

The last knights

A preliminary study of the developments in the habitus of the Cadets' Corps

René Moelker

Abstract

On the basis of theoretical and empirical considerations the author concludes that values of chivalry, such as courtesy, politeness, etiquette, courage and honour are still relevant for the modern Cadets' Corps. In particular rules of conduct, which find expression in etiquette, are the subject of investigation in this chapter. As a result of a far-reaching democratization of recruitment – cadets come from all layers of society – the cadets' society cannot be called chivalrous anymore. Nevertheless, the values of chivalry are still cherished, as they are functional for the work of the officer. They guarantee safety and security within an environment that is still characterized by a great extent of inequality in rank and Corps status. Moreover, they allow a group of future officers to distinguish itself from other professional groups in civilian society. A number of hypotheses, inviting further research in the subject conclude the chapter.

Introduction: military educational institutes as hotbeds for values and norms

The start of lectures, classes and meetings of the Cadets' Corps and other gatherings are often rather noisy affairs. Cadets are chatting, sharing the latest bits of news or gossip and joking, while the speaker or chairperson of the meeting is clearly making preparations to begin. He wants to make a start, but cannot break through the buzz. At that moment there will always be a cadet to shout out in a loud voice 'politesse'. The term betrays a French influence in the educational system, but it also clearly indicates that in certain circumstances aspirant officers should have the decency and respect to listen to a speaker. The fact that it is used implies that the Royal Netherlands Military Academy (RNLMA) is a place where something like 'politesse' still has real meaning.

It always strikes visitors to the RNLMA that people greet each other, sometimes perfunctorily, for the Cadets' Corps has the rule that the military always salute each other, but also often spontaneously and voluntarily. A civilian, unfamiliar to the RNLMA, is often greeted out of politeness. A female visitor will find doors opened for her, an almost unique experience nowadays! There are general norms, often indicated by the broad term 'common decency' and specific ones that only apply to cadets, such as the rules regarding outward appearance, behaviour and dress. General manners and rules of conduct for cadets, as laid down in 'the Blue Book' or the booklet 'White on Black' in particular, indicate that courtesy and chivalry are still values that apply to the population of cadets.

To what extent do these 'chivalrous values' still play a role in the socialization of the cadets? That is the central question of this chapter. It is a preliminary study, as the method of investigation, the theoretical refinement and empirical profundity have not been perfected as yet. The investigation's main aim is to generate hypotheses, while constructing an image of reality by means of 'sensitizing concepts'. That construction is realized by studying

- the history of the military profession as a fusion of military and civilian values;
- the theoretical foundation for an explanation of class- and rank-bound values and norms;
- the objectives of the Cadets' Corps;
- examples of etiquette;
- punitive measures.

In the final section conclusions will be drawn and hypotheses which may function as starting points for further investigation are presented.

Professionalization: a fusion of civilian and military values

Not all cadets will know 'how to behave'. One reason for this may be their changed social backgrounds, but there are also the changes in society, which result in the traditional rules of conduct no longer providing any guidelines. In the days when officers were solely recruited from higher circles of society, everyone knew how to behave. After all, the existing etiquette had been developed by society's elite - the nobility. For the medieval aristocracy the art of warfare was an exalted form of sport, and certainly not a profession that required technological or scientific knowledge. Officers led the actual fighting and concerned themselves little with the technical aspects or logistics.

The first professionalization of the officer profession took place in an organization in which technical aspects began to influence warfare first, the Royal Navy. Incidentally, but not without importance in the context of this article, the form of address 'Mister' in the 16th and 17th century navy was exclusively reserved for noblemen and officers, and only later became a general epithet for civilians.

Medieval naval battles were exact copies of land battles. A ship was boarded and subsequently a hand-to-hand fight would take place. (Teitler, 1974) Developments in artillery, such as the heavy gun, allowed a battle from a distance. It was possible in the 17th century to beat an opponent by sinking his ship - from a distance. This, however, implied that officers knew how to navigate. The profession of the officer had to be merged with that of the sailor. All of a sudden officers had to know about ocean currents, winds, sailing, rigging, but also the sailor's language of command. More so even, noble officers had to make their own some of the language and customs of a professional

group that was generally despised for its low descent. In the middle of the 17th century even booklets were issued to teach the officers the common sailor's argot.

The composition of the officer corps was strongly influenced by the technological requirements of certain military environments. As the more technologically advanced arms, the Navy, the Engineers and Artillery had a relatively large proportion of non-aristocratic recruits. These arms depended on civilian technological know-how of navigation, mathematics, fortifications and ballistics, but at the same time they wanted to establish one officer corps, with one *esprit de corps*. The officers that were commoners had to be socialized in the chivalrous values of the officer corps in order to be able to function at the Court, to fulfil diplomatic functions (naval officers were required to speak several foreign languages) and to behave in accordance with the values and norms of the officer. This situation brought about quite a few tensions for the fledgling Royal Navy. In 1578 privateer-captain Francis Drake, a commoner, had Thomas Doughty, an aristocrat, decapitated because tensions between the two had risen too high. In the 18th century, however, a training system was developed that managed to combine the good things from both social layers.

Over time, conflicts like that between Drake and Doughty could be resolved by means of a new institution, the education of the 'midshipman'. Officers traditionally were to be found aft, and sailors fore. In principle, noblemen considered it beneath them to carry out the craft that, willy-nilly, belonged to a sailing profession. The problem of training noblemen without loss of reputation along with commoners was solved by positioning them amidships. Due to this 'middle position' the 'midshipmen' learned the craft from an experienced hand, whereas they acquired fencing, dancing and all other skills an officer should possess from a captain or an almoner. (Elias, 1950; Moelker, 2003b) Court manners, too, were taught. Midshipmen, or in Dutch 'adelborsten', were thus introduced to the values and norms of the chivalrous elite, of which courteous manners and etiquette constituted a natural element.

In the Army, too, technological developments caused a shift in recruitment. Engineer and artillery schools demanded a technical and mathematical background (see the historical contributions elsewhere in this volume). The commoner element in the officer corps grew steadily, but the term of address 'jonkers' ('squires'), which was still in use long after World War II, clearly demonstrates the parallel to the midshipman-system. The function of military academies is to generate a fusion between civilian knowledge and aristocratic - chivalrous, if you please, - values and norms. Sometimes the concepts of '*esprit de corps*' or 'character development' are used, while referring to the above-mentioned socialization and chivalrous values.

Courtesy is only one of those values of chivalry. It concerns values that have to be regarded as traditionally military. Courage, loyalty, honour, discipline, subordination,

perseverance are among them. These values are functional for officers. Thus, courtesy and etiquette enabled one to move in diplomatic circles at Court. Courage and discipline were essential when ships or men had to be held in line during a firefight. Together with technical expertise and scientific knowledge these values and norms form the cultural capital for the officer.

Theoretical exploration: origin and habitus

The relation between the status of the officer and the manner of recruitment in a modern society was already studied in the middle of the 19th century by the French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville. (1994) In an aristocratic society the military occupation was still seen as a respectable pastime for young noblemen, whose status in life was derived from their social position and not their military rank. In a more egalitarian society, on the other hand, the armed forces recruit people of humbler descent, whose status does depend on their military rank. In other words, precisely because there is more recruitment from the commoners, it becomes essential, also out of considerations of status of the officer profession, to pass on values of chivalry to future generations of officers. After all, they have not been imbued with these values from birth. Investing in cultural capital, therefore, is extremely sensible. Paul Bourdieu's habitus-theory explains why and how, but first some data about the social background of cadets are presented below.

The Netherlands has for a long time retained recruitment from the nobility and upper classes. In 1872, 22% of the generals and colonels in the Army were of noble descent. In 1912 this was 12% and in 1950, 0%. Around 1950, 22% of the cadets came from 'military' families. For the Royal Naval College this was 30%. In other countries a similar development can be discerned, with a decreasing proportion of nobility. (Van Doorn, 1974: 13ff.; Abrahamsson, 1972; Moelker and Soeters, 2003a)

Van Doorn's work shows that prior to and immediately after World War II there were hardly any officers from working class or farmer families (1 - 2%). For the sake of comparability with the past the same class division was used by Moelker and Soeters in their survey (1998), which showed that in 1995 17% of the RNLMA cadets were from the lower classes (working and farmer classes). Over time, the middle class began to be represented more and more. The percentage of cadets with a middle class father rose from 28% between 1918-23, to 38% in 1948-51, to 59% in 1995. The percentage of cadets/officers from the upper classes fell (41%, 38% and 14% respectively), as did the percentage of cadets/officers whose fathers had been officers (26%, 13% and 9%, respectively). A similar development was found in the recruitment from NCO families (4%, 9%, and 1%, respectively). What can be deduced from these figures is that the social background of cadets/officers increasingly began to mirror the average working population. A recent

survey of Groen and Klinkert (see elsewhere in this volume) yields different data, partly because more accurate methods were used, partly because a different class division was used. However, the trend is comparable.

The changes in the composition of the officer corps also have consequences for the values and norms of this corps. Bourdieu's habitus-theory (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) sheds an unexpected light on this. It distinguishes economic, social and cultural capital. Economic capital can be measured by property and income, and social capital by the social contacts a person has. His knowledge, good manners and good taste make up his cultural capital.

Taste is a way to distinguish oneself - a tool for distinction- from others (Bourdieu, 1984). It also betrays someone's status. In general, the taste of the social elite enjoys a higher reputation than that of others. That is even true when it concerns a sense of humour. (Kuipers, 2001) Higher circles can distinguish themselves through their taste and because taste is part of their cultural capital, these circles can reproduce themselves by means of this distinction (hence, the title of Bourdieu's classic from 1977, *'La Reproduction'*). After all, the chances of acquiring the different capitals are not equal for everyone. The division of chances is dependent on the habitus, the internalized values and norms of the group to which one belongs. Their habitus enables people to react adequately on new situations by means of their expectations. Representatives of higher social circles expect their children to choose an education or profession that offers them high prospect of economic success. Cultural capital and the habitus, acquired in one's milieu, facilitate (school) career. As the talent to assess risks and grasp opportunities is reserved to a higher social layer, it is relatively beyond reach for individuals belonging to the lower social layers.

As habitus consists of internalized values and norms, it allows one to act as a matter of course, recognize opportunities and grasp them at the moment they present themselves. It allows one to move in a certain way within a specific group of people, to communicate with them and to function in a manner accepted by that group.

Etiquette enables people to move among other people because it is part of the habitus. They do not have to ask themselves each time 'how to behave', but they automatically follow the rules of conduct - if they have internalized them well enough. The previous section showed that values of chivalry, and consequently etiquette, are functional for officers. The theory is clearly borne out by the conclusion that rules of conduct are indispensable in contact with other people; they are a precondition for interaction. Rules of conduct 'bring people of diverse backgrounds together and allow them to interact without threat of the situation collapsing into a struggle of competing self-interests... the chances of developing a more civilized society are increased'. (Finkelstein, 1989:139; Elias, 1939)

Etiquette, courtesy and other values of chivalry are especially important within groups that still show great inequality. Etiquette allows people to interact, irrespective of their social status, and in view of the diverse backgrounds of the present-day cadets, this fact underpins the importance of rules of conduct. Etiquette makes the interaction between people of unequal rank safe and predictable. In his latest book, entitled '*Respect in a World of Inequality*', Richard Sennet (2003) maintains that the way in which people can show respect is dependent on the way in which they can develop impersonal manners. These manners manifest themselves in ritual role play (you know the CO also acts out a role) and accepted rules of conduct. High and low can chat in a relaxed manner, make jokes, etc., because there are rules to govern polite conversation.

It is important to stay far from personality cult and the quest for authenticity. This glamorization of the individualistic personality cult was already the butt of criticism in Sennet's famous '*The Fall of the Public Man*' (1977). In his latest book he takes his criticism even further. In his view it is impolite and offensive - disrespectful - to harp on one's personal merits. The personality cult only leads to people placing themselves above others, and that is something completely different than when someone is a functional superior. In the latter case he only plays a role, and emotions, personal feelings and narcissistic tendencies are kept outside the work atmosphere.

It would take too far to fully elaborate Sennet's complex argumentation. His voice is one of many in a discussion on the effects of an egalitarian society. It is a discussion on the role of rules of conduct in a society in which everyone is becoming increasingly equal, and in which etiquette is criticized from an 'anything goes' or 'must be possible' attitude. It seems as if the civilization process has changed course and less and less importance is attached to manners and rules of conduct. (Wouters, 1976) Values and norms often change content, while traditional meanings lose their hold. (Brinkgreve and Korzee, 1978) Emotional authenticity and individual originality seem to gain weight. People should express their emotions. But this may also be a form of styling, or a sort of role play à la Sennet. For this reason Zeegers (1988) does not speak of presentation of emotionality but of cultivated social representations. Wouters (1990) states that people have such control over their emotions that it becomes possible for them to flout fixed rules of conduct. Such control do we have over our passions, that we even behave decently on a nude beach, where the dress code dictates that we be naked. He calls this the 'controlled decontrolling' of emotions and passions.

Let us leave this complex discussion behind. What it makes clear, however, is why among cadets the discussion on norms and values, and in particular the restrictive rules of conduct, flares up from time to time. This is demonstrated by the discussions on the objectives of the rules of conduct in the following section. Even in a world in which differences of rank and class are still very relevant, cadets do feel the need for individ-

ual self expression. The strict rules of conduct seem to limit this self-expression, and they seem to become a burden. An author like Sennet, on the other hand, argues that social intercourse is facilitated when certain institutions – rules of conduct – are observed. In his view it is precisely those rules that allow individual self-expression.

Objectives

The rules of conduct^I acquire their normative significance as cadets who want to be members of the Corps make a promise that binds them to a trust system. That promise is as follows: ‘I promise on my word as a cadet, at all times to be honest, faithful to the Corps and obedient to the Senate, that I promise’. This Cadet’s Promise morally commits him to the values and norms of the Corps.

Objectives, statutes and documents in which the rules of conduct have been laid down, provide an explanation of their significance. The rules of conduct reflect the norms and values of chivalry, but whether these norms and values still have the same meaning as in the past largely depends on the explanation that is given to them. It is expressed in the objectives.

In 1952 cultural and intellectual development were stated as the objectives of the Cadets’ Corps. In the 1969 statutes the objectives were:

- Making an essential contribution to the officer education of the cadet;
- Cultivating comradeship and solidarity among its members in order to constitute a close community;
- Stimulating a common behaviour in dealing with the outside world;
- Establishing and maintaining contacts with other student societies, military associations and other institutions.

The present objectives of the Cadets’ Corps can be found on the internet:

- Contributing to the personality development of its members;
- Contributing to the development of the physical condition of its members.

Apart from these specific Corps objectives, the objectives to a large extent run parallel to those of the RNLMA, as formulated in its official ‘Mission Statement’, the core of which is formed by the phrase: ‘The RNLMA is the only military-scientific institute that educates officers for the Royal Netherlands Army and Air Force and the Royal Marechaussee’.

Although the present-day objectives have a different ring to them, the continuity appears to be great, considering how they work out in practice. One of the concrete examples with regard to the development of personality is the concept of integrity.

Besides, the guarding of norms and values, the following of the norms and values of the officer corps, solidarity and relations with student societies outside the RNLMA come back in the modern texts.

Of all times, too, seems to be the concern about the tension between ideal and reality. The older documents contain warnings – civilian values and norms are on a slippery slope, future officers do not know how to behave, or the influx of cadets from other classes necessitates a constant attention for the socialization in norms and values.

During the Corps meeting of 6 March 1953 there were warnings against the ‘slipping into vulgarity and triviality instead of an inward civilization and self-discipline’. On 14 June 1952 the chairman of the Senate stated he saw the social, intellectual and cultural education of the cadet as the Corps’ main task, because ‘from a social point of view the officer belongs to a certain class which should be at the same intellectual and cultural level as that of academics’. So, the Senate has an educational value. It is therefore that in 1965 the Senate stated that the prospective officer’s behaviour was expected ‘to be in keeping with the norms of the social regions of the higher circles, in which the officer profession used to be embedded’. (Klinkert, 1998: 21)

In the period during which Lieutenant General Van der Wall Bake was Commandant of the RNLMA a ‘guide regarding the social intercourse of officers of the army and air force’ was published. This guide from 1967 had been written for officers in general, but from its preface it becomes clear that this particular version was expressly intended for educational purposes at the RNLMA (incidentally, there were more regulations intended for all officers, such as VS 2-2525 ‘Manners and Correspondence’). The introduction to this guide states the goals of the specific rules of conduct:

The officer is expected to be a civilized and educated person, who knows how to behave in any environment... After all, the officer comes into contact with distinguished and high-ranking persons...his services can also be required in functions that bring him into direct contact with diplomatic life and society... apart from that, as a military superior, the officer is expected to set an example for his subordinates in inward and outward civilization, showing himself to be truly ‘superior’. Moreover, through his good manners the officer makes life in the officers mess more pleasant for his colleagues and himself... It has to be realized that the officer corps cannot accept a mediocre level of civilization. The decay that set in during the war years, fortunately, has been reversed, so that good manners are widely appreciated once more.

From 1986 onwards the Cadets’ Association Board has published a Blue Booklet that functions as a guide to ‘good Corps or Mess membership’. In the 1993-4 edition of the Blue Booklet the Chef du Protocol Hugens wrote with regard to the so-called ‘lending’

behaviour of certain Corps members, that the norms of decency were interpreted wrongly, 'another example is the way in which some of you deal with colleagues (and others) that come from a different cultural climate. Seen against the background of your future function, I find these matters worrying'.

The level of civilization of the officer, according to these objectives, finds its roots in the past. It has to be guarded, for apparently there is the threat of decay or blurring of standards, caused either by wars, that threaten the level of civilization, or the continuous democratization

of the influx of cadets, making it necessary to familiarize cadets from the lower circles with the civilization norms of the officer. The rules of conduct are also functional, for an officer has to be able to behave in all environments, and certainly in circles where diplomacy and good taste are held in high esteem.

From time to time the rules of conduct need to be adapted because they have become old fashioned or impractical. In 1993 the Corps rules from the 'Blue Booklet' were even symbolically carried to their grave because they were felt to be too restrictive. New, more generally phrased, rules were presented in the brochure 'White on Black' in 1994. (Klinkert, 1998, 23) In this booklet the seven values of the Cadets' Corps, that today are seen as the standard for the behaviour of the cadets, are described. These seven rules will be discussed later.

The preface to the 2001 edition of 'White on Black' says the following on values, norms and rules of conduct:

'White on black', because not everything has to be black on white. This is the essence of this book and the Cadets' Corps. All the rules and customs that apply in our Corps, and that are also stated in 'White on Black', do not stand on their own. Their main function is to provide a good preparation for officership. Adherence to the rules and customs... is a guarantee for behaviour that will never let you down and therefore increases your self-confidence. This is true for your functioning in the Cadets' Corps, but in particular for later in the officer corps and civilian society as well.



It clearly differs from the introduction in the earlier publications. Of course, it is also about future functioning, but it is not anymore about learning behaviour that is dispositional, as if officer behaviour were acquired by birth, permanent and unchangeable. Much more than in the other introductions, this preface implies that behaviour is situational. There is an implicit recognition that there is a suitable behaviour for every situation, and that the norms of conduct provide 'a guarantee for behaviour that will never let you down'. The norms give a level of civilization for the behaviour that belongs to the officer, but the reference to the environments the officer will frequent is absent. The preface does not refer to the past, it does not point at an origin that in certain cases did not fully match the officer profession; it refers to a future as an officer, instead. The desired behaviour can be learned.

Outward appearance

Obviously, a training institute has many rules and regulations regarding dress. The most interesting ones, however, are those that relate to the off-duty hours of the cadets. After all, they will reveal the way in which the rules of conduct have an effect on an individual's life. In their spare time many cadets can be seen casually dressed, but in 1993-94 serious discussions were held on whether it was to be allowed to go into town 'collarless'. The official guidelines of the Corps, as laid down in the Blue Book, were very explicit, indeed. Men were not allowed to wear earrings and they had to have a decent hairstyle. The armed forces as a whole have freedom of hairstyle, but the Cadets' Corps has different rules. Side-whiskers were not to grow longer than halfway the ears and a beard was forbidden. Clothing had to be decent, and dungarees were not considered decent. Jeans were allowed, but not with repairs, damaged or bleached. Ladies in military dress were expected to wear their long hair held together by means of a ribbon or clip in neutral colours. With regard to trousers the same rules applied as for the men. Decent blouses or turtleneck sweaters were recommended, but 'when a sweater is worn, a collared blouse has to be worn underneath'. Needless to say, with regard to wearing a skirt, the length of this garment was also prescribed.

In 2001 these rules still applied more or less fully. There were some minor differences, but they did not change the essence of the regulations. Thus, in 2001 a beard or moustache was allowed if the direct commander and the Chef du Protocol approved. The section on 'outward appearance' is interesting:

As a cadet, and later as an officer, you are at all times a representative of the Armed Forces and at this moment of the RNLMA, in particular. That is why a correct appearance and dress are expected of you. They determine the 'first appearance', and the good image of a(n) (future) officer.

Associating with ‘fairy’ or ‘gnome’

In the past rules with regard to ‘social intercourse’ used to be very strict. Until several decades ago the leave arrangements were so restrictive that there was hardly an opportunity to make contact with civilians. One of the reasons for establishing the Cadets’ Corps in 1898 was to make the rules and regulations regime more bearable by providing relaxation and a social life of sorts. (Klinkert, 1998)

Leave arrangements were made less restrictive, but the rules of conduct with regard to contact with the young ladies of the Breda society meticulously dictated what was allowed and what was not. In the regulations (1967) regarding social intercourse of officers of the army and air force there are many rules that may seem old-fashioned nowadays, such as, ‘In the company of a lady, always let her go first when getting into a means of transport’, ‘Always leave the best part of the road to a lady’, ‘In uniform, do not walk arm in arm in public without a good reason’.

On Cadets’ Corps parties, of which the Assaut – the Cadets’ Annual Ball - is the high point, there are many rules to be observed. The 1993-1994 Blue Book, for instance, forbids excessive intimacies. What is to be qualified as such, is not specified, however. But the behaviour can never run out of hand far, because ‘the cadet is responsible for the behaviour of his ‘fairy’ or ‘gnome’’. ‘Fairies’ and ‘gnomes’ are the invited guests of the cadets on activities like the Assaut. When evening dress is required (as is the case with the Assaut), the ‘fairy’ has to wear an evening gown ‘down to several centimetres above the ankle’. Some regulations are of a more practical nature, such as, ‘When your ‘fairy’ is wearing an evening gown, take a taxi instead of a bike or motorcycle’. Other rules concern polite manners, such as, ‘never exclude a ‘fairy’ from conversations with your colleagues’, ‘talk about something else from time to time’, and ‘do not force yourself upon someone else’s ‘fairy’’. Courteous behaviour is expressed in such regulations as, ‘assist a ‘fairy’ when she wants to sit down’, ‘walk to the left of your ‘fairy’ and in the street, walk on the street side’.

The most striking thing in the 2001 edition of ‘White on Black’ regarding relations with the other sex is that the subject does not have its own section anymore. There are, however, instructions regarding the dress of partners during (gala) balls. Again it is stipulated that a public display of intimacies with one’s ‘fairy’ or ‘gnome’ will not be tolerated, and that the partner is at all times responsible for his/her guest. The cadets are advised to inform their partners about the traditions that apply within the Cadets’ Corps.

Table manners

The Cadets’ Corps sees it as its task to familiarize aspirant corps members with table manners. In order to teach them, a very clear instruction video has recently been made.

For the sake of the instruction cadets, who give the right example, are dressed in their ceremonial dress. This underlines the fact that formal table manners may always be important, but most certainly so at formal occasions like ceremonial dinners. It is only logical, the cadets state in their video, that the officer is familiar with table manners, for instance, at a regimental dinner. In doing so, they say that these table manners are part and parcel of the Academy.

The video first explains general civilian etiquette. Table seating, tableware, the arrangement of the many sorts of cutlery, the position and function of the serviette, and all other matters that are of importance at a dinner are discussed. Thus, it is better to wish each other a pleasant meal rather than a 'tasteful meal', as this in fact expresses some doubt as to the tastefulness of the meal. Under no condition is food to be brought to the mouth by means of the knife. Handling a fork is quite an art, for instance, in dealing with those awkward peas. What is quite funny in the tape is the use of almost 'vulgar language' to explain that eating in a common manner is not allowed. The voice-over in the video says, 'We do not plant the fork upright in a piece of meat in order to cut slices'. Other instructions are 'Take moderate helpings (do not be greedy), eat without making noises, with your mouth closed, and drink without slurping. Do not hang over the table. Do not bend forward with every bite. Sit up straight, legs next to each other, not crossed'. The protective attitude of placing an arm around the plate is rejected as a custom that stems from times of extreme poverty or situations of extreme food rivalry (think of prisons). This sort of behaviour clearly is not civilized.

The fact that it has become necessary to teach table manners to new generations of Cadets, means that they do not exist as a matter of course within the population of aspirant Corps members. With regard to specific values and norms typical for the Cadets' Corps some education is entirely in place. The Corps has some different table manners, although it has to be said that they have all but disappeared in the daily routine because of the introduction of the academy restaurant. The specific table manners dictate that the progress of the dinner is determined by the table eldest - a cadet with the highest seniority among the table companions. The more junior cadet pays his respects to the table eldest, or he introduces himself to him. When serving out the food, the dishes are to the left. Preferably, the lion emblem is kept clean. Should it become stained, it has to be wiped clean. In a cold meal a slice of bread is eaten by starting right hand bottom, and working counter-clockwise. Second-year cadets are allowed to place hands and wrists on the table. Third-year students may rest their elbows on the table between courses. To indicate one has finished the cutlery is laid down on the plate, round side up to show the lion emblem. The knife lies above the fork.

Punitive measures

Values and norms, etiquette and other regulations of the Cadets' Corps are not without obligation. They are guarded by a five-man strong Senate of the Cadets' Corps, assisted by a Chef du Protocol. This functionary, who is sometimes called the sixth senator, is responsible for changes in and compliance with the rules of conduct. The Senate can impose punishments of varying severity. It can admonish, impose obligations, deny rights, suspend or expel. In its 1969 statutes, rules and regulations/ disciplinary regulations, it is stated that, 'a cadet who has violated the Cadet's Promise, who has shown conduct, unworthy of the Corps, or conduct through which he has not fulfilled an obligation he was under as such, can be punished by the Senate'. In the statutes there is a further elaboration of the code of honour, 'Honesty, as mentioned in the Cadet's Promise, also means no cheating'. Indeed, in those days the Cadets' Corps itself saw to it that anyone found cheating during tests was punished. Nowadays, 'White on Black' still condemns all forms of dishonest behaviour; after all, 'You promise to be honest at all times. And by doing so you declare that as a cadet and aspirant officer you want to be free of lies'.

In order to guard values and norms the Senate established a Disciplinary Council (originally, in 1957, an honorary Council), and an Appeal Council. The Disciplinary Council is an organ that assesses the behaviour of Corps members in case there are complaints from other Corps members. The minutes of the Corps meeting of 7 December 1999 show that this body is very much alive, 'In comparison to previous years we have dealt with more cases than our predecessors. This does not mean that cadets have begun to behave more badly, it only means that the cadets are taking values and norms more seriously'. Apparently, there is some sort of cycle for the guarding of values and norms, with an upswing in 1999.

Corps meetings contributed to compliance with values and norms, for it was here that the criticism was voiced. (Klinkert, 1998: 25) Thus, cadets were 'held accountable for their behaviour, for instance, 'being in a public place, embracing a "fairy"' (1958), or 'Do not show in the train home that you have had enough of it' (1959). In the seventies there were still punishments for 'taking off one's jacket in a public place' (1971). With regard to values of chivalry the attitude towards the emerging phenomenon of the 'female cadet' is of importance. The Corps meeting debated on 'the extent to which a female cadet should be accepted as such, in other words, should a female cadet be treated like a male cadet, or as a woman first and foremost'? The meeting decided: 'A female cadet remains a woman, whom we also have to respect as such, when approaching her as a cadet'.

In recent years, too, it has regularly happened that cadets have had to be reminded of values and norms. This is shown, for instance, in a letter from the secretary of the

Cadets' Association Board and the Chef du Protocol from 1995:

Recently it has regularly happened that Corps members have taken their dinners with a sweaty body... After having done exercise it is normal to wash/shower first, before changing and going to dinner... If in the future again a situation, in which even *normal civilian decency* norms are violated, present itself, the Corps member will immediately be removed from the dining hall.

Severe punishments, including the expulsion from Corps activities, were demanded for a number of fourth-year Air Force cadets in 1996 who had really gone too far. They showed up at the Academy in wrong civilian dress (no collar, shirts hanging out of their trousers), they urinated against the wall of the dining hall and the Cadets' bar, and they stole the piano from the Spijker (the Cadets' bar) with the intention of throwing it down the stairs.

Informalizing and renewed explicitation

The complaint that cadets do not know how to behave is of all times. As is the criticism that the RNLMA is characterized by too many rules. This regularly gives occasion to debates on how strictly and explicitly the rules should be formulated. Times of tight regulation are followed by a relative relaxation, almost like a cycle in the extent of regulation. In 1993, the Blue Book, was, as mentioned above, symbolically buried, to indicate that the old rules had become obsolete. 'White on Black', the booklet that replaced it, departed from some seven generally phrased values of the Cadets Corps:

- 1 Act in the spirit of the Cadet's promise;
- 2 Show respect and tolerance towards others;
- 3 Honour the valuable traditions;
- 4 Show effort and creativity;
- 5 Show collegiality and bring solidarity;
- 6 Take your own responsibility;
- 7 Dress and behave decently.

In parallel with developments in civilian society this 'deregulation' can be seen as a movement towards informalization. (Wouters, 1985) In accordance with the idea in civilization theory (Elias, 1939), an increased affect control allows a less explicit mentioning of (all too explicit) manners as conduct becomes more and more civilized. But the informalization that started in the sixties is already on the wane, according to youth sociologists such as Ter Bogt and Hibbel (2000). In the nineties the young are again fairly attached to traditional values and norms. Even the traditional institution of marriage enjoys an increase in popularity.

As mentioned above, the subtitle of 'White on Black' is 'because not everything is black on white'. This title is a clear indication of the informalization tendency. Certain norms of civilization do not have to be put in writing, but belong to an attained level of civilization. However, the swing of the pendulum that characterises developments of regulation and deregulation also applies to the informalization tendency among cadets, as in 2001 the seven values are even more explicitly explained than in 1993! 'White on Black' counts 32 pages and with that it is 11 pages thicker than the old Blue Book. It is at least as explicit as the old booklet, if not more so. The values and norms are elaborately presented and explained. But there are also topics that were not discussed in the 1993 version, such as 'correspondence' and 'forms of address'.

Conclusions and hypotheses: values of chivalry without chivalry

The central conclusion of this chapter is that values of chivalry still have their place in the life of a cadet and consequently also in officer socialization. At the same time the chivalry itself has eroded. The origin of etiquette and values of chivalry are to be found historically in the nobility and the system of knighthood. Because of the democratization of the recruitment, cadets are increasingly coming from all layers of society and the natural foundation for the values of chivalry has disappeared. Earlier prefaces to the guides for etiquette identify the changing social composition of the Cadets' Corps as one of the legitimizations for the socialization in manners and rules of conduct.

There are several reasons for the fact that the values of chivalry still exist, while chivalry itself has disappeared. The first is that etiquette and values of chivalry are functional for the work of the officer. Courage, honour, and discipline are values and norms that are essential on the battlefield or in aerial combat. Courtesy and etiquette were once essential requirements because officers often found themselves in diplomatic or court circles. The relevance of these values and norms, however, has not decreased, for nowadays especially peace operations require diplomatic skills of the officer-communicator/officer-diplomat. (Soeters, 1998) Norbert Elias, as one of the first, already pointed at the fact that military training institutes proved to be able to meet the need for both scientific and professional know-how as well as make a contribution to the socialization of cadets within the framework of values and norms of the officer corps. Probably military academies are the most suitable institutions to bring about a fusion between civilian knowledge and military-chivalrous values and norms.

The second reason can be derived from Richard Sennet's work. The manners/rules of conduct of the etiquette system give a certain firmness and safety within an environment that is strongly characterized by inequality in rank and status. Not only is there a great inequality between cadre and cadets, but also among the cadets themselves, espe-

cially in the relation between senior and junior year-cadets. Etiquette remains important because there will always be inequality at a military academy. Rules of conduct allow people of unequal rank to communicate with each other in a civilized way.

A third reason is the urge felt by every group to distinguish itself from others. In 1965 Van Hessen could still maintain that military academies, apart from providing professional knowledge, of old had also had the function of elite formation. 'Elite' in his view meant a group of people who demand a number of privileges for themselves on the basis of very specific knowledge, power of position, values and norms. When officers were still mainly recruited from the nobility, it was obvious that their values and norms were also those of the noble elite. Whether elite formation is still one the functions of the RNLMA and the Cadets' Corps remains open for debate. On the one hand, there is a reluctance to use the term 'social elite'. On the other, there is still a lot to be said for the argument of the chairman of the Senate of 1952, quoted above, who maintained that the officer should be formed 'at the same intellectual and cultural level... as that of the academics'. If academics are considered a certain elite, then this also holds good for officers. Let us leave the question about whether the RNLMA still has the function of elite formation. It is, however, possible to speak of what Pierre Bourdieu calls the need to distinguish oneself. Socialization in a very specific habitus and cultural capital results in a professional grouping of officers that reproduces its esprit de corps. In doing this, it distinguishes itself from other professionals, not necessarily as a group that feels superior to others (for that would be elite formation), but different (and unique) and therefore distinct from others.

The objective of this preliminary study into developments of the habitus of the Cadets' Corps was to generate hypotheses, which is why this chapter is concluded with a number of them. They relate to the period from the sixties onwards and the describe trends that are still ongoing.

- 1 Etiquette at the RNLMA is retained, as it enables a safe communication between people of unequal rank and status. As long as this inequality exists, etiquette will have a function.
- 2 The difference between cadets and students at civilian universities with regard to values and norms will increase because universities are exposed to a larger extent to influences from the broader society (where there is less inequality).
- 3 Within the cadet population the discrepancy between the norm and actual behaviour will increase. After all, the norm remains stable, whereas the behaviour evolves. This can lead to:
 - a. adjustment of the norm;
 - b. an increase in 'furtive' behaviour;
 - c. a policy of tolerance, where the norm still exists on paper, but where the

behaviour is adjusted to the norms and values of the broader society.

- 4 There is a cycle in which 'innovation and modernization', on the one hand, alternate with 'restoration' and 'warnings against the slipping and blurring of norms', on the other.
- 5 Punishment will keep pace with the social development, so it will not only become more lenient, but its limitations as an instrument will become clearer from the sixties onwards.

Whether these hypotheses are correct or not, will have to be borne out by further investigation. Finally, institutes of officer education aim at reaching a fusion between civilian knowledge and military values and norms – in the present chapter these values and norms were called values of chivalry. Their whole point is that 'one knows how to behave as an officer'. What this means, can differ in different times. The curriculum, the comprehensive body of knowledge that is offered to the cadets during their education, is probably not decisive for the functioning of an officer (another hypothesis worth investigating!). Character building is most likely the factor that gives the education at the RNLMA its surplus value. In order to build character one needs time, and that is why the education lasts four years! In his book *'The Credential Society'* (1979) Randall Collins maintains that the 'hidden' curriculum of the institutions is at least as important as the official one. The things students learn outside the lectures, are often precisely the things that determine professional success. All the more reason to cherish the remaining values of chivalry, though not without a simultaneous critical evaluation of whether they are still relevant, or whether they are too different from civilian society and whether they facilitate or hamper the functioning of cadets.

Sources

Archief van het Cadettencorps [Cadets' Corps Archives].

Blauwe boekje voor het Corpsjaar 1993-94, Breda: KMA [1993-1994 Blue Book].

Handleiding (1967). *Betreffende het maatschappelijk verkeer van officieren van land- en luchtmacht*. Breda: KMA [Guide (1967) *Regarding the social intercourse of Army and Air Force officers*. Breda: KMA.

http://www.kma.mindef.nl/kma/cadettenleven/cadettencorps/het_corps/index.html (accessed, 1 April 2003).

Statuten huishoudelijk reglement / Reglement tuchtrecht 1969 [Regulations/ Disciplinary regulations 1969].

Tafelmanieren (video uit 2001 op basis van etiquette-publicaties ten behoeve van de instructie van nulde-jaars cadetten). [Table manners (2001 video on the basis of

etiquette guides for the benefit of instructing new cadets].
'Wit op Zwart' Uitgave van het Cadettencorps in 2001, Breda: KMA. [White on Black A publication of the Cadets' Corps 2001, Breda: KMA].

References

- Abrahamsson, B. (1972). *Military Professionalization and Political Power*. Beverly Hills / London: Sage publications.
- Bogt, T. ter en B. Hibbel (2000). *Wilde jaren: een eeuw jeugdcultuur*. [Wild years: a century of youth culture] Utrecht: Lemma.
- Collins, R.C. (1979). *The Credential Society. A Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.
- Doorn, J.A.A. van, (1971). 'Militaire en industriële organisatie'. [Military and industrial organization] In *Organisatie en Maatschappij*. Leiden/Antwerpen: Stenfert Kroese, 207-231.
- Doorn, J.A.A. van, (1974). *The Soldier and Social Change*. Beverly Hills/London: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P. and J.C. Passeron (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills/London: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Brinkgreve, Ch. En Korzec, M. (1978). *Margriet weet raad. Gevoel, gedrag, moraal in Nederland 1938-1978*. [Ask Margriet. Feelings, behaviour and morals in the Netherlands 1938-1978] Utrecht: Het Spectrum.
- Elias, N. (1939). *Ueber den Prozess der Zivilisation*. [On the civilization Process] Basel: Haus zum Falken.
- Elias, N. (1950). Studies in the Genesis of the Naval Profession. In *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol I No. 4, 291-309.
- Finkelstein, J. (1989). *Dining Out. A Sociology of Modern Manners*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Groen, P. en W. Klinkert (2003). *Studeren in uniform. 175 jaar Koninklijke Militaire Academie 1828-2003* [Studying in uniform. 175 years of Royal Netherlands Military Academy], Den Haag: Sdu.
- Hessen, J.S. van (1965). 'Elitevorming door apartheid – Een historisch-sociologische analyse' [Elite formation through apartheid – An historical-sociological analysis], in J.A.A. van Doorn (red.) *Beroepsvorming in internaatsverband*. Rotterdam: UPR.
- Janowitz, M. (1960). *The Professional Soldier*. New York.
- Klinkert, W. (1998). *100 Jaar Cadettencorps*. [100 years Cadets' Corps] Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

- Kuipers, G. (2001). *Goede humor, slechte smaak. Nederlanders over moppen*. [Good sense of humour, bad taste] Amsterdam: Boom.
- Moelker, R. en J. Soeters (1998). 'Democratization of recruitment. On the social origins of cadets'. In: G. Caforio (ed.) *The European Cadet: Professional Socialisation in Military Academies*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 121-135.
- Moelker, R. (2003a). 'Méér dan een beroep'[More than a profession] in: R. Moelker en J. Soeters (red.) *Krijgsmacht en Samenleving, klassieke en eigentijdse inzichten*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Moelker, R. (2003b). 'Elias, Maritime Supremacy and the Naval Profession On Elias' unpublished Studies in the Genesis of the Naval Profession'. *British Journal of Sociology*. September.
- Teitler, G. (1974). *De wording van het professionele officierskorps. Een sociologisch-historische analyse*. [The genesis of the professional officer corps. A sociological historical analysis] Rotterdam: Universitaire Pers Rotterdam.
- Sennett, R. (1977). *Fall of Public Man. On the Social Psychology of Capitalism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sennett, R. (2003). *Respect in a World of Inequality*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Soeters, J. (1998). 'Valeurs militaires, valeurs civiles: vers le soldat-communicateur' in *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, vol. 26, 2.
- Tocqueville, A. de (1994, oorspr. 1835 vol I; 1840 vol II) *Democracy in America*. Everyman's Library.
- Wouters, C. (1976). 'Is het civilisatieproces van richting veranderd?' [Has the civilization process changed course?] *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift*, Vol. 3, 336-360.
- Wouters, C. (1985). 'Formalisering van informalisering. Veranderingen in omgangsvormen, vooral tussen de sexen in Nederland [Formalization of informalization. Changes in manners, in particular between the sexes in the Netherlands] , 1030-1985.' *Sociologisch Tijdschrift* Vol. 12, 133-162.
- Wouters, C. (1990). *Van minnen en sterven*. [Of loving and dying] Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Zeegers, W. (1988). *Andere Tijden, Andere Mensen. De sociale representatie van identiteit*. [Other Times, Other People. The social representation of identity] Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.

Notes

- ¹ Orders to cadets have been left out of consideration here, as these documents pertain to RNLMA-imposed regulations, rather than the internal Corps rules themselves.

