

The Army Chaplain as Counselor: An Exploration of Self-Reflexivity and Denominational Particularities

Joshua T. Morris

The psychological issues surrounding combat are not new phenomena. One can look to Homer's epic poem *The Iliad*, in particular Achilles's experience of betrayal by his commander, Agamemnon, and Achilles's response to this betrayal, to understand that moral ambiguities are inherently prevalent in conflict. However, the issues facing veterans from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are at a level of sophistication that Achilles could not have comprehended. Asymmetric warfare, with its blurred lines between enemy combatant and civilian and the strategic use of non-combatants (i.e., women and children) in combat, creates a battlefield that is unlike any in history. These battlefields have led to increased levels of post-traumatic stress disorder, suicide, suicidal ideation, moral injury, traumatic brain injury, and other psychological implications of combat. Brett Litz, Leslie Lebowitz, Matt Gray, and William Nash state in their 2016 text *Adaptive Disclosure: A New Treatment for Military Trauma, Loss, and Moral Injury* that "10–20% of the 2 million U.S. troops who have served in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq experience significant mental health difficulties including PTSD, depression and anxiety."¹ What follows in this essay is my

Joshua T. Morris is a board-certified chaplain, an Army Reserve chaplain, and a PhD student at the Claremont School of Theology, Claremont, California.
Email: Joshua.morris@cst.edu.

Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry

ISSN 2325-2847 (print)* ISSN 2325-2855 (online)

* © Copyright 2017 *Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry*
All Rights Reserved

attempt to take the context of these estimated 200,000–400,000 individuals seriously and to argue that Army chaplains are perfectly situated to provide the acute care necessary as well as to know the proper channels for referral.² The use of a spiritual diagnosis case study will explore the ambiguity of moral injury.

Army Specialist (SPC) Andrews comes to see me for counseling after driving the lead vehicle during a routine convoy mission in Kandahar, Afghanistan, and killing a child in the road. As the lead driver, he is inherently responsible for everything that occurs behind him. His truck operates as the “eyes and ears” of the convoy. The Taliban in the area are known to employ young children as “decoys” in the road to get the U.S. Forces to either stop for the child or hit the child. In this binary, one of two things occurs. If the vehicles stop for the child, an ambush ensues; if the vehicles continue, striking the child, the villagers are rightfully incensed and relations between the U.S. Forces and the local communities are further strained. The soldier in question did not stop, following the convoy Standard Operating Procedure, and struck the child with his MRAP (Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected) truck. The soldier brings to our relationship this situation with the question, “Chaplain, what does the Bible say about killing a child in war?”

Using this scenario, I will reflect on the counseling relationship between a soldier and an Army chaplain, noting the discrepancies in rank, age, education, and some of the other embodied locations pastoral theologian Nancy Ramsay addresses in her seminal text, *Pastoral Diagnosis: A Resource for Ministries of Care and Counseling*.³ Within this counseling relationship, it is important for the chaplain to be aware of the issues around pastoral identity and pastoral authority and how a chaplain, through self-reflexivity, modifies his or her care for individual soldiers. In other words, I want to reflect on what do I as the chaplain and on what I bring to this relationship that is unique to my situatedness. As an ordained minister within the United Church of Christ (UCC), how is my care different than that of an evangelical Christian, a Buddhist, or a Roman Catholic priest? There are facets of the UCC’s commitment to social justice that might give me “eyes to see” issues differently than my more conservative evangelical colleagues. Further, besides doctrinal differences, what denominational resources do I bring to such situations? The UCC’s statement of faith, for example, is helpful in expressing a nuanced view of sin, providing alternatives to sin’s traditional understanding. Finally, as a practical theologian, I want to converse

with resources outside traditional spiritual care and counseling and pastoral theology to explore a diagnosis. This situation meets the basic rubric for moral injury; therefore, what wisdom is to be gained from clinical psychologists and ethicists? These are some of the issues that must be taken into account before intervention or treatment can commence.

PASTORAL IDENTITY: EMBODIED LOCATIONS

It is important to identify how *who* I am impacts my care relationship with the soldier in this situation. I assume that my “locations” affect the care I give and distinguish my care from that offered by my colleagues. However, this is all unilateral as it fails to account for the place and identity of SPC Andrews. Counseling is a dynamic interchange; it evolves with each soldier I encounter. Beginning with an exploration of my locations is helpful, as Ramsay notes: “Because pastoral diagnosis is a hermeneutical process heavily dependent on the pastor as an interpretive lens, there is no doubt about the importance of an internalized integration of one’s theological foundations for one’s pastoral identity.”⁴

So, I am a Caucasian, cisgendered, married, father, progressively inclined Protestant Christian standing within the Reformed and Congregational histories that merged to create the UCC in 1957, educated in graduate schools in southern California, a pediatric hospital chaplain, and a chaplain in the rank of captain in the United States Army Reserve. These identifiers are merely containers, and it is important to fill each container with the type of progressive Christian or captain that I am.

To elaborate, as a minister in the UCC I understand the relationship between clergy and community as having a more equal voice in how the church operates and makes decisions in various situations. This inclination cannot be overstated for my counseling relationships in a military context. The polity of the UCC is such that the congregation holds tremendous power. Within my identity and story is a tradition that upholds the importance to listening to those we have not heard from.⁵ The UCC lifts up its history of either directly or via its ecclesiastical ancestors of leading the way in ordaining the African American men, women, and the first openly gay ministers. This is significant for my identity. I stand within a community that listens for opportunities to broaden the people of God. The particulars of this case, however, create tension within my tradition and personality as a co-

constructing and communal minister. Soldiers ask direct questions that demand a direct response. The soldier is asking me, “Chaplain, what does the Bible say about killing a child in war?” and the soldier expects an answer.

At this point, the soldier apparently does not want me to listen; he wants biblical proof texts that would implicate or free him from the pain caused by this child’s death. I will say much more about the role of the officer in the next section, but suffice it to say that my identity as an officer is as one who tries to include enlisted soldiers in conversation instead of operating in an ecosystem that thrives on the giving and receiving of orders. Yet, is this beneficial in the caring relationship? There is a functional level of authority that a military chaplain occupies. Military chaplaincy, then, “requires the exercise of power and authority. The issue is not whether but what kind of power and authority are exercised” by the chaplain.⁶ The struggle and ever-present reality for my identity as an Army chaplain is the recognition that I am always occupying multiple roles and that those roles are not mutually exclusive.

I am a pastor to my soldiers, whether or not they identify as Christian. I provide religious support to these individuals, and when I am not able to properly provide specific care—or it falls outside my scope and training—I refer and provide another chaplain to support the soldier. I am also an officer to my soldiers. To be an officer means I fall within a tradition of customs and courtesies. I may bring my identity *as a pastor* to the officer corps, but in these counseling instances I bring the *characteristics* of the officer corps into my identity. This is counter to my identity as a UCC minister. I prefer to co-create meaning with congregants, but I recognize that I am also dictating meaning as an officer. Whereas in a parish or healthcare chaplaincy situation I would collaborate with colleagues to find the best solution, in the military context I submit to an authority that does not want my collaboration. With all that as backdrop, I will now explore more how authority plays out in this counseling situation.

PASTORAL AUTHORITY:

THE CHAPLAIN’S DUAL ROLES OF OFFICER AND PASTOR

The basic philosophical questions I raise to begin this section are: From where do I derive my pastoral authority, and how much pastoral authority is given to me on account of my status as an Army chaplain and commis-

sioned officer? The broader question, however, is: Can my authority “emerge through the exercise of relational power in particular relationships and contexts”?⁷ The nuance that is important here is that it is my pastoral identity and the use of my pastoral authority within the military rank structure that creates an environment in counseling that allows a soldier to have more relational power. I embody my role as an officer and pastor by conveying my authority to soldiers in such a way that they know they have a safe space to discuss issues. I would argue that in a counseling setting the rank ecosystem matters less than in other military settings. The power differential is always present, however. I cannot escape the fact that the soldier in question is a Caucasian and a specialist, which means he is not yet in a leadership position (which first happens as a non-commissioned officer or sergeant), and he is a high school graduate with perhaps some college. The soldier in question is in his early twenties, and I am in my early thirties in a different phase of life and with different values. My authority in the relationship must take this power differential into account.

Mutually understood dynamics of authority is one of the three philosophical and ethical assumptions of the therapeutic paradigm in Ramsay’s *Pastoral Diagnosis: A Resource for Ministries of Care and Counseling*. She asks three pertinent questions that guide the remainder of this section. First, “What is the status of the practitioner representing that priority relative to the status of those seeking help?”; second, “What is the relationship between the practitioner’s power and her or his accountability for it?”; and finally, “To what or whom is she or he accountable?”⁸

I understand Ramsay’s first question concerning “the status of the practitioner representing that priority relative to the status of those seeking help” as reflecting the power relationship between the officer corps and the enlisted soldiers. The *Army Officer’s Guide* offers the following advice on how to navigate the two distinct worlds:

Both the officer and the enlisted soldier would earn the scorn of their peers for establishing such a relationship [in other words, fraternization], and the effectiveness of both members to the Army would be reduced. To any officer who may think of establishing a relationship with an enlisted soldier, we can offer only one word of advice: Don’t!⁹

What about the chaplain, though? The majority of an Army chaplain’s counseling ministry is with enlisted soldiers. The chaplain already stands between the two worlds in regard to his or her ability to relate to the enlisted

soldiers without the threat of fraternization. The chaplain occupies the liminal space in between the two worlds but does not really belong to either. What is most important, though, and is in keeping with my pastoral identity and authority, is that the chaplain is located *with* the soldiers. The locatedness of the chaplain matters in imbuing authority; soldiers trust a chaplain they know is present in their lives. I rely heavily on the Apostle Paul's admonition in 1 Thessalonians 2:8, "So deeply do we care for you that we are determined to share with you not only the gospel of God but also our own selves, because you have become very dear to us," as a source of my authority.¹⁰ The chaplain's identity and authority comes from the conviction that by getting to know these soldiers in a ministry of presence, we are affected by our mutuality. However, in keeping with Ramsay, the chaplain's ability to cross over to relationships with enlisted soldiers exists because of the trust imparted to the chaplain as a religious authority figure.

Ramsay's second question, "What is the relationship between the practitioner's power and her or his accountability for it?" is curious because of the chaplain's role as an officer amongst the officer corps in which he or she operates, similar to the role of Heije Faber's "circus clown."¹¹ I address this now because even though the chaplain is a commissioned officer, his or her authority is quite different from colleagues in other branches of the military (e.g., Infantry, Armor, or Adjutant General). The chaplain, by regulation, has no authority to command soldiers. The chaplain wears the same rank as his or her colleagues, has the same evaluation criteria, and even has similar professional military education requirements, but the differences are distinct. This is where Faber's 1971 comparison of the hospital chaplain's place in the medical system as akin to the necessity of the clown in the circus is helpful. The clown has tension within his or her place amongst the other circus performers, feeling like an "amateur amongst acknowledged experts."¹² The chaplain is responsible for aspects of the military that are on a different plane than those of his or her colleagues. While the other officers are creating orders and implementing the commanding officer's intent, the chaplain is in a place of continuously proving him or herself because the chaplain's work is unknown to many within the structure. Faber writes that the minister, or in our case the chaplain, "is only true to his calling when he does not draw attention to himself in any way whatever, but by his actions and his words points a way to the one in whose service he stands, whom he represents and seeks to make present to the man in his sickness."¹³ Although

chaplains may appear to be amateurs amongst experts, chaplains maintain an authority within the officer culture by the nature of the Divine that they represent and the authority imbued on them by the soldiers, which all culminates in Ramsay's third question.

Ramsay's third question, "To what or whom is she or he accountable?," is an important summation before transitioning to an exploration of interdisciplinary wisdom. Briefly, the chaplain is accountable to his or her God or deity and to the soldiers. The chaplain is one of the few military professionals who are accepted as "safe" because of the strict confidentiality clause; therefore, the chaplain has tremendous influence and power on behalf of being accountable to the soldiers. The soldiers know that the chaplain is safe because what is said is kept in confidence. The "office" of the chaplain carries an authority that is present outside of the chaplain's influence. It exists, and there is a way in which the chaplain is accountable to that power. To borrow from Ramsay, the chaplain is beholden to a "functional responsibility."¹⁴ For the soldier in question, I am the religious authority in his life. My "office" as a chaplain functions symbolically for the soldier. He came to me with his question. He did not take this question to a civilian pastor, and this is because inherent in the role of the Army chaplain is the embeddedness with the soldiers that earns Army chaplains credibility beyond that of civilian clergy. Perhaps this soldier encountered another chaplain in a previous unit who assisted him in working through another situation, and therefore he assumed that chaplains solve problems or at least chaplains listen to problems. My authority is therefore given to me by the uniform I wear. To some extent, then, I am accountable to that uniform—or "office."

Now that I have explored my various locations in the counseling relationship, I will identify how practical theology's reflexivity locates interdisciplinary conversation partners by offering a robust understanding of trauma and moral injury.

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO MORAL INJURY

This counseling situation is an example of moral injury. When defining moral injury, I am describing the decisions made in combat (either received or given) that betray an individual's personal understanding of right and wrong. Rita Nakashima Brock, director of the Soul Repair Center at Brite Divinity School in Fort Worth, Texas, describes moral injury as a "violation

of core moral beliefs.”¹⁵ Brock, as a theologian, situates moral injury within the clergy’s purview, noting that ministers have resources available to work toward the reconstruction of moral identity. Theologians are not the only practitioners working with moral injury, and it is prudent to draw on interdisciplinary wisdom to understand how clinical psychologists, psychoanalysts, and ethicists define moral injury. Brett Litz, Nathan Stein, Eileen Delaney, Leslie Lebowitz, William P. Nash, Caroline Silva, and Shira Magues offer the current standard definition of moral injury as “morally injurious events such as the perpetrating, failing to prevent, or bearing witness to acts that transgress deeply held moral beliefs and expectations.”¹⁶ Critical facets of that definition offer entryways to the case of the soldier in question. Not only did the soldier perpetrate the act, i.e., he drove the vehicle that struck the child, but he relives the trauma through his re-visualizing of the act. In this scenario, our soldier bears witness to what Nancy Sherman describes as “the intense human suffering and detritus that is a part of the grotesquerie of war and its aftermath.”¹⁷ Sherman’s point is important. It is more than the transgression; it is the act of the visualization of *seeing* the trauma take place repeatedly. These visualizations will play out as emotional stressors, social/relational stressors, and cognitive stressors. These images will stay with this soldier and will be present in counseling. To further grasp the seriousness of the vignette, Litz and his colleagues report that 60 percent of service members deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan witnessed women and children injured or exposed to violence and were unable to assist them.¹⁸

The concept of the phenomenon of moral injury is attributed to psychiatrist Jonathan Shay’s work with Vietnam veterans in a Department of Veteran’s Affairs outpatient clinic.¹⁹ He found that the specific moral failings of individuals and military units created trauma that was similar to PTSD but also quite specific. He looked at the military culture overall as a moral construction with its own expectations and values. What these constructs create is a familial bond in which the individual soldier will sacrifice for the good of the whole or will potentially cover up heinous acts to protect the integrity of the whole. When the individual soldier returns home, though, the guilt and shame of those traumas set in.

In our clinical scenario, although nothing needed covering up, the soldier was put in a position of having to make the decision to either protect the lives of his fellow soldiers by killing the child or to protect the non-combatant and risk the death—and blame—of an ambush that would destroy

the unit's moral construct. The ambiguous aspect of this scenario is that the soldier did what was "right" in the eyes of his commander. He followed the convoy SOP, but that does not erase the moral guilt and shame of taking the life of the child. This is why moral injury is similar to PTSD—it involves an event—but it is also distinctly different as it is encased in the entire military moral construct of meaning. Interestingly, Litz and his colleagues note the important role of clergy in treating moral injury, stating that the themes of moral violation are recommended for religious counseling.²⁰ Therefore, as I turn now to look at denominational resources, the themes embedded in this scenario are violence, penitence, forgiveness, and, ultimately, sin. With these in focus, what does the UCC offer to support and understand these themes?

DENOMINATIONAL RESOURCES

One of the benefits of belonging to a progressive denomination such as the UCC is a metaphysical worldview that enables one to reflect on and reference divergent conversation partners. One particularly helpful conversation partner is process theology. Process theology's understanding of corporate sin is perhaps most helpful in this scenario. The soldier in question is bringing to counseling the moral injury of his shame and guilt from the experience of killing the child. Without painting with too broad a brush, some Christian theologies understand sin only as the separation between God and humanity. Because of this separation, God the Father sent God's Son to die on the cross in order to bring humanity back into right relation with God. However, this view tends to be violent and individualistic and fails to take into account the (total) historical narrative of the people of Israel. The soldier in question would be left with a view of God that is judging him just as harshly as he is judging himself. What these traditional views of sin either briefly touch on or miss entirely is the corporate responsibility for violence and sin. This is where the UCC's compatibility with process theology and the UCC's Statement of Faith are important resources for treatment.

Process theologian Marjorie Suchocki redirects our attention back to relationships and the interconnectedness of humanity that are always in process. Relationships are the very element within process theology that enrich life, but they also create the opportunity for the destruction of life. Process theology's metaphysical understanding of the interrelatedness of everything creates the vulnerability that subjects humanity to sin. This un-

derstanding of sin is more nuanced than the traditional Christian view. Suchocki contends that “process theology suggests a more tragic view, naming the cumulative acts of human beings in society as the source of the demonic. We are ourselves corporately responsible for the societies we create and the ill effects they engender.”²¹ Suchocki expands this in other places and focuses on the violence that comes from sin, because for Suchocki sin is less about rebellion against God and more about violence toward humanity. This is an important delineation because if we were to focus on our rebellion against God, we would “remove our focus from our responsibility to each other.”²² This is precisely what is going on in our scenario. The soldier has *violently* broken his responsibility to his fellow human, the child, and it is this sin that needs addressing in the spiritual care relationship. This is the type of sin I would like to explore through biblical texts and other denominational resources.

As I begin to think about the treatment of moral injury, albeit briefly, I can already see how this metaphysical worldview helps alleviate the blame and shame that the soldier is experiencing; he will come to understand that the war with the Taliban—like the war with Al-Qaeda or ISIS—is not an isolated battle of good vs. evil but an ongoing and ambiguous conflict. The point, however, is not to make it merely political; rather, the point is to allow the soldier to locate his own complicity in the act within the wider arc of global responsibility. That is a powerful aspect of healing in moral injury. To move too quickly to forgiveness or the abdication of blame misses a key moment in healing, and once again, to use process theology, the soldier needs to reconcile the damage he did to another human because of the interconnectedness of humanity. In process theology, sin always has both a “personal and transpersonal aspect.”²³

To take this away from the theoretical realm is important. What resources are available within my tradition that I can reference and use in the counseling relationship and briefly in the treatment phase of this relationship? First, to work towards healing an individual with moral injury, the chaplain acts as a “benevolent moral authority.”²⁴ The power of ritual is vital for healing from moral injury. A healthy ritual should contain elements of storytelling, confession, lament, remembrance, reconnection, and absolution (when the soldier is ready). In keeping with the process theology worldview, the UCC has a corporate penitence ritual that works to reintegrate this soldier back into a community of believers, highlighting the ritual elements.

The UCC *Book of Worship* contains an Order for Reconciliation of the Penitent Person and an Order for Corporate Reconciliation. The instructions for both rituals state that “Christians are called to bear one another’s burdens . . . it is the privilege and responsibility of Christians to intercede for one another.”²⁵ The importance of this is that it works to surround the soldier with a community that co-bears the pain of the incident. The prayer that begins both rituals states, “Forgive what our lips tremble to name, what our hearts can no longer bear, and what has become for us a consuming fire of judgment. Set us free from a past that we cannot change.”²⁶ In that prayer is both individual forgiveness and transpersonal forgiveness. What biblical references are available (remembering that the soldier in question holds the Bible in high esteem) to help in this situation?

First, I would start in Genesis 4 with the story of Cain and Abel. This primeval history provides the people of YHWH with language to understand what happens when the image of God, that is imparted on humanity in Genesis 1:26, is violated through violence and murder. When humans fail to see the divine in others, violence and sin ensue. Genesis 4:10 describes that Abel’s blood “is crying out from the ground.” The idea is that blood from a murder pollutes God’s ecosystem. We affect everyone and everything through our actions. Moving on, a passage from the New Testament that would assist in broadening the role of the community in healing a moral injury is John 17:21, in which Jesus prays for his disciples “that they may all be one.” I would exegete and expand on this verse in order to detail the reconciliation and redemption offered through ritual acts. To build on my emphasis that the church community has a responsibility to our soldiers and those experiencing moral injury, I would interact with Galatians 6:2, “Bear one another’s burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ.” This connects with Cain and Abel and our accountability to humanity. Finally, I would add texts that highlight hope in the midst of redemption and re-creation. Luke 21:28, for example, states, “stand up and raise your heads, because your redemption is drawing near” after Jesus describes the rupturing effect of war on individuals and communities. Our soldier has experienced that rupture; now is the time for re-creation.

To reference one more UCC denominational resource, The Statement of Faith of the United Church of Christ, both in its original form in 1959 and its “doxological” revision of 1981, contains a beautiful corporate prayer that articulates similar broad views of sin to those mentioned above. The origi-

nal version states, "He seeks in holy love to save all people from aimlessness and sin," and the doxological revision states, "You seek in holy love to save all people from aimlessness and sin."²⁷ Once again, the UCC maintains corporate responsibility for sin. Shinn, in his explanation of *The Statement of Faith*, reminds us, "We are familiar with war. . . . Some of us can plead innocent to some of these sins. But if we look for their roots, we find that they are not just 'out there.' Sometimes we have to accept the famous words of Pogo, 'we have met the enemy and he is us.'²⁸ Aimlessness is precisely the issue at hand within most moral injury situations. The community is, borrowing from Shinn's understanding of aimlessness, stuck in an ailment that is "individual and societal."²⁹

These two denominational resources, the *UCC Book of Worship* and *The Statement of Faith*, are necessary resources because they assist me in providing an understanding of sin, violence, and complicity in the world. I can therefore use these resources in a ritual setting, which is vital for reintegration and healing from moral injury. I now conclude with some brief entryways for treatment and intervention, along with some final thoughts.

BRIEF ENTRYWAYS FOR POTENTIAL INTERVENTION AND CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

In the dynamic relationship between the chaplain and the soldier, one can see how self-reflexivity is an essential step in identifying relational entanglements. The chaplain is constantly situating himself or herself within a tradition and the congregation within a tradition, a military unit, and the military culture overall. Issues involving identity and authority are constantly being negotiated as each hermeneutical encounter changes the chaplain.

Although intervention and treatment are outside the reflexive scope of this essay, there are entryways present in Ramsay's text that connect to the rituals required for healing moral injury. Earlier I mentioned the importance of the chaplain operating as a "benevolent moral authority," which is important because the imparting of absolution is vital within the process of reintegration. Therefore, the symbolic authority that the chaplain employs is key. Ramsay, borrowing from Elaine Ramshaw, notes the human needs that rituals serve: establishing order, reaffirming meaning, community bonding, handling ambivalence, and encountering mystery.³⁰ All of these needs are

important in any ritual to repair moral injury. To repair the moral identity that was ruptured by an event, the chaplain provides symbolic leadership. A primary goal is to rebuild the connection to the broader community that has been fractured because of the “sin” of the event. The intervention is never done in isolation. Rather, it is vital to weave the personal narrative within the community’s narrative. Encountering mystery is the symbolic role that only a chaplain can fill within the military structure. It is important to include the interdisciplinary wisdom of clinical psychologists, but the chaplain, as a religious leader, encourages the soldier to embrace the mystery of the divine. In this instance, the mystery of the divine is that God offers forgiveness and redemption not only to the soldier but to society as well. Healing *for* the community is an essential piece of the individual healing. Moral injury is becoming more prominent within the national conversation on combat, and more resources must be allocated to address these concerns with proficient and clinical acumen.

NOTES

- 1 Brett T. Litz, Leslie Lebowitz, Matt J. Gray, and William P. Nash, *Adaptive Disclosure: A New Treatment for Military Trauma, Loss, and Moral Injury* (New York: The Guilford Press, 2016), 6.
- 2 For the sake of consistency, this essay will focus on Army chaplains and therefore refer to service members as “soldiers.” This is not to disparage the work of Navy or Air Force chaplains or to denigrate airmen, sailors, or Marines; rather, the point is to hone in on one “community” and its current reality in the ongoing War on Terror.
- 3 Nancy Ramsay, *Pastoral Diagnosis: A Resource for Ministries of Care and Counseling* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 87–103.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 83–84.
- 5 I would argue that enlisted soldiers are a group that is not heard from within the military rank structure.
- 6 Ramsay, *Pastoral Diagnosis*, 113.
- 7 *Ibid.*, 115.
- 8 *Ibid.*, 15.
- 9 Robert J. Dalessandro, *Army Officer’s Guide*, 51st ed. (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2009), 78.
- 10 All scripture verses are from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV).

- 11 Heije Faber, "The Circus Clown," in *Images of Pastoral Care: Classical Readings*, ed. Robert C. Dykstra (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2005), 85–93.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 85.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 89.
- 14 Ramsay, *Pastoral Diagnosis*, 133.
- 15 Rita Nakashima Brock and Gabriella Lettini, *Soul Repair: Recovering from Moral Injury after War* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2012), xv.
- 16 Brett T. Litz et al., "Moral Injury and Moral Repair in War Veterans: A Preliminary Model and Intervention Strategy," *Clinical Psychology Review* 29, no. 8 (2009): 695.
- 17 Nancy Sherman, *Afterwar: Healing the Moral Wounds of Our Soldiers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 8.
- 18 Litz et al., "Moral Injury and Moral Repair in War Veterans," 696.
- 19 This is outlined extensively in *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character* (New York: Scribner, 1994).
- 20 Litz et al., "Moral Injury and Moral Repair in War Veterans," 696.
- 21 Marjorie Hewitt Suchocki, *God, Christ, Church: A Practical Guide to Process Theology* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co.), 15.
- 22 Catherine Keller, *On the Mystery: Discerning God in Process* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 80.
- 23 Roland Faber, *God as the Poet of the World: Exploring Process Theologies* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 225.
- 24 Litz et al., "Moral Injury and Moral Repair in War Veterans," 703.
- 25 United Church of Christ, *Book of Worship* (Cleveland: United Church of Christ Press, 2012), 268.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 271.
- 27 Roger L. Shinn, *Confessing our Faith: An Interpretation of the Statement of Faith of the United Church of Christ* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1990), xi–xii.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 53.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 55.
- 30 Ramsay, *Pastoral Diagnosis*, 138.