



2016 Quadrennial Presidential Candidate Survey

* Required Question(s)

To: 2016 Presidential Candidates

In recent years, American voters have become increasingly concerned about national security and military capabilities in a dangerous world. Part of these concerns center on the administration's repeated imposition of controversial social agendas on the men and women who volunteer to serve. This **CMR Quadrennial Presidential Candidate Survey**, consisting of six questions and brief background information, includes references to relevant statements already inscribed in the **2012 Republican National Platform**. The survey is designed to ascertain the views of 2016 presidential candidates on issues that will continue to develop at the intersection of national defense and social issues.

Please respond to the survey as soon as possible, using this on-line system. Upon completion we will confirm receipt with a copy of your survey and responses. Each question allows one of three options for answers, together with space for additional comments if desired.

Because time is short, CMR will report candidate responses to contacts nationwide as soon as they are received. The final deadline for responses is COB January 15, 2016.

Answers to each of the six questions below will help Americans, especially residents of early-voting states, to identify and support a strong national defense candidate. Men and women in the armed forces deserve a Commander-in-Chief who is willing to objectively review controversial policies and to take appropriate action to restore the strength of the finest military in the world.

- CMR

Candidate Name: _____

Each of these six questions require a single selection response. Extended comments may be added in the box provided.

Sound Priorities & Social Experimentation

Q. #1: As Commander-in Chief, will you review and revise military personnel policies that assign higher priority to egalitarian social agendas over military effectiveness?

2012 Platform: *"We reject the use of the military as a platform for social experimentation and will not accept attempts to undermine military priorities and mission readiness."*

Background: The 2012 platform statement affirmed support for military/social policies that advance national security and military necessity as the highest priority. It also recognized and opposed attempts to impose controversial social agendas on the military, including mandates for "gender diversity metrics" (quotas) and other policies that weaken morale and combat readiness.

Selective Service & the Draft

Q. #2: Do you agree with this plank in the 2012 Republican National Platform, and will you support continuance of women's exemption from Selective Service obligations?

2012 Platform: *"The all-volunteer force, begun on the watch of Republican Presidents, has carried America to victory from the Caribbean and Central America to the Balkans and Southwest Asia. We oppose the reinstatement of the draft, whether directly or through compulsory national service."* (In platform since 2000)

Background: Reinstatement of a military draft or mandatory national service, on a gender-neutral basis, would constitute unwarranted extensions of government power that would weaken the special culture of the all-volunteer force. Since the Obama Administration has acted unilaterally to order military women into direct ground combat (infantry) units on the same involuntary basis as men, liberal groups representing men already have filed litigation asking federal courts to impose Selective Service obligations on unsuspecting civilian women, without a vote of Congress.

Women in Direct Ground Combat

Q. #3: Do you agree with this plank in the 2012 Republican National Platform, and will you reconsider the Obama administration's decision to overrule the U.S. Marine Corps' request for exceptions to women-in-combat mandates?

2012 Platform: *"We support the advancement of women in the military... [and] We support women's exemption from direct ground combat units and infantry battalions."* (In national platform since 2000.)

Background: In 2012, Republicans expressed respect and appreciation for our women in the military, and recognized their courageous service "in harm's way" in Iraq and Afghanistan. The platform also recognized different requirements in "tip of the spear" direct ground combat units, such as Army and Marine infantry, artillery, armor, Special Operations Forces and Navy SEALs. These are small fighting teams that seek out and attack the enemy with deliberate offensive action. In September 2015 the U.S. Marine Corps submitted a formal request for exceptions to the administration's plans to eliminate women's exemptions from the combat arms, and supported their request with scientific

Q. #3: (cont.)

research and empirical evidence. Due to physical disparities that cannot be "mitigated," gender integration to achieve the administration's desired "critical mass" of women in the combat arms would have a substantial negative effect on "survivability and lethality" in battle.

On December 3, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter disregarded the Marines' best professional advice, and announced plans to impose controversial policies known to impede combat effectiveness and speed while significantly increasing female injuries. In an official Army survey, 92.5% of women said they did not want to serve in direct ground combat battalions, but Secretary Carter confirmed that such assignments would not be voluntary. Military leaders are duty-bound to follow current administration orders, but the next Commander-in-Chief is not. Following an open and objective review of the Marine Corps' 2015 research and recommendations, which the Obama administration ignored, the next President should take appropriate action to restore combat effectiveness as the highest priority in formulating policies for the combat arms and special operations forces.

LGBT Events & Demonstrations

Q. #4: Do you agree with this plank in the 2012 Republican National Platform and will you discontinue divisive special interest initiatives and demonstrations at the Pentagon and on military bases?

2012 Platform: *"We affirm the cultural values that encourage selfless service and superiority in battle, and oppose anything that might weaken team cohesion, including intra-military special interest demonstrations."*

Background: Every year since 2009, the Obama White House has proclaimed June as LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) Equality Month. Accordingly, the Department of Defense and some military bases officials have sponsored "gay pride" events to promote additional LGBT activist goals, including full civil rights status and benefits for transgendered personnel. In the same way that military officials do not allow labor unions, political activities, and other special interest demonstrations, LGBT other special interest activist events should be considered inherently divisive and harmful to unit cohesion.

Evaluation and Correction of Harmful Military/Social Policies

Q. #5: Do you agree with this plank in the 2012 Republican National Platform?

2012 Platform: *"We will support an objective and open-minded review of the current administration's management of military personnel policies and will correct problems with appropriate administrative, legal, or legislative action."*

Background: In order to determine the full impact of social policies imposed by the current administration since 2009, the next Commander-in-Chief should specifically direct all personnel to be candid in all evaluations of controversial military/social policies. For example, claims that all has gone well since Congress repealed the 1993 law regarding gays in the military reflect the understandable satisfaction of a minority of LGBT personnel. However, many

Q. #5: (cont.)

concerns about problematic legal consequences; e.g., same-sex marriage and benefits, religious liberty challenges, increased rates of sexual assaults, civil rights status for sexual minorities and the administration's push for transgenders in the military, are playing out as predicted. Accurate, unbiased information would help in formulating appropriate administrative, legal, or legislative action to restore sound priorities and to strengthen morale and readiness in the all-volunteer force.

Religious Liberty in the Military

Q. #6: Will your administration defend and protect rights of religious liberty in the military?

2012 Platform: *"The spiritual welfare of our troops and retired service members should be a priority of our national leadership. With military suicides running at the rate of one a day, [and with other] post-service medical conditions [such as] addiction and mental illness [increasing] . . . there is an urgent need for the kind of counseling that faith-based institutions can best provide. We support rights of conscience and religious freedom for military chaplains and people of faith. A Republican Commander-in-Chief will protect religious independence of military chaplains and will not tolerate attempts to ban Bibles or religious symbols from military facilities.*

Background: The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees rights of conscience and religious liberty to both chaplains and military personnel who are deployed far from home. Servicemen and women have a right to receive counsel from chaplains who are free to discuss matters of morality during all activities, not limited to worship services. Conscience clauses are common in civilian law, but the 2010 legislation that repealed the 1993 law regarding gays in the military did not protect religious liberty. Despite promises that rights of conscience would be protected, there were numerous attempts to infringe rights of religious liberty, creating a "chilling effect" due to fear of career penalties. Some military personnel found it necessary to seek legal defense.

In 2012 and 2013, Congress enacted legislation to protect rights of conscience and religious liberty for military chaplains and people of faith. The law bars adverse discrimination or denial of promotion, schooling, training, or assignment. Chaplains continue to minister to persons of all faiths and backgrounds, as they always have, but they should not be required to endorse certain life choices that traditions of most major faiths consider to be wrong.

* * * * *

The Center for Military Readiness, founded in 1993, is an independent, non-partisan public policy organization that reports on and analyzes military/social issues. CMR does not endorse political candidates. More information on all of the above issues is available on the CMR website, www.cmrlink.org.