

May 5, 1993

Statement of Sgt. Edward A. Striedinger, Seattle Police Department

(33) Men and women enter the military at an age that requires a great deal of structure. Most are still struggling with the process of maturation. To expect these people to readily accept lifestyles contrary to their own community standards would be unrealistic. 207

QUESTIONS

(34) **Mr. Striedinger:** I suppose if you had a situation where nobody knew one way or the other, I really don't think you would have any difference than you do now. If on the other hand, it was something that was open, were the military to allow the open practice, I think that would be quite a difficult situation. 210

Statement of Gregory M. Herek, Ph.D., Associate Research Psychologist, University of California at Davis, On Behalf of the American Psychological Association

(35) Would heterosexual personnel refuse to work and live in close quarters with lesbian or gay male service members?

This question reflects a recognition that stigma leads many heterosexuals to hold false stereotypes about lesbians and gay men and unwarranted prejudices against them....

...the assumption that heterosexuals cannot overcome their prejudices toward gay people is a mistaken one.

246

Statement of Lt. Col. William J. Gregor, U.S. Army (Retired)

Statement of Col. William Darryl Henderson, U.S. Army
(Retired)

(36) The general effects of the acceptance of openly homosexual soldiers on unit cohesion and unit effectiveness can be projected with some confidence. Much is known about the attitudes of members of the Armed Forces on this issue....

In view of the survey data available, the long-term problems associated with gays serving openly appear to be major ones. The data, taken primarily from the Moskos, Miller survey and the *L.A. Times* survey and other surveys, shows, for example that:

Seventy-eight percent of soldiers oppose lifting the ban.

Ninety percent believe their privacy would be violated.

Seventy-four percent of male soldiers in this recent poll believe that homosexuality is abnormal and deviant... 268

(37) In those European armies, as well as Israel, that are concerned more with readiness and warfighting, homosexuals are not banned, but there is an informal practice in these armies that has been described by Charlie Moskos as: "We won't ask; you don't talk or flaunt." In practice, this means that for the most part gays stay mostly in the closet in these armies. 269

QUESTIONS

(38) Mr. Segal: There are currently assertions that sexual orientation integration will similarly undermine unit cohesion. Cohesion is now defined as heterosexual male bonding. 283

(39) Chairman: The Chair is simply saying that in this situation, if someone stands up and says: It will be done, it will be done. The Chair has the feeling that this temporary, quote, argument of unit cohesion will go away, and we will be dealing with people in a very cohesive fashion, because we will have gotten beyond mores and values and ways of perceiving people that are perhaps inappropriate to the reality of the situation. 287-88.

(40) Colonel Henderson: So I would say that until you do see major change in the American society--and that, of course, is where we draw our young soldiers from--until you see that change also reflected within the ranks of the Armed Forces, you are going to have cohesion and unit performance problems until you do get that change. 288

(41) Colonel Henderson: If values did change within the American Armed Forces and it was no longer a point of contention where you had a strong feeling against it, then

there would be no cohesion problem. But as long as you have these high percentages that say there would be problems, then you are going to have unit performance problems. 289

(42) **Mr. Segal:** What happens in your military when gays come out?...

....It depends on at what point they come out. If they come into the unit and come out immediately...the dominant norms are still heterosexual, and there is still some distrust, and distrust impacts negatively on cohesion....

If, however somebody has been serving in the unit for a while, has proven himself as a soldier, and then comes out, his sexual orientation essentially becomes irrelevant. 290

(43) **Mr. Spence:** What are we being asked to accept as being normal when we have been taught to believe that it is not normal and accepting it as normal brings about all these problems with cohesion and all the rest that we are faced with? 292

(44) **Mr. Skelton:** Assume in approximately half of each of these platoons, the young men were raised to believe at their grandmothers' and their mother's knee and in Sunday School and church that homosexuality was immoral or against the teachings of their particular religion.

Would you, in your opinion, describe the unit cohesion... 297

(45) **Colonel Henderson:** If you do not have the basis for that strong personal identification, and...the basis would not be there, because the leader would be very different in that he is homosexual, and those soldiers were brought up to believe in the traditional American values vis-a-vis homosexuality and so on. So you have that basic conflict. 298

(46) **Mr. Hunter:** ...you have morale...where the soldier's personal values coincide with his perception of mission purpose.... [I]f that is the requirement for high morale, and he feels that the military in lifting the ban and bringing people whose lifestyle he finds repugnant as a result of his values into the military, you are not going to have that coincidence of military purpose and his personal values that produce high morale.... 299

(47) **Mr. Dornan:** So I take it personally when I hear that you are going to have to take kids from the heartland of America, coast to coast, and train them that they must accept something as normal, in some cases something to be admired, that they have been taught all their lives was a transgression against God and something that Jesus Christ was crucified for each single, solitary act. 303

Prepared Statement of Dr. Joseph G. Hatheway

(48) While I do not doubt that some soldiers are uncomfortable around gays and lesbians, it is important to keep in mind that this is their problem, not ours. Why should a while class of people be punished because of the fears of the majority? 318

Prepared Statement of Hon. Robert K. Dornan, A Representative From California

(49) I hope these witnesses will demonstrate to us the problems our young troops will have with homosexual leaders whose behavior and beliefs directly contradict the cultural beliefs of the overwhelming majority of our middle class. 320

Prepared Statement of Maj. Gen. Evan L. Hultman, AUS (Ret.) Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States

(50) It is the knowledge that the person in the bunk or in the foxhole next to you is homosexual that is at issue. Ignoring any question of integrity, the homosexual who "remains in the closet" and does his job, has no effect on unit morale or cohesion. It is the coming out or [sic] the "closet" that becomes the problem. 348

May 5 Hearing

THE PROBLEM OF GAYS OR A PROBLEM OF HETEROSEXUALS' BELIEFS?

In the current debate concerning military policy, the issue has often been framed as the 'problem of gays' ("Pentagon's Boss Warns Clinton," 1993, photo caption, p. A-1). Yet, once it is recognized that gay men and lesbians are not inherently unfit for military service, the crux of the "problem" shifts to heterosexuals' attitudes and beliefs about gay people. Supporters of the ban on military service by open lesbians and gay men appear to believe that heterosexuals, as a group, are incapable of overcoming their prejudices regarding sexual orientation. Historical and social science data, however, dispute this assumption. Training to reduce anti-gay prejudice in the private workplace and in schools has, in fact, proven effective in reducing fear of and resistance to the presence of homosexual individuals. In the past, the military has proved itself willing and able to attack prejudice and stereotypes based on race and gender within its ranks. The challenge of the 1990s may well prove to be to continue this tradition by eliminating barriers based on sexual orientation.

Survey data assessing the attitudes of heterosexual military personnel toward gay men and lesbians are not currently available, although the various service branches are in the process of conducting such research (e.g., Stepanek, 1992). In February of this year, the *Los Angeles Times* published the results of a poll conducted outside of 38 military bases in the continental United States and Hawaii (Healy, 1993). In that survey, 74 percent of the enlisted personnel who completed a questionnaire said that they disapproved of "lifting the ban on gays in the Armed Forces" (p. A23). The extent to which the results of this survey accurately represent the opinions of all service personnel, however, cannot be known. The sample was not a true probability sample and so we do not know how representative it is. In addition, the negative consequences that potentially could follow from expressing approval for lifting the ban (such as being suspected of being gay or lesbian) probably deterred some individuals who oppose the ban from answering truthfully or from participating in the survey at all. Nevertheless, given the existence of widespread hostility toward gay men and lesbians among U.S. civilians (Herek, 1991b), it is reasonable to assume that negative attitudes also exist within the military. Using the same logic, it is also reasonable to assume that some proportion, albeit currently unknown, of heterosexual military personnel currently hold favorable or neutral attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. As a consequence of the negative attitudes, the DOD believes that several problems would arise if openly gay personnel were allowed to serve.

The following section reviews some of the beliefs held by some members of the military that have been proposed as justifications for the ban on lesbians and gay people and considers scientific evidence relevant to those beliefs.

Problems in establishing close relationships. The DOD has expressed concern that unit cohesion and morale will be lowered because heterosexual personnel will be unable to establish close interpersonal relationships with lesbian or gay male service members. Survey data and laboratory studies, however, suggest that heterosexual personnel are capable of establishing such relationships. Roughly one American adult in three knows someone who is openly gay or lesbian (e.g., Herek, Capitanio, & Glunt, 1992). Heterosexuals who have a close relationship with a gay man or lesbian (e.g., as a friend or close family member) are more likely than other

heterosexuals to express favorable attitudes toward gay people as a group (W. Schneider & Lewis, 1984). A large body of social psychological research on prejudice indicates that providing opportunities for contact under favorable conditions is likely to reduce heterosexuals' negative feelings toward gay men and lesbians (Herek, 1991b).

Problems in working together. The military has also contended that its heterosexual members will not respect and obey an openly lesbian or gay male superior, and will not be willing to trust and work with lesbians and gay men. Historical and cross-cultural data are useful in evaluating this argument.

Berube (1990) provided extensive evidence that man lesbians and gay men served more or less openly in the U.S. military during World War II. Their sexual orientation was known to many of their heterosexual comrades, and they served effectively in combat with the respect and admiration of those comrades. Since World War II, published works and legal challenges to DOD policy have demonstrated that many gay people have served with distinction in the U.S. military, often with at least some of their peers and superiors knowing of their sexual orientation (Anderson & Smith, 1993; Berube, 1990; Gibson, 1978; Harry, 1984; Hippier, 1989; Humphrey, 1990; Murphy, 1988; Williams & Weinberg, 1971).

Furthermore, lesbians and gay men have been allowed to join the armed forces of other countries (e.g., Denmark, The Netherlands, and Sweden) without creating insurmountable problems (Benistant & Thuijsman, 1990; Harris, 1991; Tatchell, 1990; Tielman & de Jonge, 1988). Late in 1992, the Canadian Government reversed its ban on lesbians and gay men in that country's armed forces (Claridge & York, 1992). In the United States, quasi-military organizations such as police and sheriffs' departments have successfully integrated openly lesbian and gay male officers into their ranks (GAO, 1992a; Gordon, 1993; Sarbin & Karols, 1988).

The entry of lesbians and gay men into military and quasi-military organizations has not been without incident. The Dutch military has observed anti gay prejudice in its ranks and has implemented educational programs to counter such prejudice (Benistant & Thuijsman, 1990). In the United States, some police and sheriff's departments with openly gay members have encountered negative attitudes among their heterosexual personnel. In response, they have developed sensitivity training programs for their officers (GAO, 1992a; Gordon, 1993). The active involvement and leadership of high-ranking officers has been perceived to be important for the success of such programs (Benistant & Thuijsman, 1990; GAO, 1992a).

In summary, historical data and experiences in other organizations show that heterosexuals can work with openly gay people in military environments. Gay male and lesbian personnel are likely to encounter individual incidents of anti gay prejudice that will necessitate sensitivity training and strong leadership from the DOD.

Problems in sharing living quarters. The DOD's justifications for its policy have suggested that certain situations pose insurmountable obstacles to integrating gay and heterosexual people. Specifically, the DOD has pointed to its need to deploy service members worldwide to settings in which they must live and work under conditions affording minimal privacy. The military has argued that heterosexual personnel would be so resistant to living and working in close quarters with openly gay women and men that unit cohesion would be dangerously lowered.

The focus of this argument has been the military's contention that heterosexuals would be unwilling to share sleeping quarters, latrines, and showers with lesbians or gay men. Moskos (1992), for example, argued, "Most women—and many men—dislike being stripped of all privacy before the opposite sex. Similarly, most heterosexual men and women dislike being exposed to homosexuals of their own sex. If feelings of privacy for women are respected regarding privacy from men, then we must respect those of straights with regard to gays" (p. 27).

This parallel between gender and sexual orientation is problematic for several reasons. Whereas males and females are segregated from an early age in public toilets and locker rooms, gay men and lesbians have grown up sharing such facilities with heterosexuals of their same gender. Consequently, they are likely to be habituated to the presence in such settings of one or more individuals whom they might find sexually attractive. Of necessity, they have developed the same behavioral patterns generally used by heterosexuals in such settings (e.g., gaze aversion and other behaviors that Goffman [1963] termed *civil inattention*). Indeed, fear of violence or harassment might lead gay men and lesbians to be exceptionally cautious in such settings. Although they might discreetly look at others' unclothed bodies, they probably do so in an unobtrusive manner—perhaps with even greater discretion than the many heterosexuals who also look at others' bodies in such settings.

It should be recalled that gay men and lesbians currently serve covertly in the military. Hence, they already are present in the barracks and showers. Thus, the only change will be that possibly more persons will be known to be gay or lesbian

and those persons will not be subject to discharge for that knowledge. For that reason there may be an increased vulnerability of gay people to physical attack.

Concerns about sharing showers and sleeping quarters should be evaluated within the broader context of empirical research on bodily modesty. Shawver (1987) defined bodily modesty as "a discomfort or embarrassment at having one's body perceived especially undressed, or in partial undress, and especially in particular situations," such as using the toilet or bathing (p. 155; see also Shawver & Kurdys, 1987). Although people first develop their attitudes and beliefs about bodily modesty during childhood and adolescence (Parke & Sawin, 1979; Rosenfeld et al., 1984), they adapt to new circumstances throughout life by revising their personal standards of modesty when necessary.

Such adaptation has been observed in a variety of settings, including college dormitories (Vivona & Gomillion, 1972), medical environments (Millstein, Adler, & Irwin, 1984), and prisons (Shawver, 1987; Shawver & Kurdys, 1987). Female U.S. military personnel in the Persian Gulf War reported adjusting to frequent intrusions from males and a general lack of privacy for dressing, bathing, and using the latrine. They reported that modesty needs often assumed less importance than other needs, such as hygiene (D. Schneider & Schneider, 1992).

Concerns about bodily modesty are not limited to concerns at being viewed by a gay person of one's own gender or a heterosexual of the other gender. Heterosexual military personnel may have a general wish not to be viewed in a state of undress or in private functions by anyone, regardless of gender or sexual orientation. Some people prefer not to be seen undressed or engaging in private functions by heterosexuals of their own gender (e.g., Vivona & Gomillion, 1972), members of their immediate family (Parke & Sawin, 1979; Rosenfeld et al., 1984), and even sexual partners (Brecher, 1984; Kinsey et al., 1948; Kinsey et al., 1953). Military life, however, has traditionally demanded adaptation from such individuals. Submitting to pre-induction examinations and living in a barracks, for example, have required that personnel undress in front of others, regardless of their own wish not to do so or their personal standards of bodily modesty (e.g., Berube, 1990; Humphrey, 1990). Although encountering openly gay people in such settings may initially be novel to some heterosexuals, they can be reasonably expected to adapt to such experiences in the same way that they have adapted to other aspects of military life.

Recruitment and retention. The DOD has argued that public acceptability of military-service will decrease if openly gay personnel are accepted for service, and that a reversal of the anti gay ban will interfere with the military's ability to recruit and retain heterosexual members. No data exist to test these assumptions directly. Public attitudes toward an institution as large and complex as the military, however, inevitably are multifaceted. Similarly, it is likely that most men and women have multiple motivations for enlisting in the Armed Forces. Consequently, a reversal of any single personnel policy is unlikely to create a radical, enduring shift in support for the military.

Data are available concerning public attitudes toward allowing lesbians and gay men to serve in the military. The Gallup poll has assessed public opinion on this topic in a series of telephone surveys with national probability samples since 1977. Gallup has found increasing support for employment rights for lesbians and gay men in many fields, including the military. A 1992 poll, for example, showed that although most Americans (57 percent) still did not regard homosexuality as an acceptable lifestyle, an even larger majority (74 percent) felt that "homosexuals should have equal rights in terms of job opportunities" (Hugick, 1992, p. 3). When asked whether "homosexuals should or should not be hired" for specific occupations, 57 percent responded that they "should be hired" for military service (p. 3). This compared with 51 percent who felt that gay people should be allowed to serve in 1977, the first time Gallup posed the question (Hugick, 1992). In 1992, the right to serve in the military was supported by a majority of women and a plurality of men, and by majorities of whites and non-whites, people at all income and educational levels, and people in all geographic regions (Hugick, 1992).

After President Clinton announced his intention to reverse the policy, however, public opinion appeared to become more polarized and volatile. When a *Time/CNN* poll (conducted on January 13-14, 1993) asked whether "gays and lesbians should be banned from the military 57 percent of the sample responded that they should *not* be banned ("Public Views," 1993), consistent with the earlier Gallup poll (Hugick, 1992). But a *New York Times/CBS News* poll (conducted on January 12-14) found that 48 percent opposed "permitting homosexuals to serve in the military," whereas only 42 percent favored it ("Public Views," 1993). When a Gallup/*Newsweek* poll (conducted January 21-22, 1993) asked "Should Clinton delay his promise to lift restrictions on gays in the military if it will produce morale and readiness prob-

lems?" Forty-nine percent responded yes, compared to 40 percent no ("Newsweek Poll," 1993, p. 59).

It is possible that these disparate findings resulted in part from differences in item wording (e.g., the *Time/CNN* item asked about "banning" whereas the *New York Times/CBS* item asked about "permitting") and from the way the issue was framed (e.g., the Gallup/Newsweek item specified possible negative outcomes and asked whether Clinton should delay-not reverse-his decision). An additional explanation is that the public supports allowing gay people to serve in the military when the issue is framed solely in terms of employment rights (as in the Gallup series between 1977 and 1992), but becomes more polarized when gay rights are portrayed as antithetical to military effectiveness. Nevertheless, it is striking that 40 percent of the Gallup/Newsweek respondents felt that the President should proceed in reversing the policy, even if doing so would produce morale and readiness problems.

The extent to which public support for or opposition to the policy on homosexuality affects overall attitudes toward the military remains unknown. It appears, however, that widespread acceptance for a new policy will not be forthcoming until most Americans are convinced that the Armed Forces will not be unduly disrupted or impaired.

CONSIDERATIONS ON IMPLEMENTING A NONDISCRIMINATORY POLICY

Anti-black attitudes were widespread in the US. military when President Truman ordered an end to racial discrimination in the Armed Forces in 1948 (Ambrose, 1972; Hope, 1979). Indeed, the arguments used against racial integration were remarkably similar to those that have been recently articulated against lesbians and gay men. For example, in 1942 a General Board commissioned to consider the integration of African Americans in the Navy submitted its report, concluding that "the enlistment of Negroes for unlimited general service is inadvisable." The board provided the following rationale for its conclusion:

Enlistment for general service implies that the individual may be sent anywhere—to any ship or station where he is needed. Men on board ship live in particularly close association: in their messes, one man sits beside another, their hammocks or bunks are close together, in their common tasks they work side by side; and in particular tasks such as those of a gun's crew, they form a closely knit, highly coordinated team. How many white men would choose, of their own accord, that their closest associates in sleeping quarters, at mess, and in a gun's crew should be of another race. How many would accept such conditions, if required to do so, without resentment and just as a matter of course? The General Board believes that the answer is "Few, if any," and further believes that if the issue were forced, there would be a lowering of contentment, teamwork and discipline in the service. (Navy General Board, 1942, p. 1)

Notwithstanding beliefs such as those expressed by the Navy in 1942, the military, proved itself willing and able to deal with such prejudice (Day, 1983; Hope, 1979). Because many of the same social psychological processes underlie majority group members' attitudes toward both racial and sexual minorities (Herek, 1987), the military's past experience suggests that it is capable of reducing anti gay prejudice in its ranks. Some suggestions are offered below. These suggestions are presented under three headings: policy; education and training; and research.

POLICY

Identity versus sexual behavior. In drafting a uniform code of sexual conduct, the DOD should avoid equating all public manifestations of a gay identity (including involvement in a relationship) with inappropriate sexual behavior. Gay men and lesbians tend to be perceived by heterosexuals entirely in terms of their sexuality (Herek, 1992). Some heterosexual personnel, for example, may perceive lesbians or gay men to be flaunting their sexuality when they merely identify themselves as lesbian or gay, or when they display a partner's photograph in a setting in which heterosexuals are allowed to do so. Such perceptions result from the lack of nonsexual social roles and identities for lesbians and gay men comparable to those available to heterosexuals through institutions such as marriage. Consequently, conduct that is regarded as innocuous when performed by a heterosexual (e.g., stating that one is married, greeting a spouse with a kiss) can be perceived as an inappropriate public manifestation of private sexuality when performed by a lesbian or gay man. Gay people allowed to engage in the same sorts of behaviors that are allowed for heterosexuals. This will require education and sensitivity training

May 5 Hearings

Colonel HENDERSON. Basically that assumes that if a homosexual comes into the military and asserts his homosexuality, that is behavior, and that is talking about their flaunting it, and then that would not be permissible.

If he comes in and nobody says anything, nobody asks him he does not say anything, then there is no problem in terms of cohesion or unit performance or what have you, because you do not have at that point these factors that present cleavage in a unit.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So if we put the Clinton proposal in effect and you do not change the conduct code, which they have not proposed, then how are we any different, unless you are just saying that by the mere fact that someone could say they were homosexual and not be dismissed? That alone would be flaunting it, just saying it?

I think a flaunt requires more action.

Colonel HENDERSON. I think the quote was: "Don't talk and don't flaunt." In other words it is a question of whether you come out in the open and assert your homosexual orientation or not. If you do that, then at that point you bring into action to some degree all these data that I read about. Seventy-eight percent of the people

right there in the military are against you; 90 percent do not want to room with you, because you are going to violate their privacy and so on.

So just by saying, "I am homosexual", in an open manner in the military, you run against these data that I cited.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But they have rights. I mean, they have rights to protest, obviously, if their actions are violative.

Colonel GREGOR. Ma'am, the problem historically has revolved around the fact that the commander is responsible for conduct both on and off-duty, 24 hours a day. If you bring in a group of people and you do not identify them, the assumption in the organization is not that everybody is heterosexual; the assumption is that I do not know what the organization is composed of. But that does not—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But you do not now, right? There is no way to see—

Colonel GREGOR. Yes, you do. You have the putative assumption, because everybody is interrogated, that everybody who has entered is heterosexual. That is a legal fiction, it creates an organizing assumption, but it also creates an interpretation of all the other probing things that we do, such as the medical history and the inquiries into past personal conduct in high school, et cetera.

The definition of what a homosexual is is going to have to be defined within the law, because historical evidence is that 29 to 33 percent of those who enter identify themselves, and many of them identify themselves for the purpose of seeking a discharge. So you are still going to have to define for legal purposes what that term means.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think I am going to have to adjourn the hearing, because the Chairman isn't back yet. But I have not quite sorted that out. I will be right back, and we will temporarily adjourn so we can vote.

Thank you.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. Since there is no one else in the room, the Chair will take this great opportunity to engage the witnesses.

Even colleagues who will give lip service to the notion that some of us start at the point that this is a civil rights issue will then say: However, the question is one of effectiveness, readiness, which then ultimately comes down to the question of cohesion. Everything now is turning on the issue of unit cohesion.

I would like to challenge the panel, and I would like to challenge Colonel Henderson, since all of his paper was on the issue of cohesion, and suggest to Colonel Henderson that in this gentleman's opinion, cohesion at best is a temporary condition. If it is a temporary condition, then the question is: How do we close the window of discomfort in that temporariness?

Let me explain what I am attempting to say. If the whole issue of combat preparedness, combat readiness, comes down, as the gentleman made as the quintessential point of his paper, what makes a fighting force capable of fighting is unit cohesion, unit cohesion is based on the similarity or the sameness of the unit.

Now gays and homosexuals in our society—and has been manifested by the numbers in the military—are not great numbers. You

may, if they step forward and say, "I am gay or lesbian," recognize them. If they do not, you do not know who they are. But a black American, for the most part, you would know a black American.

Now let us go back historically for a moment, because it would seem to me that if the issue of unit cohesion is being argued in the context of this issue, when the issue of unit cohesion was discussed in the context of race just a few decades ago, the visceral reaction must have been qualitatively and quantitatively, perhaps on a geometric basis, even more powerful. People argued, unit cohesion would fall apart. We share different values; we share different attitudes. Unit cohesion will break down; and therefore, the fighting force and effectiveness.

But that was because of people's racial attitudes, discrimination, prejudice, racism—a temporary condition. We are today several years intellectually and politically beyond where we were when that started, and the Chair would suggest that tomorrow we will be substantially farther down the road on the issue of gays and lesbians serving in the military than we are today, because this, it seems to me, has to be a temporary condition.

As someone said, to advocate change is a progressive idea, but it is not all that progressive to come to grips with the notion that cohesion is a temporary idea. You may not like me at first, but to know me is to love me. So that cohesion is a temporary thing.

I thought that radical Dellums from Berkeley was the devil incarnate until I came to Congress and found out he is a lovable guy, okay?

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. So then unit cohesion? We work together. A temporary condition.

What this whole debate now comes down to—pardon my personal reference—if what this whole debate comes down to is combat effectiveness, combat readiness, and the quintessential point around which that issue turns is the issue of unit cohesion, trust, similarity, shared goals, ability to communicate, et cetera, the Chair would suggest strongly that that is at best a temporary condition, and that temporary conditions can be overcome.

When we had to overcome the temporary condition of unit cohesion falling apart because black people were integrating the military, then we had to educate the white folks in the military. So now black and white and red and yellow and brown fight side by side.

The question of unit cohesion never comes up anymore on that issue. So if that is the question, as a modern society, if your major argument is, what makes a fighting force competent is unit cohesion, then it would seem to me that as a group, my colleagues at a political level should come to terms with the fact that it is a temporary condition and that as a society it does make sense for us to take steps to move us beyond our fears and our ignorance as a way of breaking down the barriers to cohesion, if it is based on stereotypes, fear, ignorance, lack of understanding, et cetera, et cetera, because that is what this society ostensibly is all about.

I offer that as a challenge. I would like the panel to engage at that level.

May 5 Hearing

The Association of the United States Army stands firmly in support of the ban against homosexuality in the Armed Forces. The following presents some of the principal reasons why we take this position. It also outlines some of the issues raised over recent months which require serious appraisal.

The military services exist for the purpose of defending the Nation and protecting national interests with minimum loss of life. The admission of open homosexuals is potentially divisive within an organization whose strength is unity and teamwork.

- Units are a special segment of the military environment. They live, train and fight together. Bonding is important. Shared values are essential in their bonds, and inclusion of homosexuals could serve to diminish these values. It would be difficult for a publicly avowed homosexual to bond with and be fully accepted by the group. In the professional judgment of military commanders, such divisiveness would degrade unit readiness and impair the combat effectiveness of the team.

- Senior-subordinate relationships may be adversely affected. Military organizations operate in a disciplined and structured way and are hierarchical in nature with clearly established channels for command and control. In such a framework, everyone knows who is in charge, but the system demands mutual senior-subordinate trust and respect in order to be effective. It is difficult to perceive an openly homosexual officer in a leadership role demanding and receiving the kind of trust and confidence needed from subordinates who find his or her lifestyle morally objectionable. This situation could not help but be erosive to effective control and discipline.

- Heterosexual animosity toward known homosexuals can cause latent or even overt hostility, resulting in degradation of team or unit esprit. While this animosity is unfortunate, it is a fact of society at large and cannot be changed by the military.

- Significant evidence exists that homosexuals, for whatever reasons, are at greater risk of contracting diseases (including AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases) that would affect their deployability and long-term service. (While this may only reflect past behavior and is not an intrinsic aspect of homosexuality, it is nonetheless of current and real concern to the military.) This becomes a unit readiness problem whenever an individual is physically unable to carry out his or her duties at full capacity or is not eligible for deployment overseas due to HIV or other infections.

Lifting the ban would immediately create complex administrative problems in the accommodation of homosexuals in the Armed Forces.

- Privacy is a real issue. Service requirements place many service members in close association, often in a status of prolonged forced intimacy (in barracks, aboard ships and in the field). Integration of homosexuals leads to a host of privacy issues such as the sharing of showers, latrines and barracks assignments.

- Added to the privacy issue is the question of accommodating homosexuals in military living arrangements—either troop billets or family housing. In the former, heterosexuals can be expected to object to sharing rooms, tents or bunkers with known homosexuals, thus confronting commanders with the challenge of either forcing cohabitation of heterosexuals with ho-

M a y 5 H e a r i n g

However, the HIV testing program is currently under attack by homosexual advocacy groups.

Homosexual behavior is contrary to the moral convictions of the vast majority of Americans, including Armed Forces personnel.

- The claim for minority status is predicated on the claim that 10 percent or more of the population (and of the military) is homosexual. This assertion is based on a discredited 1948 study by Alfred Kinsey, who polled large numbers of convicts and male prostitutes in his sample. A recent study by the National Center for Health Statistics suggests the real figure is less than 2 percent, the point being that homosexual preference or practice is not widely ingrained in American society.

- The moral dimensions of the issue cannot be ignored—American societal standards are clear from the statutes (Uniform Code of Military Justice and about half the State codes) which make sodomy a crime. The religious/moral dimension is clear from the long-established teachings of numerous denominations on the subject.

- The Armed Forces of the United States reflect the mores of our society. Altering military policy will not only affect the military community but, at the same time, have far-reaching consequences on society in general. It would seem that many would say lifting the ban is permissible as long as it does not involve them but would—not accept it for their sons and daughters. Parents are likely to discourage their children from entering military service as well. Therefore, acceptance of homosexuals into the Armed Forces could discourage young people from entering service and cause widespread recruiting and retention problems.

Most nations either bar homosexuals from serving or place restrictions on those who are allowed to serve.

- Abuse and fear of recrimination seem to be subtle, but there are reports of ongoing problems in every nation which allows homosexuals to serve in the military. The Dutch did a study in 1990 after 20 years of permitting homosexuals to serve in the military and found it extremely difficult to have anyone come forward to admit that he/she was homosexual.

- Israel is cited by homosexual advocates as a place where homosexuals are satisfactorily integrated into the Armed Forces. In the Israeli Defense Forces, homosexuals are not allowed to stay in the barracks with the other service members; they are sent home each night. This is totally impractical for U.S. forces. Israeli homosexuals are also prohibited from joining elite combat units and in most cases simply are not accepted.

- The Germans readily admit that known homosexuals have little, if any, chance of advancement because of the deep-seated prejudice against their behavior.

- The performance standards expected almost exclusively of our Army (to deploy world-wide and to accomplish varied and complex missions quickly and efficiently) makes comparisons with other nations' forces of limited value.

Before proceeding to inflict such a drastic social change upon the Armed Forces of the United States, we need to get a thorough educated public sensing of the impacts of lifting the ban. We need to hear and understand the concerns of the people who would be most directly affected by this major policy change—the men and women who wear the uniform of this country and their families. Today they are universally concerned and deeply troubled by this whole matter.

It is vitally important that this question be thoroughly reviewed by Congress. Public hearings should be held and all facts considered. Public support or lack of support should be scrupulously evaluated. If implemented, this will be a wrenching social change and we are dealing with one of our Nation's largest and most important institutions, the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF M.SGT. MICHAEL P. CLINE, RETIRED

Introduction

On behalf of the Enlisted Association National Guard of the United States (EANGUS) we extend our thanks to provide testimony for the record on Gays in the Military.

Let me state from the outset that lifting the ban on homosexuals serving in the military is not a civil rights, equal rights, or gay rights issue. If it is considered a

May 5 Hearing

"There are three critical factors underlying the DOD exclusionary policy on homosexuals that need to be recognized. First, the DOD policy is the result of the considered professional military judgment based on years of experience, of civilian and military leaders of the Department of Defense. Second, the policy is a matter of professional military judgment, not scientific or sociological analysis. Third, the DOD policy is based solely on what contributes to overall combat effectiveness (i.e., accomplishment of the military mission)."

The wide spread current debate fails to put into perspective the relatively low level of discharge of homosexuals under current policy. Each year the Department of Defense separates about 300,000 service members, approximately 100,000 of whom are separated for force management reasons. Homosexuals make up less than one-third of 1 percent of the total.

The collective military and management judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (who have nearly 150 years of combined military service) is certainly buttressed by The Retired Officers Association's (TROA) survey reported in the December 1992 issue of its magazine. A random survey of 1013 TROA members found that 94 percent of those polled considered themselves either very familiar or somewhat familiar with the issue. Eighty-three percent either strongly opposed (67 percent) or oppose (16 percent) allowing homosexuals in the military.

In addition to the considered judgment of military leaders, a critical question is the view of the troops—those who will deal with the results of the lifting of the ban. How do the troops feel, beyond the widely reported "sound bite" pools of the press and media?

While we are unaware of any extensive studies, the following excerpt from the aforesaid GAO Report is valuable: "A recent Navy study concluded that, despite the apparent increase in society's acceptance of homosexuals, there was virtually no support around Navy women and men at all levels, and at every site visited, to change the current Navy homosexual exclusion policy. The study noted that, although many young people entering the Navy today view the homosexual life style as a legitimate choice, experience with the exceptionally close living and working environment in the Navy tends to convince many of the junior personnel that homosexuality cannot be tolerated among Navy members."

We strongly believe that any decision to admit homosexuals to the military would be fundamentally flawed if the men and women directly affected by it—day in and day out, not 9-5, but 24 hours a day—are not heard. Senator Sam Nunn in his address on the Senate floor on January 27 asked a series of questions concerning the issue. These questions need to be answered in addition to a number of others.

He also clearly supported our views on the imperative of consulting those whom it would affect. Senator Nunn stated, "I have advised both President Clinton and Secretary Aspin to seek the advice and views, first and foremost, of a broad range of military personnel—the people who would be most directly affected by any change in the current policy on service by homosexuals—before making any final changes." The views of those who must share barracks, showers, latrines and foxholes with acknowledged homosexuals must be given foremost consideration and should certainly be more weight than public opinion polls because the given general public lacks personal knowledge of military life.

Our opposition to lifting the ban is reinforced by serious concerns in numerous areas, all of which will weaken the combat effectiveness of the force. These are:

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

Lifting of the ban will have a decidedly negative impact on the retention and recruitment of military personnel. Additionally, it will have long-term impact on the Nation's ability to recruit in future years.

MEDIAL ISSUES

The incidence of both HIV and sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) is drastically higher among male homosexuals than in the general population. The level and nature of homosexual activity obviously increases the probability of contracting those diseases, and studies indicate extraordinary levels of both frequency and number of partners in the male homosexual community (*Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women*). Because of the dramatic incidence of HIV in the male homosexual community, lifting the ban will surely increase its incidence in the military services. This will markedly increase medical costs and cause a reallocation of already limited medical resources. Moreover, one can only ponder the increased fear of HIV susceptibility among the great majority of heterosexual service members. Additionally, the walking blood supply of the military will come into serious question.

All of these problems will pose significant dangers for soldier health and result in lower readiness.

Military medical facilities are already unable to meet the total needs of Active and retired personnel. The increased medical support requirements by lifting the ban on homosexuals would significantly burden an already hard pressed health care delivery system.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY

The individual rights, particularly the privacy rights of the vast majority of military personnel must not be ignored. Involuntary military assignment causes particular problems in all services in regard to personal privacy, and heterosexuals should not be expected to share facilities with homosexuals. Theoretically, the military could eventually be compelled to provide five types of housing Male homosexual, female homosexual, male heterosexual, female heterosexual and family housing.

VALUES

A unique part of the military society is a group of shared values-both professional and personal. The military is more "traditional" American value oriented than the population as a whole. As some measure of this statement, 74 percent of officers and 57 percent of enlisted personnel in the US. Army are married, averaging about 2.5 dependents per family. Lifting the ban will legitimize a life style which runs counter to the religious, personal and moral views of most military families. The issue could well cause even additional family stress in a community which is by direction living in a restricted housing and social environment.

Many military members have deeply held religious beliefs which view homosexuality as immoral and sinful. The Military Chaplains Association of the U.S. Army has expressed its deep concern over the lifting of the ban and such views by religious leaders in close, daily contact with service members must be weighed heavily.

DISCIPLINE AND GOOD ORDER

Many heterosexual service people will reject the sanctioned integration of homosexuals. It will create explosive situations both in the work and living environments.

Homosexual soldiers will cause other discipline problems for military officials. According to *Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women* by Alan P. Bell and Martin S. Weinberg, homosexuals are six times more likely to attempt suicide than heterosexual men. This will certainly present a leadership and discipline challenge for military leaders.

Studies cited in *Alcoholics Anonymous and Gay American Men* by Robert J. Kus (*Journal of Homosexuality*, Vol. 14, No. 2) indicate that between 25 and 33 percent of homosexual men and women are alcoholics. The abuse of alcohol is linked with discipline problems.

The potential for violence among homosexual and heterosexual service members, the homosexual community's higher suicide rate and the incidence of homosexual alcoholics will undermine organizational discipline and detract from unit readiness.

MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS

Most importantly, incorporating homosexuals in the U.S. military services will drastically reduce military effectiveness. The military sociologist, Charles Moskos, writing in the op-ed page of the February 1, 1993 issue of the *Washington Post* provided an important discussion of the issue and I asked that it be made a part of the record. Col. David Hackworth succinctly stated the impact of lifting the ban: "I cannot think of a better way to destroy fighting spirit and gut US. combat effectiveness."

AMERICAN PUBLIC'S ACCEPTANCE

Today, the US. military is widely and favorably accepted by the American public. This support acknowledges the fact that the military—because of military necessity—limits participation by entire categories due to height, weight, educational achievement, physical and mental limitations, and other reasons. The public's current acceptance of the military acknowledges that such service is a citizen duty, a citizen privilege but not necessarily a right. The lifting of the current ban could seriously erode the favorable view of the Armed Forces by most Americans.