

**Volume 4 Number 1 (2010): 11-39**

<http://www.infactispax.org/journal/>

**“Good” Americans and “Bad” Americans:  
Personal Epistemology, Moral Reasoning, and Citizenship**

Lori Olafson  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The title for this paper comes from a participant in a study that I recently conducted comparing war resisters and war veterans from the Vietnam era. Hardy, a war resister, moved to Canada in 1967 in opposition to the Vietnam War. When I was interviewing Hardy about his decision to move to Canada, he made a distinction between “good” Americans and “bad” Americans. He described a good American as “someone who is proud of their country and it’s my country right or wrong,” and a bad American as one who will “question and will want to debate and would follow principles as opposed to policies.” His description of good and bad Americans in the context of the Vietnam War has relevance for today’s society, especially when considering the values and beliefs for democratic citizenship.

The 27 million men who came of draft age during the Vietnam War had to choose from among a number of unpleasant choices, and these alternatives – combat, avoidance in or out of service, evasion, desertion, or exile – “involved the possibility of sacrifice, punishment, or moral guilt.”<sup>1</sup> Although previous generations experienced times of war, conscription, and the draft, the participation of the United States in earlier wars had not been widely regarded as immoral and illegal as was the case for the Vietnam War. Questions about the morality and legality of the war gave rise to unparalleled debates across the nation. “Vietnam tore at the nation as a whole,” wrote Levy, “and the dilemma ripped at the social fabric and imperiled the civility and mutual respect” of the United

---

<sup>1</sup> Lawrence Baskir and William Strauss, *Chance and Circumstance: The Draft, the War and the Vietnam Generation* (New York: Random House, 1978), 250.

States.<sup>2</sup> At the heart of these debates was the question of what constituted effective participation in a democratic society. Do engaged citizens question their government or do they believe that the primary responsibility of effective citizens is to accept the policies of a democratically elected government? How do these views of citizenship develop, and how are they related to other cognitive processes? These are some of the questions that this paper will explore.

The purpose of the larger study from which this paper is drawn was to examine the connection between personal epistemology and moral reasoning. In particular, I was interested in the differences between Vietnam War resisters and veterans, given that these two groups had made such different decisions regarding their involvement in the war. The purpose of this paper is to extend these previous results by including perspectives on citizenship and considering their relationship to moral reasoning/behavior and epistemic beliefs. This paper has three main sections. The first section describes the theoretical framework. The second section compares war resisters and veterans on two dimensions: moral reasoning/behavior and epistemological beliefs. The final section of the paper considers these results and their implications for beliefs about citizenship.

## **Theoretical Framework**

As Creswell notes, some researchers use social science theory to guide their inquiry and all researchers begin a study “with some hunches, ideas, and frameworks from past experiences and readings.”<sup>3</sup> This section of the paper describes the social science theories that guided the study (i.e. the theoretical framework). Literature related to the psychology of morality and the construct of worldviews is discussed and then combined to construct the theoretical framework that framed the study.

### *The Psychology of Morality*

Lawrence Kohlberg’s work on the psychology of morality has provided major ideas for research in morality for decades.<sup>4</sup> One of the key contributions of Kohlberg’s work was the differentiation between stages of moral judgment. At the highest level of moral judgment (i.e. the *postconventional level*), for example, “there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or people holding these principles and apart from the individual’s own identification with these groups.”<sup>5</sup> In response to some of the criticisms directed at Kohlberg’s work, another group of scholars developed a “neo-Kohlbergian approach” to

---

<sup>2</sup> Daniel Levy, *The Debate Over Vietnam* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 66.

<sup>3</sup> John Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003), 74.

<sup>4</sup> James Rest, Darcia Narvaez, Muriel Bebeau, and Stephan Thoma, *Postconventional Moral Thinking: A Neo-Kohlbergian Approach* (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1999).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

moral understanding.<sup>6</sup> The core ideas of this cognitive-developmental approach are derived from Kohlberg and include: an emphasis on cognition (i.e. understanding how a person is making sense of the world); the construction of the basic structures of morality by the individual; moral development from simpler ideas to more complex; and a developmental shift from conventional to postconventional moral thinking.<sup>7</sup>

Instead of conceptualizing development as movement through stages, the neo-Kohlbergian approach views the cognitive structures of moral judgment as moral schemas. There are three structures in moral thinking: the personal interest schema, the maintaining norms schema, and the postconventional schema.

The personal interest schema “justifies a decision as morally right by appealing to the personal stake the actor has in the consequences of an action.”<sup>8</sup> In the maintaining norms schema, morality is defined as maintaining the established social order, wherein law is connected to order in a moral sense. Four elements comprise the postconventional schema: “primacy of moral criteria, appeal to an ideal, shareable ideals and full reciprocity.”<sup>9</sup>

#### *The Four Component Model*

Another limitation of Kohlberg’s work, according to Rest and his colleagues, is that it focused on moral judgment, which is only one component of moral psychology. Rest, Bebeau, and Volker (1986) conceptualized the Four Component Model to account for the entire domain of moral psychology.<sup>10</sup> Within this model there are four psychological processes that represent the production of moral behavior in a specific situation.

The first component, *moral sensitivity*, involves interpreting a particular situation and being aware of different possible lines of action. “Component 1 involves identifying what we can do in a particular situation, figuring out what the consequences to all parties would be for each line of action, and identifying and trying to understand our own gut feelings on the matter.”<sup>11</sup>

*Moral judgment* is the second component, and involves an individual judging which possible line of action is morally right. How people decide what is right or wrong, from a cognitive developmental perspective, depends in part on different senses of

---

<sup>6</sup> Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> James Rest, Darcia Narvaez, Stephan Thoma, and Muriel Bebeau, “A Neo-Kohlbergian Approach to Morality Research,” *Journal of Moral Education* 29 (2000): 381 – 395.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 388.

<sup>10</sup> James Rest, Muriel Bebau, and Joseph Volker, “An Overview of the Psychology of Morality.” In *Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory* (New York: Praeger): 1-39.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 7.

fairness. This sense of fairness is conceptualized as a stage of moral development, and stage schemes “reside in long-term memory and are invoked to help make sense of problematic social situations in arriving at a judgment of what is morally right.”<sup>12</sup>

The third component is *moral motivation*: prioritizing moral values over other personal values. There are many theories that attempt to explain why some individuals choose the moral alternative. For example, Blasi maintained that concern for self identity is what motivates moral action: “Intentionally acting against one’s core values and commitments is then experienced as self-betrayal and as a loss of one’s self.”<sup>13</sup>

The fourth component, *moral character*, refers to the strength of one’s convictions to execute and implement a course of action and to overcome obstacles. “Component 4 involves figuring out the sequence of concrete actions, working around impediments and unexpected difficulties, overcoming fatigue and frustration, resisting distractions and allurements, and keeping sight of the eventual goal.”<sup>14</sup>

### *World View*

The construct of “world view” provides an opportunity to explore how individuals’ beliefs, attitudes, and values are integrated, impacting their decision-making and behavior in the social world. World views, according to Pepper (1942) are “internally consistent epistemological systems used to organize information about the world...The major proposition of the world view construct is that each individual makes assumptions about the nature of the social world with some consistency.”<sup>15</sup> In the context of the current study, there are two particular aspects of worldviews that are relevant: epistemological beliefs and moral reasoning.

Epistemology is the study of beliefs about the origin and acquisition of knowledge.<sup>16</sup> Epistemological beliefs, in the framework of worldviews, collectively refer to a set of beliefs or a personal theory about knowledge and knowledge justification. Similar terms used in the literature include *personal epistemology*<sup>17</sup> and *epistemological stances*.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>13</sup> Augusto Blasi, “Moral Functioning: Moral Understanding and Personality.” In *(Moral Development, Self, and Identity)*. Edited by Daniel Lapsley and Darcia Narvaez (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2004), 343.

<sup>14</sup> Rest, Bebeau, and Volker, 15.

<sup>15</sup> As cited in Patricia Kalhbaugh and Deidre Kramer, “Brief Report: Relativism and Identity Crisis in Young Adulthood,” *Journal of Adult Development* 2 (1995): 64.

<sup>16</sup> Barbara Hofer, “Exploring the Dimensions of Personal Epistemology in Differing Classroom Contexts: Student Interpretations During the First Year of College,” *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 29 (2004): 129-163.

<sup>17</sup> See, for example, Kwok-Wai Chan and Robert Elliot, “Relational Analysis of Personal Epistemology and Conceptions About Teaching and Learning,” *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20 (2004): 817-831, and Barbara Hofer, “Personal Epistemology Research: *In Factis Pax* 4(1) (2010): 11-39

<http://www.infactispax.org/journal/>

Research over the last three decades has been based on the work of William Perry.<sup>19</sup> The continuum of development first proposed by Perry in 1968 viewed young adult development through a framework that included both ethical and intellectual development. Perry recognized the relationship between the development of structures of assumptions about knowing and about valuing. In Perry's framework, the progression of development in which participants construed their experiences included both the nature and origins of knowledge and of values. That is, Perry believed that moral development - assumptions about values and responsibility - were inherent in any consideration of human development in a given cultural setting.

Perry hypothesized a developmental scheme consisting of nine positions along a continuum. Development through the nine positions moved through the characteristics of simple dualism, complex dualism, relativism, and then commitment to relativism. Position 1, for example, is basic dualism representing the simplest set of assumptions about the nature of knowledge and values. In position 5, by contrast, a person "perceives man's knowledge and values as relative, contingent, and contextual."<sup>20</sup> Relativism, according to Perry, refers to a plurality of points of view and frames of reference that are subjected to various sorts of analysis, comparison, and evaluation. At the other end of the spectrum is position 9, where the individual sees the world in complex terms and undertakes to affirm his own commitments in a "world of contingent knowledge and relative values."<sup>21</sup> From this position, the individual realizes the necessity of personal commitment in a relativistic world.

Perry's ideas about *position* are closely related to the construct of worldview. He notes, for example, that "the notion of 'position' is happily appropriate to the image of 'point of outlook' or 'position from which a person views his world.'"<sup>22</sup> For example, position 1 is indicative of a view of the world in which a person construes the world in polar terms of absolute right-wrong, good-bad, and position 5 is characterized by a view of the world that recognizes the importance of specific context when weighing the reasonableness of various points of view.

## Methodology

The study utilized a mixed methods approach to the research design, and can be characterized as a mixed-model design because both quantitative and qualitative

---

Implications For Learning And Teaching," *Educational Psychology Review* 13 (2001): 353-384.

<sup>18</sup> Peter Johnston, Haley Woodside-Jiron, and Jeni Day, "Teaching and Learning Literate Epistemologies," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 93(2001): 223-233.

<sup>19</sup> William Perry, *Forms of Ethical and Intellectual Development in the College Years* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999).

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

*In Factis Pax* 4(1) (2010): 11-39

<http://www.infactispax.org/journal/>

approaches were included throughout all stages of the research process.<sup>23</sup> Qualitative and quantitative data were collected sequentially; a common approach in mixed methods research.<sup>24</sup>

### *Participants*

Participants were solicited through the use of recruitment flyers, newspaper and on-line ads, and snowball sampling. Thirty-two participants who met the criteria of moving to Canada between 1964 and 1973 in opposition to the Vietnam War and who were currently living in British Columbia participated in the study as war resisters. Fifteen Vietnam veterans participated in the study.

### *Data Sources*

Three data sources were utilized in this study: two survey instruments and an in-depth interview. In addition to a brief demographic information questionnaire, the two quantitative measures included the Defining Issues Test (DIT)<sup>25</sup> and the Epistemological Beliefs Inventory (EBI).<sup>26</sup> The DIT is a widely used and objectively scored test of moral judgment in which participants are presented with a set of six stories containing a moral dilemma along with a list of statements reflecting possible considerations for deciding how to solve the moral dilemma. The EBI included 28 items designed to measure beliefs about knowledge.

Forty in-depth interviews were conducted with war resisters and veterans following procedures for phenomenological interviewing.<sup>27</sup> All transcribed interviews were entered into a software program for qualitative data analysis (ATLAS.ti), and were analyzed using grounded theory procedures for open coding, axial coding, and selective coding.<sup>28</sup>

## **Results**

---

<sup>23</sup> R. Burke Johnson and Anthony Onwuegbuzie, "Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come," *Educational Researcher* 33 (2004): 14 – 26.

<sup>24</sup> John Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003).

<sup>25</sup> James Rest, *Development in Judging Moral Issues* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1979).

<sup>26</sup> Gregory Schraw, Lisa Bendixen, and Michael Dunkle, "Development And Validation of the Epistemological Belief Inventory (EBI)." In *Personal Epistemology: The Psychology of Beliefs About Knowledge and Knowing*. Edited by Barbara Hofer and Paul Pintrich (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002): 261 – 275.

<sup>27</sup> Irving Seidman, *Interviewing as Qualitative Research* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).

<sup>28</sup> Juliet Corbin and Anselm Strauss, *Basics Of Qualitative Research: Techniques And Procedures For Developing Grounded Theory* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008).

*In Factis Pax* 4(1) (2010): 11-39

<http://www.infactispax.org/journal/>

### *Quantitative: Moral Reasoning and Epistemic Beliefs*

DIT researchers have relied on what is called the “P” score to index moral judgment. The P score resulting from analyses of the DIT represents an individual’s moral development and is interpreted as the extent to which a person prefers postconventional moral thinking.<sup>29</sup> The P score can range from 0 to 95, and age/education norms for the P score published by the DIT developers show that P scores for adults in general are in the 40s. DIT results from the current study indicate that resisters’ (male) mean P score is 58, and veterans’ mean P score is 41. On the Maintaining Norms index, however, the veteran’s group had a mean score of 40 in contrast to the resisters’ mean score of 16.

The EBI was selected as a data source for the current study because previous research indicates that epistemological beliefs are related to moral reasoning.<sup>30</sup> On the EBI, the veterans had a higher total score indicating a more dualist, realist view of nature. From a dualist perspective, the world is viewed in polarities of right/wrong, black/white, we/they, good/bad.<sup>31</sup> War resisters, on the other hand, had lower EBI scores reflective of a more relativist view. From this perspective, individuals believe that truth is relative and that the meaning of an event depends upon its context.<sup>32</sup>

### *Qualitative Results: Moral Behavior and Moral and Ethical Development*

First, Rest’s Four Component Model of moral behavior was used as a framework to analyze the interviews. A second phase of analysis was conducted using Perry’s development scheme of moral and ethical development.

#### *Moral Behavior*

Using the four components of moral behavior (moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral motivation, and moral character) as the major units of analysis allowed me to trace how a particular course of action was produced in the context of a particular situation. The experiences of resisters and veterans are discussed from this framework.

*Moral sensitivity.* *Moral sensitivity* refers to the idea that an individual must recognize that a moral dilemma exists. Rest et al. (1986) described this as “interpreting the situation.”<sup>33</sup> In the current study, resister-participants described a variety of factors

---

<sup>29</sup> James Rest, Stephan Thoma, Darcia Narvaez and Muriel Bebeau, “Alchemy and Beyond: Indexing the Defining Issues Test,” *Journal of Educational Psychology* 89 (1997): 498 – 507.

<sup>30</sup> Lisa Bendixen, Gregory Schraw and Michael Dunkle, “Epistemic Beliefs and Moral Reasoning,” *The Journal of Psychology* 132 (1998): 187 – 200

<sup>31</sup> Mary Belenky, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule, *Women’s Ways of Knowing* (New York: Basic Books, 1986).

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Rest, Bebeau, and Volker.

that influenced their thinking and beliefs about the situation that led to a realization that the Vietnam War was a moral issue. Sources of information came from a variety of contexts: personal, social, and cultural. For example, several participants described how the social context of the 1960's had an impact on their thinking:

My activism for the Vietnam war came out of another issue that I was exposed to at a way younger age, in fact one of the first memories of my entire life had to do with racial issues and civil rights. (Tim)

The university context provided several sources of information. At a more formal level, information was provided by professors in specific classes, as recalled by Rob, one of the participants: "Another influence were a couple of professors that I had at East Los Angeles College. There was a Belgian guy who was very anti-war and he was a psychology prof." Outside of class, but still within the university context, information was provided by various organizations, such as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the new national left-liberal organization, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corp (ROTC) that supplied half of the officers on duty in Vietnam and became a direct target of student protests.<sup>34</sup> Experiences such as these at various universities had an impact on participants' political beliefs and beliefs about the war.

A second aspect of moral sensitivity includes imagining possible courses of action related to the moral dilemma. With respect to the Vietnam war, possibilities of action were limited, as noted by the following participant, "Well, there was the possibility of going into the army, you know, it was one of the suggestions, go in and work against the war while you're in the army, another was to go to jail, the other was to go to Canada" (Ron). Additional options described by the participants included going to jail, or taking advantage of a complex and shifting system of various deferments that fell into the broad classes of student, fatherhood, hardship, and occupational.<sup>35</sup> All of the resister participants eventually interpreted the situation of the Vietnam War as a moral dilemma and considered a variety of options that ranged from joining the army to killing oneself.

Like the resisters, veterans' thinking and beliefs were influenced by a number of factors but several of these were due to a differing social context. It was, said Mark, a different era. The veterans considered themselves to be products of the 50's generation rather than the 60s. During their college years, for example, they experienced the Cold War. Paul remembered that the Cuban Missile Crisis was probably the closest that the United States ever came to war with Russia during the entire Cold War period: "It was a scary time," he noted.

---

<sup>34</sup> Marilyn Young, *The Vietnam Wars 1945-1990* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991).

<sup>35</sup> Leslie S. Rothenberg, *The Draft and You: A Handbook on the Selective Service System* (Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1968).

Relatedly, veteran interviewees spoke of a military background and their familiarity with military history as influences on their thinking about the role of the United States in times of war. But perhaps more than anything, these men were influenced by notions of duty, honor and country - the title of General MacArthur's farewell speech at West Pointe delivered on May 12, 1962:

"Duty," "Honor," "Country" - those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you want to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn. (The National Center for Public Policy Research's Archive of Historical Documents)

Paul, for example, noted that his decision to serve was because of his mindset. This mindset, he said, was characterized by General MacArthur's farewell speech.

The decision to serve in Vietnam was not experienced as a moral dilemma by the veterans in the study. Consequently, alternate courses of action other than doing one's duty were not considered by these career military men. There was no question that serving was the only possible course of action, and the only decision was related to deciding in which branch of the armed forces to complete the military obligation. This sentiment was described by Paul: "I knew I had that obligation so the question was, okay, 'How am I going to do it?'" The nature of the obligation itself was not questioned.

One participant, however, discussed the possibility of moral dilemmas occurring during combat. But not everyone experienced these moral dilemmas according to Stan: "Aviators, navy people, air force people, had very few moral dilemmas 'cause they weren't on the ground engaged with one another." Mark agreed with this sentiment ("We weren't in direct contact with the enemy other than just from the air") as did another participant who characterized his experience in the Vietnam War as "fantastic" given that he "was not in any bad, bad, bad war stuff."

The veterans that were interviewed did not view the decision to serve as a moral choice, and if they were engaged in combat they rarely considered the morality of their actions. This was especially true for those who were distanced from direct encounters with the enemy.

*Moral Judgment.* Once an individual realizes that there are a number of options related to a specific situation, a best option must be chosen. Obviously, the resisters decided that the option of moving to Canada was "best." This decision was not taken lightly, and usually occurred with deliberation, debate with parents and friends, and considered weighing of available options. Ron and Roberta, a married couple who moved to Canada in 1967, talked about the decision-making process:

We had talked about it, all the alternatives, we visited the war resisters, a committee in Chicago, gathered up some information and we had decided that we were going to go to Canada. My parents were firmly against the war, but they

didn't like the idea of me leaving the country. They thought it would be better to go to jail.

One of the justifications for doing the right thing included the belief that it was morally wrong to kill others in general, and more specifically that it was morally wrong to kill women and children. Resisters viewed the Vietnam War as illegal, undeclared, and unjust.

On the other hand, the veterans formed a very different judgment. Veterans did not view the decision to serve as a choice and it did not come about as a result of weighing a variety of options. Rather, the decision was motivated by a sense of obligation. Serving, then, was considered the "right" thing to do.

None of the veteran participants were drafted – if they weren't already in the armed forces they voluntarily went to the recruiting station prior to being drafted. And for those who were in the armed forces, participating was not questioned. Typical of this attitude was Mark, who was a pilot in the air force for 32 years prior to retiring in 1975:

I volunteered to go; I felt like I owed that to the air force and to the government 'cause I was a career air force officer. I just felt that I had to, that that was my obligation, it was my duty. I felt very strongly that all career officers in the air force should volunteer for a tour in Vietnam because it went on for such a long time.

This sense of obligation was present even when participants indicated disagreement about the Vietnam War's objectives, strategies, or tactics. Certainly there was lack of agreement regarding the legacy of the Vietnam War. One participant noted: "We were terribly wrong in the manner in which the war was conducted. Improper conduct of that horrible debacle resulted in 58,000 deaths and 350,000 wounded – all for naught."

The notion of "right" and "wrong" in the context of the Vietnam war and from the context of these military men had more to do with the tactics of the war, as expressed by Mark: "Those of us who've served in Vietnam for the most part, I won't say that all felt this way. But many of us felt that the war was not handled properly." Particularly regretted, said Mark, was the loss of American lives:

What many of us who served in Vietnam regret is that there were 58,000 American young men killed in that war. 58,000. It was a very sober, somber affair. And to our way of thinking that was a huge, needless loss of life. It was an awfully sad affair. The rules of engagement were all wrong, the conduct of the war was wrong from the beginning, it wasn't conducted in the manner which it should have been and everybody who was ever associated with that debacle would agree with that I'm sure.

Additionally, the morality of the Vietnam War was not questioned by the participants. Participants rarely mentioned the three commonly accepted reasons for

objecting to the morality of the Vietnam war: the legality of the war, the involvement in what could be called another country's civil war, and the nature of the fighting itself were not addressed in great detail.<sup>36</sup> Even when directly questioned, participants did not seem to question the morality of the war. For example, when I asked Brad if he thought the Vietnam War was an unjust war he responded by saying, "It was not called a war. There was never war declared, it was a police action." And when participants spoke of the fighting, killing others was seen as a justifiable act:

That was the nature of the mission and as I said there was an awful lot of good feeling associated with it. As bad as it was, knowing that you were taking other people's lives, we justified it. We felt good about it because we were saving our guys lives. (Mark)

The loss of millions of Vietnamese lives was rarely mentioned by any of the veterans, in what could be described as a classic case of moral disengagement. Typically, people do not behave in ways that violate their moral standards (e.g. killing innocent civilians), but at times disengagement of self-sanctions permits conduct that would otherwise be reprehensible and this is known as moral disengagement.<sup>37</sup> One type of moral disengagement occurs when people reconstruct the behavior itself. People do not usually engage in harmful conduct, said Bandura, until they have justified the morality of their actions: "In this process of moral justification, pernicious conduct is made personally and socially acceptable by portraying it as serving socially worthy or moral purposes."<sup>38</sup> Bandura identifies this type of moral justification as one that is commonly revealed in military pursuits: killing is reframed as morally justified when "people see themselves as fighting ruthless oppressors, protecting their cherished values, preserving world peace, saving humanity from subjugation or honoring their country's commitments."<sup>39</sup> Brad's comments in the anecdote above provide an example of how he justified taking other people's lives. The military men in the study viewed themselves as saving the world from communism and, perhaps more importantly, saving American troops.

*Moral Motivation.* Moral motivation, prioritizing moral values over other personal values, in the context of resisting the Vietnam War included the realization of the consequences of the decision to leave the United States. The consequences of war resistance included alienation from family, being exiled from one's birthplace, and psychological consequences. Most participants recognized the finality of crossing the border: "And I knew that for all intents and purposes, I was never coming back. That was the path that I had to leave with, and to make such a scary decision it was sort of scary" (Ross). Given the political climate of the time, participants remembered thinking that amnesty would not be a possibility: "What I felt the most torn with when I came to Canada, I really thought I would never in my life to able to go back to the U.S." (Hardy).

---

<sup>36</sup> Levy.

<sup>37</sup> Albert Bandura, "Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency," *Journal of Moral Education* 31(2002): 101 – 119.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 103.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 103.

The consequences of leaving the United States were summarized by one participant who stated, “They have no idea of the price we paid for this.” In spite of these consequences, the participants in the current study persisted with their course of action, leaving the United States with the idea they would never be able to return.

The veterans in the study, as noted previously, did not view the Vietnam War as a moral dilemma and did not engage in making a moral judgment about the best course of action in the face of this dilemma. The values that they prioritized were not of the same kind of individual moral values as those prioritized by resisters (e.g. not killing innocent civilians). Rather, their moral motivations, stemming from a duty-based sense of morality, meant that duties and role obligations took precedence over individual rights and freedoms.<sup>40</sup>

*Moral Character.* Moral character refers to the ability of the individual to execute and implement a course of action in the face of obstacles. After making a moral choice and choosing a course of action (moving to Canada), resisters were faced with the reality of putting their plans into action. For many of the participants, their first concrete actions related to resisting the war occurred when they refused or delayed induction by overt and covert means.

Another important aspect of executing a course of action related to leaving the United States was the process of immigrating to Canada. The majority of participants applied for immigration at the border; only a few men applied from within the United States. Participants either gained entry to Canada as visitors, or received landed immigrant status at the border if they were able to meet the requirements for immigration.

After arriving in Canada, participants were faced with starting a new life. Some saw it as an opportunity to carve out an alternative lifestyle:

I tried to live out my back to the land fantasies by going east and looking for land and all that stuff, and finally it was in '72 that I thought that I was fed up with working shit jobs and wanted to do something more with my education and I decided to apply for medical school and I was accepted at Dalhousie in Halifax (Rick).

For others, moving to a new country meant the interruption of an established career and working as unskilled, or illegal, laborers. Hardy, for example was a social worker prior to moving to Canada, and his first job in Canada was as a gardener. Like Rick, however, all of the participants embarked on career paths in Canada that eventually led to success in the sphere of work.

From the veterans' perspectives, operating primarily from a conventional form of moral reasoning that emphasized duty and obligation, the decision to participate in the

---

<sup>40</sup> Elliot Turiel, *The Culture of Morality* (Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Press, 2002).

Vietnam War was not experienced as a moral dilemma with an ensuing weighing of options in order to make a moral judgment. Therefore, moral character within the context of the Four Component Model was not applicable to the veterans' actions. As conventional moral reasoners, their actions with respect to the Vietnam War were consistent with their moral reasoning schema. In their view, they were acting morally in the context of the Vietnam War.

Findings from the interviews demonstrated that the decision to leave the United States was a moral choice precipitated by perceptions that the Vietnam War was an illegal, undeclared war and that it was morally wrong to kill Vietnamese civilians. As one participant stated, "As a young man, with no family, no responsibilities, my feeling was I'd rather die in prison than go through an experience where I was forced to commit what I felt was a crime." Veterans, on the other hand, did not consider the Vietnam War a moral dilemma – their actions and decisions were motivated primarily from a sense of duty to country, whether or not it was the right thing to do.

### *Ethical and Intellectual Development*

William Perry recognized that the ways in which people perceived their worlds included both intellectual and moral elements. In discussing attitudes towards war in general, and the Vietnam War specifically, it is clear to see intellectual and moral elements at play. Analyzing the interviews from the framework provided by the Four Component Model showed that the war resisters and the veterans viewed the Vietnam War quite differently. Examining the results from the DIT and the EBI further suggested two very different worldviews from which war resisters and veterans viewed their social worlds, and especially the ways in which they viewed the Vietnam War. Because intellectual and ethical beliefs and values are part of an individual's world view I was prompted to engage in a second phase of analysis. In this phase, I analyzed the interviews based on Perry's developmental scheme in order to examine if participants' world views were also expressed during the interviews. That is, were the differences between the two groups on the EBI and the DIT also reflected by the ways in which they spoke about moral issues and epistemological issues? In this phase of the analysis, the interviews were analyzed using a part to whole approach. This approach involved locating and coding every instance where participants made comments related to ethical and moral development. Perry's developmental scheme consisted of nine positions along a continuum, and he saw his developmental scheme in terms of three parts each consisting of three positions: Part 1 consisted of positions 1, 2, 3; Part 2 consisted of positions 4, 5, 6; and Part 3 consisted of positions 7, 8, 9. The main line of development moves from modifying dualism (positions 1, 2, and 3) to realizing relativism (positions 4, 5, and 6) to evolving commitments (positions 7, 8, and 9).<sup>41</sup> In the next section of the paper, results from using the Perry scheme as an analytic framework are described. Key differences between war resisters and veterans are highlighted within each of the three parts.

#### *Part 1: Positions 1, 2, and 3*

---

<sup>41</sup> Perry.

Position 1 represents basic dualism: the simplest set of assumptions about the nature of knowledge and values. The world is divided right down the middle, and is a “bifurcated structuring of the world between Good and Bad, Right and Wrong, We and Others.”<sup>42</sup> As the individual moves through positions 2 and 3, he “modifies an absolutist right-wrong outlook to make room, in some minimal way, for that simple pluralism we have called Multiplicity.”<sup>43</sup>

Perry used the phrase “a world divided down the middle” to describe the basic dualism that is characteristic of positions 1, 2, and 3. Implicitly and explicitly, this phrase was commonly used by participants in the current study. One of the resisters, for example, recognized this bifurcated world and its implications for the Vietnam generation:

You’re on one side or the other and if you’re on the side of justice and equality and rights for the people then you’re likely to be shot at by the police if you stand up for your rights, that was the feel. (Rick)

The world that was divided down the middle during the Vietnam generation had no middle ground or grey areas. A popular bumper sticker at the time, for example, proclaimed “America – love it or leave it.”

The dualist view of America during the Vietnam years could also be expressed by the phrase *my country right or wrong*. Rob explained what this viewpoint entailed when he described his father’s beliefs, saying, “my father was a my country right or wrong guy. He wasn’t sure the Vietnamese war was the right thing, but he was sure that the country was fighting and when it is you have to contribute.”

In order to accept the notion of *my country right or wrong*, the individual cannot adopt a critical attitude. For the dualist, Authority is not questioned, and Authorities themselves, whether they are government, school officials, or parents, convey the notion of absolute truth or knowledge by justifying their pronouncements through references to truths or principles.<sup>44</sup> During the Vietnam War, for example, this meant believing in one of the justifications for the war, the Domino Theory, that held that if Vietnam became a communist country then all the other neighboring countries in Southeast Asia would also become communist.<sup>45</sup> Peter recalled his early belief in the Authority of the government: “I was very much brain washed, so I just assumed that everything the government said was true, you know. They were there to save people from the communist conspiracy.”

For the veteran participants, the notion of *my country right or wrong* was experienced as their military obligations. Much like Rob’s father, their beliefs did not allow them to question whether or not the Vietnam war was the right thing to do – the right thing to do

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 287.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 64.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Young.

was service to the country without questioning their military obligations. As John explained, “we’re trained to go to war and so when we go to war we want to go to war.” Questioning whether or not going to war is the right thing to do is not part of this training. Indeed, as Gary, one of the deserter participants noted, “all the military training is geared toward making you not question, act. If you’re a thinker, you’re dangerous to them.” Obedience to Authority, for the veterans, meant a willingness to unquestioningly obey the Commander in Chief.

For the dualist who believes in the absolutes of right-wrong, good-bad, we-they, there is only one way to think and act, and *other* ways are perceived as being dangerous. During the Vietnam War, serving the country was right and good from a dualist perspective. Those who questioned the goodness and rightness of the Vietnam War were, of course, wrong and bad. Hardy described the consequence of being both wrong and bad in the southern States where he had been uncooperative with his draft board:

My hearing was scheduled in the state where I grew up and registered for the draft, which was Alabama, but apparently my draft board made some information public that I had this hearing and I was not cooperating ‘cause my parents got phone calls saying that when I showed up for the hearing they’d be waiting there to shoot me.

In a dualistic world, there is only one correct point of view, or one worldview that is privileged. One of the resister participants, Carl, described what he called his childhood patriotism:

It was difficult in Tucson to hear any other point of view. I mean in that part of the United States there is really no difference between business and the military and so everybody you know is in some way connected to killing people. That’s just how you live.

As Carl noted, there was little awareness of other points of view. By position 3, however, a person modifies an absolutist right-wrong outlook to make room for simple pluralism, the realization of the existence of other points of view. Initially, this realization is characterized by Perry as simple multiplism - everyone has the right to their own opinion but the individual does not go beyond this simple realization in terms of thinking about and evaluating different opinions. The "unexamined opinion is as good as examined opinion."<sup>46</sup>

For some, this realization occurred early. One of the participants recalled the first sense of simple multiplism:

And from kindergarten when you sit at the flag and they tell you how this is the greatest country in the world – and I began to realize that well wait a minute, look, Americans are just as good and just as bad as everyone else.

---

<sup>46</sup> Perry, 42.

For others, the realization occurred during university years and came as a result of exploring ideas. Patrick described some of his explorations while attending university in Tucson:

I was still stuck to this libertarian, objectivist base, this anarchist group and we even had a newsletter called the Match that I think back on. If it was today we'd be arrested, you know? That was something I thought. But you know, we were exploring ideas.

And for others, perceiving multiplism didn't occur until the Vietnam years when they were forced to confront their ideas about the war as more and more information became available.

For the resisters in the study, the perception of multiplism often began with an initial skepticism about authority. In the previous stages, it is assumed that the Authority (government, school, parent) has the "right" answers. Participants, however, began to question what they were being told. In particular, the Domino Theory was questioned: "I guess just the basic skepticism about, you know, this whole Domino Theory that was being put forth by the president and his crew." Also questioned was the official story of the war provided by the government and textbooks in contrast to the news stories that were starting to come out of Vietnam:

I must have still been in high school, I remember hearing about the napalm and all of the things that were being done to the Vietnamese people and also at the same time because I was pretty smart and I used to read a lot outside of school and a lot in history and current events and I began to recognize that all this crap in the textbooks was just propaganda and bullshit. I kind of started not believing any of these things I was told.

With respect to the current study, the notion of plurality of points of view is characterized by the recognition that there were differing opinions about the war in Vietnam. However, only two of the veterans, Kevin and Brad, allowed that war resisters may have had a different point of view regarding the war in Vietnam. When asked directly about the draft dodgers, Brad said, "They had a different point of view."

Resisters, on the other hand, were clearly aware of the differing points of view related to the war in Vietnam. In organizing some of the teach-ins, Michael noted that "the whole notion of the teach-in was to give both sides of the story."

### *Part 2: Positions 4, 5, and 6*

The primary characteristic of Part 2 is a developing awareness of relativism. Beginning in Part 2, a person "perceives man's knowledge and values as relative, contingent, and contextual."<sup>47</sup> In position 4, the individual recognizes that everyone has

---

<sup>47</sup> Perry, 64.

a right to their own opinions, but each of these viewpoints is accorded equal status. That is, “anything goes” and all interpretations are seen as equally valid. By position 6, however, the range of alternate possibility and points of view are judged through a process of interpretation. The interpretation of points of view, according to Perry, is “a method of assessment or adjudication among alternatives in a plurality of possibilities, all of which are made potentially legitimate by the context of uncertainty.”<sup>48</sup>

Perry used the phrase *recognizing the diversity of human outlook* to demonstrate a key characteristic of positions 4, 5, and 6 - the idea that multiple interpretations can occur and complexity is assumed as a general state. Related to the recognition of a plurality of points of view is the awareness of alternate possibilities. When people perceive the same situation differently, it is likely that they will take different actions. Because the veterans for the most part failed to recognize different points of view, they were unable to consider that different actions were available.

But in addition to simply noticing different points of view and alternatives for action, one of the key concepts of relativism is what Perry called analysis, comparison, and evaluation. In addition to thinking about one's own thoughts and the assumptions made, individuals compare their own thoughts to the thoughts that others might have.<sup>49</sup> In position 4, the comparison is not detailed beyond the recognition that everyone has their own opinion. But during this phase of development, recognizing relativism, the opinions of others are examined, and a distinction is made between an opinion and a supported opinion.<sup>50</sup> Instead of questions having only one right answer, or any number of answers with equal rightness, during this developmental phase it is recognized that a question may have some answers that are more legitimate than others.<sup>51</sup>

Characteristics of relativism evident in participants' interviews included the idea of making informed decisions from among a number of choices, being open-minded, and not passing judgment on the actions of others. Ed, for example, noted, “I stick up for my right to choose. And my ability to choose. And I try to extend that to everybody else too.” This example is a direct contrast to a dualist world view where there is only one correct possibility for action. Another example of relativism was provided by Ross who recalled that being embedded in the context of the Vietnam War encouraged people to ask deep questions such as “What should we be pursuing? Should we be dropping out? Should we be dropping in? What are we dropping in to?” From a dualist perspective, a questioning stance is not needed as Authorities provide any information that is needed.

Not passing judgment on the actions of others is another indication of relativism, as it reflects the notion that opposing points of view are not necessarily “wrong.” Opposing points of view from a dualist perspective, however, are typically demonized.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 90.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Michael Foley, *Confronting the War Machine: Draft Resistance During The Vietnam War* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

Hal, a resister participant, noted that he didn't condemn the people that went to Vietnam. On the other hand, veterans were quick to pass judgment on the war resisters. Because they "turned their backs on their country," war resisters were largely viewed as wrong and bad. One veteran called the war resisters "scumbags" and another noted that the "draft dodgers will die in hell."

*Part 3: Positions 7, 8, and 9*

Part 3 traces the development of commitments in the person's actual experience. Commitment "refers to an act, or ongoing activity relating a person as agent and chooser to aspects of his life in which he invests his energies, his care, and his identity."<sup>53</sup> By position nine, the individual sees the world in complex terms and undertakes to affirm his own commitments in a "world of contingent knowledge and relative values."<sup>54</sup> From this position, the individual realizes the necessity of personal commitment in a relativistic world. One would expect these personal commitments to reflect some level of consistency between a person's beliefs and subsequent actions. The key characteristic of positions 7, 8, and 9 is commitment upon the recognition of relativism. By the end of the Part 2 (position 6) commitment is foreseen - that is, the individual begins to recognize the personal and social implications of living in a relativistic world.<sup>55</sup> An example of commitment foreseen was provided by Hal:

I really believed this whole thing about that the world was going to be different and that we can be different you know. There could be a revolution, and it could be peaceful. It would be different, but you have to stand up for what you believe.

In this example, Hal recognized the possibility of a new world order that was dependent upon people like himself being committed to their principles, and standing up for what they believed.

There were very few participant comments, however, that could be considered as reflective of position 7, 8, or 9. This is consistent with previous research.<sup>56</sup> More resisters than veterans expressed commitment. Specifically, war resisters expressed political and social commitments consistent with their previous actions. Politically, many of the resisters became involved in the War Resister Support Campaign in order to provide assistance to deserters from the Iraq war who have been moving to Canada and claiming refugee status. And many others continued to be active in social justice issues; for example, doing anti-poverty work, addressing violence against women, working with mentally ill, and becoming active with labor unions.

On the other hand, very few veterans expressed social and political commitments that had arisen from the recognition of relativism. That is, because most veterans

---

<sup>53</sup> Perry, 150.

<sup>54</sup> Perry, 3.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

continued to have a world view that did not account for relativism they did not provide accounts of committing to one world view over another. The world view to which they remained committed was a dualistic view that seemed to be unexamined or unevaluated. One exception was Mitchell. In the following excerpt he described how his commitment was related to the commitment of his twin brother, a war resister:

We're always, I mean, all his life he has striven to touch people's lives. I think he touches them much deeper than I do. I really admire him immensely for it, he's a power. But I opted to try and touch people's lives through sharing or communication in a group setting, outside of my work environment and touch people's lives in my work environment. That's why being a judge has been so enormously rewarding 'cause I'm interacting with people's lives.

Level of moral reasoning (measured by the DIT) and sophistication of epistemological beliefs (measured by the EBI) were clearly related in the current study. War resisters scored higher on the DIT and lower on the EBI whereas veterans scored lower on the DIT and higher on the EBI. When comparing hypothetical moral dilemmas (DIT scores) to actual moral dilemmas (interview analysis using the Four Component Model of moral behavior), the results are also consistent. War resisters, postconventional moral reasoners, demonstrated through their interviews that their decision to leave the country was a moral decision based on a conception of morality oriented to self-reliance and resistance to social pressure for obedience to authority.<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, war veterans who were more realist on both the DIT and the EBI demonstrated realist tendencies when discussing their war experiences. Their actions were consistent with a view of morality in which duty, obedience to authority, and interdependence are valued.<sup>58</sup> These results are consistent with Perry's developmental scheme, in which ethical and intellectual development are clearly related to one another. That is, war resisters had more relativist views with respect to both knowledge and morality, while veterans demonstrated dualistic views. There were striking differences between the two groups, not only on the two questionnaires, but also along other dimensions as demonstrated by the individual interviews. I was interested in examining if these two very different world views had any connection to the participants' views on democracy and citizenship and so I returned once again to the interview transcripts.

## **Democracy and Citizenship**

An informed and thoughtful citizenry is crucial for maintaining democratic ideals.<sup>59</sup> However, there is a spectrum of ideas about what constitutes a good citizen. Westheimer and Kahne detailed three conceptions of the "good" citizen in their

---

<sup>57</sup> Turiel.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> Howard Crowson and Terry Debacker, "Belief, Motivational, and Ideological Correlates of Human Rights Attitudes," *The Journal of Social Psychology* 148 (2008): 293 – 310.

discussion of democracy and citizenship.<sup>60</sup> These conceptions include the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen. Although Westheimer and Kahne do not reference the work of Perry or Rest, clear relationships can be seen between notions of citizenship and democracy, ethical and intellectual development, and moral reasoning. In particular, the personally responsible citizen and the justice-oriented citizen map neatly onto moral reasoning schema and Perry's positions. These relationships are detailed in the next section of the paper.

The *personally responsible citizen* is someone who acts responsibly in the community: the core assumption of this view of citizenship holds that "To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible, and law-abiding members of the community."<sup>61</sup> This vision of obedience and patriotism is closely related to Perry's positions 1, 2, and 3 in which "All problems are solved by Adherence: obedience, conformity to the right and what They want."<sup>62</sup> The focus on obedience to the law is also present in the maintaining norms schema of moral reasoning: individuals within this schema defer to authorities, obey the law and do their duty, "expecting that other people are doing their duties."<sup>63</sup>

The second conception of citizenship is the *participatory citizen*, and its core assumption is as follows: "To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must actively participate and take leadership positions within established systems and community structures."<sup>64</sup> In addition to being personally responsible (i.e. obeying laws and paying taxes), participatory citizens recognize the importance of moving beyond personal interests. The participatory citizen has elements of both the maintaining norms schema (maintaining and working within the established social order) and the postconventional schema. Participatory citizens might also be seen as beginning Perry's fourth position as they recognize plurality and differing opinions.

Westheimer and Kahne's third conception of citizenship is called the *justice-oriented citizen*, and the central assumption of this conception is that "citizens must question and debate, and change established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time."<sup>65</sup> Within this conception, there are clear linkages to Perry's relativism as described in positions 4, 5, and 6. For example, Westheimer and Kahne recognized that justice-oriented citizens must acknowledge, and even learn from, different perspectives. In other words, justice-oriented citizens should adopt a relativistic view of the world, similar to what Perry described as a central component of positions 4, 5, and 6 within his

---

<sup>60</sup> Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne, "What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating For Democracy," *American Educational Research Journal* 41 (2004): 237 – 269.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid, 240.

<sup>62</sup> Perry, 288.

<sup>63</sup> Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma, 37.

<sup>64</sup> Westheimer and Kahne, 240.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

developmental framework: man's knowledge and values are perceived "as relative, contingent, and contextual."<sup>66</sup>

Another key characteristic of the justice-oriented citizen is questioning and debating the established social order. This is related to Perry's view of the importance of evaluating points of view in a relativist world – this evaluation consists of "a method of assessment or adjudication among alternatives in a plurality of possibilities, all of which are made potentially legitimate by the context of uncertainty."<sup>67</sup> And, finally, the justice-oriented citizen is conceptualized by Westheimer and Kahne as one who has developed commitments. These are citizens who have developed "commitments for civic participation and social justice as well as fostering the capacities to fulfill those commitments will support the development of a more democratic society."<sup>68</sup> Again, the similarities to the work of Perry are striking, as Perry noted that ethical and intellectual development at the higher levels involved the development of commitments, necessary for action in a relativist world. Commitment, for Perry, "refers to an act, or ongoing activity relating a person as agent and chooser to aspects of his life in which he invests his energies, his care, and his identity."<sup>69</sup> Such commitments could include, but are not limited to, commitments to social justice and civic participation.

The justice-oriented view of citizenship is also related to Rest et al.'s notion of postconventional moral thinking, where moral obligations are based on shared ideals, are fully reciprocal, and are open to scrutiny.<sup>70</sup> Obedience to authority is no longer mandated, from this perspective, as authority is also viewed as being accountable to the shared ideals of the society.<sup>71</sup>

With these connections between ethical and intellectual development, moral reasoning, and citizenship in mind, I re-examined participants' interviews for comments related to their views of democracy and citizenship.

### *Conceptions of Democracy*

Westheimer and Kahne note that "conceptions of democracy and citizenship have been and will like always be debated – no single formulation will triumph."<sup>72</sup> These differing conceptions were apparent in the views of the resisters and veterans as they discussed the Vietnam War. For the resister, democracy was about making choices and for the veteran, the defining feature of democracy was obeying a president who had been democratically elected.

---

<sup>66</sup> Perry, 64.

<sup>67</sup> Perry, 90.

<sup>68</sup> Westheimer and Kahne, 245.

<sup>69</sup> Perry, 150.

<sup>70</sup> Rest, Narvaez, Thoma, and Bebeau.

<sup>71</sup> Darcia Narvaez, Irene Getz, James Rest, and Stephan Thoma, "Individual Moral Judgment and Cultural Ideology," *Developmental Psychology* 35 (1999): 478 – 488.

<sup>72</sup> Westheimer and Kahne, 238.

When faced with the dilemma of the Vietnam War, resisters saw that there was a choice to be made, and that making such a choice was part of the democratic process. The choice was clearly in the moral realm as participants spoke of the struggle to do the right thing. As Ross noted, "I mean the issue is really what is the right thing to do, I guess. How do you respond to the draft papers? How do you serve your country?" Serving your country involved making an informed decision: "Again, that's part of your obligation to yourself and your community. When the government says to do something, you have to think about it and say, this is morally unjust--well then, no, I'm not going to do it" (Peter). Resisters remembered thinking about democracy during the 60s:

The propaganda machinery of the U.S. in terms of things about what democracy meant, what people's rights meant - we were really in a heightened awareness of it and I think by the time I was 15, 16, 17, began to see the contradictions in the system between the values which we said we held and suddenly the reality of the world around us. (Walter)

From a dualistic perspective, there is of course, only one definition for democracy and there is only one right answer to the question "How do you serve your country?" Unquestioningly serving one's country when called to do so was one of the conditions of citizenship described by Mitchell, one of the veteran participants, as a moral obligation. Although questions did arise, these were not taken up, as described by Pat:

The mission was right, our purpose in going was right, and I was all for it, even though we didn't understand everything that was coming down in terms of do it this way and do this; the guys were always in question but, never to the point of saying okay I won't do it.

The resisters and the veterans, then, viewed the notion of democracy, quite differently. For the resisters, democracy was connected to question and debate, hallmarks of the relativist, postconventional thinker. Veterans, on the other hand, viewed democracy from a dualist, conventional position.

### *Patriotism*

Patriotic commitments can support a democratic society; however, as Kahne and Middaugh note, other forms of patriotism can undermine democratic ideals.<sup>73</sup> Love of country, for example, is a common component of patriotism. But loyalty to country has nothing to do with commitment to democracy, as "both fascist states and democracies desire loyalty."<sup>74</sup> Kahne and Middaugh describe various dimensions of patriotism. One component is commitment to country, and another is the attitude toward critique. Here, Kahne and Middaugh make a distinction between *blind patriotism* ("Blind patriots adopt

---

<sup>73</sup> Joseph Kahne and Ellen Middaugh, "Is Patriotism Good for Democracy?" In *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools*. Edited by Joel Westheimer. (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007), 115 – 125.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 117.

a stance of unquestioning endorsement of their country”<sup>75</sup> and *constructive patriotism* (“Constructive patriots applaud some actions by the state and criticize others in an effort to promote positive change and consistency with the nation’s ideals.”)<sup>76</sup> A third component of patriotism is active involvement. Active patriots, according to Kahne and Middaugh, “are those who take it upon themselves to engage in democratic and civic life in an effort to support and sustain what they feel is best about the country and to change features they believe in need of improvement.”<sup>77</sup>

The difference between blind patriots and constructive patriots was summarized by one of the resister participants, Hardy, as he made a distinction between “good” Americans and “bad” Americans:

A good American is someone who is proud of their country and it’s my country right or wrong, you know, I’ll make great sacrifices for my country, it’s the country that’s important and the policies stated by big business and kind of endorsed by the politicians and people who followed that are kind of the loyal and the good Americans.

On the other hand, the “bad” American as described by Hardy is one who will “question and will want to debate and would follow principles as opposed to policies.”

Differences between veterans and resisters were clear in their discussions of patriotism. The veterans that were interviewed, for example, noted that they were patriotic. Mark said, “And we’re all very, very, very patriotic. I just felt that I had to, that that was my obligation, it was my duty.” For Mark and the other veterans, patriotism was closely connected to their sense of duty and obligation. Patriotism was also manifested by their respect for the office of the President. John noted that although he did not like all the presidents, he always respected, and obeyed, the commander in chief. The veterans seemed to embody a view of blind patriotism. From this perspective, criticizing the president is unpatriotic. On the other hand, Peter, a resister, explained the differences between resisters and veterans, the United States and Canada, on this issue of respect for the leader of the nation: “You can be called unpatriotic in the U.S. for criticizing the presidents. Here, criticizing the prime minister is like a national sport, and nobody says you’re ‘un-Canadian.’”

In contrast to the “my country right or wrong” brand of patriotism (i.e. blind patriotism), resisters were more apt to express a more constructive brand of patriotism. Leaving the country, for example, was certainly an expression of critique. A broader view of patriotism was expressed by one of the resisters. Ross said “I was never a patriot in the sense that it was my country above all others,” and this view was connected to a broader view of service, as he further explained: “serving my country was not a concept that had much meaning to me. Maybe serving my community, maybe you know, serving the world.”

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 119.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 120.

### *What Kind of Citizen?*

Using comments about democracy and citizenship made by the participants, resisters and veterans were categorized by type of citizen, based on Westheimer and Kahne's description of three kinds of citizens.

The majority of veterans in the current study could best be described as *personally responsible* citizens. They worked, paid taxes, and emphasized duty and obligation to their country. Implicit in the personally responsible kind of citizen is a conservative view of citizenship, and the veterans in the study could certainly be viewed as conservative: 79% self-reported their political affiliation as conservative on the demographic questionnaire completed for the study.

The second conception of citizenship is the *participatory citizen*. Active participation in established structures was evident for one of the veteran participants: Paul was the president of the community's organization for veterans. Other veterans may have been involved in community participation but they did not spontaneously discuss these activities. Approximately 40% of the resisters were categorized as participatory citizens. In addition to being active community members, they organized community efforts related to education and the environment. Joel, for example, described his efforts at applying for government grants for community enhancements: "I'd become active working on the community projects and I just loved it, you know, applying for grants from the government and getting this money to build things, the community hall, the school."

*Justice-oriented citizens* question and debate, seeking to eliminate injustice. None of the veterans in the current study expressed any beliefs that could be considered indicative of the justice-oriented citizen. However, many of the war resisters could be considered justice-oriented citizens, given their commitment to political and social activism that has continued long after their first political act of resisting the Vietnam War. Relatedly, on the demographic questionnaire, there were clear differences between resisters and veterans regarding their involvement in social activism. Close to 50% of the resisters indicated that their current involvement in social activism was *much* or *extensive*. No veterans were extensively involved in social activism, and only 7% indicated *much* involvement.

Rob's experience highlights his social justice efforts over the years, and provides an example of a resister's commitment to extensive social activism:

My main political work until was as a trade unionist. I was a teacher's unionist and very much of a left wing teacher's unionist and I fought for social justice issues as well as the kind of bread and butter issues like working conditions and salary, all that. I did a lot of grievance work and just basic union work. Then I retired and I still have the political convictions and what am I gonna do? So I ended up taking up a number of projects. My wife and I both sing in a choir called Solidarity Notes which is a

choir very much of the labor movement. We sing at peace and solidarity events, on picket lines, we're kind of the left wing choir in town and that's great and I love that. I consider that a form of political work. I also have gotten involved with peace work so I'm a supporter of the war resister's support campaign.

## Conclusion

There are striking differences between war resisters' and veterans' epistemic beliefs, moral reasoning, moral behavior and the kind of citizen they embody. Moreover a pattern emerges linking these dimensions (see Figure 1). A relativist, postconventional moral thinker is more likely to be a justice-oriented citizen. A dualist, conventional moral thinker is more likely to be a personally responsible citizen. Dan, a war resister, explicitly connected these dimensions when he discussed his social justice work in relation to the domain of morality:

If you measure moral thinking in terms of how it's acted out, you know, and what you're doing, not just what you're thinking or what your heart is saying or whatever, but what you're actually doing - to me, the evidence of that would be my involvement in the anti-poverty movement after the anti-war movement.

Figure 1: Comparing World Views of Resisters and Veterans

	Resisters "Democracy is about making choices"	Veterans "My country right or wrong"
Epistemic Beliefs	Relativist	Dualist
Moral Reasoning	Postconventional	Conventional
Moral Behavior	Moral activation of self sanctions	Moral disengagement of self sanctions
Patriotism	Constructive patriotism	Blind patriotism
Kind of Citizen	Participatory; Justice-oriented	Personally responsible; participatory

In their study of the Vietnam generation, Baskir and Strauss provided in-depth descriptions of evaders, deserters, and exiles and noted that "Reconciling personal freedom with national security will never be easy in America's democratic society."<sup>78</sup> Thirty years later, the conclusion reached by Baskir and Strauss continues to ring true. Today's climate, "intolerant of alternative voices or dissenting opinions" is in many ways similar to the Vietnam era, and dissent, resistance, and confrontation are demonized.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>78</sup> Baskir and Strauss, 246.

<sup>79</sup> Foley, x.

Questioning war, says Foley, is a perfectly valid act of citizenship and would be considered consistent with the justice-oriented citizen described by Westheimer and Kahne. The personally responsible citizen, emphasizing obedience and patriotism, however works against “the kind of critical reflection and action that many assume are essential in a democratic society.”<sup>80</sup> The resisters in the current study have shown that resistance to authority involves a more sophisticated implicit and explicit personal epistemology, a developmentally more advanced level of moral reasoning, and view of citizenship that is more reflective of the kind of thoughtful citizenry that can advance democratic ideals.

### *Educational Implications*

The results of the current study have important educational implications. The relationship among epistemic beliefs, moral reasoning and behavior, patriotism, and citizenship suggest the need for a curriculum that pays attention to democracy and patriotism. Kahne and Middaugh describe the goals of this type of curriculum:

Rather than “teaching” students to love their country, teachers need to help students build an explicit connection between their “love of country” and democratic ideals – ideals that include the role of informed analysis and, at times, critique; the importance of action; and the danger of blind loyalty to the state.<sup>81</sup>

However, the goals of this kind of citizenship education must be extended throughout the curriculum. Analysis, comparison, and evaluation of what Perry called the plurality of points of view should be at the center of the curriculum if the goals of commitment to social justice and active civic participation are to be realized. These are the values and beliefs of the “good” Americans of the future.

---

<sup>80</sup> Westheimer and Kahne, 244.

<sup>81</sup> Kahne and Middaugh, 125.

## Bibliography

- Bandura, Albert. "Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency." *Journal of Moral Education* 31 (2002): 101 – 119.
- Baskir, Lawrence, and William Strauss. *Chance and Circumstance: The Draft, the War and the Vietnam Generation*. New York: Random House, 1978.
- Belenky, Mary, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule. *Women's Ways of Knowing*. New York: Basic Books, 1986.
- Bendixen, Lisa D., Gregory Schraw, and Michael Dunkle, Epistemic beliefs and moral reasoning." *The Journal of Psychology* 13 (1998): 187 – 200.
- Blasi, Augusto. "Moral Functioning: Moral Understanding And Personality." In Daniel Lapsley and Darcia Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral Development, Self, and Identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2004.
- Bogdan, Robert and Sari Biklen. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 2003.
- Chan, Kwok-Wai and Robert G. Elliott. "Relational Analysis of Personal Epistemology and Conceptions About Teaching and Learning." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20 (2004): 817-831.
- Corbin, Juliet and Anselm Strauss. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures For Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008.
- Creswell, John. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003.
- Crowson, Howard M., and Terry Debacker. "Belief, Motivational, And Ideological Correlates Of Human Rights Attitudes." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 148 (2008): 293 – 310.
- Foley, Michael S. *Confronting the War Machine: Draft Resistance During The Vietnam War*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Hagan, John. *Northern Passage: American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada*. Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Hofer, Barbara K. "Exploring The Dimensions Of Personal Epistemology In Differing Classroom Contexts: Student Interpretations During The First Year Of College." *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 29 (2004): 129-163.
- Hofer, Barbara K. "Personal Epistemology Research: Implications For Learning And Teaching." *Educational Psychology Review* 13 (2001): 353-384.

- Johnston, Peter H., Haley Woodside-Jiron, and Jeni Day. "Teaching and Learning Literate Epistemologies." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 93(2001): 223-233.
- Johnson, R. Burke, and Anthony Onwuegbuzie. "Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come." *Educational Researcher* 33 (2004): 14 – 26.
- Jones, Joseph. *Contending Statistics: The Numbers for U.S. Vietnam War Resisters in Canada*. Vancouver, BC: Quarter Sheaf, 2005.
- Joseph Kahne and Ellen Middaugh, "Is Patriotism Good for Democracy?" In *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools*. Edited by Joel Westheimer. New York: Teachers College Press, 2007.
- Kalhbaugh, Patricia E., and Deidre A. Kramer. "Brief Report: Relativism and Identity Crisis in Young Adulthood." *Journal of Adult Development* 2 (1995): 63 – 70.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. *The Philosophy of Moral Development*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981.
- Levy, David W. *The Debate Over Vietnam*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Narvaez, Darcia, Irene Getz, James Rest, and Stephan Thoma. "Individual Moral Judgment and Cultural Ideology." *Developmental Psychology* 35 (1999): 478 – 488.
- Perry, William G. *Forms of Ethical and Intellectual Development in The College Years*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.
- Rest, James. *Development in Judging Moral Issues*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1979.
- Rest, James, Muriel Bebeau, and Joseph Volker. "An Overview of the Psychology of Morality." In James Rest (Ed.), *Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory*. New York: Praeger, 1986: 1-39.
- Rest, James, Darcia, Narvaez, Stephan Thoma, and Muriel Bebeau. "A Neo-Kohlbergian Approach to Morality Research." *Journal of Moral Education* 29 (2000): 381 – 395.
- Rest, James, Darcia Narvaez, Muriel Bebeau, and Stephan Thoma. *Postconventional Moral Thinking: A Neo-Kohlbergian Approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum, 1999.
- Rest, James, Stephan Thoma, Darcia Narvaez, and Muriel Bebeau, M. "Alchemy And Beyond: Indexing The Defining Issues Test." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 89 (1997): 498 – 507.

- Rothenberg, Leslie S. *The Draft and You: A Handbook On The Selective Service System*. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1968.
- Schraw, Gregory, Lisa Bendixen, and Michael Dunkle. Development and validation of the Epistemological Belief Inventory (EBI).” In Barbara K. Hofer and Paul R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Personal Epistemology: The Psychology of Beliefs About Knowledge and Knowing*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002: 261-275.
- Seidman, Irving. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2007.
- Turiel, Elliot. *The Culture of Morality*. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Press, 2002.
- Young, Marilyn B. *The Vietnam Wars 1945-1990*. New York: Harper Collins, 1991.
- Westheimer, Joel and Joseph Kahne. “What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating For Democracy.” *American Educational Research Journal* 41 (2004): 237 – 269.