

**Statement of Brigadier General William Weise, USMC (Retired)  
to the House Armed Services Committee  
May 4, 1993.**

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you on this issue which is so important, not only to our Armed Forces, but to our nation and the world. The issue goes much deeper than the admission of homosexuals into our Armed Forces. The primary issue is: Which is more important

- (1) The civil rights of all Americans or
- (2) The special interests of a very small fraction, probably less than 2%, of our population?

I believe that the rights of all Americans should take precedence over the special interests of any small segment of the population and that is why I urge you to ban the admission or retention of homosexuals in our Armed Forces.

Our Armed Forces exist to protect the freedom and national interests of all Americans. To do this the Armed Forces must be ready to fight and win on the battlefield-- that is to be combat effective. Anything which detracts from combat effectiveness puts the lives of young American service people and the national interests of the United States at great risk. Allowing open homosexuals in our Armed Forces will seriously degrade combat effectiveness by undermining morale, discipline and unit cohesion.

I served in the Marine Corps for 31 years. I led infantry troops in close combat in Korea and Vietnam, and I spent many years training personnel from all the services to prepare for war--that is, to be combat effective. Why do I say combat effectiveness will be seriously degraded if we admit homosexuals? I could give many reasons, but today I wish to focus specifically on the clearly-stated agenda and objectives of homosexual organizations.

Based on numerous public announcements, here are the demands shared by many homosexual organizations:

1. Amend all civil rights laws to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation; federal ban on homosexual discrimination; guarantee civil rights protection for homosexuals in public employment barring discrimination based on sexual orientation in federal employment and contracts.

2. Permit homosexuals to serve in the Armed Forces;
3. Allow the immigration and naturalization of homosexual aliens; an end to an immigration and naturalization service policy that denies entry visas to foreign nationals who test positive for antibodies to HIV, the virus believed to lead to AIDS.
4. Federal encouragement and support for pro-homosexual sex education courses in the public schools;
5. Federal funding for homosexual advocacy groups;
6. Immediate release of all sexual offenders now incarcerated for crimes related to sexual orientation;
7. Decriminalize private sex acts between consenting "persons"; repeal sodomy laws.
8. Repeal all laws governing the age of consent;
9. Repeal any legal restrictions on the sex or number of persons entering into a marriage unit.
10. Repeal all laws prohibiting transvestism and cross-dressing.
11. Funding of all programs of homosexual organizations designed to alleviate the problems engendered by a sexist society against homosexuals.
12. Ensure federal funding for all AIDS services and protect people with HIV or AIDS from discrimination; fund the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency Act; eliminate mandatory HIV testing programs.
13. Develop a "Manhattan-type project" to find a cure for AIDS.
14. Appoint a National Endowment for the Arts director who will provide grants to artists who produce sexually explicit homosexual - themed works.
15. Appointment of nominees to federal courts, including the Supreme Court, who are sympathetic to homosexual rights issues.
16. Sexual orientation should not be a factor in denying security clearances.
17. Limit the power of government to dictate the reproductive rights and sexual choices made by its citizens.
18. Recognize homosexuality in the young and undo the damage done in the past by government youth studies. Government should study suicide among gay youth.

19. More research on lesbian health care needs.
20. Federal agencies must remedy bias crime -- including crime motivated by prejudice based on sexual orientation.
21. Promote school and community based programs that help prevent future anti-homosexual crime.
22. Fund programs that support victims of hate crimes.
23. NEA chairman who will safeguard artistic expression and promote the full diversity of all American artists; ensure gay themes and artists do not receive undue scrutiny in the grant approval process; disband the National Obscenity Enforcement Unit.
24. Statehood for the District of Columbia.

Why are the Armed Forces so high on the homosexual agenda? Today, the military is arguably the most respected of all American institutions. Homosexual rights activists want to impose government-enforced approval of homosexual behavior and special rights on the Armed Forces. Then they wish to impose their values on all Americans through special rights laws, using America's Armed Forces as a model. How do I know this? Because of the public statements of homosexual activists. For example:

● "And now," says lawyer-activist Bob Wightman of Arlington, Texas, "when Bill Clinton lifts the ban, he is going to push national acceptance of homosexuality. It's not just going to push people out of the closet in the military - it's going to push people out of the closet all over the country. It's going to be OK to be homosexual." (Newsweek, "Gays in the Military," 1 February 1993)

● "Other gays are fighting back as well - and all are providing new test cases for the gay-rights movement, which sees Pentagon policy as a prime target in the campaign to change attitudes of society at large." (Newsweek, "Gays in the Military," 1 February 1993)

● "We have taken on the most conservative institution in America and forced it to at least discuss domestic partnership," Osborn said. "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. We're ready, and this march signals a new era." (Torie Osborn, executive director, National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, in "Gay Activists Summon Their Hopes, Resolve, The Washington Post, 18 April 1993)

● "The Campaign for Military Service was hurriedly formed last week to take charge of the battle. The group's formation reflects the desperate state that gay-rights figures believe the fight is in. And it reflects a growing conviction by many homosexuals that

the military issue, which had not been their central priority, must be won at all costs or gay rights in general will be set back." (The New York Times, "Gay Groups Regrouping for War on Military Ban," 7 February 1993.)

● "This will truly be a massive effort," said David Mixner, a Los Angeles gay activist and Clinton campaign advisor who will head the coalition fund-raising efforts. "We are fighting for survival as a civil rights movement." (Los Angeles Times, "Coalition Fights to Lift ban on Homosexuals in the Military," 5 February 1993)

● "What has been demonstrated this last week is it is not enough to have the President of the United States on your side," observed David M. Smith, executive Director of the Los Angeles branch of the Gay and Lesbian Alliance against Defamation. "It's incumbent upon us to change public attitudes." (Los Angeles Times, "Coalition Fights to lift Ban on Homosexuals in the Military," 5 February 1993)

● "The Campaign for Military Service also sought to learn from the results of a common marketing practice - the focus group - to determine what information most convinces the general population that discrimination against Gays is wrong. Tom Stoddard, executive director of the Campaign, told his staff Monday that the focus group, conducted in Ohio, revealed that 'individual stories of discrimination is the key'." ("War Over Military Ban Escalating," The Washington Blade, 19 March 1993)

● "This struggle will determine in some fashion the outcome of every civil-rights issue confronting this community for the next decade and beyond. This is not a fight about the military. This is a fight of every lesbian and gay American for their place in society." (Thomas Stoddard, Coordinator of the Campaign for Military Service, quoted in the New York Times, "Gay Groups Regrouping for War on Military ban," 7 February 1993)

Based on these and other statements it is quite clear that if homosexuals are admitted, they will not be satisfied with merely acknowledging their status.

They want quotas:

● "We intend to sue in Federal Court as soon as the ban is lifted to insure compensatory representation in the service academies. In particular, we intend to get a ruling mandating a set number of places for homosexuals in the Air Force Academy, the Naval Academy, and West Point....Furthermore, we intend to see any official of a military school charged in a civil rights violation if they attempt to harass homosexuals...." (ACT UP member, Bob Wingate in a letter to Superintendent, United States Military Academy, on 26 November 1992).

They want to stop HIV screening:

- "Someone's HIV status shouldn't be a determining factor for a job, and the military is a job." (Daniel T. Bross, executive director of the AIDS Action Council in a Washington Times article, "Gay Activists Protest HIV Testing in Military," 1 December 1992)

They want more than acceptance, they want to change society's behavior:

- "We ought to advertise our potential to change straight society in radical, beneficial ways. Straights have much to learn from us: first and foremost the fact that pleasure is possible (and desirable) beyond the sanctions of the state. Another fact gleaned from gay experience -- that gender is for all intents and purposes a fiction -- also has the potential to revolutionize straight lives." (Donna Minkowitz, a lesbian writer in The Advocate article "Recruit, Recruit, Recruit." (29 December, 1992)).

- "Gay men should wear their sexually transmitted diseases like red badges of courage in a war against a sex-negative society." (Edmund White in The Joy of Gay Sex)

- "Every time I get the clap I'm striking a blow for the sexual revolution." (Michael Callen in Surviving AIDS)

- "I haven't worked for 30 years to give gays the right to be celibate." (Frank Kameny, "guru of the gay-liberation movement," quoted in Newsweek, "Gays in the Military," 1 February 1993)

They want to indoctrinate our children:

- Donna Minkowitz, explaining her agenda for going on the Montel Williams show: to "talk about children, sexual choices, and the reasons we need pro-gay curricula in our public schools...I wanted to go on the show to argue the morality of teaching kids that gay is OK even if it means that some will join our ranks." (Donna Minkowitz, a lesbian and regular contributor to the Village Voice in The Advocate article, "Recruit, recruit, recruit!," (29 December, 1992))

Flawed Data Used to Support Homosexual Agenda.

Interestingly, much of the data used in support of the Homosexual Agenda are seriously flawed. One example is the 1988 PERSEREC report by Sarbin and Karols, "Nonconforming Sexual Orientations in the Military and Society". Serious questions about the PERSEREC study raised by Robert L. McGinnis and Robert Knight in their paper, "Homosexual Security Issue Clouded by Partisan Study", attached as enclosure (1).

Another example is the claim that homosexuals comprise 10% of the population. See "Homosexuals and the 10% Fallacy", The Wall Street Journal, March 31, 1993, p. A14, attached as enclosure (1A).

In addition, the claim that homosexuality is hereditary is based on research that lacks scientific rigor at best. See enclosure (1B), "Flawed Science Nurtures Genetic Origin of Homosexuality", Infocus, May 1993.

### Who Are the Homosexuals?

Homosexual activists, with the help of a friendly media, a large budget, clever advertising and excellent planning try to portray themselves as persecuted minority whose members are victimized by "homophobic" bigots. The homosexual community could be more accurately described as a well financed special interest group seeking approval of its lifestyle. See enclosure (1C), "The Homosexual Subculture", an unpublished article by Robert L. McGinnis.

### Recent Cases of Homosexual Misconduct

Having looked at the goals of the homosexual movement, lets look at why, based on centuries of experience, DOD excludes homosexuals as a category (status). As a category, homosexuals have placed tremendous burdens on the military, even though some have served honorably. The series of cases which follow represent empirical data that confirm the DOD exclusion policy:

(Note: Graphic descriptions may be offensive to some persons)

**CASE #1.** Extract from a letter to a member of Congress from an active duty Soldier. Homosexual rape of a male recruit.

" ....In my view, too much is claimed about the distinguished service of homosexuals. What I see are frequent violations of criminal laws by the handful of gays on active duty.

"I am particularly uneasy with the casual manner in which the gay community dismisses the privacy rights of normal soldiers. Gays claim they won't take an interest in others they see in the showers. I'm not convinced. I want to give you just one example of the danger I see in opening the service to homosexuals:

"A new recruit, Private C., enlisted in the Army and was in basic training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Late at night on September 18, 1991, he was alone in the shower room when he was joined by two homosexual recruits. Private Jamison, also a basic trainee, approached Private C. He turned the shower off and grabbed C., spinning him around to expose his bare buttocks. He immediately jammed his finger into C.'s anus. Frightened and startled, C. screamed out. In an instant, Jamison unsuccessfully tried to force his penis into C.'s anus. Again, C. screamed out for help, but to

no avail. Jamison wrapped a towel around C.'s neck strangling him as he lubricated his penis with soap and rammed his penis into C.'s anus. As C. struggled, Jamison controlled him by choking him with the towel.

"The second homosexual, Williams, watched as the attack progressed. Jamison next withdrew from C., then calmly washed his hands. He switched the lights off for the next event. As C. cowered in fear and pain, Williams commanded C. to suck Jamison's penis. Jamison grabbed C. and forced him to his knees before Williams. He ordered him to suck Williams' penis. C. placed his lips on Williams' penis, but that was not enough. The homosexuals forced C. to suck Williams' penis as the two homosexuals leered down at their kneeling victim. Unsatisfied, Williams demanded that the victim further degrade himself by licking Williams' scrotum. Jamison helped by forcing Williams to comply. After the attack, Jamison ordered the victim out of his barracks. As C. struggled to gather his belongings, Private Jamison threw a shoe and struck him. When he still was unable to move fast enough, Jamison kicked him with full force in the head.

"C. ran to a cadre member and immediately reported the attack. Following a criminal investigation, Jamison and Williams plead guilty to the offenses and were sentenced to 54 months and 36 months respectively.

"Private C., in effect received a life sentence. At the time of trial, he was a psychiatric patient in the Air Force hospital at Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas.

"Several nights ago, Prime Time had a show in which they "debunked" soldiers' silly fears of assaults by gangs of homosexuals in the showers. I simmer with anger when I think of this case, and of how the American people are being misled by such tripe. Gays are a danger now, and after they are emboldened by the inevitable sensitivity training that will accompany lifting the ban, more young Americans will become their victims.

"By eliminating questions about homosexuality from our enlistment forms, we are unwittingly signaling a diminished willingness to protect normal soldiers from degrading attacks like these. I wonder if our government believes that good Americans have any rights remaining. We must codify the gay ban for all time. The Department of Defense is one of the bastions of American morality. Break down those walls, and you can expect a flood of criminal misconduct to result."

**CASE #2. Senior drill instructor commits sodomy with recruit.**

A Marine Staff Sergeant senior drill instructor was instructed to temporarily billet a Private for one night. The Private was a

recruit from another platoon, who was being administratively separated from the Marine Corps for his admission of homosexuality. To protect the Private from other members of his platoon, he was placed with the Staff Sergeant's platoon while awaiting processing. The Staff Sergeant, knowing that the Private was being separated for admitted homosexuality, separated him from the rest of his platoon during evening showers. The Staff Sergeant ordered the Private to take a shower by himself. The Staff Sergeant came into the shower area and ordered the Private to pull down his shorts and expose himself. The Private complied and the Staff Sergeant ordered the Private to go to the Staff Sergeant's office where he had consensual anal sodomy with the Private.

The Staff Sergeant was relieved of his duties as Senior Drill Instructor during the middle of the platoon's training cycle. He was found guilty at a General Court-Martial (GCM) of sodomy (UCMJ Art. 125) and indecent acts (UCMJ Art. 134), and was sentenced to reduction to E-1, forfeiture of \$400.00 per month for 9 months, confinement for 9 months, and a Bad Conduct Discharge.

As a senior Drill Instructor, the Staff Sergeant was entrusted to protect and train young men entering the Marine Corps. He had a billet of utmost trust and responsibility. He violated that special trust and confidence by taking advantage of his position to gratify his sexual desires.

He was removed from the platoon which caused a loss of focus and turmoil within the platoon that directly affected the level of performance and professional development of all the recruits within the platoon.

From the perspective of impressionable young recruits, the senior drill instructor is the supreme role model who is the center of their lives while at recruit training. The authority and control that a drill instructor has is unmatched anywhere else in the Marine Corps. Misconduct such as the Staff Sergeant's caused irreparable damage to the unit and the recruit training command by degrading respect for the rank and command structure.

### **CASE #3. Female Drill Instructor commits sodomy with recruit.**

A female Marine Sergeant drill instructor committed oral sodomy on a female recruit, who was under her supervision. At a General Court Martial the Sergeant was convicted of recruit training SOP violations (UCMJ Art. 92), committing an indecent act and obstruction of justice (UCMJ Art. 134). She received a dishonorable discharge, reduction to E-1, forfeiture of \$350.00/mo. for 14 months and confinement for 14 months. A pre-trial agreement limited confinement to six months and mitigated the dishonorable discharge to a bad conduct discharge. Subsequently, the sentence was over-turned and the case is being re-heard for sentencing at

Quantico.

The Sergeant was entrusted with the care, protection, and training of young women entering the Marine Corps. She violated the special trust and confidence accorded her. Her removal as a drill instructor from the battalion caused a loss of confidence and created turmoil that directly affected the level of pride and performance of her platoon.

The Sergeant compromised her position of respect and authority by taking advantage of a female recruit. She caused irreparable damage to the reputation of Marine Corps drill instructors as well as damage to the morale and esprit of her unit and the recruit training command.

**CASE #4.** Staff non-commissioned officer drugs and attacks subordinate.

A Staff Sergeant (platoon sergeant), during 1989, repeatedly invited junior personnel to his barracks room on weekends, one a time, where he would provide them with alcohol, always including 151 proof rum. The victim would then pass out or fall into a drunken sleep. The Staff Sergeant would then fondle the victim's penis or commit anal sodomy.

On one occasion, a Private woke up in the Staff Sergeant's room to find the Staff Sergeant fondling the Private's penis. When the Private woke up, he found the Staff Sergeant lying in the bed behind him, his pants were pulled down to his knees and the Staff Sergeant had one hand inside the Private's underwear, fondling his penis. Immediately following this incident, the Private went on unauthorized absence (UA). When found, he underwent psychiatric examination. He reported the incident to the Chaplain who in turn reported it to the First Sergeant.

Another victim was a Lance Corporal, who, like the Private, was a member of the Staff Sergeant's platoon. The Lance Corporal went to the Staff Sergeant's room in late Aug or early Sep 89 and drank rum and coke until he passed out. He woke up to find his underwear had been pulled down to his knees, and his buttocks, including his anus, had been greased and was sore for two days after the incident.

Two other individuals provided some information that was not used as the basis for any formal charges. Essentially, each went to the Staff Sergeant's room and drank until he passed out. One reported waking up and finding the Staff Sergeant in bed with him, but nothing beyond that. The other passed out in a chair and woke up in the Staff Sergeant's bed on his stomach with the Staff Sergeant either sitting or lying on the bed.

The Private manifested the effects that the Staff Sergeant's conduct had on him by going UA and later requiring psychiatric intervention. Obviously, the effects of this kind of trauma and violation to an individual's person are not always overt and measurable, but are no less profound.

Order and discipline in the unit were seriously degraded. The victims were taunted. Members of the unit did not want to work with the Staff Sergeant. The unit was disrupted and fractionalized for a substantial period of time.

**CASE #5.** Staff sergeant, drill instructor, convicted of performing homosexual acts with two recruits.

A staff Sergeant drill instructor ordered a recruit to pull down his trousers and masturbate to ejaculation on the platoon flag inside the Staff Sergeant's office. The Staff Sergeant forced the recruit to perform oral sodomy on him on two different occasions and the Staff Sergeant performed forcible anal sodomy on the recruit.

On another occasion the Staff Sergeant bound the wrists of a recruit with a belt, pulled down his trousers and grabbed his penis.

The Staff Sergeant was relieved of his duties as a senior drill instructor and was found guilty at a General Court Martial (GCM) of sodomy under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) Art. 125, and indecent acts (UCMJ Art. 134). He was sentenced to reduction to E-1, forfeiture of \$400.00/mo. for 15 years, confinement for 15 years, and a Dishonorable Discharge. A pre-trial agreement suspended confinement in excess of six years.

As a result of the Staff Sergeant's actions one recruit suffered psychological damage and underwent psychotherapy to facilitate his recovery from the emotional damage he suffered. The Staff Sergeant was discharged.

The Staff Sergeant had been assigned the duties of senior drill instructor, a billet of extreme trust and responsibility. He was entrusted with the care and training of young men entering the Marine Corps. He grossly violated the special trust and confidence bestowed upon him. In addition to the heinous nature of his actions, the Staff Sergeant's removal from the platoon caused a loss of focus and created turmoil and trauma that directly affected the level of performance and professional development of all recruits in the platoon. This Staff Sergeant's conduct caused irreparable damage to the reputation of Marine Corps drill instructors, and damage to the morale and esprit of the unit and recruit training command. A drill instructor's unique position of authority provides an opportunity to intimidate, coerce, and

manipulate recruits who are then afraid to report such actions. This causes distrust and disrespect for the rank and command structure.

**CASE #6. Company gunnery sergeant sexually assaults officer candidate.**

In 1981 a Marine Corps officer candidate was left behind in the squad bay while the rest of his platoon was conducting scheduled training. While the candidate was alone the candidate's company gunnery sergeant, entered the squad bay and forced the candidate to engage in forcible sodomy with the gunnery sergeant. The candidate was subjected to a forcible sexual assault which required medical treatment. The candidate submitted a claim for medical treatment which the Marine Corps paid. The gay Sergeant was convicted by a general court-martial of forcible sodomy, and sentenced to a bad conduct discharge, total forfeitures, and reduction to pay grade E-1. The case was overturned for a procedural error.

The publicity surrounding this incident can only discourage qualified potential officer candidates from considering service in the Marine Corps or other branches of the Armed Forces which require forced living and training environments.

The admission of homosexual service members to training environments will increase tension and concern about forced or coerced sexual contact, which will degrade focus and attention on training and mission accomplishment.

Homosexual male drill instructors in charge of male officer candidates or recruits will be confronted with similar issues as heterosexual male drill instructors would be if placed in charge of female officer candidates or recruits. The Marine Corps restricts male drill instructors from directly training female candidates or recruits. Similar logic would require restricting homosexual drill instructors from training members of the same sex, thus creating administratively restricted billets for homosexual service members and limiting billet and career opportunities.

**CASE #7. Drill instructor commits sodomy with recruit.**

In August 1990, a Marine Sergeant drill instructor was administratively discharged due to engagement in and solicitation of homosexual acts with a Private. The victim had previously been a recruit in the Sergeant's platoon and was then assigned to the School of Infantry. The Sergeant fondled the penis of the Private and performed oral sodomy on him. The Private indicated he "froze" and did not know how to stop the Sergeant from performing oral sodomy on him.

The Sergeant was administratively discharged. The effect on the Private was obvious distress and victimization. Such conduct by a senior violates the trust between Marines of different rank and denigrates the command structure. Incidents of this kind in a recruit environment can only have a detrimental effect on recruiting efforts and create distrust within the recruit environment.

**CASE #8. Recruit solicits homosexual acts.**

A Private at Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, was administratively discharged for homosexuality in Nov 92. She would have graduated the next day. The Private was the subject of allegations by her fellow recruits. The allegations centered around inappropriate behavior such as touching another female recruit's breast and solicitation of sexual acts from other recruits. She was the subject of a Criminal Investigation Division (CID) investigation and subsequently discharged from the Marine Corps.

Testimony at the Private's administrative discharge board, revealed a sense of intimidation among fellow recruits due to her aggressive behavior. This caused significant disruption, fear, and distrust in the recruit platoon. The impact on morale in the recruit platoon as a result of the homosexuals recruit's misconduct was clearly illustrated at her administrative discharge board. The overall disruption, distraction and distrust resulting from her behavior had the net effect of degrading training and subverting the recruit training mission.

The discharge of a recruit who was obviously a homosexual before entering the Marine Corps resulted in a waste of recruiting time and negative impact on the recruiting command's goals

**CASE #9. Non-consensual sodomy committed on private first class.**

A Corporal committed an act of oral and anal sodomy upon a PFC who occupied a room adjoining his, in Okinawa Japan. The PFC had been brought back to his barracks room heavily intoxicated. The Corporal observed that the PFC was incapacitated due to his intoxication. The Corporal pulled the PFC's pants down and performed oral sodomy on him. The Corporal then rolled the PFC over, greased his anus with hand lotion committed anal sodomy with him. The Corporal was court-martialled, given a dishonorable discharge, reduced to E-1, and sentenced to 30 months confinement.

The PFC was sexually assaulted while incapacitated in his own room by a Marine of superior rank. Beside the physical and psychological damage done to the PFC, the human dignity and privacy rights of the PFC were also severely assaulted. The breach of

trust perpetrated by the Corporal on the PFC created a sense of suspicion and uneasiness among other Marines. If a Marine cannot trust another Marine to protect him when he is vulnerable, a basic foundation of unit camaraderie and morale is severely affected.

Although an assault such as the one perpetrated by the Corporal would be just as despicable if perpetrated on a person in the civilian community, the civilian community is not dependent on unit cohesiveness which is at the crux of military effectiveness, Military effectiveness is at the crux of National Defense.

**CASE #10. Homosexual acts committed in public facility in Okinawa.**

A Master Gunnery Sergeant pleaded guilty to and was convicted of three acts involving sodomy (UCMJ Art. 125). The first incident involved a Sergeant in the Air Force. The second incident involved a Petty Officer in the Navy. The last indecent act committed involved a Marine Lance Corporal. These incidents occurred on a base that had no military business offices, but existed primarily for the housing and support of military families. The base had a medical facility, picnic ground, and recreation fields. The base maintained bathroom facilities to accommodate those using the picnic ground and recreation fields. It was in those facilities that the acts took place. A hole had been cut through a partition and the parties could solicit and perform (sometimes anonymous) homosexual acts through the partition. The Master Gunnery Sergeant was sentenced to a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, 15 years confinement, and reduction to E-1. He had a pre-trial agreement that suspended the dishonorable discharge, the forfeiture, the confinement, and any reduction below E-6, for one year.

These incidents and subsequent court-martial were extensively publicized on Okinawa and generated outrage by military service members and dependents using the base. The events created fear and negative impressions among dependents that would certainly reflect negatively the desire of these families to have their service member deploy or return to Okinawa.

In addition, such behavior by a SNCO has a devastating impact upon the respect subordinates should have for the system of rank and command that makes the military community unique, and which is indispensable to military effectiveness. Moreover, such conduct erodes the trust and confidence necessary for unit cohesiveness which history demonstrates is critical to success on the battlefield.

**CASE #11.** Marine Lance Corporal admits sodomy with 138 other males.

In October 1992, a Marine male Lance Corporal was administratively discharged after he admitted being homosexual, when the command found out that he was receiving homosexual materials through the mail. The Lance Corporal admitted engaging in sodomy with 138 different males since he was 21 years old. This particular Marine had four years prior service in the Army.

A Marine was concerned enough about the prospect that the Lance Corporal was a homosexual (due to the prurient literature the Lance Corporal was receiving) to report him to the command.

A concern by the Lance Corporal's fellow Marines about the prospect of coming into contact with the blood or possibly sharing the blood of a Marine who admits to having sex with 138 different males is not unrealistic. Fortunately, this Lance Corporal was removed from the ranks before other Marines in his unit were fully aware of the extent of the Lance's Corporal;s activities.

**CASE #12.** Lance Corporal desires to engage in homosexual activity.

In December 1990, a Marine male Lance Corporal was administratively discharged for homosexuality after admitting a desire to engage in homosexual acts. This Marine's homosexuality was discovered by his roommate when a homosexual magazine was found in the Lance Corporal's possession. The roommate was sufficiently concerned upon finding the homosexual magazine that he reported it to the command. The discovery that the Lance Corporal was homosexual, had a dramatic effect on his roommate's right to privacy and sense of well-being. The Lance Corporal was discharged.

Inasmuch as the homosexual Lance Corporal's roommate was part of the unit, a reduction in his morale, concern about privacy, and the distraction of having to report a fellow Marine necessarily detracted from his focus on his mission and resulted in a corresponding reduction in his unit's morale, cohesiveness, and military efficiency.

**CASE #13.** Fort Hood Homosexual Public Toilet Sex Activities.

Between May 7th and 14th 1992, as many as 60 homosexual men gathered in a public toilet at Building 241 on Fort Hood, Texas, to engage in various illicit sex acts. Legal action was taken against thirty of those were who subsequently identified.

That public toilet had become popular with both military and civilian homosexuals. Walls were modified by cutting holes of various sizes up to 6"x15" to accommodate sex between men in

adjacent stalls. The homosexuals installed a mirror to warn participants of intruders. The toilet became increasingly popular and was rumored to have been advertised as a good spot for homosexual sex in both a gay homosexual magazine and on a computer bulletin board.

Homosexuals traveled from as far as Austin, Texas (over an hour away) to visit this spot. As the homosexuals became bolder, they solicited janitorial workers and harassed maintenance workers who were sent to patch the "glory holes" in the stalls. In response to complaints, authorities obtained a search warrant through the U.S. Magistrate.

The U.S. Magistrate authorized installation of a video camera in the ceiling of the latrine and the camera was run intermittently for seven days. During that time, numerous homosexuals were observed having public sex in the restroom. There were no doors on the stalls; participants were visible to anyone who entered.

The video showing these acts has been described as "very graphic." All participants engaged in unprotected sex. Two were HIV positive and one had fully developed AIDS. The participants were indiscriminate in their choice of partners, often engaging in sex with strangers, just moments after entering the bathroom.

The men participated in oral and anal sodomy, mutual masturbation, and fondling of the buttocks, often through holes between the stalls. There is doubt whether some knew, or even saw the faces of their "lovers."

Participants included 14 soldiers and 16 civilians. One civilian was an AIDS counselor from Temple, Texas, who nonetheless participated in unprotected sex.

Two Army officers were involved in sex acts with enlisted men. They did not conceal their uniforms or rank. One captain from Fort Hood was charged with:

- a. committing sodomy on a staff sergeant;
- b. committing sodomy with two unidentified males;
- c. taking an unlawful drug;
- d. masturbating while watching an Air Force specialist masturbate;
- e. masturbating a staff sergeant; and
- f. fondling the buttocks of an Air Force specialist.

All of the soldiers, including the two officers, were

administratively eliminated. Nine, including both officers, received other than honorable discharges.

There was only one court-martial. In that case, the defendant, a staff sergeant, challenged the validity of the search authorization. When the judge ruled that the search was constitutional, the staff sergeant requested an administrative elimination in lieu of court-martial, which was granted.

Twelve of the civilians were prosecuted in the U.S. Magistrate court. Three cases were dismissed, one civilian failed to appear in court, and eight were convicted of indecent exposure or public lewdness, after pleading guilty.

The incident was reported in the Fort Worth Star Telegram on September 25, 1992. An Associated Press article quoted Miriam Ben-Shalom, President of Milwaukee-based Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Veterans of America: "I cannot believe that the Army has nothing better to do with its time and resources than to set up a sting operation in a latrine," despite the fact that action was taken in response to numerous complaints.

If the homosexuals exclusive policy is lifted, investigative agencies will undoubtedly feel pressure to refrain from interfering in the sexual activities of homosexuals, even when their activities are as open and notorious as they were at Ft. Hood in 1992.

#### CASE #14. US Air Force Sergeant Homosexual Assault Case.

SGT Staley indecently assaulted three members of his squadron, each of whom described incidents when they awoke to discover Sergeant Staley touching his buttocks or penis. The first victim was an airman who lived 2 hours away in the barracks. Three assaults on Sergeant Staley's roommate occurred within a 2-day period. The third victim was assaulted in a tent on Diego Garcia, where a portion of Sergeant Staley's unit had deployed during the Persian Gulf conflict. Sergeant Staley was convicted by a general court-martial at March Air Force base of four indecent assaults. The U.S. Air Force Court of Military Review affirmed the decision.

The negative impact of these actual examples of homosexual conduct is readily apparent. They occurred while the ban was in force. Imagine what will happen if the ban is lifted. They are only the tip of the iceberg. There are thousands of similar cases in the official files of the Services. I strongly recommend that you subpoena all such cases and review them. Compare their numbers and negative impact against the numbers and "positive" impact of homosexuals who claim that they have served honorably. Then decide whether or not it's wise to exclude homosexuals, as a class, from the Armed Forces.