

Kentucky Edition

February 1994

Lifting the Ban on Homosexuals in the Military: The Subversion of a Moral Principle

"We have taken on the most conservative institution in America and forced it to at least discuss domestic partnership. Down the line, we will get gay marriage. We're going to get the military to recognize us and our partners. We're going to promote our agenda..."²

BY RONALD D. RAY, COLONEL, USMCR¹

At the close of 1993 most Americans were surprised to learn that open homosexuals have been reinstated and have been serving openly in our armed forces since October 1, 1993. The Joint Chiefs acquiesced to Clinton and Aspin's questionable order called "Don't ask, don't tell," on January 29, 1993, and stood behind Clinton on July 19, 1993 and publicly approved the "don't pursue" compromise which was struck between the White House and Pentagon during the summer. Colin Powell had opposed lifting the ban publicly during 1992, however he was a major factor in delivering the Chiefs during 1993 on this issue which was crucial to advancing the "gay rights" legal position in the courts.

Legally the "gay rights" movement needed to have the Chiefs approve not screening for homosexuality at the recruiting stations to avoid the legal doctrine of Military Necessity. This concept denotes the Supreme court's long-standing deference to military judgment and executive leadership in areas of war and defense

policy. Homosexuality has always been a disqualification from American military service. In other words, in the past, the Court has always deferred to the wisdom that whatever America's military leadership has deemed necessary to defend America against its "enemies foreign and domestic" must be granted.

The Chiefs' acquiescence to "Don't ask, don't tell" was necessary to overturn 375 years of law policy and military order in the courts. These concessions on the part of the Chiefs which included allowing openly homosexual servicemen and women to return to duty, form critically important parts of the "gay rights" legal positions as they now enter the courts. The American people only saw flickering images reflecting impressions that the homosexual movement was angry at Clinton for "compromising," while many conservative leaders opposed to allowing homosexuals to serve were claiming victory in Congress. Thus, many Americans were led to believe that the homosexual ban has been preserved, which is simply not true. The

Congress only codified the earlier compromise, not the pre-Clinton homosexual ban.

Homosexual Joe Steffan, a former Naval Academy midshipman, was ordered back to duty by three liberal Carter appointed D.C. Circuit Court judges on November 16, 1993. With a limited appeal by gay favoring Clinton Justice Department attorneys, Steffan will likely be graduated from the Naval Academy and perhaps be commissioned. Homosexual sailor Keith Meinhold was ordered reinstated during November, 1993, only the second open homosexual to serve.³ Meinhold was permitted to re-enlist on December 16, 1993 and was sworn in by an openly lesbian Naval officer.⁴ This window of service for open homosexuals would not have been possible without the Joint chiefs' endorsement of "don't ask, don't tell" and their support of the Clinton/Aspin compromise. Failure to screen out or investigate for homosexuality and with homosexuals now serving openly, gives homosexuals a claim of service without

"incident." It also provides the ability to claim the possibility of separating homosexual "status" or "orientation" from sodomy or homosexual behavior...all key events which could be turned into winning legal points for the "gay rights" movement in the federal courts.

There are over fifty lawsuits winding their way through the courts. Homosexual activists continue to seek new or different fact patterns to make new arguments to overturn the military homosexual policy. They even argue that the ban or don't ask, don't tell, etc. violates freedom of speech and that the new "officially recognized status" of homosexual orientation should be given legal status as a "cultural minority" under the equal protection clause of the constitution. These arguments are essential legal abstractions and sophistry to provide cover for a revolutionary change in American law, policy and morals which occurred during 1993. The American military's first principle of virtue was surrendered without a shot being fired.

¹ Colonel Ronald D. Ray is a Christian, husband and father, a practicing attorney and a highly decorated combat veteran of the Vietnam War (two Silver Stars, a Bronze Star, and a Purple Heart). He served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense during the Reagan Administration, and on the 1992 Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces. He is an author and lecturer, whose recent book is entitled *Military Necessity & Homosexuality*. He writes and speaks on a wide range of subjects and has appeared on national television news and call-in radio stations. He speaks on public and constitutional issues of local and national interest such as American Heritage, the proper role of women in the armed forces, separation of church and state, gun control, history of the Vietnam War and MIA/POW's and a variety of defense and current policy subjects.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are the personal views of the individual author and are not necessarily endorsed by, nor necessarily reflect the official position of the Department of Defense, Department of the Navy, United States Marine Corps, or any other government agency.

² "Gay Activists Summon Their Hopes, Resolve" *The Washington Post*, 18 April 1993.

³ Lancaster, John, "Agrees to reinstate Gay Sailor, Service to comply with Judges order while case proceeds," *Washington Post*, 11 November 1992, p. 1.

⁴ See Brinkley, "Meinhold re-enlists, then returns to the Courtroom," *Washington Blade*, 24 December 1993, Vol. 24, No. 54, p. 1.


EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SEXUAL ORIENTATION: A COMPARISON STUDY of HOMOSEXUAL & HETEROSEXUAL
PERSONAL CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS in
THE ADVOCATE & WASHINGTONIAN (1988-1992)

Due to changes in the sociosexual nature of partner selection, singles not uncommonly seek partners via "IN SEARCH OF" (ISO) ads in magazines reflecting their population profile. The mainstream homosexual newsmagazine, *THE ADVOCATE*, appears to reach at least 33% to 50% white homosexual males 20-45 years; upscale, degreed, affluent and politically active. The content analysis research charted below is supported by both homosexual advocacy scholarship and ex-and current homosexual male testimonies more verifiable than sex survey and self-report data. The replicable, validatable, scientific data outlined below reveal a "gay" sociosexual system of aggressive, multiple partner condomless sex (including sex between men and boys) much of which is swiftly becoming law and public policy and taught in classrooms nationwide. A pilot study of a demographically similar heterosexual publication, the *WASHINGTONIAN*, (see April 1993 pilot data below) finds major "straight versus gay" differences, hence a comparison study of these 7 "gay" findings is underway.

THE ADVOCATE TABLE
7 "IN SEARCH OF" HOMOSEXUAL SOLICITATION CHARACTERISTICS
(Nearest Percent of ~47,200/~446,000~ Rank-Ordered by Rate of Occurrence, 1972-1993)

1. ISO Straight looking ("masculine") men/boys	97% ('72-93)
2. ISO Casual, AIDS-efficient sex	97% ('92-'93) 99% ('72-91)
3. ISO White partners	97% to 99% ('72-'93)
4. ISO Prostitution services	77% ('92-'93) 58% ('72-91)
5. ISO Body parts sex/phallus	65% ('92-'93) 32% ('72-91)
6. ISO Man-Boy sex	31% ('92-'93) 20% ('72-91)
7. ISO Sadism/humiliation	14% ('92-'93) 20% ('72-91)

(Code identifiers/groupings explained in Main Body Chapter)



WASHINGTONIAN TABLE
7 "IN SEARCH OF" HETEROSEXUAL SOLICITATION CHARACTERISTICS
(Rank-Ordered by Rate of Occurrence, April 1993)

1. ISO Straight (normal)	99% (Nearly all ads)
2. ISO White partners	99% (Nearly all ads)
3. ISO Casual sex <i>(VS: Marriage permanence)</i>	26% males, 8% females <i>(67% males, 86% females)</i>
4. ISO Prostitution services	4% males, 3% females
5. ISO Sadism/humiliation	2.6% males, .06% females
6. ISO Man-Girl sex	0.5% (2 males ISO 18+)
7. ISO Body parts/phallic size wanted	no ISO citations