

1-1-1993

## Letter to the Editor: Tactical Decision Games

Robert J. Bunker  
*Claremont Graduate University*

---

### Recommended Citation

Bunker, Robert J. "Tactical Decision Games." *Marine Corps Gazette*. Letter. September 1993, Vol. 77. No 9: 10.

This Letter to the Editor is brought to you for free and open access by the CGU Faculty Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in CGU Faculty Publications and Research by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact [scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu](mailto:scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu).

VOL

77

ISS

9

S E

1993

### Tactical Decision Games

□ My compliments to the *Gazette* for its utilization of tactical decision games as an educational tool. These exercises give the journal a seldom found interactive quality which goes way beyond the passive learning provided solely by articles.

Because of the great educational potential of these games, I suggest that they, along with their solutions, be collected together in an annual or biannual workbook series to be made available by the Marine Corps Association. Such workbooks would be extremely useful as supplementary teaching aids for college and military school courses which focus on tactics. The price of such workbooks should be kept to a minimum so that the largest possible audience can profit from the education benefits that these games provide.

**Dr. Robert J. Bunker**

*>Plans for the first of these notebooks are well underway, and it should be available by the end of the year.*

### The Homosexuality Burden

□ "Chiefs Back Clinton on Gay-Troop Plan" read the headline of the 19 July *New York Times*. The new policy was accepted by our Service chiefs quietly, in the spirit of compromise.

As so often is the case, the

guidelines issued on the 19th of July:

Bodily contact between service members of the same sex that a reasonable person would understand to demonstrate a propensity to engage in homosexual acts will be sufficient to initiate separation . . . yet . . . Sexual orientation, absent credible information that a crime has been committed will not be the subject of a criminal investigation . . . [and] hostile treatment against a service member based on a perception of his or her sexual orientation will not be tolerated.

The egg-shell floor that seniors gave their juniors to tread upon in the 1970s when racial tensions were at their height, and in the 1980s on the issue of sexual harassment, pale in comparison.

As I read the *New York Times* article and saw the picture of uniformed men whom I knew, shaking hands on the new policy guidelines, "Don't Ask; Don't Tell," my mind flashed to the Honor Code we were taught at the Naval Academy in 1958. There would be, according to the code in which we took such pride, no *attempt to deceive*. For a midshipman to tell a lie was intolerable and meant expulsion. But you did not have to tell a lie to be expelled for an honor violation. The attempt to deceive sufficed, even if unspoken. It was your actions that counted, as much as your words. "Don't ask, don't tell" wouldn't have passed muster then. That was long ago, but