

This an excerpt of a book chapter by CMR President Elaine Donnelly titled [“Defending the Culture of the Military,”](http://books.google.com/books?id=-5FnvJEclewC&lpg=PP1&pg=PA249#v=onepage&q&f=false) published in May 2010 by the Air Force University Press as part of a book titled *Attitudes Are Not Free: Thinking Deeply about Diversity in the U.S. Armed Forces*. Footnotes are in sequence but different from the original text, which begins on page 249. The chapter is available at <http://books.google.com/books?id=-5FnvJEclewC&lpg=PP1&pg=PA249#v=onepage&q&f=false>.

The Intolerance of “Zero Tolerance”

Once the military establishes an issue as a matter of “civil rights,” it does not do things halfway. Passage of the new LGBT law would introduce corollary “zero tolerance” policies that would punish anyone who disagrees. Any military man or woman who expresses concerns about professed (not discreet) homosexuals in the military, for any reason, will be assumed “intolerant” and suspected of harassment, bad attitudes, or worse. Attitudes judged to be unacceptable will require disciplinary action and denials of promotions—penalties that end military careers.

Enforcement of the gay agenda in the military would be particularly divisive among men and women whose personal feelings and convictions are thrown into direct conflict with the new LGBT law and the corollary zero tolerance policy. Among the first to be affected would be chaplains of major religions that disapprove of homosexuality for doctrinal or moral reasons. These would include major denominations of the Jewish, Christian (Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox), and Muslim faiths. Likely issues of conscience would include personal counseling of same-sex couples and requests to perform marriages or to bless civil unions between same-sex couples.

The language of Section 654, Title 10 is completely secular, but individual service members who are practicing members of the religions mentioned above also would face choices involving matters of conscience. These would include the accommodation of same-sex couples in married/family housing and the introduction of personnel and curricula that promote the homosexual agenda in military base schools and childcare centers.

Even those who do not see this as a moral issue could be affected by cultural changes and mandates associated with official zero tolerance of dissent. At the House Armed Services Personnel Subcommittee hearing on 23 July 2008, a member of the committee asked retired Army Sgt Maj Brian Jones, who was testifying in support of the 1993 law, whether he saw the issue as a matter of religious conviction.

Jones, a former Ranger and Delta Force soldier who rescued fallen colleagues in the 1994 “Black Hawk Down” incident in Somalia, said that readiness for combat was his most important concern.¹ Mid-career and non-commissioned officers who are key leaders in combat-oriented communities could be hit with severe zero tolerance penalties just for expressing opinions similar to those of Brian Jones. Among these would be potential four-stars and senior NCOs who are needed to lead the military of tomorrow.

Carrots, Sticks, and Zero Tolerance Taken to Extremes

In a May 2009 report promoting a road map for repealing the 1993 law, the Palm Center provided insight into social difficulties that the activist group expects the military to overcome with conscious coercion.² In a three-page section of that report, subtitled “Organizational Changes that Should Accompany Policy Change,” the authors used variations of the word “implementation,” “enforcement,” or “compliance,” often in tandem with the word “problems,” no less than 35 times.³

The largely civilian leaders of the Palm Center based their recommendations not on military history or experience, but on “social science research that has focused specifically on sexual orientation and on the open service of gays and lesbians in militaries abroad.” Recommendations proceed from an erroneous premise, suggesting that military organizational culture is essentially a “theme” related to successful inclusion of racial minorities.⁴ The inapt comparison underlies an apparent plan to *redefine* military culture as a means to advance social goals, not to achieve military objectives—that is, deterring or winning wars.

In this paragraph of the Road Map Report, the Palm Center confirmed consequences of zero tolerance that would have devastating effects on the culture of the military:

Compliance with the new policy will be facilitated to the extent that personnel understand that *enforcement will be strict and that noncompliance will carry high costs*, and thus perceive that *their own self-interest* lies in supporting the new policy. Consequently, the implementation plan should include clear *enforcement mechanisms* and *strong sanctions for noncompliance*, as well as support for effective implementation in the form of adequate resources, allowances for input from unit leaders for improving the implementation process, and *rewards* for effective implementation. *Toward this end, the Defense Department should work to identify the most potent “carrots” and “sticks” for implementing the new policy.*⁵ (emphasis added)

Under such a regime, the “most potent” career “carrots” would reward commanders who embrace the new law enthusiastically. Civilian and military commanders would be required to interpret and apply the law in all stages of training, education, and deployment and to do so under threat of career penalties if they fail to make it “work.”

Career incentives for superior officers—recommended by the Palm Center as “carrots,” “self-interest,” or “rewards for effective implementation”—could create conflict with the expectation of “accurate information about implementation problems.”⁶ Human nature being what it is, some officers might be tempted to advance their own careers by reporting no issues of concern under the new law, even if they are aware that subordinates are experiencing demoralizing problems.

Other commanders might fear that accusations of unacceptable attitudes and poor leadership could sink their careers if they take the side of a heterosexual person over a homosexual one. The appearance of self-interest in the decisions of superior officers—an element that the Palm Center considers a *positive* thing—would undermine the bond of vertical cohesion and trust that must exist between commanders and the troops they lead.

Disciplinary “sticks,” described as “strong sanctions for noncompliance,” would deny promotions and end the military career of anyone who disagrees for any reason. This would force out of the military thousands of junior officers and enlisted personnel who are the land, sea, and air combat commanders, chiefs of staff, and senior enlisted advisors of tomorrow.

Involuntary losses of good people would compound the harmful effects of shortages caused when others decline reenlistment or avoid military service in the first place. It is impossible to justify the potential loss of valued future leaders such as this, incurred just to satisfy the demands of determined homosexualists and their civilian allies in academia and the media.

“Diversity” Training and Education

The Palm Center recommends that “military leaders must signal clearly that they expect all members of the armed forces to adhere to the new policy, regardless of their personal beliefs.”⁷ Coercive implementation would require what the Palm Center described as “surveillance and monitoring of compliance” combined with mandatory training programs to change attitudes and make the new gay-friendly policy work.⁸

Absent current law, the DOD will “salute smartly” and proceed to implement all-encompassing, “nondiscriminatory” training and education programs to enforce acceptance—even among mid-level commanders who would be forced to set aside their own objections in order to teach others. Success for such training would be far more difficult than historic programs designed to end discrimination and irrational prejudice against racial minorities. Mandatory sensitivity sessions will attempt to overcome the normal human desire for modesty and privacy in sexual matters—a quest that is inappropriate for the military and unlikely to succeed.

With the exception of lawyers needed to defend military personnel accused of “bad attitudes,” the only people likely to benefit from the mandatory implementation of such programs would be LGBT advocates and professional diversity trainers that the Department of Defense invites to participate.

None of the time or expense involved in these activities would improve morale, discipline, or readiness in the all-volunteer force. Our military respects women and does not expect them to accept constant exposure to passive/aggressive approaches of a sexual nature. It should not be ordered to change personal feelings and beliefs about human sexuality.

Special Events and Sexual Expression

Gay activists expect special events and occasions to celebrate homosexual service members, in the same way that special days or months are scheduled to recognize minority groups and women in the military. Early in the Clinton administration, the Department of Defense sponsored a day-long “Diversity Day Training Event” in an Arlington, Virginia, Crystal City building near the Pentagon. Programs cosponsored with 18 other government agencies featured lectures, anti-Christian panel discussions, exhibits, workshops, and a controversial video titled “On Being Gay.”⁹

In 2009, Pres. Barack Obama signed a statement proclaiming June to be “LGBT Pride Month.” The Department of State and NASA followed with similar gay and lesbian pride proclamations and activities posted on their Web sites.¹⁰

Social events can have consequences. According to the *Washington Post*, in May 2009 employees of the American Embassy in Baghdad celebrated gay rights by sponsoring a “Pink Zone” theme party event at a pub called BagDaddy’s.¹¹ Guests were invited to attend dressed in drag as their favorite gay icon. An embassy spokesman explained that social events are permitted there because there are no gathering places elsewhere in Baghdad. The same rationale could apply to military people serving on remote bases in war zones.

Consistency in gay-friendly social events would create a new *inconsistency* with policies requiring Americans to avoid practices considered offensive to the Muslim civilians and soldiers that Americans are supposed to train in combat or local security skills. The problem was presaged in July 2009, when the State Department came to regret an incident involving male security contractors in Kabul, Afghanistan.¹² The alcohol-besotted men partied wildly around a bonfire in a state of near-nudity—bacchanalian behavior that rivaled the most offensive abuses of Abu Ghraib.

Public nudity will not become acceptable in the military, but if the Pentagon follows the State Department’s lead in equating consensual heterosexual and homosexual behavior, where will local commanders be able to draw the line? It is difficult to put one’s foot down when there is no visible floor on which to place one’s foot.

¹. USA retired Sgt Maj Brian Jones testimony. House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Personnel, 110th Cong., 23 July 2008, available at <http://cmrlink.org/fileuploads/HASC072308JonesTestimony.pdf>.

². “How to End ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’: A Roadmap of Political, Legal, Regulatory, and Organizations Steps to Equal Treatment,” Michael D. Palm Center, University of California Santa Barbara, CA, May 2009, hereafter referred to as the Palm Road Map Report.

³. Palm Road Map Report, 19–21.

⁴. The Palm Road Map Report suggests that “a new policy will work best if personnel are persuaded that it will not be harmful to the armed forces or to themselves, and may even result in gains. Toward this end, explanations of the new policy should be framed using themes reflecting military culture, such as the military’s pride in professional conduct, its priority of mission over individual preferences, its culture of hierarchy and obedience, its norms of inclusion and equality, and its traditional ‘can do’ attitude,” 19.

⁵. Ibid., 20.

⁶. Ibid., 21.

⁷. Ibid., 6.

⁸. Ibid., 20.

⁹. Rowan Scarborough, “Navy Officers Balk at Pro-Gay Seminar,” *Washington Times*, 8 September 1994, A-1.

¹⁰. Office of the White House Press Secretary, “Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered Month,” News Release, 1 June 2009. Also see Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/pix/lgbt/>, and NASA Equal Opportunity Programs Office, <http://eeo.gsfc.nasa.gov/>.

¹¹. Al Kamen, “For One Night, Baghdad Gets a Pink Zone,” *Washington Post*, 22 May 2009.

¹². “14 from U.S. Embassy Security Staff in Afghanistan Fired,” *CNN.com*, 5 September 2009, available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/asiapcf/09/04/afghanistan.contractors/index.html>. Indiscipline is cumulative and progressive. Date-stamped photos taken at Abu Ghraib prison indicated that the Soldiers debased themselves before they abused Iraqi prisoners. See Duke *Law Journal*, 886.