

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Legislative Affairs

Series/Staff Member: Felton Newell

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 5280

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Gays in the Military

Stack:

S

Row:

26

Section:

6

Shelf:

9

Position:

2

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

SUBJECT: Policy on Homosexual Conduct in the Armed Forces

On January 29, 1993, the President directed me to review DoD policy on homosexuals in the military. The President further directed that the DoD policy be "practical, realistic, and consistent with the high standards of combat effectiveness and unit cohesion our armed forces must maintain."

An extensive review was conducted. I have paid careful attention to the hearings that have been held by both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, conferred with the Joint Chiefs and acting Secretaries of the Military Departments and considered recommendations of a working group of senior officers in the Department of Defense and those of the Rand Corporation.

The Department of Defense has long held that, as a general rule, homosexuality is incompatible with military service because it interferes with the factors critical to combat effectiveness, including unit morale, unit cohesion and individual privacy. Nevertheless, the Department of Defense also recognizes that individuals with a homosexual orientation have served with distinction in the armed services of the United States.

Therefore, it is the policy of the Department of Defense to judge the suitability of persons to serve in the armed forces on the basis of their conduct. Homosexual conduct will be grounds for separation from the military services. Sexual orientation is considered a personal and private matter, and homosexual orientation is not a bar to service entry or continued service unless manifested by homosexual conduct.

I direct the following:

Applicants for military service will not be asked or required to reveal their sexual orientation. Applicants will be informed of accession and separation policy.

Servicemembers will be separated for homosexual conduct.

Commanders and investigating agencies will not initiate inquiries or investigations solely to determine a member's sexual orientation. Servicemembers will not be asked or required to reveal their sexual orientation. However, commanders will

continue to initiate inquiries or investigations, as appropriate, when there is credible information that a basis for discharge or disciplinary action exists. Authority to initiate inquiries and investigations involving homosexual conduct shall be limited to commanders. Commanders will consider, in allocating scarce investigative resources, that sexual orientation is a personal and private matter. They will investigate allegations of violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice in an even-handed manner without regard to whether the conduct alleged is heterosexual or homosexual or whether it occurs on-base or off-base. Commanders remain responsible for ensuring that investigations are conducted properly and that any abuse of authority is addressed.

The constraints of military service require servicemembers to keep certain aspects of their personal lives private for the benefit of the group. Our personnel policies will be clearly stated and implemented in accordance with due process of law.

Commanders remain responsible for maintaining good order and discipline. Harassment or violence against other servicemembers will not be tolerated.

Homosexual conduct is a homosexual act, a statement by the servicemember that demonstrates a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts, or a homosexual marriage or attempted marriage.

A statement by a servicemember that he or she is homosexual or bisexual creates a rebuttable presumption that the servicemember is engaging in homosexual acts or has a propensity or intent to do so. The servicemember has the opportunity to present evidence that he does not engage in homosexual acts and does not have a propensity or intent to do so. The evidence will be assessed by the relevant separation authority.

A homosexual act includes any bodily contact, actively undertaken or passively permitted, between members of the same sex for the purpose of satisfying sexual desires or any bodily contact which a reasonable person would understand to demonstrate a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts. Sexual orientation is a sexual attraction to individuals of a particular sex.

The interim policy and administrative separation procedures that I established on February 3, 1993, will remain in effect until October 1, 1993. Secretaries of the Military Departments and responsible officials within the Office of the Secretary of Defense shall, by October 1, 1993, take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this directive. Secretaries of the Military Departments will ensure that all members of the armed forces are aware of their specific responsibilities in carrying out this new policy. This

memorandum creates no substantive or procedural rights. Any changes to existing policies shall be prospective only.

Policy Guidelines are attached.

cc: Secretary of Transportation

POLICY GUIDELINES ON HOMOSEXUAL CONDUCT IN THE ARMED FORCES

Summary of Policy

- Accession Policy
 - Applicants for military service will no longer be asked or required to reveal if they are homosexual or bisexual, but applicants will be informed of the conduct that is proscribed for members of the armed forces, including homosexual conduct.
- Discharge Policy
 - Sexual orientation will not be a bar to service unless manifested by homosexual conduct. The military will discharge members who engage in homosexual conduct, which is defined as a homosexual act, a statement that the member is homosexual or bisexual, or a marriage or attempted marriage to someone of the same gender.
- Investigations Policy
 - No investigations or inquiries will be conducted solely to determine a servicemember's sexual orientation. Commanders will initiate inquiries or investigations when there is credible information that a basis for discharge or disciplinary action exists. Sexual orientation, absent credible information that a crime has been committed, will not be the subject of a criminal investigation. An allegation or statement by another that a servicemember is a homosexual, alone, is not grounds for either a criminal investigation or a commander's inquiry.

Activities

- Bodily contact between servicemembers of the same sex that a reasonable person would understand to demonstrate a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts (e.g., handholding or kissing in most circumstances) will be sufficient to initiate separation.
- Activities such as association with known homosexuals, presence at a gay bar, possessing or reading homosexual publications, or marching in a gay rights rally in civilian clothes will not, in and of themselves, constitute credible information that would provide a

basis for initiating an investigation or serve as the basis for an administrative discharge under this policy.

- The listing by a servicemember of someone of the same gender as the person to be contacted in case of emergency, as an insurance beneficiary or in a similar context, does not provide a basis for separation or further investigation.
- Speech within the context of priest-penitent, husband-wife or attorney-client communications remains privileged.

Off-Base Conduct

- No distinction will be made between off-base and on-base conduct.
- From the time a member joins the service until discharge, the servicemember's duty and commitment to the unit is a 24 hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week obligation. Military members are required to comply with both the UCMJ, which is federal law, and military regulations at all times and in all places. Unacceptable conduct, homosexual or heterosexual, is not excused because the servicemember is not "at work."

Investigations and Inquiries

- Neither investigations nor inquiries will be conducted solely to determine an individual's sexual orientation.
- Commanders can initiate investigations into alleged homosexual conduct when there is credible information of homosexual acts, prohibited statements or homosexual marriage.
- Commanders will exercise sound discretion regarding when credible information exists, and will evaluate the information's source and all attendant circumstances to assess whether the information supports a reasonable belief that a servicemember has engaged in proscribed homosexual conduct. Commanders, not investigators, determine when sufficient credible information exists to justify a detail of investigative resources to look into allegations.

Credible Information

- Credible information of homosexual conduct exists when the information, considered in light of its source and all attendant circumstances, supports a reasonable belief that a servicemember has engaged in such conduct. It requires a determination based on articulable facts, not just a belief or suspicion.

Security Clearances

- Questions pertaining to an individual's sexual orientation are not asked on personnel security questionnaires. An individual's sexual conduct, whether homosexual or heterosexual, is a legitimate security concern only if it could make an individual susceptible to exploitation or coercion, or indicate a lack of trustworthiness, reliability, or good judgment that is required of anyone with access to classified information.

The Threat of Extortion

- As long as servicemembers continue to be separated from military service for engaging in homosexual conduct, credible information of such behavior can be a basis for extortion. Although the military cannot eliminate the potential for the victimization of homosexuals through blackmail, the policy reduces the risk to homosexuals by making certain categories of information largely immaterial to the military's initiation of investigations.
- Only credible information that a servicemember engaged in homosexual conduct will form the basis for initiating an inquiry or investigation of a servicemember; suspicion of an individual's sexual orientation is not a basis, by itself, for official inquiry or action.
- Extortion is a criminal offense, under both the UCMJ and United States Code, and offenders will be prosecuted. A servicemember convicted of extortion risks dishonorable discharge and up to three years confinement. Civilians found guilty of blackmail under the U.S. Code may be subject to a \$2000 fine and one-year imprisonment. The risk of blackmail will be addressed by educating all servicemembers on the policy and by emphasizing the significant criminal sanctions facing convicted extortionists.

Outing

- A mere allegation or statement by another that a servicemember is a homosexual is not grounds for official action. Commanders will not take official action against members based on rumor, suspicion or capricious allegations.
- However, if a third party provides credible information that a member has committed a crime or act that warrants discharge, e.g., engages in homosexual conduct, the commander may, based on the totality of the circumstances, conduct an investigation or inquiry, and take non-judicial or administrative action or recommend judicial action, as appropriate.
- Commanders are responsible for initiating an investigation when credible information exists that a crime or basis for discharge has been committed. The commander examines the information and decides whether an investigation by the Service investigative agency or a commander inquiry is warranted, or if no action should be taken.

Harassment

- Commanders are responsible for maintaining good order and discipline.
- All servicemembers will be treated with dignity and respect. Hostile treatment or violence against a servicemember based on a perception of his or her sexual orientation will not be tolerated.

June 16, 1993

MEMORANDUM

To: Ann Walker, Special Assistant to the President
Office of Communications Research
Fax: Stuart Trevelyan, Legislative Affairs
From: Dan Meyer, Research Assistant
Subj: PRESS CONFERENCE, NATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO KEEP THE BAN ON HOMOSEXUALS IN THE
MILITARY, U.S. CAPITOL, HC-9.

Overview. Rep. Cliff Stearns (R-FL), Chairman, Military Personnel Task Force (as appointed by the House Republican Congressional Research Committee) convened a press conference with seven other congresspersons and the spokesmen of nine special interest lobbies after the group met behind closed doors for about forty-five minutes. The conference unveiled the three television advertisements designed to simultaneously collect petition names and credit card donations to the "National Campaign to Keep the Ban on Homosexuals in the Military." The conference was laced with moral statements and harsh commentary on the state of national security.

- o Throughout the opening remarks, reference was made about "opposition." The conference is best viewed as the far right's attempt to formalize opposition to the President's plan and to raise public support for their bill: the Military Readiness Act of 1993. Passage of the MRA would legislate the ban on homosexuality in the armed forces.

Participants and Highlights of their Remarks. Only six of the congressman and lobbyists who attended the conference made substantive remarks:

- o **Duncan Hunter (R-CA).** Made no comments, but issued a written statement explaining his role as Chairman, House Republican Research Committee and as President of the "bipartisan" American Security Council (ASC). The ASC is the "holding company" uniting the governmental and civilian research and lobbying efforts associated with maintaining the ban against homosexuality.

- o **Cliff Stearns (R-FL).** Rep. Stearns opened the conference by quoting General Schwartzkopf's line before Congress, "Process is not broken." Rep. Stearns explained his charge by the House Republican Research Committee to "find the facts" underlying the issue of gays in the military. Stearns presented a brief review of the

CLIFF STEARNS, FLORIDA
CHAIRMAN

JON KYL, ARIZONA
CO-CHAIRMAN

1622 LONGWORTH H.C.
(202) 225-0871



**TASK FORCE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL
HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

Mr. John M. Fisher
Chairman and CEO
American Security Council Foundation
Congressional Conference Center
Boston, Virginia 22713

Dear John:

I am writing in my role as Chairman of the Military Personnel Task Force of the House Republican Research Committee. The Task Force has sponsored many in-depth hearings on the various aspects of President Clinton's decision to lift the ban on homosexuals serving in the Armed Forces.

As you may know, my colleagues and I have heard testimony from many prominent retired flag and general officers. These retired military leaders were adamantly opposed to President Clinton's decision, but my Task Force colleagues also wanted to learn the views of all active duty Admirals and Generals. Accordingly, Rear Admiral Robert H. Spiro, Jr. USNR (Ret.), the former Under Secretary of the Army during the Carter Administration, and I developed the enclosed "Confidential Survey."

This was mailed to all 1,040 U.S. flag and general officers throughout the world, and the 621 responses we received are enclosed. The purpose of this letter is to make a formal request of the bipartisan American Security Council Foundation to conduct a statistical analysis of the survey.

I would like to share the results of this analysis with my colleagues and the news media. For this reason, I am hoping you will be able to provide us with a statistical breakdown for every question in the survey. It will also assist us if you can provide an overall analysis, as well as results for each of the individual services.

My colleagues on the Military Personnel Task Force will be conducting a media briefing on Wednesday, June 30th, and we would like to release your analysis of the "Confidential Survey" at that time. If your staff has any questions about this project and our methodology please have them contact Kevin Fitzpatrick at 225-0871. Many thanks.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Cliff Stearns".

cliff Stearns
Chairman



AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

June 30, 1993

The Honorable Cliff Stearns
Chairman
Military Personnel Task Force
1622 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In response to your recent request, I am pleased to enclose our analysis of the "Confidential Survey" of flag and general officers conducted by the Military Personnel Task Force. The bipartisan National Security Caucus Institute of the American Security Council Foundation received completed surveys from 621 Admirals and Generals on June 22nd. Over the next week, the ASCF staff tabulated responses for all of your survey questions. As requested, we are providing you with an overall report as well as a statistical breakdown for each of the services. The attached report also describes the survey's methodology, and provides a summary of our analysis.

As you may know, the American Security Council Foundation was formed in 1958, and is a tax exempt public policy research, analysis and educational organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The ASCF staff is available to answer any questions regarding methodology, statistical analysis, or our overall summary.

We hope you find this analysis useful, and we were pleased to have the opportunity to assist the Military Personnel Task Force.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "John M. Fisher".

John M. Fisher
Chairman and CEO

cc: Honorable Duncan Hunter
Honorable Joe Barton
Honorable Robert K. Dornan
Honorable Sam Johnson
Honorable Jon Kyl



AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY OF 1,040 ACTIVE DUTY U.S. FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICERS

SPONSORED BY
THE MILITARY PERSONNEL TASK FORCE
OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE

METHODOLOGY AND SUMMARY
BY THE
AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

DATES: JUNE 7-21, 1993

NUMBER RESPONDING: 621

Methodology

The Military Personnel Task Force survey was sent to 1,040 flag and general officers in the U.S. Armed Forces between June 7th and 21st, 1993. The total number of respondents as of June 22nd was 621 active duty general officers.

The respondents were asked by Chairman Cliff Stearns of the Task Force not to reveal their identity, either name or command, in order to ensure complete candor. For statistical purposes only, respondents were asked to identify their service branch in order to determine whether there were major ideological differences among the services. The Military Personnel Task Force did not identify the return survey in any way.

According to Chairman Stearns, "The purpose of this survey is to help educate decision-makers about the current attitudes of those who serve in leadership positions within the United States military. The views of those currently in command positions are perhaps the most important factor in helping policymakers deal with this contentious issue."

Summary

Of the 621 officers who responded, 602 indicated opposition to lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military. Additional probing revealed that these reservations were based on practical issues such as lower recruitment, health risks, housing and training, and opposition of leaders such as General Colin Powell for reasons of morale and discipline. When such issues are introduced by the unique reality of the military, the officers conclude, by a roughly 31 to 1 ratio, that they are unwilling to force the military to accept homosexuals.

Among findings of the Confidential Survey were the following:

- * By a strong majority, 97.6% of the surveyed officers agree with General Colin Powell's statement that allowing homosexuals in the military would be "prejudicial to good order and discipline." Only 13 officers, or 2.1%, disagree. This is a very significant finding when most officers favor the opinion of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff over their Commander-in-Chief.
- * When asked whether they view the issue of gays in the military as one of civil rights or national security, 88.7% of the officers indicated that it is solely an issue of national security. 6% said it was exclusively an issue of civil rights.
- * By a 15 to 1 ratio, a vast majority of senior officers believe that heterosexual soldiers should not be forced to share the same sleeping and bath facilities with homosexual soldiers. According to the survey, 97.6% of the officers believe that young people will be less likely to join the military if the gay ban is lifted and service members are forced to share shower, toilet and sleeping facilities with homosexuals. 0.48% say young people will be more likely to join the military.
- * When considering the health risks associated with accepting homosexuals in the military, a majority of officers, 82.3%, responded that it would pose a substantial threat. Concerns center around HIV and AIDS prevalence in the homosexual community and the dangers of infecting the military's "walking blood supply."
- * When officers were asked about the effects of open homosexuals in the military, of greatest concern was the conclusion that acknowledged homosexuals would undermine soldier morale and the cohesiveness and readiness of the combat unit. 98.1% of those responding indicated a possible detrimental effect on the morale of those in uniform. 99% said open homosexuals would significantly disrupt unit cohesion and readiness.
- * A strong majority of officers believes that forcing the military to accept homosexuals would hurt our all-volunteer military's recruiting efforts. 98.4% indicated that some heterosexual soldiers would be deterred from serving. Interestingly, however, only 52.5% indicated that it would lead to large numbers of heterosexual soldiers seeking discharges.
- * Another interesting result of the poll appears to be that while 58.9% of the officers believe they could give a fair performance evaluation of a homosexual soldier under their command, only 28.2% believe they would receive a fair evaluation from a homosexual counterpart if he were a commanding officer.
- * The results of this survey clearly indicate that the nation's senior military leadership has underlying, deeply-felt concerns about President Clinton's proposals.



Center for Military Readiness

P.O. Box 2324 ★ Livonia, Michigan 48151
313/464-9430 ★ Fax 313/464-6678

ELAINE DONNELLY
President

PENTAGON PLAYING SPECIAL INTEREST POLITICS

Board of Advisors

GEN. ROBERT H. BARROW
FORMER COMMANDANT, USMC RET.

ALLAN CARLSON, PhD
President, Rockford Institute

VICE ADM. DUDLEY CARLSON
USN RET.

LINDA CHAVEZ
Senior Fellow, Manhattan Institute

RG SAMUEL G. COCKERHAM
USA RET.

LTG DANIEL O. GRAHAM, USA RET.
Director, High Frontier

DAVID HOROWITZ
President, Center for the Study of
Popular Culture

BEVERLY LAHAYE
President,
Concerned Women for America

CAPT. EUGENE B. "RED" MCDANIEL
USN RET.
President, American Defense Institute

LT COL. OLIVER NORTH, USMC RET.
President, Freedom Alliance

KATE WALSH O'BEIRNE

COL. JOHN RIPLEY, USMC RET.

PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY
President, Eagle Forum

LTG RICHARD G. TIERNEY, USA RET.

MSGT SARAH F. WHITE, USAFR

For Immediate Release

June 30, 1993

Elaine Donnelly, President of the Center for Military Readiness, charged today that the process being followed by the Department of Defense to formulate policy on homosexuals in the military is being undermined and skewed by special interest politics.

She also pointed out that because of exclusive, insider access to Pentagon policy-makers during the deliberations of an internal DOD Military Working Group, it appears that activists for attorneys representing homosexual groups will be well-positioned to exploit irreconcilable contradictions in any form of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy that might be endorsed by the Administration.

"Homosexual activists are complaining that the various "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" proposals, including one being promoted by Rep. Barney Frank, are unacceptable to them. The truth is, however, that the Campaign for Military Service and their attorneys were granted direct access to the Pentagon's Working Group during their secret policy-making process, while individuals and groups opposed to lifting the ban were not invited to address the group until *after* the Policy Outline, dated June 8, had been completed.

"The Working Group refused to answer questions about the status of the report, or what was presented to them by the Campaign for Military Service, whose President, David Mixner, raised \$3.4 million for the President's campaign. In addition, President Clinton and White House officials have reportedly met twice with homosexual activists, while organizations opposed to lifting the ban have not, to my knowledge, enjoyed similar access."

Mrs. Donnelly continued, "The result of this politically-charged process is a set of recommendations that constitute a collection of contradictions and strategic loopholes that will be easy to exploit in future court challenges. I am also concerned that the current Administration's Department of Justice is too

PAGE 2 -- CENTER FOR MILITARY READINESS

politicized to defend the interests of the military if the shaky premises of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" are adopted and then challenged in court.

Mrs. Donnelly also released a brief summary listing twenty-one points of concern raised by the Military Working Group's Policy Outline.

"Barney Frank is right in suggesting that any form of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" that passes Congress would be an important first step in achieving the gay agenda. This is why nothing short of codification of the ban as it was prior to January, 1993 will serve to preserve the interests of men and women in uniform."

The Center for Military Readiness is a public policy educational organization that is concerned with military personnel issues. During 1992, Mrs. Donnelly served as a member of the Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces. Mrs. Donnelly can be reached in Washington D.C. at 202/544-0355.

* * * * *

TWENTY-ONE PROBLEMS WITH "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL" -- HOMOSEXUALS IN THE MILITARY --

**Re: OSD Military Working Group -- Recommended Policy Outline
Submitted to the Secretary of Defense 8 June 1993**

The Pentagon's latest version of a Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy is *unacceptable*. It is full of ambiguities and loopholes that will invite successful litigation by activist groups seeking to repeal the ban on homosexuality in the military. If adopted as a so-called "compromise," the policy's contradictory statements and vague definitions would make it relatively easy for attorneys for homosexual groups to achieve their goals through the courts, rather than the Congress.

Regardless of the details, any "compromise" policy that declares homosexual conduct to be incompatible with military service, but permits those who commit homosexual acts to join, is in direct contradiction with itself. The shaky premises behind all versions of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" will please no one but an army of activist attorneys.

"Don't Ask, Don't Tell" schemes cannot replace the clear, legally defensible policies which existed prior to January of 1993. The classic concept that "homosexuality is incompatible with military service" must be codified in law, not rendered meaningless for the sake of political expediency and social experimentation.

- 1) The first point listed under the Outline's "Key Policy Features" indicates that *"Sexual orientation will be considered a personal and private matter. The Armed Forces won't ask and no one will be required to reveal their sexual orientation."*
- 2) This policy *contradicts* and cancels out the fundamental principle of current policy that *"homosexuality is incompatible with military service"*--which is mentioned, but only in a secondary "Discussion" section. If this is the policy, why is it not in the policy statement?
- 3) Once the military embraces the "personal and private" idea it undermines its ability to legally defend the "incompatible with military service" concept. Creating a new "right of privacy" would also create new problems because in the military, *any* kind of privacy is at a premium.
- 4) Questions regarding homosexuality are no more unreasonable than those asked about drug abuse, underage drinking, or other problems with the law.
- 5) The second point says that *"The presence in the Armed Forces of persons who engage in homosexual acts; who state they are homosexual or bisexual; or marry or attempt to marry persons of the same gender remains inconsistent with the requirement to maintain high standards of combat effectiveness and unit cohesion."*

- 6) The underlined phrase above appears to support the military judgement that "homosexuality is incompatible with military service," but it imposes a burden of proof regarding "combat effectiveness and unit cohesion" that would be extremely difficult for commanders to meet, especially in peacetime.
- 7) A change of this kind would likely be construed by future courts as significant legislative history in favor of the homosexual agenda.
- 8) The statement is also vulnerable to challenge because of the legally shaky premise that being a homosexual in the military is acceptable, but *saying* that you are is not.
- 9) Secrecy does not resolve the medical problem. Since homosexual activity is known to create high risk of HIV infection and other sexually-transmitted diseases, forbidding commanders to ask precautionary questions denies military people the same protection as civilians, who are asked many personal questions about prior sexual activity before they are allowed to donate blood.
- 10) The third point amplifies the contradiction by stating that "*Sexual orientation alone is not a bar to service entry or continued service unless manifested by homosexual acts, statements, or marriages.*"
- 11) In addition to conflicting with the "incompatible with military service" standard, this point implies that persons with a homosexual orientation can join the service if they remain both silent and celibate. This is unrealistic, unenforceable, and unacceptable to both sides.
- 12) LTC William J. Gregor (USA Ret), a former Professor of Military Science at the University of Michigan outlines a likely scenario:

If a recruit is not asked about the "private matter" of his homosexuality upon entry, his attorney would argue that since his sexual conduct prior to induction was not important to the military, his sexual behavior after induction ought not be important either. Furthermore, if his sexual orientation were revealed indirectly—absent evidence of a homosexual act—he could and would argue that it is not a valid basis for separation.

In other words, if the military judgement that homosexuality is incompatible with military discipline is set aside, then the military judgement that particular behavior is disruptive becomes suspect and subject to challenge in court.
- 13) Point four creates a legal nightmare for commanders trying to enforce contradictory policies.

- 14) There is no definition of what kind of "credible information" may allow a commander to initiate an inquiry or investigation regarding homosexuality. Under current policy, persons belonging to the class known as "homosexuals" are defined by their intention to engage in homosexual acts.
- 15) Inflammatory language in the document's "Investigative Policy Statement" referring to "witchhunts, etc." would also deter commanders from fulfilling their responsibilities to "be vigilant in inspecting the conduct of all persons placed under their command (and) to guard against and suppress all dissolute and immoral practices." (Section 5947, Title 10, USC)
- 16) Point five appears to toughen the policy, because it would punish (with discharge) any servicemember who engages in "any act involving bodily contact...between members of the same sex for purposes of sexual gratification."
- 17) At the present time, a single act which is not likely to recur and was not accompanied by force or coercion is not considered a threat to good order and discipline, and therefore does not constitute grounds for dismissal on the grounds of homosexuality. (This is for the protection of a young service member who, for example, may do something out of character while drunk and on liberty, but is not a homosexual.)
- 18) The proposed "tougher" standard may be more vulnerable, however, to legal challenge. Current policies have withstood challenge because they do not split hairs over orientation and action; persons belonging to the class known as "homosexuals" are defined by their intention and desire to engage in homosexual acts.
- 19) Point 6 calls for an "education plan" to inform all personnel about the policy *"so as to reinforce the principle that all service members can serve without fear of unwarranted intrusions into their personal lives."*
- 20) The neutral-sounding wording cannot disguise what would quickly become an all-out internal campaign to promote acceptance of homosexuality in the military, executed with the full force of military discipline. It will, in effect, teach servicemembers how to tolerate behavior in others that is contrary to the US Code of Military Justice.
- 21) The educational plan also departs from the concept that the needs of the military must take precedence over the needs and desires of individuals. The long-term consequences of such a radical change in the principles that govern the military would be truly revolutionary and contrary to the best interests of our armed forces.

CLIFF STEARNS, FLORIDA
CHAIRMAN

JON KYL, ARIZONA
CO-CHAIRMAN



1622 LONGWORTH HOB
(202) 225-0871

**TASK FORCE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL
HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

**FOR IMMEDIATE
RELEASE**

**CONTACT: Kevin Fitzpatrick
202-225-0871**

**NEW CONGRESSIONAL SURVEY OF ALL ACTIVE-DUTY
ADMIRALS AND GENERALS SHOWS OVERWHELMING
OPPOSITION TO LIFTING MILITARY GAY BAN**

**CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY ALSO POINTS TO TROUBLE FOR
PRESIDENT CLINTON WITH MILITARY LEADERSHIP IF
COMPROMISE IS ADOPTED**

If President Clinton attempts to implement even a compromise on his decision to allow homosexuals in the military, he does so at the risk of further alienating the flag officers who serve under his command and who would have to implement the Clinton policy within their units.

That's the conclusion of a new, confidential survey of all 1,040 Generals and Admirals presently on active duty. The survey, conducted by Rep. Cliff Stearns (R-FLA), Chairman of the House Republican Research Committee's Task Force on Military Personnel, was taken by mail between June 7 and June 21, 1993. Rep. Stearns' questionnaire emphasized that responses would be confidential and should be unsigned in order to elicit the most candid opinions from the military's most senior officers. The survey drew 621 respondents. Congressman Stearns called this "an overwhelming response for a voluntary survey and at least double what we expected."

The survey found that 96.94 percent of the respondents support the current ban on homosexuals in the military. Similarly, 97.6 percent agree with the statement by the General Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that allowing homosexuals in the military would be "prejudicial to good order and discipline." And only 6.0 percent agree with the contention of homosexual advocacy groups that this is an issue of "civil rights". Instead, 88.7 percent of the senior officers see it as a question of "national security".

"This is the senior uniformed leadership of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines, and it appears that President Clinton is about to ignore their overwhelming and strongly-felt advice," said Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-CA), Chairman of the Republican Research Committee. "These are the men and women who are going to have to live with and implement whatever rules are put together by President Clinton and Secretary Aspin. and try to implement them. They're not only saying that it's a bad idea -- they are demonstrating that lifting the ban will devastate the morale and welfare of our men and women in uniform."

"This also shows the folly of any compromise on this issue," said Rep. Stearns. "Even though we didn't specifically poll on 'don't ask, don't tell', the confidential survey demonstrates a depth of opposition to any fundamental change that would allow homosexuals to serve in the military. Through their overwhelming opposition, our military leaders are signalling us that a compromise would be a big mistake."

"The White House and the Congressional leadership delayed this issue for six months, and the stated purpose was to allow for hearings and fact-finding," said Rep. Hunter. "This confidential survey illustrates the most significant fact of all: provides us one of the most significant facts of all: the senior leadership of our Armed Forces are totally, unalterably opposed to changes in the present policy. Any

effort to change the policy, even slightly, will be destructive to our national security."

Rep. Stearns also noted that he is circulating a letter among House colleagues, urging Chairman Powell to "stand firm" against any compromise proposal from the White House on the gay ban. That letter will be sent to Powell later this week.



AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY OF 1,040 ACTIVE DUTY U.S. FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICERS

SPONSORED BY
THE MILITARY PERSONNEL TASK FORCE
OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE

SELECTED QUOTATIONS FROM SERVICE OFFICERS
BY THE
AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

DATES: JUNE 7-21, 1993

Army General:

"Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the survey on homosexuals in the military. Here are some unsolicited comments which I hope may be of use. First, if the decision is made to allow homosexuals to serve, the leaders I know will try mightily to make it work without impact on the force.

"Regardless of their efforts, the issue is so divisive that I do not see how some degradation in readiness can be avoided. The key to me is behavior; another is life-style; another is openness. We have rules now which proscribe inappropriate heterosexual and homosexual behavior. Both are harmful to morale and discipline. I would be opposed to openly permitting homosexuals to serve; said another way, I would be opposed to allowing homosexuals to be acknowledged as serving.

"We have said for years that service in the Army involves a commitment to a way of life; service is not just a job. Our service commitment carries with it the agreement to give up some rights and behavior seen as normal by many Americans otherwise employed. I do believe that telling homosexuals that their price for service is to forgo admission of their sexuality and practice of sex. Homosexuality is inconsistent with other rights and privileges foregone by others."

Army Officer:

" . . . Open homosexuality in our military is "dead wrong," and I think a waste of individual, organizational, and institutional energies to even consider it."

" . . . The detrimental effect of open homosexuality in our military cannot be overstated. It will be devastating to cohesiveness, morale and overall readiness. We are constantly faced with the issue of keeping a first class military with declining resources--do more with less and do it better. We can work those issues to the best of our ability because it's our job and we deeply believe in our American way of government. We should not have forced upon us the requirement to enforce good order and discipline, which are absolutes, in an environment where open homosexuality is permitted. I do not believe that [the homosexual] lifestyle is moral and would find it extremely difficult to convince soldiers they should live and work with them when they too think it's immoral--in fact, I couldn't."

Army Officer:

"This war and combat thing is bad business. I have been there, and I have seen American soldiers shot, and I have talked to them right after they were shot when they were scared, and I have seen them dead. And I have driven up that farm lane in a government car to tell that man out there on the tractor that his son has been killed."

"The only way you can live with all that is to know that you have done your best as a commander and leader. The unit has to pull together as a team and it cannot be distracted by anything. Homosexuals will badly disrupt the outfit--the company, the battalion, the Army. The result will be a less mission-capable force and more soldiers shot, wounded and killed. That outcome is not acceptable."

"I am not a homophobe--(whatever that is exactly)"

"Allowing homosexuals to openly serve will badly hurt recruiting, I believe."

"Some would paint officers and key Army leaders as intolerant by reflex and prejudiced by nature. That won't square. If the White officers felt this way why would they join the Army where they will have lots of minority soldiers in their outfit and where they will work with and for Black and Hispanic officers? I have worked for 4 Black officers (as a Captain, Major and Brigadier General) and for an Hispanic officer (as a Captain); (when I say "worked for," I mean they wrote my efficiency report.)"

"It took 20 years to put together the Army we have now. Unfortunately, it can be taken apart overnight."

"Don't take the volunteer force for granted."

Marine General:

"When the issue [gays in the military] first began to dominate the media, there was a groundswell of resentment which included significant numbers of Marines who voiced intent to separate [from the military] on moral, religious and other grounds. We have urged Marines to await the outcome of the Administration's deliberations on 15 July, and have further stressed that Marines do not desert the Corps during times of peril or stress, irrespective of the cause of the peril or stress. This appears to have mitigated some of the early reactions which included statements of intent to leave the Corps. However, I am convinced that a significant number of Marines would be lost, either through request for early discharge or election not to enlist."

Navy Officer:

"I am asked frequently [about gays in the military], and my sailors do not want this. They do not support what they feel is moral weakness-it will affect unit cohesion and effectiveness, not necessarily because of performance but because of lack of respect and trust."

Navy Officer:

"I personally, professionally and with great silent feeling oppose any change in the present policy. If the policy is changed, I will look forward to leaving the military as soon as I'm allowed."

Navy Officer:

"On this issue, the country and mankind should first condone [homosexuality] before forcing it onto our military as another social experiment."

Marine Officer:

"Is the American taxpayer prepared to assume this burden?"

Army Officer:

"[A homosexual soldier's] sexual orientation would be seen as a professional liability in terms of leadership potential"

Army Officer:

"This issue, 'allowing homosexuals into the military,' is seriously affecting our soldiers' respect for and confidence in our Commander-in-Chief."



AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY OF 1,040 ACTIVE DUTY U.S. FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICERS

SPONSORED BY
THE MILITARY PERSONNEL TASK FORCE
OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM COMBINED SERVICES
BY THE
AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

DATES: JUNE 7-21, 1993

NUMBER RESPONDING: 621

1. General Colin Powell has said that allowing homosexuals in the military would be "prejudicial to good order and discipline." Do you agree with this statement?

Yes:	606	97.58%
No:	13	2.09%
No Opinion:	0	0.0%
Other:	2	0.32%

2. Do you view the issue of gays in the military as one of civil rights or of national security?

Civil Rights:	37	5.96%
National Security:	551	88.73%
No Opinion:	12	1.93%
Other:	12	1.93%

Both:	9	1.45%
-------	---	-------

3. Do you think homosexuals in the military should share the same sleeping and bath facilities?

Yes:	36	5.80%
------	----	-------

No:	567	91.3%
-----	-----	-------

No Opinion:	16	2.58%
-------------	----	-------

Other:	2	0.32%
--------	---	-------

4. Do you think young people will be more or less likely to join the military if they have to share the same facilities with homosexuals?

More Likely:	3	0.48%
--------------	---	-------

Less Likely:	606	97.58%
--------------	-----	--------

No Opinion:	11	1.77%
-------------	----	-------

Other:	1	0.16%
--------	---	-------

5. Do you think homosexuals pose a health threat to the military?

Yes:	511	82.29%
------	-----	--------

No:	68	10.95%
-----	----	--------

No Opinion:	39	6.28%
-------------	----	-------

Other:	3	0.48%
--------	---	-------

6. Based on your military experience, do you feel the presence of open homosexuals in the military would:

Undermine soldier's morale?

Yes:	609	98.07%
------	-----	--------

No:	8	1.29%
-----	---	-------

No Opinion:	4	0.64%
-------------	---	-------

B. Undermine the cohesiveness and readiness of a combat unit?

Yes:	615	99.03%
------	-----	--------

No:	6	0.97%
-----	---	-------

No Opinion:	0	0.0%
-------------	---	------

C. Deter some heterosexual males from joining the military?

Yes:	611	98.39%
------	-----	--------

No:	6	0.97%
-----	---	-------

No Opinion:	4	0.64%
-------------	---	-------

D. Lead to large numbers of heterosexual soldiers seeking discharges?

Yes:	326	52.50%
------	-----	--------

No:	208	33.49%
-----	-----	--------

No Opinion:	76	12.24%
-------------	----	--------

Other:	11	1.77%
--------	----	-------

7. If one of the soldiers under your command were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you could give a fair performance evaluation of that soldier?

Yes:	366	58.94%
------	-----	--------

No:	196	31.56%
-----	-----	--------

No Opinion:	51	8.21%
-------------	----	-------

Other:	8	1.29%
--------	---	-------

8. If the situation were reversed and one of your commanding officers were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you would receive a fair performance evaluation?

Yes:	175	28.18%
------	-----	--------

No:	262	42.19%
-----	-----	--------

No Opinion:	174	28.02 %
-------------	-----	---------

Other:	10	1.63 %
--------	----	--------

9. Do you support the ban on homosexuals in the military?

Yes:	602	96.94 %
------	-----	---------

No:	16	2.58 %
-----	----	--------

No Opinion:	2	0.32 %
-------------	---	--------

Other:	1	0.16 %
--------	---	--------



AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY OF 1,040 ACTIVE DUTY U.S. FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICERS

SPONSORED BY
THE MILITARY PERSONNEL TASK FORCE
OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM THE U.S. NAVY
BY THE
AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

DATES: JUNE 7-21, 1993

NUMBER RESPONDING: 145

1. General Colin Powell has said that allowing homosexuals in the military would be "prejudicial to good order and discipline." Do you agree with this statement?

Yes:	141	97.24%
No:	3	2.07%
No Opinion:	0	0.0%
Other:	1	0.69%

2. Do you view the issue of gays in the military as one of civil rights or of national security?

Civil Rights:	14	9.66%
National Security:	120	82.76%
No Opinion:	4	2.76%

Other:	2	1.38%
--------	---	-------

Both:	5	3.45%
-------	---	-------

3. Do you think homosexuals in the military should share the same sleeping and bath facilities?

Yes:	14	9.66%
------	----	-------

No:	125	86.21%
-----	-----	--------

No Opinion:	6	4.14%
-------------	---	-------

4. Do you think young people will be more or less likely to join the military if they have to share the same facilities with homosexuals?

More Likely:	0	0.0%
--------------	---	------

Less Likely:	141	97.24%
--------------	-----	--------

No Opinion:	4	2.76%
-------------	---	-------

5. Do you think homosexuals pose a health threat to the military?

Yes:	111	76.55%
------	-----	--------

No:	17	11.72%
-----	----	--------

No Opinion:	16	11.03%
-------------	----	--------

Other:	1	0.69%
--------	---	-------

6. Based on your military experience, do you feel the presence of open homosexuals in the military would:

A. Undermine soldier's morale?

Yes:	140	96.55%
------	-----	--------

No:	5	3.45%
-----	---	-------

No Opinion:	0	0.0%
-------------	---	------

B. Undermine the cohesiveness and readiness of a combat unit?

Yes:	142	97.93%
No:	3	2.07%
No Opinion:	0	0.0%

C. Deter some heterosexual males from joining the military?

Yes:	141	97.24%
No:	3	2.07%
No Opinion:	1	0.69%

D. Lead to large numbers of heterosexual soldiers seeking discharges?

Yes:	70	48.28%
No:	55	37.93%
No Opinion:	15	10.34%
Other:	5	3.45%

7. If one of the soldiers under your command were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you could give a fair performance evaluation of that soldier?

Yes:	92	63.45%
No:	44	30.34%
No Opinion:	6	4.14%
Other:	3	2.07%

8. If the situation were reversed and one of your commanding officers were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you would receive a fair performance evaluation?

Yes:	49	33.79%
No:	53	36.55%

No Opinion:	37	25.52%
-------------	----	--------

Other:	6	4.14%
--------	---	-------

9. Do you support the ban on homosexuals in the military?

Yes:	140	96.55%
------	-----	--------

No:	4	2.76%
-----	---	-------

No Opinion:	1	0.69%
-------------	---	-------



AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY OF 1,040 ACTIVE DUTY U.S. FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICERS

SPONSORED BY
THE MILITARY PERSONNEL TASK FORCE
OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM THE U.S AIR FORCE
BY THE
AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

DATES: JUNE 7-21, 1993

NUMBER RESPONDING: 187

1. General Colin Powell has said that allowing homosexuals in the military would be "prejudicial to good order and discipline." Do you agree with this statement?

Yes:	181	96.79%
No:	5	2.67%
No Opinion:	0	0.0%
Other:	1	0.53%

2. Do you view the issue of gays in the military as one of civil rights or of national security?

Civil Rights:	12	6.42%
National Security:	166	88.77%
No Opinion:	3	1.60%

- | | | |
|--------|---|-------|
| Other: | 2 | 1.07% |
| Both: | 4 | 2.14% |
3. Do you think homosexuals in the military should share the same sleeping and bath facilities?
- | | | |
|-------------|-----|--------|
| Yes: | 7 | 3.74% |
| No: | 176 | 94.12% |
| No Opinion: | 3 | 1.60% |
| Other: | 1 | 0.53% |
4. Do you think young people will be more or less likely to join the military if they have to share the same facilities with homosexuals?
- | | | |
|--------------|-----|--------|
| More Likely: | 3 | 1.60% |
| Less Likely: | 180 | 96.26% |
| No Opinion: | 4 | 2.14% |
5. Do you think homosexuals pose a health threat to the military?
- | | | |
|-------------|-----|--------|
| Yes: | 150 | 80.21% |
| No: | 28 | 14.97% |
| No Opinion: | 8 | 4.28% |
| Other: | 1 | 0.53% |
6. Based on your military experience, do you feel the presence of open homosexuals in the military would:
- A. Undermine soldier's morale?
- | | | |
|------|-----|--------|
| Yes: | 181 | 96.79% |
| No: | 3 | 1.60% |

No Opinion: 3 1.60%

B. Undermine the cohesiveness and readiness of a combat unit?

Yes: 185 98.93%

No: 2 1.07%

No Opinion: 0 0.0%

C. Deter some heterosexual males from joining the military?

Yes: 184 98.4%

No: 2 1.07%

No Opinion: 1 0.53%

D. Lead to large numbers of heterosexual soldiers seeking discharges?

Yes: 80 42.78%

No: 75 40.11%

No Opinion: 29 15.50%

Other: 3 1.60%

7. If one of the soldiers under your command were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you could give a fair performance evaluation of that soldier?

Yes: 110 58.82%

No: 67 35.83%

No Opinion: 9 4.81%

Other: 1 0.53%

8. If the situation were reversed and one of your commanding officers were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you would receive a fair performance evaluation?

Yes: 54 28.88%

No: 70 37.43%

No Opinion:	62	33.16%
Other:	1	0.53%

9. Do you support the ban on homosexuals in the military?

Yes:	178	95.19%
No:	8	4.28%
No Opinion:	0	0.0%
Other:	1	0.53%



AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY OF 1,040 ACTIVE DUTY U.S. FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICERS

SPONSORED BY
THE MILITARY PERSONNEL TASK FORCE
OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM U.S. MARINE CORPS
BY THE
AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

DATES: JUNE 7-21, 1993

NUMBER RESPONDING: 57

1. General Colin Powell has said that allowing homosexuals in the military would be "prejudicial to good order and discipline." Do you agree with this statement?

Yes: 57 100.0%

No: 0 0.0%

No Opinion: 0 0.0%

2. Do you view the issue of gays in the military as one of civil rights or of national security?

Civil Rights: 1 1.75%

National Security: 55 96.49%

No Opinion: 1 1.75%

3. Do you think homosexuals in the military should share the same sleeping and bath facilities?

Yes: 2 3.51%

No: 53 92.98%

No Opinion: 2 3.51%

4. Do you think young people will be more or less likely to join the military if they have to share the same facilities with homosexuals?

More Likely: 0 0.0%

Less Likely: 56 98.25%

No Opinion: 1 1.75%

5. Do you think homosexuals pose a health threat to the military?

Yes: 54 94.74%

No: 3 5.26%

No Opinion: 0 0.0%

6. Based on your military experience, do you feel the presence of open homosexuals in the military would:

A. Undermine soldier's morale?

Yes: 57 100.0%

No: 0 0.0%

No Opinion: 0 0.0%

B. Undermine the cohesiveness and readiness of a combat unit?

Yes: 57 100.0%

No: 0 0.0%

No Opinion: 0 0.0%

C. Deter some heterosexual males from joining the military?

Yes: 56 98.25%

No: 0 0.0%

No Opinion: 1 1.75%

D. Lead to large numbers of heterosexual soldiers seeking discharges?

Yes: 38 66.67%

No: 15 26.32%

No Opinion: 4 7.02%

7. If one of the soldiers under your command were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you could give a fair performance evaluation of that soldier?

Yes: 26 45.61%

No: 12 21.05%

No Opinion: 19 33.33%

8. If the situation were reversed and one of your commanding officers were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you would receive a fair performance evaluation?

Yes: 5 8.77%

No: 37 64.91%

No Opinion: 15 26.32%

9. Do you support the ban on homosexuals in the military?

Yes: 57 100.0%

No: 0 0.0%

No Opinion: 0 0.0%



AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY OF 1,040 ACTIVE DUTY U.S. FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICERS

SPONSORED BY
THE MILITARY PERSONNEL TASK FORCE
OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM THE U.S. ARMY
BY THE
AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL FOUNDATION

DATES: JUNE 7-21, 1993

NUMBER RESPONDING: 232

1. General Colin Powell has said that allowing homosexuals in the military would be "prejudicial to good order and discipline." Do you agree with this statement?

Yes: 227 97.84%

No: 5 2.16%

No Opinion: 0 0.0%

2. Do you view the issue of gays in the military as one of civil rights or of national security?

Civil Rights: 10 4.31%

National Security: 210 90.52%

No Opinion: 5 2.16%

Other: 7 3.02%

3. Do you think homosexuals in the military should share the same sleeping and bath facilities?

Yes:	13	5.60%
No:	213	91.81%
No Opinion:	5	2.16%
Other:	1	0.43%

4. Do you think young people will be more or less likely to join the military if they have to share the same facilities with homosexuals?

More Likely:	0	0.0%
Less Likely:	229	98.71%
No Opinion:	2	0.86%
Other:	1	0.43%

5. Do you think homosexuals pose a health threat to the military?

Yes:	196	84.48%
No:	20	8.62%
No Opinion:	15	6.47%
Other:	1	0.43%

6. Based on your military experience, do you feel the presence of open homosexuals in the military would:

A. Undermine soldier's morale?

Yes:	231	99.57%
No:	0	0.0%
No Opinion:	1	0.43%

B. Undermine the cohesiveness and readiness of a combat unit?

Yes:	231	99.57%
No:	1	0.43%
No Opinion:	0	0.0%

C. Deter some heterosexual males from joining the military?

Yes:	230	99.14%
No:	1	0.43%
No Opinion:	1	0.43%

D. Lead to large numbers of heterosexual soldiers seeking discharges?

Yes:	138	59.48%
No:	63	27.16%
No Opinion:	28	12.07%
Other:	3	1.30%

7. If one of the soldiers under your command were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you could give a fair performance evaluation of that soldier?

Yes:	138	59.48%
No:	73	31.47%
No Opinion:	17	7.32%
Other:	4	1.72%

8. If the situation were reversed and one of your commanding officers were an openly practicing homosexual, do you think you would receive a fair performance evaluation?

Yes:	67	28.88%
No:	102	43.97%

No Opinion:	60	25.86%
-------------	----	--------

Other:	3	1.30%
--------	---	-------

9. Do you support the ban on homosexuals in the military?

Yes:	227	97.84%
------	-----	--------

No:	4	1.72%
-----	---	-------

No Opinion:	1	0.43%
-------------	---	-------