

Ten Reasons to Oppose the “LGBT Law” for the Military

Congress approved the 1993 law regarding homosexuals in the military, usually mislabeled “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” with bipartisan veto-proof majorities. Federal courts have upheld the constitutionality of the law (Section 654, Title 10, U.S.C.) several times. President Barack Obama has promised lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered (LGBT) activists that he would repeal the 1993 law. For reasons summarized below, Congress should reject pending legislation to impose a new LGBT Law on the Military:

1. **Current findings remain valid.** The 1993 law states “there is no constitutional right to serve,” and the military is a “specialized society” that is “fundamentally different from civilian life.” In living conditions offering little or no privacy, homosexuality presents an “unacceptable risk” to good order, discipline, morale and unit cohesion--qualities essential for combat readiness.
2. **Open-Ended “LGBT Law.”** Legislation sponsored by Rep. Patrick Murphy (D-PA) and Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-CT) would require acceptance of professed (not discreet) sexual minorities, banning discrimination against *“homosexuality or bisexuality...whether real or perceived.”*
3. **Effects far-reaching, retroactive.** If passed, the LGBT Law would affect all military branches and communities, to include Army and Marine infantry, Special Operations Forces, Navy SEALs, surface ships, and submarines, on a constant (24/7) basis, with retroactive effect.
4. **Violations of sexual privacy.** Separate housing would be impractical, hugely expensive or unacceptable to LGBT “civil rights” activists. Pretending that sexual tension does not matter would create a “hostile work environment,” tantamount to forcing women to live in close quarters with men.
5. **Increased misconduct, both consensual and nonconsensual.** Because human beings are not perfect, male/male and female/female incidents, in addition to problems already occurring, are predictable. Unit commanders will be burdened with personnel turmoil, accusations of bias, and potential career penalties that have the effect of weakening trust and team cohesion.
6. **Involuntary losses and “zero tolerance” of dissent.** Assigning “civil rights” status to LGBT personnel would impose a corollary “zero tolerance” policy, forcing career penalties on anyone who disagrees for any reason, starting with chaplains and personnel of most major faiths.
7. **Voluntary personnel losses.** Many personnel will not complain of problems, even in cases of assault or abuse of rank, due to fear of career penalties and questions about their own “attitudes.” They will simply decline reenlistment. Potential recruits will avoid the military.
8. **Mandatory LGBT Training.** To make the new law “work,” the Defense Department will modify mandatory sensitivity training programs to include LGBT curricula at all educational institutions and schools.
9. **Family housing and benefits.** Military family housing likely will include same-sex couples, increasing pressures for repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA). Declining family retention would leave fewer, less skilled troops to face more deployments and potential combat.
10. **No case for repeal.** If the proposed LGBT Law does not improve recruiting, retention, and readiness in the All-Volunteer Force, it should not be passed.

* * *