

Causes for Concern: Homosexuality and the U.S. Military



International Conference of Evangelical Chaplain Endorsers

June 2011

Causes for Concern:

Homosexuality and the U.S. Military

Introduction: What is Homosexuality?

On December 22, 2010, President Barack Obama signed a repeal of the military's Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT) policy. The policy was in place to allow homosexuals to serve in the military with restrictions. Several days prior, the U.S. Congress voted to repeal the DADT policy. Weeks before these decisions there was an exhaustive report prepared by the Obama administration, to research and discuss issues related to repealing DADT, with recommendations. Virtually every accommodation was made to homosexuals in this report, with a few condescending paragraphs scattered throughout the document intended to sooth the emotions and answer questions from opponents of the repeal.

It is remarkable that in the recent 255 page document, *Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell*, November 30, 2010, there is no definition of homosexuality or homosexual acts.

What is homosexuality? *The Random House College Dictionary* defines homosexuality as "sexual desire or behavior directed toward a person or persons of one's own sex."¹ The *Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary* defines homosexuality as "1. Sexual desire for others of one's own sex. 2. Sexual activity with another member of the same sex."² Wikipedia states, "Homosexuality is romantic and/or sexual attraction or behavior among members of the same sex or gender."³

These definitions clearly state (others could be added) that homosexuality is centered on sex, the use of male and female sexual organs. It is behavior. Homosexuality cannot be defined as only friendships between members of the same sex. Homosexuality is not camaraderie or companionship men-to-men or women-to-women. This is a part of homosexuality, but not the basis. The basis of

¹ *The Random House College Dictionary*, (New York: Random House Publishers, 1980), p. 635.

² *Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary*, (New York: Riverside Publishing, 1988), p. 589.

³ "Homosexuality," *Wikipedia*, accessed January 10, 2011.

homosexuality by definition relates to members of the same sex sharing erotic feelings or practicing erotic behavior. Homosexuality is about acts, or behavior, or performance. It is something someone feels and does. The male acts of homosexuality are male on male anal intercourse and oral sex. The female acts of homosexuality are oral sex and anal sex. Females often use sexual toys to arouse orgasm while men generally do not use erotic toys. As one report stated, homosexuals commonly engage in oral and anal sex; well over 90 percent engage in anal intercourse, and over 60 percent engage in anilingual (tongue in anus) sex.⁴

Detailed scientific research on homosexuality has been going on for decades. Generally, homosexuals differ from each other as do heterosexuals. But they do have in common a craving for sexual stimulation and orgasm with members of the same sex. They tend to be preoccupied with sexual acts and seek out orgasmically focused relationships.⁵

The homosexual sponsored web site GLITSE (Gay Lesbian International Therapist Search Engine) is a referral center for homosexuals that understands homosexuals will have unusual mental health problems, alcohol and drug abuse issues, eating disorders, domestic violence, and sexual problems.⁶

One may disapprove of homosexuality for moral, religious or health reasons without hating or fearing homosexuals. This paper will demonstrate that opposition to homosexuality is not a “phobia,” and that “homophobia” is not a proper term for those who resist the pro-homosexual cultural agenda in America today.⁷ For the military, homosexuality is detrimental to the good order, morals, readiness, and discipline of the armed forces.

The Myth of the Homosexual as “Gay”

The homosexual community seeks to convince Americans that the homosexual issue is a civil rights or human rights issue. Sodomites, to use the historic name for

⁴ Dr. Paul Cameron, Dr. Kirk Cameron, and Dr. Kay Proctor, “Effect of Homosexuality upon Public Health and Social Order,” *Psychological Reports*, 64 (1989), pp. 1167-1179.

⁵ Alfred M. Freedman, *Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry*, (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1967), pp. 964-965.

⁶ *Gay Lesbian International Therapist Search Engine*, http://www.glitse.com/our_vision.htm. Accessed January 10, 2011.

⁷ Richard A. Fowler and H. Wayne House, *The Christian Confronts His Culture*, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1983), pp. 117-154.

homosexuals, seek to identify themselves as a minority similar to an Asian American, a Jewish American or an African American. But racial groups and individual behaviors or lifestyles are not the same thing. The concept of rights does not belong to both groups. Under the Declaration of Independence, all racial groups are equal under the law. The founding documents of our nation recognize the worth and dignity of all races of Americans, although it took over a century for Americans to fully implement this idea. This does not mean that all lifestyles and behaviors are equally worthy. And not all are equally beneficial, either to their followers or to society as a whole. Some lifestyles are destructive, both to individuals and society.⁸ Polygamy, bigamy, and incest quickly come to mind as lifestyles or behaviors not accepted as morally helpful to society. Until the racial counter-culture of the 1960s and 1970s, homosexuality was always listed in this morally deviant and harmful group.

There is nothing gay or happy about homosexuality. Historically, the word “gay” meant happy, carefree or joyful. There is nothing gay about homosexuality. This minority subculture is far from content in its insatiable appetite for sexual deviancy. Judge John M. Murtagh, in his book *Cast the First Stone*, said, “probably 50% of all suicides in the big cities can be attributed to homosexuality.” Why? Because as Dr. Melvin Anchell, M.D. and practicing psychiatrist, points out, “Homosexuals are seldom satisfied with their relationships.” Therefore, one of the biggest problems with homosexuals [outside the moral and medical issues] is their own loneliness. In the homosexual’s own publications, and in the writing of psychiatrists who treat them, and ministers who try to help them, there is this constant repetition of the loneliness of the homosexual life.⁹

Homosexuals are frequently melancholy, frustrated, and unhappy. Some say this is because of our heterosexual dominated culture that makes them feel like outsiders. Others state that their typically melancholy disposition comes from an internal frustration, a conscience that silently informs them that their lifestyle is not right. While acknowledging that there are wide differences in gay and lesbian personalities, an underlying theme is discontent. In a perceptively titled article, “Why Lesbians aren’t Gay,” the author states that heartbreak is often a trait of homosexuals and their families, and that a typical male homosexual has a craving for promiscuity, pornography, sexual fantasy, and young, thin same sex

⁸ “The Awful Sin of Homosexuality,” *Pulpit Helps*, January, 1982, p. 1.

⁹ “The Awful Sin of Homosexuality,” p. 1.

partners.¹⁰ Predictably, there is nothing gay or happy or content about this lifestyle.

Previous to the President Clinton era debate on homosexuality and the military, Dr. James D. Mallory, a psychiatrist and the director of the Atlanta Counseling Center, stated;

A physician would be guilty of malpractice if he didn't warn a diabetic of his condition because he didn't want to hurt his feelings. Simply letting the person continue eating excessive carbohydrates without proper treatment condemns him to a worsening physical condition. The most loving act one can do is point out that an abnormality exists, and offer help. This needs to be done – but not in a spirit of condemnation – with homosexuality.¹¹

Recent History of Don't Ask Don't Tell

Since 1993, the United States military has allowed homosexuals to serve in the military under the Don't Ask Don't Tell policy provided they were discreet about their activities and obeyed the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). On December 18, 2010, the U.S. Senate voted 65-31 to repeal the policy known as Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT). On December 22, 2010, President Barack Obama signed this repeal into law.

This now means that homosexuals will be able to express their sexuality freely in the military, with respect to considerations that all soldiers must show towards sexual behavior as described in UCMJ regulations.

The aggressive homosexual movement over the past 30-40 years has been pushing for acceptance, an acceptance of deviance not given them in almost 2,000 years of western civilization. Such behavior is morally wrong. It is unhealthy. It is unnatural. It is a perversion of how and why we were created as human beings. To such statements the homosexual cries, "Discrimination!" To be against homosexual behavior in the military is no more discriminatory than to be against adultery, pedophilia, stealing, murder, lying or some other behavior.

¹⁰ Steve Sailer, "Why Lesbians aren't Gay," *National Review*, May 30, 1994, p. 42.

¹¹ James D. Mallory, "Homosexuality: Part III – A Psychiatrist's View," *Christian Life*, October, 1977, p. 28.

Only in the last 30-40 years has the homosexual lobby been able to change much public thinking on this issue. It is not in the best interest of the military to repeal Don't Ask Don't Tell. The repeal has nothing to do with military readiness and everything to do with transient, irresponsible public opinion by an outspoken minority. This repeal will do nothing to make us stronger and will potentially erode military recruiting, retention, health, and morale. Yet the repeal has occurred.

Homosexual advocates do not have the military's best interests in mind. They want recognition for their deviant lifestyle and this is one way they will seek it. Many states still have anti-homosexual laws on the books. How will the repeal work with states that ban such behavior? What are the practical issues about military housing, religious freedoms of chaplains to preach according to their beliefs, sleeping arrangements, use of chapels for gay weddings, and a host of other questions? What about the individual religious freedoms of everyday troops who have a religious objection to homosexuality?

It is not discrimination but discerning to be against the repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell, just as it is not discrimination but discerning to be against polygamy, pedophilia, stealing, bestiality, or incest. The claim by the gay lobby that to oppose them is discrimination is no more true than to discriminate or discern against obesity, alcoholism or child abuse. Everyone makes discriminating or discerning evaluations and decisions every day. Homosexuality, or sodomy to use its historic name, is a moral issue with deep religious roots, an issue that has huge public health and morale ramifications.

How did we get to this Point?

Why was it that in 1993, President Bill Clinton implemented the DADT policy? And why, in December 2010, was that policy removed allowing homosexuals the freedom to practice their lifestyle while in the military?

President Bill Clinton, President Barack Obama, the U.S. Congress, and their generation of Americans were educated in a fully secular America. Many books have been written about the decline of the religious culture in America and the

secularization of our society.¹² The changes in American culture came from a basic belief in the theory of evolution and an elevation of the theory of humanism. Historically, American clergy failed to meet these two opposing viewpoints. Eventually many of the clergy embraced these ideas. Much of the cultural decline of the twentieth century can be blamed on clergy who were unwilling to fight for traditional Bible values against the culture of that day.

Today we reap the fruit of the neglect on the part of the clergy and the rise of evolutionary and humanistic thinking. In the last few decades, God has been removed from the public schools. Colleges and universities which once believed and taught the Bible now ignore the Bible or ridicule it.¹³ Our culture has become secularized. Once religious values were removed from education, permissiveness took its place. Many people believed, and still believe, that there are no absolute morals and that morality is a private matter. This is intellectual folly, as our culture routinely has legal consequences for individual behavior, such as punishments for lying, stealing, cheating, incest, polygamy, embezzlement, fraud, traffic violations, child abuse, and numerous other examples. Individual morality has public consequences.

Today we live in a morally confused society. That which was once considered offensive or morally repugnant is now acceptable. Take homosexuality as an example. Historically, Americans were so repulsed at homosexual behavior that it was little spoken about and hidden in shame. The biblical and traditional values of our country are written in the founding documents of our nation. To claim, as does Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont, that homosexuality is a civil right, is more than ridiculous.¹⁴ Historically, states had anti-sodomy laws which addressed homosexuality as criminal behavior. But our society changed. God, the Bible and traditional values were removed. What took their place were permissiveness, tolerance, and accommodation of often the most reprehensible behavior. We now live in a biblically illiterate society, where the values of our founding fathers

¹² Two examples of many are as follows: Margaret L. Bendroth, *A School of the Church: Andover Newton Across Two Centuries*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2008); Roland H. Bainton, *Yale and the Ministry: A History of the Education of the Christian Ministry*, (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1985).

¹³ Sidney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*, (Yale University Press, 1972), pp. 388-404, 763-804. David O. Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity*, (Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1986), pp. 69-95, 165-170.

¹⁴ "Bill to Repeal Discriminatory Don't Ask Don't Tell Policy Signed into Law today," *The Leahy Letter*, December 22, 2010.

are forgotten, or ignored, or ridiculed.¹⁵ The change has been so complete, that homosexuality, considered a grievous sin only fifty years ago, has recently been declared acceptable behavior in our culture and now in the U.S. military.

There is a reason that homosexuality is considered an alternative lifestyle by many today. Historically, homosexuals were called sodomites and were classed as moral reprobates along with those who practiced child abuse, bestiality, spouse abuse, pedophilia, polygamy, and a host of other behavioral sins. Two generations ago, homosexuals became outspoken and relentlessly advocated changes in the perceptions of gay behavior. They recruited on college campuses and made accusations of discrimination. Since the 1970s, the homosexual lobby in Washington and the movement nationwide has relentlessly spread its propaganda with skillful and tireless efficiency. Now the generation of the 1970s are senior leaders in our society. All their lives they have been exposed to atheistic public education from kindergarten through college, and at the same time have heard tireless pleas by gay rights advocates for equal opportunity and acceptance. Now our senior leaders, trained without serious reflection on ethics, morals, or religion, have accepted homosexual behavior.

Why homosexual behavior now acceptable and pedophilia or bestiality is not? Simply because gay rights advocates have relentlessly pushed their agenda to a morally adrift culture, and have succeeded. Why is homosexuality approved but incest or polygamy or bestiality is rejected? Our adrift culture can give no reason. With no moral compass, these other sins can also be accepted into our society. In a culture with no ultimate right or wrong, why should not pedophilia or incest be approved?

Lessons from the Early 1990s

In 1993, President Bill Clinton signed the DADT policy as a compromise between the aggressive homosexual lobby and those who opposed homosexuality in the military. Clinton wanted to give homosexuals full rights and privileges in the military, but the political, religious, and cultural climate at that time was not right for such ideas to be accepted.

¹⁵ The Boston University scholar Dr. Stephen Prothero has written a 372-page book on the religious illiteracy of Americans, and how our culture has changed from its founding values. See his book, *Religious Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know – and Doesn't*, (New York: Harper-Collins Publishers, 2007).

The homosexual lobby was quite active and vocal at that time. Shortly before the 1993 DADT policy was implemented, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force was seeking to “gain acceptance into the U.S. military, overturn state sodomy laws, establish laws equating homosexual relationships with marriages and receive health care and insurance benefits for their partners.” A popular photograph at that time was of a woman attached to a cross, dressed in a bikini, with a crown of thorns on her head, a visual statement against traditional Christianity by the group Queer Nation.¹⁶ Also shortly before the 1993 DADT policy was implemented, gay activists were outspoken and brazen in their anti-Christianity and rejection of traditional values.

Michael Swift, a well-known military gay activist, declared, “All laws banning homosexual activity will be revoked. Instead, legislation shall be passed which engenders love between men. All churches who condemn us will be closed. Our only gods are handsome young men.”¹⁷

In April 1993, the nationally syndicated newspaper columnist Mr. Cal Thomas spoke up about the rise of the homosexual movement under the President Clinton administration. He stated,

The open celebration of homosexuality represents the final disconnect from a personal God. If the barrier against societal acceptance of homosexuality fails, there will be no other that can stand. How can pedophiles be kept at bay if their “brothers” and “sisters” are liberated?... That’s why it is necessary to oppose behavior one believes is objectively wrong and counter-productive to the society that tolerates it and to the person who practices it. The shameless promotion of sexual immorality in the streets of our nation’s capital and the public blessing bestowed on it by the President [Clinton] are the latest in a mountain of evidence that proves this nation has forgotten God and is exposing itself to the grave consequences that historically have followed spiritual amnesia.¹⁸

¹⁶ “Is America a Queer Nation?” *Action Alert*, March 1992, p. 1.

¹⁷ “Concerned Women for America Rallies Thousands against Homosexual Bill,” *Concerned Women for America*, October 13, 1992.

¹⁸ Cal Thomas, “Gays Reflect Descent into Decadence,” *Lawrence Eagle Tribune*, April 29, 1993, p. 10.

In October 1992, the American Council for Christian Churches passed a resolution stating, "Although homosexuals make up only a very small fraction of our population, 66% of serial killers in the past 17 years were homosexuals, and 40% of child molestation cases and about 50% of suicides involve gays. Of the 80,799 people who died of AIDS by 1990, 93% were homosexual." The resolution continues, "When one calls attention to these things, he is accused of being a hater or having homophobia. But that is certainly not the case. We do have a fear of AIDS which is largely spread by the homosexual community, the community where it got its start. But we have no phobia about homosexuals."¹⁹

Shortly after the 1993 DADT policy was implemented, Michael Swift of the *Gay community News* stated, "We shall sodomize your sons, emblems of your feeble masculinity. We shall seduce them in your schools, in your dormitories, in your gymnasiums, in your locker rooms, in your sports arenas, in your seminaries, in your youth groups."²⁰

The Larger Agenda

This slippery slope, this moral decline into blind accommodation, has already begun. Today we are reaping what was sown in the early 1990s. For example, only days after the December 2010, DADT policy was removed, Vice President Joseph Biden stated the open thinking both he and President Barack Obama shared in having homosexual marriage legalized nationwide. Mr. Biden was correct in stating that the next likely target for the homosexual lobby will be the 1996 Defense of Marriage Act, which legally stated that marriage is between one man and one woman.²¹

The goals of the homosexual movement are not secret. Ten months before the December 22, 2010, repeal of DADT, advocates of traditional values warned that the President Obama administration was pandering to radical homosexual, transgender, and bisexual activists, lobbies which invested millions of dollars into the Obama presidential election campaign. On February 7, 2010, former Marine Corps officer and combat veteran Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North warned that opening the military to practicing homosexuals would be quickly followed by the potential to accommodate other types of sexual perversion like pedophilia and

¹⁹ "Startling Facts about Homosexuals," *Sword of the Lord*, April 9, 1993, p. 2.

²⁰ "How does it Happen? The Path to Perversion," *Battle Cry*, March/April 1994, p. 1.

²¹ "Biden Says Gay Marriage Inevitable," *CBSNews.com*, December 24, 2010.

same sex marriages. North predicted that groups like NAMBLA (North American Man/Boy Love Association) would celebrate the repeal of DADT and seek to infiltrate the military as well. The President, Colonel North stated, was treating soldiers “like lab rats in a radical social experiment.”²²

The prediction by Oliver North and others that the homosexual lobby and other similar groups would use the repeal of DADT as a foundation for more radical activities was not misguided. For example, the pro-homosexual newspaper *Washington Blade*, only hours after the repeal of DADT, stated that LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender) advocates would use this repeal as a stepping stone for the advancement of their other issues. “It will have implications for state legislative battles and other issues,” the article stated, and “The repeal will have a huge psychological impact on the Senate in terms of passing pro-LGBT legislation in the future....” The article continued, “The repeal of Don’t Ask Don’t Tell helps build momentum in the Senate for LGBT issues....”²³ The next day another article in the *Washington Blade* Stated that homosexual advocates hoped that the repeal of DADT would lead to faster recognition of domestic partner benefits for federal workers; to a passing of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA); and to the implementing of the Uniting American Families Act (UAFA).²⁴ The ENDA seeks to cease discrimination against homosexuals in employment. The UAFA intends to facilitate the uniting of homosexual lovers who are not both American citizens.

Statistics report that the average homosexual man has fifty sexual partners per year.²⁵ That is fifty different male-to-male partners, which means several hundred homosexual experiences annually. We are supposed to believe that it is normal for a man to lust after the body of another man; that it is acceptable for a man to fondle the private sexual parts of another man’s body on average twice or more per week over the course of a year; that anal penetration from one man to another man is routine and normal. Year after year this adds up to thousands of male-to-male sexual experiences. The emotional, physical, and spiritual damage

²² Joe Coscarelli, “Ollie North on Homosexuals in the Military: NAMBLA Members are Next,” February 7, 2010, <http://www.mediate.com/tv/Ollie-north-on-homosexuals-in-the-military-nambla-members-are-next/>. Accessed January 4, 2011.

²³ Chris Johnson, “Don’t Ask Repeal a Tough Act to Follow,” *Washington Blade*, December 22, 2010, <http://www.washingtonblade.com/2010/12/22/dont-ask-dont-tell-a-tough-act-to-follow/>. Accessed January 4, 2011.

²⁴ Kevin Naff, “A Momentous Achievement,” *Washington Blade*, December 23, 2010, <http://www.washingtonblade.com/2010/12/23/a-momentous-achievement/>. Accessed January 4, 2011.

²⁵ George Grant, editor, *Gays in the Military*, (Franklin, TN: Legacy Communications, 1993), p. 14.

of such a perverted lifestyle is incalculable. Yet we are now called to consider this normal behavior which demands our accommodation. Again, please note that these numbers are averages. There will be cases of monogamy between homosexuals; and there will be pathological addiction to gross and repeated homosexual activity.

While the pro-homosexual advocates are celebrating the repeal of DADT in the U.S. military, some of their supporters are seeking to label those opposed to homosexuality as hate groups. Only hours after the repeal of DADT, conservative Christian groups like Concerned Women for America, Focus on the Family, the Family Research Council, the National Organization for Marriage, and other traditional values organizations were labeled by the liberal Southern Poverty and Law Center as hate groups.²⁶ Over the last few decades, as pro-homosexual groups promoted their ideas, conservative Christians reluctantly recognized their right of free speech. Yet when homosexuals made advancement with the repeal of DADT, they label their critics as advocates of hate speech. What unreserved hypocrisy.

Review of the Repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell

A few days before the Senate voted to repeal DADT, Vermont Senator Patrick Leahy was an outspoken supporter of homosexual rights and the repeal of DADT. He called it "the discriminatory Don't Ask Don't Tell policy." He stated that the repeal of DADT would be "one of the major civil rights victories of our lifetimes." He called it "the pursuit of equal rights for all Americans." Leahy said, "Repealing Don't Ask Don't Tell will ensure that we stay true to the principles upon which our great Nation was founded." And he believed that the repeal of DADT would support "the Nation's deepest ideals and the Nation's conscience."²⁷

These statements by Senator Leahy are so misleading that they deserve individual attention.

First, Senator Leahy states that the DADT policy is "discriminatory." The military routinely practices discrimination based on age, physical fitness, mental ability,

²⁶ Stephen Clark, "Conservative Organizations Slam Law Center for labeling them Hate Groups," *Foxnews.com*, Accessed December 24, 2010.

²⁷ "Statement of Senator Patrick Leahy on the Effort to Repeal Don't Ask Don't Tell," December 18, 2010, <http://leahy.senate.gov/press/releases/release/?id=ea53e873-3b55-4c7b-9540-9380>. Accessed December 22, 2010.

and gender. Not everyone can enlist in the military. Not everyone is accepted. Not everyone can do every job. There are standards that must be met. This is discernment and common sense; it is discrimination in the sense that decisions and evaluations are made and some do not qualify. Some are excluded because they do not meet the standard. To say that the DADT policy is discriminatory is a smokescreen, the use of an emotional word “discrimination” to give an impression of a reality which is incorrect. The military does not discriminate against homosexuals any more than it discriminates against obesity, lower intelligence, flat feet, a criminal record, or age requirements. Historically, homosexuals were considered unfit for duty because they did not meet the standard. Their behavior was considered lewd, unhealthy, and immoral and they were not accepted.

Next, Senator Leahy stated that “repeal of DADT would be one of the major civil rights victories of our lifetimes.” This is an outrageous claim. By what standard is homosexuality a civil right? Our founding fathers believed that civil rights came from God as our creator.²⁸ This is an indisputable fact. The original documents which are the foundation of our nation are full of references to God. Although our founding fathers were a diverse group of exceptional men, they did agree on the centrality of civil rights as coming from Heaven.²⁹ It is ridiculous to look at the founding documents of our nation to seek any references or any support for homosexuality as a civil right. Civil rights protect the personal safety of people and property. They insure a moral and ethical standard for behavior and government. While unimaginable to the founding fathers, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) movement, supported by Senator Leahy, seeks to convince us that a man fornicating with other men’s private body parts is a civil right.

Senator Leahy called the repeal of DADT, “the pursuit of equal rights for all Americans.” Here is another emotionally charged phrase, “equal rights.” As Americans we are all expected to be for equal rights. But not always. A thief does not have equal rights to another person’s property. A husband does not have equal rights to beat his wife or not beat his wife. We as a nation of laws restrict equal rights in order to function as a society. Equal rights refer to the fair

²⁸ Tim LaHaye, *Faith of our Founding Fathers*, (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2005), pp. 30-36, 67-79.

²⁹ Alf J. Mapp, *The Faiths of our Founding Fathers: What America’s Founders Really Believed*, (New York: Fall River Press, 2003). Here the author makes the case that not all the founding fathers were conservative, devout Bible-reading Christians. Nevertheless, even for those founding fathers who did not fully accept conservative Christianity, homosexual behavior was repugnant.

application of the law. There are no privileged classes and the law applies to all equally. Homosexuals do not have “equal rights” to practice sodomy. It is a twisting of the intent of equal rights to state that deviant, illegal, and unhealthy behavior is somehow covered under “equal rights.” The founding fathers knew no such application of equal rights; it is unimaginable that they would do so.³⁰

Senator Leahy said, “Repealing Don’t Ask Don’t Tell will ensure that we stay true to the principles upon which our great Nation was founded.” What are those principles and how do they relate to homosexual behavior? Leahy does not say. A founding principle of our nation was that the God of the Bible was to be honored. The originating documents of our nation tell us that Americans are to be a free people who obey the rule of law as all government originates from God. The freedom we Americans enjoy is not unrestricted but applicable for the public good. How homosexual behavior serves the public good is unfathomable, with its high rate of venereal disease, AIDS, rectal cancer, and abbreviated life spans.

Finally, Senator Leahy believes that the repeal of DADT would support “the Nation’s deepest ideals and the Nation’s conscience.” What deep national ideal is realized when a man fondles another man’s private parts? What part of the National conscience is fulfilled when women use their hands, mouths, or sexual toys in erotic sexual acts with other women? Senator Leahy’s words are all bluster with no historical or practical substance. They are words without meaning. His appeal to “the Nation’s deepest ideals and the Nation’s conscience” shows his historical illiteracy as to the values, morals, and leadership principles of America’s founding fathers.

The American founding fathers universally rejected homosexuality. Such acts were illegal from the earliest days of European settlement in America, long before there was a United States. As the United States came into being, diplomats had frequent contact with France. The homosexual subculture of France was repulsive to the American founding fathers. Ambassador John Adams was disgusted with French promiscuity. Gouverneur Morris, himself not socially conservative, was a native of New York who represented Pennsylvania in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Morris traveled to France for his country and was shocked and appalled at the practice of anal sex common in France at that time.³¹ Two of the more socially liberal founding fathers, Benjamin Franklin and

³⁰ For a full treatment on the idea that the nation was founded in liberty and freedom within moral guidelines, see Gary Demar, *America’s Christian Heritage*, (Nashville, TN: Broadman Publishers, 2003), pp.7-37.

³¹ Richard Brookhiser, *What Would the Founding Fathers Do?*, (New York: Basic Books, 2006), pp. 38-41.

Thomas Jefferson, both spent years in France and both were disgusted at homosexual behavior. When the Continental Congress and General George Washington approved the laws which would govern the American Colonial Army, sodomy or homosexual behavior was a punishable offense.³² When Thomas Jefferson drafted a criminal code for Virginia, he would have had sodomites castrated as well as rapists.³³

Comments made at the Signing of the Repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell

As the Senate vote for repeal neared, Rep. Pat Leahy from Vermont was seen on national television advocating the rights of homosexuals to serve in the military. He created a poster which showed four caskets. Each casket had an American flag on it, representing four dead U.S. service members. He stated that it did not matter which of the four deceased were homosexual or not; all had died for their country. All had served well and had paid the ultimate sacrifice. His point was that it did not matter which of the four was a homosexual, for all had served their country equally well. This is an example of creating the paradigm to frame a response. Senator Leahy's smokescreen argument is easily countered by saying, "Which of the deceased was an adulterer? Which was a pedophile? Which of the deceased was a thief or a drug user?" According to Leahy, if all died in the military then all are to be considered noble heroes. But that ignores the fact that the military has legal, ethical, and moral guidelines which must be honored. If a homosexual can be accepted, why cannot a pedophile or an adulterer or a thief be accepted? What is the standard that Senator Leahy uses to say that homosexuality in the military does not matter, as long as the person can do his/her job. You can say the same for a thief, a child abuser, or a drug addict – as long as they can do their job, what does it matter? In fact it does matter a great deal.

Almost two decades ago, Retired Navy Lieutenant Commander Gerry Carroll stated,

I can imagine few things more destructive to the military – upon which we have depended for two hundred years for the safety and security of our way of life – than to try to integrate homosexuals into

³² John Eidsmore, *Gays and Guns: The Case Against Homosexuality in the Military*, (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1993), p. 29.

³³ Richard Brookhiser, *What Would the Founding Fathers Do?*, p. 41.

it. Forcing your servicemen and women to live in the close contact of others with a chosen lifestyle that is utterly repugnant to them will ultimately put this nation in the position of countries like France or the Netherlands, who speak loudly but carry no stick at all... Homosexuality is by its very nature abnormal behavior. So are bestiality, pedophilia, necrophilia, kleptomania, and serial murder. It's true. The military either prevents these people from joining or throws them out when discovered. And they throw them out rather gently, I think. There's really no mark on their record.³⁴

On December 22, 2010, President Barack Obama, surrounded by pro-homosexual politicians, in a room filled with practicing gay, lesbians, transgender, and bisexual fans, signed a repeal of the DADT policy. He not only ignored but rejected the traditional values of the majority of Americans. In disregard of the pleading senior chaplains from the military community to maintain the DADT policy³⁵; and in a complete capitulation to a vocal political lobby which donated millions to his presidential campaign; President Obama signed the repeal.

In statements made at the signing of the repeal of DADT, President Obama revealed his lack of enduring moral clarity. His situational ethics and rejection of traditional Judeo-Christian values was apparent.

For example, President Obama said at the signing of the repeal, "No longer will our country be denied the service of thousands of patriotic Americans who were forced to leave the military – regardless of their skills, no matter their bravery or their zeal, no matter their years of exemplary service – because they happen to be gay."³⁶ Why does the President say it is fine for homosexuals to serve in the military, but it is not all right to have pedophiles, adulterers, thieves, liars, murderers, polygamists, and others in the military? Surely all these people have military skills. Surely they could be patriotic, brave, and zealous. But they are routinely out processed from the military on moral and legal grounds. The same

³⁴ George Grant, editor, *Gays in the Military*, pp. 13-14.

³⁵ On April 28, 2010, a carefully worded six-page document was written to President Barak Obama and Secretary of Defense Robert Gates. This document, signed by forty-one senior career military chaplains, was sent to senior military and political leaders in the United States. The letter urged the president to maintain the DADT policy based on ethical, religious, moral, and morale grounds. The letter also addressed the religious liberties of military chaplains to preach and teach against homosexuality, according to their ministerial training, denominational distinctive, and personal consciences.

³⁶ "President Obama's Speech at DADT Repeal Signing," <http://www.towleroad.com/2010/12/watch-live-president-obama-signs-dadt-repeal-act-of-2010.html>. Accessed December 22, 2010.

has been true historically of homosexuality. The gay lifestyle is deviant behavior, illegal, immoral, and harmful to military readiness and unit cohesion. What is the moral code that allows sodomites in the military but does not allow incest, adultery, and pedophilia? Why in the President's thinking are gays welcomed but other sexual deviants not welcomed? The President and his advisors, educated in a secular America, without embracing traditional American Judeo-Christian values, in defiance of the beliefs of the founding fathers, have given in to a vocal, active, and financially prosperous homosexual political lobby.

At the December 22, 2010, signing of the DADT repeal, President Obama stated "that people will look back on this moment and wonder why it was ever a source of controversy in the first place." This is a remarkable statement. The President is stating his desire that all opposition to homosexuals in the military be forgotten; that those who oppose the repeal of DADT are historically insignificant; and that the moral foundation of our nation, and the clear beliefs of the founding fathers, be considered irrelevant.

The Devastating Effects of Repealing DADT

In my own experience, I was an E-2 private in Army basic training in 1979. I had just completed my 0200-0400 guard duty and returned to the barracks to shower before wake-up at 0430. While in the shower alone I was approached by a sexually aroused male soldier, one of my roommates in the barracks. In the solitude of the showers after 0400 hours he asked me for sex. He pleaded with me to bend over so he could put his penis in my anus and eventually ejaculate. I refused his advances and he departed disappointed. For the few months remaining before graduating basic training, this soldier with homosexual tendencies was my roommate and in my platoon. I was forced to work and sleep ten feet away from a fellow soldier who was sexually attracted to me. The tension between us, and between other males he propositioned for anal sex, was intense. We were in the same group for 24 hours a day. His presence in the unit caused dissension. He was not trusted or respected. No one wanted to be alone with him. From that point on, soldiers showered in large groups to stay away from him. He was a sexual pervert, a predator looking for the weak to prey upon. Morale in our platoon plummeted.

Homosexual behavior in the military can prevent both homosexuals and others from doing their jobs most effectively. The U.S. Supreme Court's 1974 decision in the *Parker vs. Levy* case affirmed that the military is "a specialized society separate from civilian society." That means people are routinely excluded from military service because of physical disqualifications, mental limitations, criminal backgrounds, and the like. Military law still states that "Homosexual behavior is incompatible with military service."³⁷ Illustrations of how homosexual behavior in the military can prevent both homosexuals and others from doing their jobs most effectively are as follows:

Study after study has shown that the most sexually aggressive and sexually irresponsible group in the world is homosexuals. They are between twenty and fifty times more likely to contract sexually transmitted diseases than heterosexuals. Those diseases normally remove an individual from duty status for the course of the treatment. Once again, we can end the effectiveness of his unit; if he's not there, he can't do his job. Also, since members of the military are a walking blood bank, the spread of those diseases to others is a certainty. In addition, 25 to 30 percent of homosexuals are alcoholics as opposed to 10 percent of the general population. In my experience, the vast majority of discipline problems among sailors were attributable – at least in part – to alcohol abuse.³⁸

U.S. Army Colonel David Hackworth (retired) received eight Purple Hearts during his extensive career. He said of homosexuality in the military, "I cannot think of a better way to destroy fighting spirit and gut U.S. combat effectiveness."³⁹ As President Clinton sought to advocate homosexual rights in the military in the early 1990s, he was opposed by Mr. Eldon Yates, chairman of the Vietnam Veteran's Institute. Mr. Yates stated, "At this point we are in opposition based on the traditional reason, that it is a detriment to mission effectiveness and morale."⁴⁰

Repealing the DADT policy is opening the door to the most immoral, irrational, and unhealthy of behavior. Homosexuality is a divisive activity. The lustful pursuits of sodomites are notorious and undeniable. They crave sexual

³⁷ Department of Defense Directive 1332.14, 28 January 1982 for enlisted; and Department of Defense Directive 1332.30, 12 February 1986 for officers.

³⁸ George Grant, editor, *Gays in the Military*, p. 16.

³⁹ Craig A. Rimmerman, editor, *Gay Rights, Military Wrongs: Political Perspectives on Lesbians and Gays in the Military*, (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1996), p. xxi.

⁴⁰ John Eidsmore, *Gays and Guns*, p. 100.

stimulation in a way even animals avoid. Such behavior can destroy the morale and readiness of a military unit. For example, in World War II Italy there were eyewitness reports of a few homosexuals in the U.S. Army who could not keep their hands off each other. The readiness of the unit suffered. In the Korean War, there were times when homosexual superior officers gave awards to their lovers while ignoring non-homosexual soldiers who had earned such awards. Morale plummeted. In World War II in the Pacific, there were reports of homosexual sailors preying on the weak and vulnerable. Lesbian harassment was also noted at that time, creating a work atmosphere of fear, intimidation, manipulation, and guilt.⁴¹

Some might say that reeducation is the key; that through training the military can and will accept homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle. There are serious problems with this idea. First, many of the objections to troops serving with homosexuals are religious objections. Certainly no one in the U.S. government wants to get into the business of teaching what religious beliefs are acceptable and what religious beliefs are not acceptable. Yet this is exactly what a reeducation program advocating homosexuality will produce. Claims of violating First Amendment rights of freedom of religion will be made. Some troops will revolt either by rejecting the training; ignoring the training; filing Inspector General complaints; or frustrated by the system, they could leave the military.⁴²

Then there is the equally volatile issue of military chaplains. There is a deep concern throughout all branches of the Armed Forces, that a repeal of DADT will threaten the religious liberties of military chaplains.⁴³ If the government attempts to normalize homosexuality in the Armed Forces, military chaplains will be torn between political correctness and their doctrinal beliefs. Issues related to how a chaplain preaches or counsels will inevitably result in unwarranted accusations of discrimination. After addressing concerns made by chaplains on the DADT repeal, the paper, *Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell*, on page 136 states, "chaplains, in the context of their religious ministry, are not required to take actions inconsistent with their religious beliefs, but must still care for all Service members." This is a weak

⁴¹ John Eidsmore, *Gays and Guns*, pp. 102-104.

⁴² Amazingly, in a recent Army War College paper on homosexuality and the military, the religious/moral issues involved were not even mentioned. See Dana M. Capozzella, "The Time is Now to Lift the Ban," U.S. Army War College Class of 2008, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA48-6554>. Accessed January 10, 2011.

⁴³ See footnote 35.

concession. The *Report of the Comprehensive Review* proposes that only chaplains may not support the DADT policy's repeal. This will never last. The pressure to conform will be immense. Chaplains who reject the repeal of DADT will be outsiders, not team players, the only service members that do not have to support homosexuality in an equal opportunity capacity. This will never work. The religious liberties of chaplains will inevitably be sacrificed.

Further, the Report makes no allowance for individual service members who have religious objections to the repeal of DADT.

The *Report of the Comprehensive Review* states that reeducation is the key. Not true. If the troops were fully instructed on the Judeo-Christian founding principles of the military; if they were reminded of the position of the founding fathers on homosexuality; if they comprehended that the military was closed to practicing homosexuals from the founding of our country until President Bill Clinton's DADT policy in 1993; if they were educated as to the health risks of the gay lifestyle; and if they were given examples from the past and present about how sodomy is disruptive and offensive and a detriment to unit cohesion; then we might see an overwhelming rejection of the recent repeal of the DADT policy by President Obama. Instead, the homosexual lobby and the Obama administration seek to reeducate or indoctrinate the military to accept homosexual behavior.

One of the most important, yet overlooked, consequences of lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military will be the violation of the First Amendment right of the free exercise of religious beliefs. This will be especially true if the troops are forced to attend equal opportunity or sensitivity training with the goal being the acceptance or toleration of homosexual behavior. With the repeal of DADT, service members will be required to be trained in the government's interpretation of this highly sensitive religious and moral issue. Troops will be forced to change or suppress their religious views to tolerate something they view as abhorrent. The view that homosexuality is normal or morally neutral is a direct assault on many people's religious beliefs. The government will therefore be in the business of changing the deeply held religious beliefs of a huge number of Americans.⁴⁴ This is a flagrant violation of the First Amendment rights which state that the government shall not impose its religious ideas on the population; and that the government shall not prevent the free exercise of religion among the people.

⁴⁴ Gary L. Jarmin, "Homosexual 'Rights' Assault Religious Freedom," *Sword of the Lord*, July 30, 1993, p. 3.

Implementing the Repeal of DADT

The 255 page document, *Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell*, is an interesting, organized, and professional document. It is unknown why there were no military chaplains listed in the Index as part of the senior leadership team that produced this document. My focus will be on evaluating section XIII, Recommendations.

This report refuses to acknowledge that homosexual behavior is deviant, unhealthy, or immoral. To those on the report committee, it appears they viewed homosexual activity the same as one would view being born left handed or with red hair, being born male or female, or born into a minority ethnic group. These are things over which a person has no control. But homosexuality is a behavior chosen and indulged in by an individual. There is no credible scientific study which traces homosexuality to genetics or DNA. There is no such thing as a "gay gene." So immediately the Recommendations section of *Report of the Comprehensive Review*, will be resisted by those who see homosexuality as deviant behavior.⁴⁵

The Report states as its goals that equal opportunity and fairness will be granted to openly practicing homosexuals in the military. The Report says nothing as to why homosexual behavior is to be accepted, but other sexual practices, such as polygamy, pedophilia, bestiality, incest, and the like are not to be repealed. A vast number of Americans see all these sexual sins as similar. All are deviant behavior. All are morally repulsive. All violate traditional values and religious teachings. Then now why is homosexuality supposed to be allowed? Simply because the homosexual lobby over the last 40 years or so has bombarded our morally relativistic culture with its pleas of equal opportunity and fairness for their deviancy. And the culture has caved in.

The *Report of the Comprehensive Review* made recognition of those who hold religious views that reject homosexuality. The Report stated that service members are not being asked to change their religious views, but to treat others (practicing homosexuals) with dignity and respect. This is an oxymoron for many dedicated to their religious beliefs. It is like asking them to treat a wife abuser or a thief or a liar or a child molester with dignity and respect.⁴⁶ While recognizing gay Americans as U.S. citizens, those with deep religious beliefs are repulsed by the

⁴⁵ *Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell*, November 30, 2010, p. 131.

⁴⁶ *Report of the Comprehensive Review*, pp. 131, 134.

moral depravity of homosexual behavior. Asking them to treat sodomites with “dignity and respect” could be considered a direct assault on their religious liberties.

Why are so many people opposed to homosexuality in general and the repeal of DADT in particular? Opposition is mostly because of religious objections based on the Bible. The Report mentioned that they utilized two chaplains in the section on Moral and Religious Concerns. These chaplains represented the almost 3,000 military chaplains now serving worldwide. Other chaplains were invited into the discussion. Virtually all the chaplains recognized homosexuality as a sin, some calling it an abomination while other chaplains were more accommodating under the idea that we are all sinners and a chaplain is to care for all troops.⁴⁷

The Bible has a lot to say about homosexuality, all of it negative.⁴⁸ In the Old Testament, the city of Sodom was destroyed because of its homosexuality (Genesis 19:19-29). In the Levitical law code for ancient Israel, homosexual behavior is repeatedly called an abomination (Leviticus 18:22-29). In the New Testament, homosexual behavior is repeatedly listed with other sins that are worthy of the judgment of God. Such behavior is considered unnatural, immoral, based on carnal lust, and worthy of condemnation (Romans 1:26-27; I Corinthians 6:9-10; I Timothy 1:9-10). Gay rights advocates understand the severity of these condemnations but attempt to explain them away as a matter of private opinion or interpretation. Others say the condemnation was cultural for that place and time, and we today have moved beyond such archaic inhibitions. These are fallacious arguments. Alongside the biblical condemnations of homosexuality are condemnations of incest, bestiality, fornication, lying, thievery, murder, and other sins; but no one is saying these sinful behaviors are outdated or limited by culture or are interpreted too narrowly.⁴⁹

This is why so many are opposed to the homosexual lifestyle and reject the repeal of the DADT policy. The same Bible that condemns homosexuality also condemns lying, cheating, stealing, incest, adultery, murder, and a host of other sins. Why is homosexuality somehow allowed to be removed from this biblical list of sins while other sins remain forbidden? There is no answer. If one deviant behavior is allowed to be removed from the list of forbidden behaviors in the Bible, which

⁴⁷ *Report of the Comprehensive Review*, p. 134.

⁴⁸ Greg L. Bahnsen, *Homosexuality: A Biblical View*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992). P. Michael Ukleja, “Homosexuality and the Old Testament,” *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July-September, 1983, pp. 259-266.

⁴⁹ John Eidsmore, *Gays and Guns*, pp. 63-64.

one is next? Who makes that decision? Our founding fathers, as well as those millions of Americans who seek to follow the teachings of the Bible, reject homosexuality as deviant, immoral, and ungodly behavior; just as lying, cheating, adultery, murder, incest, and other forbidden behaviors are rejected.

As former California Congressman William Dannemeyer stated, the pro-homosexual movement demands that those with traditional Judeo-Christian values conform or be silent. It is not that simple. For many traditionalists, being asked to accept homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle is asking them to discard their basic religious and moral guidelines. It is analogous to asking a medical professional to discard the Hippocratic Oath, or a scientist to ignore the laws of physics, or a carpenter to ignore building codes. The moral guidelines that the Bible expresses, that our founding fathers accepted, and that millions of Americans live by today condemn homosexuality.⁵⁰ No one asks a physician to apply only part of the Hippocratic Oath. Scientists do not follow only some of the laws of physics. No one would want to live in a home where only part of the building is up to code. Asking those who embrace traditional Judeo-Christian values to accept homosexuality, or attempting to reeducate them into tolerating such behavior, directly impinges upon the religious liberties and moral guidelines on which our nation was founded.

Reported instances of homosexual activity in the military are relatively few. The DADT ban is working. There is not a single reason related to military readiness that supports lifting DADT. Three medical professionals, Dr. Peter Goyer, Dr. James Gilmore, and Dr. Henry Eddleman, have done extensive research on homosexual rape in the military. Working primarily with Sailors and Marines, they acknowledged that the DADT ban restricting acts of homosexuality was working. Dr. Gilmore stated his fear of what would happen if homosexual activity were ever openly allowed in the military:

There is no doubt that in a semi-closed community like the armed forces, tragic incidents like these can and do occur – sometimes more than we'd like to admit. But there is also no doubt that they are ameliorated in both their frequency and intensity by an enforced code of conduct. The very fact that homosexual activity within the four branches of the service has always been forced underground is testimony to the efficacy of the ban – in both inhibiting that activity

⁵⁰ William Dannemeyer, *Shadow in the Land: Homosexuality in America*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989), p. 91.

and protecting innocent parties from libertine unrestraint. Without such a code, violations of persons, property, and propriety would undeniably escalate beyond bearable limits – and commanding officers would be left without appropriate disciplinary recourse. The ban is a necessary hedge of protection against any further moral or strategic erosions.⁵¹

Summary

As stated previously, in my own experience, as a private in Army basic training in 1979, I was approached by an aroused soldier and propositioned for anal sex in a shower. He pleaded with me to put his penis in my anus for him to eventually ejaculate. For the remaining time before graduating basic training, this soldier with homosexual tendencies created tension, caused disruption, and lowered morale. We were forced to work and sleep ten feet away from a fellow soldier who was sexually attracted to other males. For 24 hours a day, the tension between us, and between other males he propositioned for anal sex, was constant. He was not trusted or respected. From that point on, soldiers showered in large groups to stay away from him. No one wanted to work alone with him. He was a sexual pervert, insatiable, a predator looking for the weak to prey upon. Morale in our platoon plummeted.

The contradictory claims of the homosexual lobby are confusing. They argue that the DADT ban costs the military manpower, yet they ignore the unhealthy effects of the gay lifestyle, with medical implications making them unfit for duty. They say they do not want to be identified by their sexual orientation, yet they demand special recognition based on that orientation. And gay activists insist the way to eliminate prejudice and foster acceptance is to educate the public about homosexuality; yet they are outraged when the graphic details about homosexual practices and health hazards are presented.⁵²

Over the last 30-40 years, the pro-homosexual movement has gained momentum. Much of their gain can be attributed to the weak moral voice of the clergy. The waffling of the clergy has resulted in many churches closing from lack of interest, with others open as not much more than social clubs. The last few generations in

⁵¹ George Grant, editor, *Gays in the Military*, p. 23.

⁵² John Eidsmore, *Gays and Guns*, p. 114.

America have been educated in a secular environment. Moral values have declined while crime rates increase; numbers of children born outside marriage is on the rise; the demands for abortions are relentless; and the divorce rate is about 50%, meaning many American children today are raised in broken homes. The results of this cultural demise are a general decrease in the decency, safety, and politeness of our culture, with increased suicide rates and societal dysfunction.

As part of this moral catastrophe, the homosexual movement no longer wants to be called sodomites, but gays. Their preference for same sex relationships is now called sexual orientation, in an attempt to take away the consequences of moral decision making for the tired and flawed argument that homosexuality is a genetic disposition. We are told that male-on-male sexual intercourse is an alternative lifestyle. In this moral madness, the liberal pro-homosexual culture seeks to redefine morality and acceptable behavior to suit their perverted and deviant lifestyles.⁵³

An effective military force must be physically fit. Homosexual advocates for open service in the military definitely avoid this point. According to the Centers for Disease Control, nearly two-thirds of all AIDS cases in the United States are directly attributable to homosexual activity. But AIDS is not the only health risk from homosexual behavior:

[A] compilation of recent health studies shows that homosexuals account for a disproportionate number of America's most serious sexually transmitted diseases. Homosexual youths [of military age] are 23 times more likely to contract a sexually-transmitted disease than heterosexual youths. Lesbians are 19 times more likely than heterosexual women to have syphilis, twice as likely to suffer from genital warts, and four times as likely to have scabies. Male homosexuals are 14 times more likely to have syphilis than male heterosexuals.⁵⁴

The results of this lack of physical readiness by homosexuals in the military will be detrimental to good order and discipline. Morale will erode. Added to this, a report by the National Lesbian-Gay Health Association acknowledged that

⁵³ William Dannemeyer, *Shadow in the Land*, pp. 125-134.

⁵⁴ Robert Knight, "Sexual Disorientation: Family Research in the Homosexual Debate," (Family Research Council, Washington, DC, June 1992), p. 6.

homosexuals are about three times more likely than heterosexuals to have alcohol or drug abuse problems. The result is that homosexuals have a relatively short average life expectancy of forty-one years. They therefore pose a severe health hazard for themselves and other military personnel, with whom they are forced to live, eat, and sleep in close quarters.⁵⁵ The fact that serious medical issues were glossed over in the *Report of the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell*, is mind-boggling,⁵⁶ and shows just how far the medical community has succumbed to the political correctness of the pro-homosexual movement.

The *Report of the Comprehensive Review* states that, "First and foremost, successful implementation of a repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell requires strong leadership, a clear message, and proactive training and education."⁵⁷ Let's think about that. One could say that the fact that DADT is even considered for repeal is a failure in moral "leadership." As far as the military voicing a "clear message," this will be impossible while military chaplains, who by military regulation are the ethical and moral advisors to commanders, are not supportive of the repeal of DADT. And as far as "proactive training and education," service members with traditional values will reject this reclassifying and ignoring of traditional morality, biblical teaching, and the anti-homosexual ideas of the founding fathers. The offices of chaplains and legal representatives and Inspector General offices will be swarmed with disenfranchised Soldiers, Sailors, Air Men and Marines who will not tolerate such social engineering in the military. Good order and discipline will suffer. Military readiness will be hindered. Our troops are not laboratory animals to be indoctrinated to the latest moral fad. Homosexual behavior is wrong on many counts and should not be openly tolerated in the United States military.

I am currently serving in my 28th year in the military with the rank of Colonel. I believe repealing Don't Ask Don't Tell is a very bad idea. As a veteran with service all over the world and having completed numerous short deployments, I can say that this repeal will hurt recruiting. It will hinder retention. It will lower morale. There will be health issues. It will be a huge moral problem for military chaplains in preaching, counseling, and supporting soldiers. There was no military reason to repeal DADT. It is a politically correct social experimentation by an active homosexual lobby. It has nothing to do with making our military stronger.

⁵⁵ John Eidsmore, *Gays and Guns*, pp. 79, 115.

⁵⁶ *Report of the Comprehensive Review*, pp. 148-149.

⁵⁷ *Report of the Comprehensive Review*, p. 132.

The December 2010, repeal of DADT opposes American traditional values. The deeply held religious beliefs of many Americans, that homosexuality is biblically, morally and socially a sin must now be repressed. Now, instead of the homosexuals in the military being silent and keeping their objections to DADT to themselves, the homosexuals can openly practice their lifestyle; while those who accept traditional morality and reject the repeal of DADT on religious grounds are told to be silent. The homosexual lobby has succeeded in duping many of our morally challenged and historically clueless political and military leaders into a complete reversal of the DADT policy. Now those with traditional religious values are told to be quiet and to conform and are considered outsiders, in suppression of their religious freedoms.