are ambushed or killed by suicide attacks. It is impossible for the soldiers to see who is going to attack them. In such intense stressful situations, soldiers often overreact. As a result, soldiers sometimes kill whole families, who just happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. Soldiers have to raid houses in the middle of the night where they arrest Iraqi men, who are fathers, husbands, and brothers, before the eyes of their children. Frightening innocent children cannot be believed as an act of "heroes". Situations such as abusing detainees in Abu Graib or killing civilians are also not acts of heroes, but are actually considered war crimes.

Some families against the Iraq war are concerned that "there was a lie in the reason to attack Iraq". The war in Iraq was a preemptive attack in order to defend the

US from an attack by weapons of mass destruction. However, it became clear, that the information about WMD was misleading. The cause has since been changed “to liberate Iraqi people from the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein and bring them democracy”. But in reality, US soldiers are an “occupation army” and are an object of hatred among Iraqi people. Furthermore, when universal values such as freedom, democracy and human rights are emphasized, it reminds soldiers and their families that Iraqi civilians are human beings just like themselves and their human rights should be respected. Unfortunately, that is not occurring. Faced with these contradictions, families find the reason for the war provided by the State to be unacceptable for the “ultimate sacrifice” of their loved ones.

Third, it is hard for families to believe that the military action in Iraq is protecting them in the US. In spite of soldiers fighting harshly, the situation of Iraq remains unstable. In fact, the existence of foreign troops in Iraq might be making the situation worse.

Fourth, the popularization of the internet enables people to get and send information and messages easily. This enhances the transnational connection between people. For instance, a young woman who was living in Baghdad until September 2007 had a blog titled, “Baghdad Burning” in English^{xlii}. She described how Iraqi people were living and what they are thinking. People around the world could read “real time” detailed reports that showed the reality of the war from the side of Iraq. When the woman’s blog was not updated for a while, some readers worried about her safety. Reading her diary helped people humanize the enemy. Through the internet, it is also easy for people to learn about the reality of war. They can access information about the weapons which hurt soldiers on both sides or see the physical and mental damage on soldiers. As well, widespread internet access enables families to connect around the world and directly communicate in real-time.

Conclusion

Soldiers are ultimately needed to carry out military action and are required to accomplish their duty even though they might lose their lives. The State can justify the consumption of its own people, only when such military action has great cause. Therefore, the State needs inviolate reasons. The State and the military praise the

soldiers, who are brave and willingly sacrifice their lives. Fallen soldiers are mourned as heroes. The State organizes ceremonies and forces the “heroes” to keep accomplishing their duty even after they die.

However, regardless of how inviolate the reason or cause, a certain rate of manpower loss is inevitable to pursue the duty. For each soldier, this cost may mean his/her life or healthy body, which has an irreplaceable value. When soldiers come home alive, there is not enough support from either the military or the State provided. Soldiers are like “articles of consumption”, that are replaceable through “contract”. Once used, they are not needed anymore and forgotten. This is one of the aspects “heroes” are facing.

Families are not sent to the battlefield and do not use force. However the battlefield will be brought to their homes through a soldier who is a family member. They suffer from numerous problems, such as separation of family members, fear from death, domestic violence and psychological damages. Families are not protected by soldiers.

Unsurprisingly the image of “soldiers protecting their families” is now being questioned by families. They think that this image is used to justify deprivation of people’s lives and so they take independent action to protect soldiers. These families are exposed to strong resentments, because they deny the image of soldiers as heroes. Mothers who are faithful to the military and the State launched a “You Don’t Speak for Me, Cindy” cross-country bus tour to counter the anti-war movement. Gary Qualls, who lost his son Luis Qualls in Falluja 2004 at the age of 20, strongly criticized Cindy Sheehan. “We need nothing but pure honor and respect for our service members and for our leader George Bush”^{xliii}. For those families who believe in the Hero image deserved by the ultimate sacrifice of their loved ones, it is unbearable to have others deny them of that image.

Nevertheless, that hero image, which prerequisites homeland defense, fails in the time of the “war on terror”. Families are forced to become semi-concerned persons because of the government policy send their loved ones to war. They want to protect soldiers and therefore, act independently from the State. Their motive is love for their families. This is common with families of “semi-heroes”.

Notes

- ⁱ <http://www.iraqbodycount.net/> (June 17 2008)
- ⁱⁱ UK 133, Italy 32, Poland 19, Ukraine 18, Bulgaria 13, Spain 11, and 31 from 12 other countries.
http://www.welt.de/politik/article769996/Body_Count_vier_Jahre_nach_Kriegsbeginn.html
(March 30 2007)
- ⁱⁱⁱ Captain Yukio Seki, the first “Military-God” who committed “Kamikaze” suicide attack in the Japanese Army, told reporters just before his departure, “I do not go for the Emperor or the Japanese Empire, but for my dearest wife. The order must be executed. I will die to protect her. Die for the loved one. Wonderful, isn’t it?” in Shiroyama Saburo, *Shikikan tachi no Tokko*, Shinchosha, 2001, p.45.
- ^{iv} <http://www.goldstarmoms.com/agsm/WhoWeAre> (October 5 2005)
- ^v A Proclamation by the President of the United States of America, “By advancing national pride and promoting international goodwill, Gold Star Mothers serve as models of grace and strength. As we honor their patriotism and dedication, we renew our commitment to upholding the honorable legacy of their fallen children by pursuing a future of security, liberty, and peace.” Gold Star Mother’s Day, 2002 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/29.html>
(October 5 2005)
- ^{vi} <http://www.bluestarmothers.org/> (Oct 5 2005)
- ^{vii} <http://www.goldstarwives.org/> (April 3 2007)
- ^{viii} <http://www.sdit.org/> (October 5 2005)
- ^{ix} No small number of Vietnam, Gulf or Iraq War veterans suffer from severe diseases even long after they return home. Although it is known Agent Orange and Depleted uranium (DU) contamination harm the soldiers and also the following generation, the military continues to use them. This fact suggests that the State regards soldiers as replaceable articles and does not care much about soldiers’ well-being.
- ^x Dana Priest and Anne Hull, , ‘Soldiers Face Neglect, Frustration At Army’s Top Medical Facility, *Washington Post*, February 18 2007, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/1007/02/17/AR2007021701172_pf.html (May 6 2007)
- ^{xi} <http://www.nvf.org/?q=facts-about-veterans-needs-and-solutions> (June 29 2008)
- ^{xii} According to the research done from June 2000 to April 2001 on Austrian PKO soldiers who were deployed to Kosovo, the most serious problem for the soldiers who were deployed for 2-5 months was separation from their families and loved ones. During their deployment, about 30% of relationships failed. In most cases, soldiers’ partners wanted to end their relationships. Nora Hlous, Psychologische Aspekte im Einsatz- Erkenntnisse aus dem Dienst der AUCON-KFOR-Truppen, in *TRUPPENDIENST*, 5/2001, S.439.
- ^{xiii} A variety of army-funded marriage programs are being made available, including vouchers for romantic getaways in luxury hotels and courses in forgiveness and communication skills. In Tom Leonard, US Army In Battle To Cut Divorce Rate, *Telegraph*, December 31, 2004, <http://vaiw.org/vet/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid> (January 14 2005)
- ^{xiv} Lea Shamgar-Handelman, *Israel War Widows-Beyond the Glory of Heroism-*, Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Massachusetts, 1986, Peter J. Mercier and Judith D. Mercier ed., *Battle Cries on the Home Front: Violence in the Military Family*, Charles C Thomas Publisher, Springfield, 2000, Donna Moreau, *Waiting Wives: The Story of Schilling Manor, Home Front to*

the Vietnam War, Atria Books, New York, 2005, Aphrodite Matsakis, *Vietnam Wives: Facing the Challenges of Life with Veterans Suffering Post-Traumatic Stress*, The Sidran Press, Baltimore, 1996, Deborah Harrison, Lucie Laliberete, *No Life Like It: Military Wives in Canada*, James Lorimer & Company, Publishers, Toronto, 1994. Hlous, *op.cit.*

^{xv} Kahori Miyanishi, “Jugun suru Nihonjin zuma” in Seikyu-sha editorial staff, *Jugun no Politics*, Seikyu-sha, 2004, pp. 191-214.

^{xvi} Robert J. Urano, Ann E. Norwood, “The Effects of War on Soldiers and Families, Communities and Nations” in Ursano, *op.cit.* p.541.

^{xvii} Peter S. Jensen, Jon A. Shaw, “The Effects of War and Parental Development Upon Children and Adolescents”, in Ursano, *op.cit.*, p.83-84.

^{xviii} Especially when a soldier is in United States National Guard. They have their vocation in civilian society, therefore their absence causes great change to family life.

^{xix} Peter S. Jensen, Jon A. Shaw, “The Effects of War and Parental Deployment Upon Children and Adolescents”, in Ursano, *op.cit.* p.88.

^{xx} According to a study of the impact of living with the threat of war on children in active-duty and reserve military families, significantly more active-duty children used “fight with someone”, “bite my nails”, and “daydream” to cope with stressors. When asked about the most helpful strategies, active-duty children were most likely to say “fight with someone” and “yell or scream”. Reserve and civilian children were more likely than active-duty children to find the strategy, “try to relax” to be helpful. When asked, “what would happen in your family if there was war?”, more reserve and active-duty children, compared to civilian children, believed that their parent(s) would go to war and that a parent would die. Nancy A. Ryan-Wenger, “Impact of the Threat of War on Children in Military Families”, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 71(2), April 2001, pp.240-242.

^{xxi} It is not easy to return to work. Israeli soldiers who were deployed to the Lebanon war in 1982 and suffered Combat Stress Reaction, indicated more increases in work absenteeism and in alcohol and cigarette consumption and higher rates of the onset of digestive problems and of chest and back pains than soldiers who had not sustained a Combat Stress Reaction. Zahava Solomon, *Combat Stress Reaction: The Enduring Toll of War*, Plenum Press, New York, 1993, pp.147-162.

^{xxii} The rates for moderate husband-wife violence for the Army and civilians were similar (about 10%), but for severe violence, the Army rate was 13.5% and the civilian rate 0.7%. The rates of wife-to-husband violence were significantly higher. For moderate violence, the Army rate was 13.5% and civilian rate was 10.8%; for severe violence, the Army rate was 2.9% and civilian rate was 0.7%. James E. McCarroll, “Deployment and the Probability of Spousal Aggression by US Army Soldiers”, *Military Medicine*, 165, 1:041, 2000, p.44.

^{xxiii} Leonard, *op.cit.*

^{xxiv} When deployment of less than 3 months was compared with no deployment, the percentage of respondents indicating moderate aggression increased 0.79%. The increase for deployment of 3-6 months was 1.76% compared with no deployment and the increase for deployment of 6-12 months was 4.76% compared with no deployment. These surveys were administered to a 15% random sample of 26,835 deployed and non-deployed married active-duty US Army men and women in 50 states during the period 1990 to 1994. The probability of severe aggression increased for each length of deployment: 15.8%, 26.4%, and 34.9% respectively., in McCarroll, *op.cit.*, pp.41-44.

^{xxv} Christina A. Byne, David S. Riggs, “The Cycle of Trauma: Relationship Aggression in Male

Vietnam Veterans With Symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder” in *Violence and Victims*, Vol. 11, No.3, 1996, pp.213-214.

^{xxvi} For example, Charles R. Figley, *Stress Disorders Among Vietnam Veterans*, Brunner/Mazel, Inc., 1978.

^{xxvii} According to a survey on 66 Vietnam veterans who have children. Ayelet Meron Ruscio, Fank W. Weathers, Lynda A. King, Daniel W. King, “Male War-Zone Veterans’ Perceived Relationships With Their Children: The Importance of Emotional Numbing”, *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, Vol.15, No. 5, October 2002, pp.351-357.

^{xxviii} Robert Rosenheck, Alan Fontana, “Transgenerational Effects of Abusive Violence on the Children of Vietnam Combat Veterans”, *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, Vol.11, No.4, 1998, pp.731-742.

^{xxix} A survey was conducted on 191 children who are living with 107 veterans. John Persons, Thomas J. Kehle, Steve V. Owen,” Incidence of Behavior Problems Among Children of Vietnam War Veterans”, *School Psychology International*, Vol.11, 1990, p.253-259.

^{xxx} In secondary traumatization, the child, in some manner, relives his father’s traumatic war experiences or becomes obsessed with the war-related issues which trouble and concern the veteran. The child may even manifest symptoms similar to the veteran’s. The child may have nightmares about Vietnam, or combat, or worry a great deal about death and injury. In another study, Rosenheck cites the case of Alan, the ten-year-old son of a Vietnam combat vet who, although he did not have nightmares, had great difficulty sleeping because he “worried about being killed or kidnapped. His main fear was that he, his father, or both would be shot ‘like in the war’. In many of his (Alan’s) fantasies, it was as if he was living in one of his father’s flashbacks rather than in his own reality”. Aphrodite Matsakis, *Vietnam Wives: Facing the Challenges of Life with Veterans Suffering Post-Traumatic Stress*, The Sidran Press, Baltimore, 1996, p.228-277.

^{xxxi} Rosenheck, Fontana, *op.cit.*

^{xxxii} Rosenheck, Fontana, *op.cit.*, p.732.

^{xxxiii} During the mid-1960s and early 1970s reports emerged in the civilian sector calling for countermeasures for child abuse and neglect. Similar appeals appeared in the military community. Gary Lee Bowen, *Military Family Advocacy: A Status Report*, *ARMED FORCES & SOCIETY*, Vol. 10, No.4, Summer 1984, pp. 583-596. shows various measures by the military to cope with these problems.

^{xxxiiii} CPT Daniel G. Amen, MAJ Linda Jellen, COL Edward Merves, COL Robert E. Lee, “Minimizing the Impact of Deployment Separation On Military Children: Stages, Current Preventive Efforts, and System Recommendations”, *Military Medicine*, Vol. 153, No.9, September 1988, p.441-446.

^{xxxv} Israeli military has also done research on military family issues to maintain combat performances. Zahava Solomon, Mark Waysman, Mario Mikulincer, “Family Functioning, Perceived Societal Support, and Combat-Related Psychopathology: The Moderating Role of Loneliness”, *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, Vol.9, No.4, 1990, pp.456-472.

^{xxxvi} The military tried to penalize Ehren Watada, a first Lieutenant in the US Army, who in June 2006 publicly refused deployment to Iraq, for his statement to reporters, though this statement was made without wearing military uniform, outside the base, off duty. The Army tried to show others that they would be punished if they spoke out. Ret. Col. Ann Wright, “To Refuse To Serve”, June 27 2006, http://www.tompaine.com/print/to_refuse_to_serve.php (February 15 2007), <http://www.thankyoult.org/> (December 2 2006)

^{xxxvi} Cindy Sheehan, “The Dangerous Gold Star Families”, *Buzzflash*, January 24, 2005, <http://www.gsfp.org/article.php?id=> (October 2 2005)

^{xxxvii} The soldiers deployed to a longer-than-expected war in Iraq and conflict in Afghanistan are in severe condition. According to an official report, as many as 121 U.S. Army soldiers committed suicide in 2007, a jump of some 20% over the previous year. The number of attempted suicides and self-injuries has also increased. Some 2,100 in 2007, less than 1,500 in 2006, and less than 500 in 2002., *International Herald Tribune*, January 31 2008, <http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2008/01/31/america/NA-GEN-US-Army-Suicides.php> (June 29 2008)

^{xxxviii} http://www.mfso.org/main_f.html (January 31 2005)

^{xxxix} “The real reason I wanted to meet with Rumsfeld was to know that his actions have terrible consequence.” “I wanted him to see the unbearable pain his ignorance and arrogance has caused me and my family”. <http://www.gsfp.org/article.php?id=49&printsafe=1> (October 2 2005)

^{xl} <http://vaiw.org/vet/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file...> (November 14 2005)

^{xli} <http://www.hgb.army.mil/default.aspx>

^{xlii} <http://riverbendblog.blogspot.com/> (March 30 2007) This blog was popular and published in UK, US and translated into Japanese in Japan.

^{xliii} Sarah Ferguson, “Cindy Sheehan’s Big Week in Washington: The ailing peace movement finds new life in a grieving mom”, September 26, 2005, <http://villagevoice.com/generic/show> (September 29 2005)