

The other point that he made I think that is a part of his point was the foreign military experience. If you look—and I might preface my remarks by saying that last fall I visited Canada, the Netherlands, Denmark, Israel, Great Britain, and talked at length with 40-odd former Soviet, now Russian general officers about personal problems and basically how they deal with issues of equal opportunity, and so on, as opposed to the requirements of military necessity and readiness.

Based on my discussions—and a lot of it is a matter of public record—you can categorize most of those countries into two categories. You can take Canada, you can take Denmark, you can take the Netherlands, and based on what I learned and what they told me openly, they put a higher priority on equal opportunity and individual rights than readiness.

The Danes will openly tell you their readiness is not a major consideration for them. The Dutch tell you that they have—in their decision process they give more priority, as well as the Canadians, to individual rights.

On the other hand, those countries as have recently undergone traumatic military experiences—Israel, Russia, and so on, put readiness, military necessity, as their priority.

You mentioned, Dr. Korb, allies in Desert Storm. The French really do not have any policy against gays serving, but the pressures are such that if they come out of the closet they are very quickly separated. The Israelis informally have very severe sanctions against homosexuals serving openly in their services, and so when you look at the foreign military experience there really is not much support there for gays or homosexuals serving openly in the military.

Chairman NUNN. Dr. Henderson, let me get to Dr. Marlowe right now, so I can stay within my time here.

Dr. MARLOWE. Thank you, Senator. Let me make a couple of observations: (a) as a scientist I cannot pontificate, because we have never studied the impact of openly gay members in Army units because we have not sanctioned openly gay members in army units. I would like to start thinking about armies, however, when we talk about this, and go back to the building block.

The issue will be what kinds of relationships can be established between the 4 men in a tank crew, the 10 men in an infantry squad, the artillery section, the team, the crew? When the general culture is ready for something, then the army will reflect it. If the general culture is not ready for it, we cannot expect that it will be reflected.

The second point is the issue of—I am not quite sure what we mean by openly gay. If a homosexual identity is the primary thing that someone is going to present to the other three men in his tank crew, to the other men in his infantry squad, rather than the identity of the soldier, it is going to make a cohesion and incorporation awfully difficult if his statement is, you have got to treat me as an A before I will behave as a B.

I think there are a great many issues involved here that have not been carefully looked at and that we simply have to think about, and that it is both a more complex issue than we might

think going into it, but an issue that can be resolved only at the cellular level where soldier meets soldier.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Dr. Marlowe. Your bottom line on Dr. Korb's view, what would that be?

Dr. MARLOWE. My bottom line is that I do not think it will be as easy or as facile as Dr. Korb thinks it will be.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you. Senator Thurmond.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Henderson, I believe you served in the Army. When did you retire?

Dr. HENDERSON. I served 26 years and retired in 1988.

Senator THURMOND. Twenty six years and retired in 1988 as a colonel.

Dr. HENDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Colonel Henderson, based upon your research and expertise on military units and cohesion, what do you think the impact of introducing openly homosexual personnel into small military units would be? Please answer as briefly as you can.

Dr. HENDERSON. Based on survey data that comes from two independently conducted surveys, Moskos survey and also the Los Angeles Times survey, where they conducted interviews in 38 military installations, all three services, you get these sorts of data:

Seventy eight percent of soldiers oppose allowing homosexuals into the military.

Ninety percent feel very strongly about the privacy issue. They are strongly against it on the grounds of privacy.

Seventy four percent of male soldiers believe homosexuality is abnormal.

seventy five percent believe gays serving openly in the Army would be very disruptive to discipline.

Eighty one percent think there would be violence against homosexuals if it did happen.

This indicates to me that if you did that you would have the severe disruption within these primary groups that we have been talking about that are so violative to cohesion that the vertical and horizontal bonding would be extremely difficult to achieve.

Senator THURMOND. Colonel Henderson, there have been some proposals to allow openly homosexual personnel to serve in the military but segregate them in certain types of units. In your opinion, is this a viable option, and how might this affect cohesion?

Dr. HENDERSON. I have not studied that in any depth. My initial response would be I do not think it is a viable option, because right away you run into fairness problems, and so on.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Korb, you have described how some police and fire departments allow homosexuals to serve openly and relate this to how a policy change might work within the military.

While there may be some superficial similarities between the military and some civilian occupations, would you agree that there are core differences, and these differences might weaken or invalidate these comparisons—for instance, men serving in submarines, men serving on ships, and men serving in foxholes and in other capacities?

Dr. KORB. Senator, I would agree that there are some differences. As I said in my statement, these are not perfectly analogous, but

I do think we can learn some things from them about unit cohesion, which is what we are here to talk about today, because you do have police and fire departments who have to go in harm's way.

I also refer to the fact that in some of the studies done there is the question of privacy, because the police and fire personnel must change in the locker rooms, but no situation is perfectly analogous.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Marlowe, are you aware of cases of homosexuals openly serving on active duty, and if so, what was the impact of their presence on cohesion?

Dr. MARLOWE. Senator, anecdotally I have come across cases in which homosexuals have openly served on active duty. The impact on cohesion depended on two things: whether or not—let me say, knowledge that people were homosexual, whether or not they brought overtly homosexual behaviors into the group, in which case the group excluded them, usually moved to have them put out of the army, or whether or not it was considered to be his private thing that is not exhibited while on duty.

The response was very much dependent on other factors as well relative to the individual. The critical variable was, did the individual behave homosexually in the group or restrict his behavior outside of the group and off post?

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Marlowe, what is the relationship between the advancement of technology and small unit cohesion? Is cohesion still important for high tech units, or has it become less important?

Dr. MARLOWE. Senator, it is my profound belief that it has become much more important. High technology has created a far more decentralized battlefield in which small groups of soldiers work and operate invisibly and in quasi isolation from each other. It is my belief, and I base this on observations of exercises, debriefings after combat, that it has maximized the need for groups to perceive absolute trust in their fellows.

A squad on one side of a warehouse in Panama has to absolutely believe in and trust in the squad members invisible to them clearing the other side of the warehouse. I think decentralization carries a greater symbolic and emotional need for high levels of cohesion rather than a lesser one and decentralization is the primary product of high technology.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I turn back the rest of my time.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Thurmond. Senator Kennedy.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry I could not be here on Monday, but I would like to just use my time to make a brief comment.

I want to reaffirm my support for President Clinton's leadership in seeking to break down the barriers of discrimination against gays and lesbians in the military. The compromise fashioned by President Clinton in conjunction with Senator Nunn and the Joint Chiefs is a first essential step towards ending that discrimination.

This struggle is the latest chapter in the great, unfinished business of America, which truly is liberty and justice for all. This Nation was founded on the principles of equality and opportunity. If

we do not end discrimination wherever it exists in our society, then America is not America.

We have been here before. We will sure be here again. For our country, the work goes on, and now it is our time to do it. The issue here is not whether gays will serve in our Armed Forces—they do, and often with great distinction. All members of this committee have acknowledged that. The issue is whether gays will have to lie about their private lives in order to be able to serve and risk their lives for the country they love.

The task before us now is how best to move toward the complete integration of our Armed Forces in a sound and effective manner while reaching the shared and compatible goals of individual liberty and military efficiency.

The efficient military exists for the sake of liberty, not for its own sake, and we must never forget that. The purpose of our Armed Forces is not simply to defend a piece of geography but to protect a set of ideas and ideals. A military that denies those ideals defeats its own most basic purpose.

While we cannot transform hearts and minds overnight, if we have learned anything from long experience it is that changing policy is an essential step in breaking down barriers, changing attitudes, and building a better Nation.

For example, it was once thought that black and white soldiers could not serve together. In fact, in 1945 testimony was delivered before this committee stating that one of the surest ways to destroy the efficiency of the army was to integrate blacks and whites. In fact, I think my colleagues would be shocked to review the record of a half-century ago and just see how little the arguments for discriminations have changed.

We were told in 1948 that integrating black and white members of the Armed Forces posed insurmountable issues of cleanliness, health, and morale. Some called it a perversion of the police and the power of the State. One of our colleagues testifying in favor of segregation, argued that the incidence of syphilis, gonorrhea, and all other venereal diseases is appalling, higher among members of the negro race than among members of the white race.

General Omar Bradley warned a congressional committee that complete integration might seriously affect morale and thus affect battle efficiency. Navy Secretary Frank Knox warned Franklin Roosevelt that men live in such intimacy aboard ship that we simply could not enlist negroes above the rank of mess men.

Nevertheless, despite strong resistance and threats of mass resignations, we moved on the issue and proudly America moved forward. Today, our best military sociologists refer to it as one of the great military success stories.

More recently, we were told that if women served alongside men, our military would be impaired, but once again, adopting a policy of justice, we improved our armed services and our society as a whole.

This is the American journey at its finest, from slavery of millions toward the full equality of all. We must not be deterred now from taking the next step.

It is time to shift the focus from status to misconduct. There are thousands of cases of sexual misconduct against women by men in

the Armed Forces with uncertain adjudications. In fact, studies show that women in the Armed Forces are more than twice as likely to experience sexual harassment than women in civilian life. Instead, our military has found the time and resources to move against 16,000 gay men and lesbians at a cost of nearly \$.5 billion over the last 12 years.

These priorities are simply wrong. We can pursue sexual harassment in the military by both heterosexuals and homosexuals and not adopt a litmus test based on status. It is through leadership, training, discipline, and a strict code of conduct that both sexual harassment and hate crimes of all kinds can be appropriately and severely dealt with. It is time for the Armed Forces to stop discriminating against anyone because of who they are and what they do in their private life.

So today, we revisit the issue of unit cohesion, which we all agree is the essential aspect of military readiness. While the concept of cohesion may be difficult to define, there is no doubt that effective leadership and the ability to get the job done define its core. These qualities are essential to making a good soldier, and this committee should do all it can to support and promote them.

Condoning prejudice is an appalling means to achieving unit cohesion. Whatever name discrimination takes, it ought to be exposed and rooted out. Change is never easy, but this change is just another way for our Armed Forces to stand for freedom, and I believe our women and men in uniform are equal to this battle.

So let us proceed now in the knowledge that some day when history looks back at this time, we will be measured as others have been before us. The questions are fundamental. Will we stand in the tradition of Lincoln? Will we stand with A. P. Randolph, with Martin Luther King, Betty Friedan, Caesar Chavez, John Kennedy, Harry Truman, Lyndon Johnson, with all of them and so many others who widened the frontiers of freedom? Will we stand for the past or the future?

So the question comes to us. It is this year that this committee, this Congress, and this country must answer the call to liberty.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Senator Kennedy, since you were not here yesterday, if you would like to take an extra 2 or 3 minutes, I would be glad to—

Senator KENNEDY. Well, I appreciate that. I really just had at this time just a question for the panel.

Dr. Henderson, you and Dr. Marlowe have stated that the core values common—and I quote—"common in a first-rate army are fighting skill, professional teamwork, physical stamina, self-discipline, duty, selfless service, respect for unit leaders, and loyalty to the unit."

I would be interested if each of the panelists can tell us which of these values may not apply or be embraced by gay or lesbian soldiers, and how do you know, and tell us any research or fact basis for your belief.

Dr. HENDERSON. When recruits come into the service, they do not come into the service with those values. What happens in the military, they are put through an intense resocialization process to

achieve those values and give primary loyalty to those values you just mentioned.

To get to that point—and this is I think the essence of what most of us have been saying here. To get to that point, to be able to arrive at those values, you have got to have commonality and group goals. You have got to have a subordination of the individual values to the group so that they can be resocialized into those group values.

If you have gross, widespread dissimilarities in your initial population of recruits, you are going to have an extremely difficult time in achieving that resocialization process. You are going to have fragmentation, you are going to have personal conflict, and so on.

So basically what I am saying is that if you do have severe differences in values in the group, you are never going to be able to achieve the levels of performance in those values you just listed.

Dr. KORB. I disagree completely. I think if you take a look at the court record of those who have been asked to leave the military without any behavioral problems, for example, just because their status has been discovered because of asking a question on a security clearance or they happen to make a remark that gets picked up by the press. These men and women—and I think at least one of them is here, Colonel Cammermeyer, I saw a reservation for her back there. I cannot see if she is there—but have embraced all of these values and then some.

When I went to Colonel Cammermeyer's hearing for her administrative discharge, the prosecutor, if you will, or whoever was presenting the Government's case, told me outside the hearing, "I do not believe in this, but I am being forced to do this."

When the hearing ended, basically what the panel said was, we want to keep you. We have no choice, these are the regulations, but if they ever change the regulations, we want you back, and the two-star general that was forced to discharge her cried when he had to do it. Now, all of these people felt that she embraced the same values that they did.

I went down to Lt. Junior Grade Tracy Thorne's administrative hearing, and I was prevented by the Navy from even taking the stand. His squadron mates took the stand and said what a fine Navy aviator he was, and they talked about how, in fact, they were proud to serve with him, and he had not undermined unit cohesion.

So I reject completely any inference that gay men and women do not embrace the values of the military, which is the desire to serve one's country and to deal with all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I think in the military, as I said in my testimony, we have people with various backgrounds and various views on every issue, but there is nothing that good leadership cannot withstand in the way of getting the correct values necessary to perform effectively in battle.

Again, I refer as I did in my testimony to the articles of General Truscott talking about specific instances of people serving under fire in Korea in a small unit with people knowing that they were gay, and the article by Richard Goodwin in the Los Angeles Times about people with whom he had served with in World War II.

So I do not think that there is any reason why, with proper leadership and training as well as training of the other members of the

group, as we have done to deal with problems caused by the integration of women and blacks, that you cannot achieve the cohesion. In fact, I know we already do.

Dr. MARLOWE. Senator, first let me say I know of no research on the specific issue you are asking about. Extrapolating from what we do know, I would only make the following observation, and I am repeating myself. It will depend entirely upon the way in which the individual presents him or herself to the group and the primary identity that the individual interacts with the group with.

If that identity is that of soldier hewing to the values of soldier and behaving to the standards of soldier, I think you have one set of issues. If the individual insists upon being treated first and foremost in terms of a different primary identity, as happened in Vietnam in terms of drug-using, as has happened in any number of cases, then I think we have another problem.

So I think what we do get down to is a question that I would ask which puzzles me, which is frankly, what role does open proclamation of gender preference have in terms of service as a soldier? I have not been able to find an answer for that question that satisfies me.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you. Senator Kennedy.

Senator KENNEDY. Just a final question. As I understand your answer, if you are satisfied that these individuals, whether gay or lesbian, are prepared to observe the code of conduct and be willing to train and work within a unit and to do everything else, and to lay down their lives for their country, then you have no trouble with those particular soldiers?

Dr. MARLOWE. If they meet the rigorous behavioral standards that the small group requires, which may also require them not, Senator, proclaiming that they are gay or lesbian to the group.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Kennedy. I believe Senator Cohen is next.

Senator COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Henderson, you indicated that, in 1953, the military favored integration at that time in the services, correct?

Dr. HENDERSON. Yes.

Senator COHEN. Were they following President Truman's lead, or was this something the military initiated on its own?

Dr. HENDERSON. As I understand, President Truman directed the military in 1948 to begin to investigate the need to go ahead and integrate. By 1953 the military had come around to that viewpoint and accepted it.

Senator COHEN. So a fair statement would be that it was presidential leadership at that time that at least provided the impetus for the change in attitude that was reflected by the military.

Dr. HENDERSON. If you read the history, and I think there is agreement on this, that military necessity at the time in terms of manpower needs caused the military leadership at the time to say, we need to do this.

Senator COHEN. Well, military necessity and presidential leadership, and I might point out, as I recall, Dr. Marlowe, that you indicated that social attitudes towards African Americans and other minorities, might change or were changing at that time compared to the attitude of society toward gays right now.

As I recall, back in 1954, we had the Supreme Court that also came down with the decision on *Brown v. Board of Education* that mandated the integration of our educational institutions, and so we had a President and a Supreme Court that were reflecting constitutional or social policy at that particular time, is that correct?

Dr. MARLOWE. That is correct. The other thing I would point out is that overwhelmingly the States of the Union at that time were nonsegregated and the army was reflecting the policies of the former Confederacy rather than the entire Nation.

Senator COHEN. Dr. Korb, you have talked about your evolutionary opinions on women in the military. Women are discriminated against today, are they not, in the military?

Dr. KORB. That is correct, unfortunately.

Senator COHEN. They are not allowed on board submarines.

Dr. KORB. That is correct.

Senator COHEN. They are not allowed on board aircraft carriers, and such.

Dr. KORB. That is correct.

Senator COHEN. They are not allowed to engage in land combat.

Dr. KORB. That is correct.

Senator COHEN. Is there a rational basis in your mind for discriminating against women in these capacities?

Dr. KORB. Not in my mind, Senator. Even when I was in office I testified before the House that we ought to drop the combat restrictions. I applaud the Congress for having dropped after the Persian Gulf war the restriction on women in air combat, and as you know, we had the Presidential Commission on Women and they recommended allowing women to go to sea in everything but submarines.

Senator COHEN. So you can find no basis whatsoever for separating the sexes in small quarters in a military capacity, and let me just ask you, should there be separate facilities for women on board submarines or aircraft carriers?

Dr. KORB. I think there already are separate facilities.

Senator COHEN. Should there be?

Dr. KORB. I think there should be.

Senator COHEN. Why?

Dr. KORB. Well, because of the way in which society expects us to separate people.

Senator COHEN. But why? What would be the rationale basis for society demanding a separation of the sexes?

Dr. KORB. I think it is based upon the moral values that we have.

Senator COHEN. Does it have to do with sexual attraction of male and females?

Dr. KORB. Certainly. That is one component of it.

Senator COHEN. Is that something that would lead to an undermining of unit cohesion and readiness?

Dr. KORB. Well, some of the research shows that when people are out in the field for long periods of time—and I think I am quoting Charlie Moskos on this, that over time the service members adopted an attitude of let them look. The soldiers of different sexes readily adapted to loss of privacy when they are in the field for a long period of time.



Senator COHEN. So it is your position, then, that women should be engaged in land combat as well.

Dr. KORB. I see no reason why not. The Canadians have dropped that restriction.

Senator COHEN. And the fact that there might be physical differences between male and female in hand-to-hand combat would be not a rationale basis, in your judgment.

Dr. KORB. Well, obviously I do not think anybody should be involved in hand-to-hand combat unless he or she can meet the prerequisites of being able to deal with hand-to-hand combat.

Senator COHEN. You have indicated there has been an evolutionary change in our society with respect to our attitude toward minorities and also women. Should there be an evolutionary policy with respect to gays in the military? Should this be a policy of evolution that we not take total action today, as opposed to allowing our social policies to evolve to that degree?

Dr. KORB. Well, as I look at the data over the eighties, the opinion polls show steadily increasing support for allowing gays and lesbians in the military.

When President Clinton made his campaign promise during the campaign, it was not really an issue, as far as I know. There was no data to say that people held that against him.

Now, after the inauguration and the publicity on the issue, the opinions began to swing back against it, and right now, it is almost too close to call. It is somewhere around 47 percent on each side.

Senator COHEN. If we were to lift the ban against homosexuals serving in the military, should there be a policy that would prevent a display of gay lifestyle?

Dr. KORB. I think that we do need appropriate standards of behavior. We have to do as the Canadians are doing and the Australians are doing, work our way through this on a case-by-case basis to ensure that we do not do anything that will undermine military cohesion.

Senator COHEN. Well, do you end up with a situation in which you are allowed to be gay and in the military but not display that gay status?

Dr. KORB. I think one would have to ask the question of what form that display took.

Senator COHEN. Let us assume that hypothetically it took place either on base or off base with displays of affection in an NCO club.

Dr. KORB. I think if you are off base, that is one's private conduct. That should have no bearing at all.

Senator COHEN. On base?

Dr. KORB. I think on base we would have to develop certain regulations. If I may point out, Senator, during the eighties there was a very big debate before this committee and the Congress about allowing chaplains to wear head gear, eventually there was congressional legislation to overturn the military's policy that prevented rabbis and imams from wearing appropriate head gear.

Senator COHEN. My time is up, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you very, Senator Cohen. The only thing, I would like to get back at some point, Dr. Korb, to this off-base, on-base, because I think that is an important area, and right now there is military jurisdiction over personal conduct off base,

and so I want to get back to that and see how you would handle the existing DUI's and the existing regulations off base. Senator Glenn.

Senator GLENN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the issue that was raised the other day about whether there is a right to be in the military, I think we should comment on, again, I do not feel that there is a right. We keep people out because of height, weight, lack of education, and a lot of other things, so there is not a right, as I see it.

The military exists for one reason, and that is they have to fight, and may have to represent us all, and we want to do that with getting the fewest people killed that we possibly can.

Now, we take young people in, and they come in at 17, 18, 19 years of age as the me generation, those interested in self-gratification, self-interest, by and large, and in about 10 weeks we take young people like that and turn them into people who come out—using words I used on the floor the other day, almost identical to what Colonel Henderson used here. They come out more afraid of letting their buddies down than they are getting wounded or killed themselves.

That is an amazing transformation in a very short period of time, and I think what—we may talk about the particular arrangements on ships or whatever, but the IET, the initial entry training, or boot camp, recruit training, is where this whole thing really starts, and I would like to have your comments on that particular area.

We take people who come in, we shave their heads, we take their clothes, we give them uniforms, we put them through drills by DI's, and all sorts of things like that, and that is really the basic experience right there. That is the real basic building block, it seems to me, right there.

We talked about basic building blocks. That is as basic as you can get, and all else later in the units, all else flows from that initial 10 weeks where you transform these people from one attitude and absolutely reverse it to another. An obvious next question—I would like for you to explore that a little bit, and go through some of these things that change, literally, body, mind, and spirit of every young person who comes in—we do not call them kids any more. They are men and women at that point.

You literally change body, mind, and spirit, and their attitude toward each other. I would like to explore how that is done. When a kid gets—well, not a kid, but a young man or woman, gets off a bus and goes into training, what is the first step. What do we do that transforms them in that short time period and changes their whole attitude?

The obvious follow-up question is, will bringing gays into that situation interfere with that process? I would like to explore first exactly what they do. Would you comment on that, Dr. Marlowe?

Dr. MARLOWE. Yes, sir. What we do really in one sense is very simple. It is to demonstrate to young people who come in from the highly individualistic, self-serving, if you will, society we live in of the me generation, the personal view, into members of a group with the profound understanding that their survival, their success, their achievement—and the Army does this through a program of continual successful achievement in basic training and advanced

individual training—is profoundly bound up in their relationships with and their interdependence with the other members of the group.

The behavior is modeled for them by a bunch of people—drill sergeants, and drill instructors in the Marine Corps, who I frankly find truly remarkable. They communicate a new set of standards, a new set of values. They truly communicate the basic meaning of service, of duty, but above all, of the obligation each has to the other.

The new soldier comes out of initial entry training understanding the nature of being a group member and his obligations to others, which may never have come before.

I guess the best way to put it is that in years in which we have worked looking at basic training, the only soldiers who would ever have had anything equivalent in terms of understanding the nature of group and being part of a group were people who had been on football teams or in bands. It is not a common experience in the United States any more.

I think once again we get to the issue of what kind of role model the people who create the behaviors and the expectation will bring to the environment, and that, for me, would be the primary behavioral issue if we are going to talk about this in terms of gays in the military. What kind of role model is being presented? How are they behaving?

I have seen over the years a number of instances, for example, in which drill sergeants, drill instructors, have abused the power that they had, the terribly asymmetric power that they had in terms of trainees, in terms of women, and have come pretty close to destroying commitment to the institution and to the group on the part of their trainees, and so I think the real issue again comes down to what kind of role model is being presented, what kind of behavior will one see, sir.

Senator GLENN. Well, it is more than just role model. The schedule starts out minute by minute. Their whole life is taken away from them. It is done by somebody else to where the unit becomes it, and they live that. They have to, and to come back to your drill sergeant of just a moment ago, what if we had a gay drill sergeant?

Dr. MARLOWE. Again, I think we have the question of what is the behavior exhibited by that drill sergeant? What is the model that we want, or that he is prepared to present to the young people whom he has charge of, you know, between 16 and 20 hours a day? He is with them continuously. He is the most important figure in their lives. They begin by hating him and wind up at the end of 8 weeks worshipping him and wanting above all things to be just like him.

Senator GLENN. Colonel Henderson, would you comment on that issue, too, of the boot camp recruit training?

Dr. HENDERSON. I think the basic techniques are isolation. First, you take these new recruits and you isolate them. You put tremendous pressure on them in terms of schedule, lack of sleep, intense training requirements, and then you reward them through their need for recognition and esteem and so on, and through that process you get this resocialization into these new values that we were talking about earlier, and at the same time you build a tremen-

dously strong vertical bonding between the soldier and the leadership.

Now if you take that process and put that in terms of what impact are we going to have if we insert homosexuals into this process as leaders or soldiers, and Dr. Korb has referred to essentially it as a leadership problem, a strong leadership can deal with it, but that would tremendously complicate the process that I have just described. You would have to have something like sensitivity sessions or what-have-you.

Sensitivity sessions are extremely nonuseful, very limited usefulness. They basically serve notice on what behavior and attitudes are not approved. In terms of changing basic values, they are not very useful.

You are going to charge the leadership with taking these new recruits and telling them that the values they learned on this issue in church or Sunday School or from their parents and friends are wrong. You have to go 180 degrees the other way, and that is putting the military force in the forefront of major sociological change in this country for those people coming into the service, and that is not the military's job.

Senator GLENN. Dr. Korb, would you comment on this, also? What happens during boot camp?

Dr. KORB. Well, I think it has been well-expressed. We have a socialization process, and we develop a team.

But I would like to comment upon a couple of things that were said in passing by the other witnesses. If, in fact, that drill sergeant had a specific sexual orientation, what impact would it have?

Well, before that person could be a drill sergeant he or she would have had to perform in the service. They would have had to accept the values of the service. DOD is very careful about the people who are allowed to become drill sergeants, because they recognize the tremendous power that these individuals have, and I assume that all of that would be done ahead of time.

There is also the question about moral values. I believe this is really a key issue. We are a diverse Nation. We do not impose any code of specific morality on any particular group.

The scientific evidence is leaning in the direction, with more and more studies, that having a homosexual sexual orientation is inherited rather than learned behavior. I refer you on this subject to James Michener's wonderful article yesterday in the New York Times, when he quoted a passage from Leviticus, which a lot of people refer to, and which says that homosexual behavior is immoral and the person should suffer some tremendous punishments.

As Mr. Michener pointed out, if you read the rest of Leviticus, lots of things that we do today, like dishonoring our parents, would also be subject to the pain of death. It is very important to be up front about this moral issue, because there are some people who believe that having a gay or lesbian sexual orientation is immoral.

I simply reject that point of view. I understand why they hold it, but I think when a person comes into the service he cannot bring his or her moral values, whether they relate to this subject, or subjects like divorce, or abortion.

I mean, supposing that drill sergeant were divorced, and you had a group of people who were raised as I was, as a Roman Catholic, how do we handle that?

Senator GLENN. My time is up. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Glenn. Senator McCain is recognized.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Korb, on July 27, 1992, you were on the Larry King Show. In response to a question by Mr. King you said, according to the Pentagon's own studies done in Monterey, approximately 200,000 people in the military are homosexuals. What study are you referring to?

Dr. KORB. The PERSEREC study, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. Conducted when?

Dr. KORB. They were conducted—they started in 1985, when the Pentagon was concerned about the fact that a lot of people with security clearances were being convicted as spies. For example, the Walkers.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, Dr. Korb, we have made a study of all of those studies, and we cannot find that. I hope you will supply it for the record.

Dr. KORB. I will be more than happy to.

Senator MCCAIN. And in response to another question from Mr. King, you said, when I tried to raise the issue—meaning that of homosexuals in the military—I was told there was no way the President would ever back it, so what we decided to do was to do studies to find out, in fact, if there was a problem. These studies were completed in 1988.

They were done by the Pentagon's own research unit out of Monterey, and they basically said, you have no empirical evidence for keeping the policy. We suggest that you consider changing it.

What study are you talking about?

Dr. KORB. These are the same PERSEREC studies.

Senator MCCAIN. Are you talking about the 1991 PERSEREC study that you referred to in your statement?

Dr. KORB. That is part of it, but the studies came out over a period of years, beginning—the drafts were first circulated in 1989.

Senator MCCAIN. But Dr. Korb, I have both of those, and the one in 1989 says, and I quote, "This paper primarily addresses the third question. Specifically, this paper attempts to answer the question, how do homosexuals differ from heterosexuals in background characteristics relative to security suitability? Thus, this paper has a narrow focus and does not address all questions concerning the suitability of homosexuals for employment in positions that require national security clearances."

In the preface of the 1991 study, which you specifically refer to in your opening statement, Dr. Korb, it says, "this work does not deal with the Department of Defense policy that excludes homosexuals from military service." It was strictly confined to security clearances.

Dr. Korb, you are being a bit disingenuous when you say that this was a study concerning homosexuals in the military, when they specifically and categorically state in the opening of the study that you refer to that it does not address that issue.

Dr. KORB. Senator, if I may, I quoted the author of the study. I did not say he said it in the study. I said that he is the co-author. He stated it, when asked about this question by a reporter. I would also point out that the December 1988 and January 1989 studies were rejected by Craig Alderman, who was then the acting Deputy Under Secretary. He sent them back and he said, you covered an area I did not want you to cover. Throw this stuff away.

So I saw the 1988 and 1989 studies, and I would be happy to supply them for the record if you would like.

Senator MCCAIN. I am sure I would be very happy to see those, Dr. Korb, but you and I both know that there are thousands of drafts that are made, and if we rely on drafts, we obviously end up in a very complicated situation.

The fact is, your reference both on the Larry King Show and here does not point out the fact that neither of these studies specifically points out that they are not addressing the issue of gays in the military.

Dr. KORB. I would beg to differ with you, Senator, and they were not a draft, they were the earlier versions, and they were told actually to throw them away and come back with a completed version because, as Craig Alderman said in that letter, this is not the subject we asked you to address, and I would suggest that you get the people who worked on that study here to tell you exactly what happened.

Senator MCCAIN. I think we can do that, Dr. Korb, but your statements clearly indicate that the study substantiates your conclusion when these studies, the final studies do not have anything to do with that.

Dr. Korb, you mentioned that countries that allow homosexuals to serve in the military, such as Israel, Canada, the Netherlands, and Australia, say that they have not experienced problems that have undermined morale and cohesion. Obviously, I think it would be important to point out that it has only been a few months that Canada has been embarked on this experiment.

Now, I have got several quotes here about the situation in Israel. Rueven Gal, former chief psychologist for the Israeli Defense Force says, "Where we stand today is still far, far behind where the United States stood even in the early 1970s. While no conscript is asked about sexual preference, anyone who says he is gay or is suspected of being gay is referred to a mental health officer for psychological testing."

He goes on to say that there will be an indicator in his file that limits him from serving with specific units, such as intelligence, or in small units where the closeness of living accommodations are so tight and limited as may create problems. They will not send him to a submarine, for example. He goes on to say that they are not allowed to serve in positions requiring top secret clearances, including any work with codes.

Is that what you had in mind when you were talking about how Israel has allowed homosexuals in the military? Is that what you had in mind?

Dr. KORB. Well, if you take a look at the Israeli experience, the Israelis still have a policy which, as Secretary of Defense Cheney said, was an old chestnut. There is apparently a feeling in Israel

that homosexuals are security risks. At one time this was the stated position of the U.S. Government. So obviously the Israelis then do not give homosexuals the highest clearances.

As Secretary Cheney said, that is an old chestnut. We no longer have that particular policy of denying security clearances on the basis of sexual orientation. On this subject I would like to read you a quote from the New York Times that "some homophobic Israeli commanders are thought to harass homosexuals or deny them promotions. Many gay Israeli soldiers in turn seek transfers to bases where they can work during the day and sleep at home, but some commanders so value their gay soldiers that they try to block such transfers."

Senator MCCAIN. Would you support a policy where if a person who is gay or suspected of being gay is referred to a mental health officer for psychological testing?

Dr. KORB. Not unless their behavior indicated it—not on status alone.

Senator MCCAIN. Then you would not agree with the Israeli policy.

Dr. KORB. I would not agree, because at one time during World War II that was the policy of the United States, that people who were gays were referred to the psychiatrist to see if they could "be sent back corrected."

Senator MCCAIN. Finally, you are quoted in the New York Times as saying, "People who are opposed to the initiative know what opinions are and they take a survey to support their point of view to say, well, we would love to do this, but see, we will have this problem. Nobody would give a damn what the troops thought if the military's leaders backed the policy." You were speaking for yourself there, sir.

I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator McCain. Senator Bingham.

Senator BINGAMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In your statement, Dr. Korb, you have a sentence which I think is pretty self-evident, and I assume all three witnesses would agree with, and it says that research tells us that the more dissimilar the group the more difficult will be the task of trying to create unit cohesion.

I would ask the other two witnesses if they have any problem with that statement.

Dr. MARLOWE. No.

Dr. HENDERSON. No.

Senator BINGAMAN. If that is true, then essentially what we are saying is that the decision to allow African Americans into the service was deleterious to unit cohesion as you are defining it, is that correct, and to an extent undermined unit cohesion? Does everybody agree with that?

Dr. KORB. Yes.

Chairman NUNN. Why do you not answer so we will have it on the record over here?

Senator BINGAMAN. Do any of you disagree with that conclusion? It seems to me it follows from the statement.

Dr. HENDERSON. Yes, but I would qualify my answer.

Senator BINGAMAN. Please go ahead.

Dr. HENDERSON. The issue of comparing race and the gay issue are not analogous. One—as I said earlier, one is more deeply held. One is physiological in basis and the other is a learned bias.

The population at the time in the military was not very strongly against, as I said earlier, against race. The population in the military today is very strongly against homosexuals.

Senator BINGAMAN. Let me ask you a question about this, because I think we get down to this issue of values.

In a book that you have written on the subject, Dr. Henderson, entitled "Cohesion," you have a two-sentence statement in there that I would like to get your reaction to or comment on.

You say, "Another ethnic situation that might become more significant for the U.S. Army is the growing Hispanic population in the United States and its distinctly pro-community, nonmilitary tradition and Spanish-speaking values. Again, intense resocialization and policies that maintain Army and national values after initial training offer the best methods of achieving values that promote unity and cohesion."

I guess my question—I am having trouble understanding what Spanish-speaking values are. My State is one where about half the people are Hispanic, and most of our Medal of Honor winners, I believe, have been Hispanic. What do you see as Spanish-speaking values, and how do you see that as making more difficult the job of cohesion in the military?

Dr. HENDERSON. I think perhaps you are reading too much into that statement. The main point there is that the main requirement to building cohesion is the ability to communicate among members of the small group. The small group has to be able to talk to each other. They have to be able to figure out what each other is about, what their values are, and so on.

The Hispanic community does maintain its Spanish-speaking characteristic for a long time in this country, and what I am saying, basically, is that you have got to be able to communicate in a small group to get the cohesion necessary. If one group cannot speak English and cannot speak and communicate its ideas in English adequately, you are going to have difficulty creating cohesion. That is basically what I am saying.

Senator BINGAMAN. I thought that was something that the military determined when they let people in, that they could speak English at an adequate level that they could serve. Are you suggesting that there are—

Dr. HENDERSON. No. That is what I am saying, is those Hispanic soldiers who speak English very well do very well in the military. They are able to communicate. So do not misread what I am saying there.

Dr. KORB. Senator, on that subject of unit cohesion, I think if you look at the example of the Navy, which in the early seventies, some 25 years after President Truman issued his executive order, was still having problems assimilating blacks, as I mentioned. You had the race riots on board the *Kitty Hawk* and you had a near mutiny on the *Constellation*, and I might mention we were at war at the time, and so these were quite serious incidents.



As a result of this, Admiral Zumwalt, a very courageous chief of naval operations, brought all the admirals to Washington, and he informed them that their careers hung on how rapidly they improved conditions for blacks, and he ordered mandatory seminars on race relations for all officers and subsequent to that—and I was part of this up at the Navy War College—the Navy made tremendous progress in this area, but it did cause cohesion problems in the Navy as late as the early seventies.

Senator BINGAMAN. So as I understand at least your position, Dr. Korb, is that whenever you make the group more dissimilar, it undermines cohesion to a degree, and the question is, is that something that is justified in order to pursue other goals?

Dr. KORB. My position is, that it can be remedied with proper leadership and education.

Senator BINGAMAN. Dr. Marlowe, do you have a view on this?

Dr. MARLOWE. No. I can only say that history demonstrated that there were indeed problems with cohesion following the integration of African Americans into the military. The Defense Race Relations Institute was set up. A large number of EEO programs were set up in the Army. Every unit had an EEO NCO.

It took years of work for the military to reach the point that it is at now, certainly in the Army, well ahead of the rest of the country in terms of racial integration, but to say that this was accomplished easily and without a significant amount of pain and dislocation would be foolish, sir.

Senator BINGAMAN. Thank you. My time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Bingaman. Senator Coats.

Senator COATS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to our panelists for your presentations here this morning.

I was particularly struck, Dr. Henderson and Dr. Marlowe, by the dissimilarity in terms of your description of small unit cohesiveness, how critical it is to military success, how important it is to the safety of the young men and women that we ask to serve in the military, and the results of Desert Storm that designated it. Particularly, Dr. Marlowe, the results that you outlined.

In listing the elements that make up a successful unit that is cohesively bonded together, you both discuss a sharing of cultural values, similarities. In fact, if I could quote from you, Dr. Henderson, you indicated that in terms of the vertical cohesion that "the respect and the sharing of values between the troops and its leader and vice versa was critical."

In fact, you even said the most potent source of a leader's power is his ability or her ability to cause the soldier to identify with the leader. Successful officers and noncommissioned officers in cohesive units relay a strong sense of personal care, competence, and security to their soldiers which relieves soldier anxiety.

You quoted from research published in 1985 that the key to achieving this quality of leadership, this similarity of values among leaders, you talked about the importance of the fact that the leader often approaches the stature of a loved and respected parent.

Then I think one of you, I am not sure which one, described this almost in terms of agape love, meaning nonerotic love. That is a very powerful bond. I think what you are saying, and correct me

if I am wrong, is that there is a direct correlation between that and unit effectiveness. In Desert Storm it produced a direct correlation to the number of casualties. Am I basically on target there?

Dr. MARLOWE. Yes.

Senator COATS. Now, let us say we interject into that small unit the element of sexual attraction, sexual desire between two people. Let us not describe their gender at this point, but just between two people.

What does introduction of sexual attraction, the erotic—not the agape, but the erotic love, do to that cohesion? Whether that attraction is among the soldiers in the unit or between the leader, or perceived with the leader, and the soldier? What does that do to cohesion?

Dr. MARLOWE. If I may, sir, it destroys it, and I think we have seen this happen on a heterosexual basis in units in which erotic love between a leader and a soldier has been introduced.

Senator COATS. Why does sexual attraction destroy cohesion?

Dr. MARLOWE. Because of the implications, which can never be kept out, of favoritism, of differential behavior and differential reward.

In World War I, I think it was Robert Graves who describes the platonic homophilia of the young British officer coming through the public school system and watching officers on the western front develop pressures on enlisted men, and the extraordinarily destructive effect this had as it became public—I am not sure whether it is Graves or Spender—the way in which other members of the unit responded. X never goes on patrol, because he is the captain's darling, and the relationship had no sexual consummation. There was never contact or touch. Just the sense of the interjection of an erotic, special view of one person by the other was enough to damage the unit.

Senator COATS. And you used the same term that General Schwarzkopf used when asked this similar question. He said, it would destroy—others have said undermine, but General Schwarzkopf said destroy. As a psychiatrist who has studied the issue, you are saying it would destroy that cohesiveness which you described as the key critical element to success.

Dr. MARLOWE. I think it would go a long way towards it.

By the way, I am not a psychiatrist, Senator. I am a social anthropologist. I want that on the record.

Senator COATS. Dr. Henderson?

Dr. HENDERSON. In answer to your generic question, what is the effect of sex on unit effectiveness, it is interesting to note that the Roper Poll surveyed soldiers who returned from Desert Storm.

Those soldiers in units that had mixed gender units, men and women in the same unit, 45 percent of those soldiers said that sexual activity was a significant degrading factor in military effectiveness, and so sex does have a negative effect.

Senator COATS. Is that essentially the basis for segregating men and women in close living situations?

Dr. HENDERSON. You have other issues, too. You have the privacy issues.

Senator COATS. But it is the sexual attraction tension that could either undermine or destroy the unit that is the basis for separate living quarters.

Dr. HENDERSON. I would say that is a major basis, yes.

Senator COATS. Now, is not homosexuality, or proclaimed homosexuality, by definition, a sexual desire or interest in someone of the same sex? Is there any dispute to that? By putting homosexuals in with heterosexuals, you are introducing that same element of what Dr. Marlowe just described, into the small unit? Is that correct?

Dr. MARLOWE. The potentially erotic, yes, sir.

Senator COATS. Therefore, the presence of homosexuality would, as you said, Dr. Marlowe, destroy the unit.

Dr. MARLOWE. It could, if it is acted on, Senator.

Senator COATS. Is the perception that it might be acted on, or the favoritism, or the distrust that might result from it key to cohesiveness? You talk about respect, identity, shared values between the troops and its leader.

Dr. MARLOWE. Senator, I have great respect for soldiers. I think the critical issue would be, is the leader exhibiting behavior that would lead to that interpretation?

Chairman NUNN. Senator Coats, I am afraid your time has expired.

Senator COATS. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Senator Exon.

Senator EXON. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Gentlemen, I have been in and out, but I thank you for your opening statements and I congratulate each and every one of you for what I thought was a very thoughtful presentation.

I would like to get maybe a better—your definition of some of the definitions that we have seen throughout your statements and with the questions here this morning.

Dr. Henderson, I notice on page 4 of your statement you say, "then the group can be expected to expel or somehow separate the nonconforming individual." Now, what do you mean by a nonconforming individual? Obviously, in the first place you are, what, talking about a homosexual? That would be a nonconforming individual under your interpretation, is that correct?

Dr. HENDERSON. Possibly, yes.

Senator EXON. Possibly.

Dr. HENDERSON. If I can put that remark in my statement into context, in combat, any situation, any isolation, any deviation from the group norms that threatens the survival of the group is acted upon by the group fairly rapidly. This whole concept of cohesion takes on added sharpness in a combat situation where survival is at stake, so any perceived behavior, any perceived value, what-have-you, that threatens the group is acted upon and that individual is isolated or expelled from the group by any number of means.

Senator EXON. I think probably your answer, then, verified what I thought you were saying, although when you said possibly a homosexual would be a nonconforming individual, let me press you a little bit further for some details on that. Would a malcontent who was a heterosexual—under those combat situations you outlined, would a malcontent affect the cohesiveness of the unit in combat,

especially the small units that I thought you concentrated on very well in your statement?

Dr. HENDERSON. A malcontent who is obviously malcontent in opposition to group values would, that is right.

Senator EXON. But under what has been the "norm" in our military service, the malcontent who is a heterosexual could conceivably do as much damage to the cohesiveness of that unit that you reference, but the malcontent could not and would not be discharged from the service, but a known homosexual would and could be, is that right?

Dr. HENDERSON. Malcontents, sir, are often discharged under provisions for unsuitability. It has got nothing to do with homosexuality. So a malcontent who is unsuitable can be discharged from the service.

Senator EXON. I am trying to expand on this. Again, what I am saying is that I really believe, although I think my opening statement here on Monday indicated my preference on this whole matter, I do think that we have to take a look at the overall situation, and let me follow up this way. It is quite clear to me from your opening statement, Dr. Henderson, that you would prefer and you are recommending certainly that we continue the former policy of once a homosexual is established they should be dismissed from the service.

Dr. HENDERSON. I think that the problem of having homosexuals serve openly, to the extent that becomes a divisive cleavage point in small units where it presents cohesion problems, that level of situation will prevent those units from reaching the highest levels of combat performance necessary. You cannot have that level of achievement of performance and homosexuals serving openly at the same time. They are mutually exclusive.

Senator EXON. Let me phrase the question another way, and I would like each of the members of the panel to put aside what are your fundamental beliefs in this area and ask each one of you that if the Congress and the President got together and dictated that we do not want, nor do we think it is proper, to discharge from the service a homosexual who is serving properly and has caused no difficulty, what kind of a code of military justice do you think we could form, or do you think we could form one that would give some protection to the homosexuals who cause no difficulty and serve with great distinction?

Chairman NUNN. Senator Exon, could you clarify one point so we will know the answer and make sure? Are you saying that if being openly gay and lesbian is where we move in policy, then what kind of code of conduct, or are you saying where you keep the prohibition on being open gay and lesbian?

Senator EXON. No. I have said earlier that I do not believe open gays in the military will work. What I am trying to get to, Mr. Chairman, the question is, if a person—if a homosexual is not open, and does not flaunt their lifestyle, then do you believe we could fashion a code of military justice that would keep that type of an individual from being discharged as long as their homosexuality does not cause a problem in the unit or a problem to cohesiveness of the unit?

Dr. HENDERSON. If the homosexual behavior is kept private and nobody is aware in the unit that this situation exists, there probably will be no effect on cohesion. I do not see any problem in that regard.

Senator EXON. Thank you, doctor. That is what I have been trying to get to. I have always felt that if homosexuals do not come up front and advertise it that it could not cause any incohesiveness in the unit because they would be treated as if they were not homosexual.

Dr. Korb, welcome back again. We are always glad to have you, doctor.

Dr. KORB. It is nice to be here. I think the real issue is, what happens if you have an individual who is performing very well in the unit and it is discovered in any number of ways that that person has a different sexual orientation, and I do not mean through behavior. I mean through somebody telling the commanding officer I think this person is gay, and the commanding officer then asks, are you gay, and then of course the individual is caught between his military oath and knowing what the policy is.

This is what we really ought to be concerned about. If a person were causing behavioral problems, they should not be there, but if you ask that person the question about sexual orientation and they answer it honestly and there is no behavior problem caused, then I think that individual ought to be allowed to stay in the service.

Senator EXON. Dr. Marlowe.

Dr. MARLOWE. Senator Exon, I will give the same answer Charlie Moskos gave the other day. I think it is readily handleable. I think it is the combination of do not ask, do not search people's private lives. For the gay service member, do not flaunt, do not talk, and I think under those circumstances it does not represent a threat, if you will, to unit cohesion, but that remains, then, the issue is openness or nonopenness rather than status alone.

Senator EXON. Thank you, Dr. Marlowe. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My time is up.

Chairman NUNN. Senator Exon, with your permission, let me just make sure that I clarify Dr. Korb's answer. He said, if the person is asked whether they are gay or lesbian, and if they say yes, being honest, in that case he did not believe they ought to be expelled.

Dr. KORB. That is correct.

Chairman NUNN. That is one set of scenarios. The other is, if they are not asked, but they volunteer their status, they announce that they are gay or lesbian, would your view be the same in that circumstance?

Dr. KORB. If in fact they had exhibited no behavioral problems, and if they said, I want to tell you this is how I feel, I do not think we ought to have a blanket policy and say that you have to be excluded.

The research on the New York City Police Department shows that if you are a good cop and people know that you are when you let your sexual orientation become known, it does not cause any problem with what we call unit cohesion.

Chairman NUNN. Okay. I just wanted to make sure, because I think that is what Senator Exon was asking.

Senator EXON. Right, and Mr. Chairman, I must tell you that Dr. Korb and I are old friends that have worked on many problems together over the years, and I have great respect for his judgment and values, and I do not agree with him on the last statement that he made.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Exon, Senator Kempthorne.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Colonel Henderson, in your book you describe how alienation has a detrimental effect on unit cohesion. Do you believe that an openly homosexual individual would feel alienation in a primarily heterosexual military, and what impact does that have?

Dr. HENDERSON. I think where you have to look to for that sort of evidence would be to probably the Dutch case. The Dutch have for a number of years included openly homosexuals in their military service. It has not resulted in a very suitable arrangement.

On one hand the officials will tell you everything is going well. When you get down and ask the questions of what is really going on in the Dutch situation you will find this: about 9 out of 10, because of pressure against homosexuality in the Dutch Armed Forces, do stay in the closet. 10 percent come out and declare their homosexuality openly.

That 10 percent over a number of years has been in constant conflict. There is a continuous conflict in the Dutch forces on this issue. It has not really disappeared over time, and so that has persisted.

When you talk about alienation you are talking about separation from the group to some degree. That has occurred in the Dutch case. The homosexuals in the Dutch military have formed a separate union to present their case and their viewpoint and so on, and there is probably a cleavage line there between the Dutch homosexual soldiers and the rest of the Dutch military forces.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. Dr. Marlowe, what types of stress might a typical 18-year-old heterosexual soldier experience living in very close quarters with openly homosexual individuals, especially if this was his or her first exposure to homosexuality, and what are typical symptoms of this type of stress, if there is any, and how would this stress affect unit cohesion?

Dr. MARLOWE. That is a very difficult question for me to answer, Senator.

I would say that the typical 18-year-old for whom this is an alien experience would feel both stressed and threatened in close quarters with a homosexual who was behaving in an overtly homosexual fashion, that it would probably under those circumstances—and I underline behaving overtly within the organization—polarize the unit, lead to a severe division within the unit, and might have some other psychological consequences.

I think the real issue there, however, once again gets down to what is the behavior the individual is exhibiting, what is the position that the overt homosexual occupies, is the person using the position of power illicitly, and on and on.

To give a simple answer I think would be unfair to represent a very complex set of situations. For some people this would be very

difficult. It could well be an issue that polarizes the small group and threatens its integrity. It might not be, however.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. To follow that up, then, is there a real distinction between homosexual orientation and homosexual behavior?

Dr. MARLOWE. An orientation, like an attitude, is in the head. What we are concerned with as human beings is the behavior that people exhibit.

Just let me point out that my father years ago was a mind reader in vaudeville, and I discovered one thing. I cannot read anyone's mind. Neither could he. We read behavior, and so I think the issue of orientation decoupled from behavior is not an issue we should be concerned with.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. Dr. Korb, yesterday one of the witnesses, Dr. Burrelli, in a report that he had sent to us stated—and I am going to quote: "Should presumed problems of discipline and morale prove to be true, it may be politically impossible to reinstate the current policy," and then when I look at your statement, and I am quoting: "The question of whether the presence of openly gay men and women in the armed services would undermine fighting effectiveness cannot be answered definitively until the policy is actually changed.

Do you believe that this Nation should undertake that sort of experimentation with—our military effectiveness and national defense in the balance in light of the testimony of other witnesses who say that if we do change the policy, it will probably be very difficult to go back to the old policy?

Dr. KORB. I am addressing the question of the scientific debate about this subject. We were asked to talk about the data. My point of view was that you cannot, in the abstract, or without having tried it, say definitively.

When we went to an all-volunteer force we had a similar situation. There was a great debate in this country when we stopped the draft in the Nixon administration about whether in fact this force could work. There was a TV series that came on on CBS in the early 1980s as I came to the Pentagon that said, who will fight for America, and there were real concerns.

Now, I would hope that no matter what we did, whether we went to a volunteer military and we found that that did not work, that we would have the political courage to go back, even if that would be difficult. I do not think you ought to underestimate yourselves in the sense that you would not have the courage to undo any mistake that you might have made in any issue when national security was involved.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Kempthorne. Senator Lieberman would be recognized at this point under the normal procedure. We have a vote on that will probably take us 10 or 15 minutes to go over and get back.

Senator Lieberman, you have proved so adept at describing these hearings and have been quoted so extensively on your description that I would not want any of us to miss your questioning, so we will take a break here at this point and be back at about 12:00 o'clock.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot promise my questions will not be dull. [Laughter.]

Chairman NUNN. Everybody tends to get that way the longer they serve on this committee. I think it is the leadership. [Recess.]

Chairman NUNN. Senator Lieberman.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Referring back to your remarks before the break to go and vote, whereas I did say somewhat tongue-in-cheek that we had managed on Monday to take this explosive subject and make it dull, or one might say rational, it is perhaps a measure of the effect my membership on this committee is having on me that I found this morning's session to be absolutely fascinating. [Laughter.]

And on that premise I will proceed.

Let me raise the question at the outset here to the three of you about, though your positions are differing, it seems to me that you have all accepted the primacy, the priority importance of unit cohesion to military readiness and success in battle.

I think a lot of people who might be following the hearing who might not have had military experience might be somewhat surprised by that and ask, for instance, what is the role of love of country, of belief in the mission of the particular war?

In other words, how does that relate to—and the question that I believe Colonel Henderson mentioned at the beginning is appropriate. Why do people subject themselves to the risk of serious injury, let alone death, and is it really so much because of the feeling that they have for their buddy in the unit as opposed to a hatred of their enemy or a love of country?

I would be interested in the reaction of the three of you to that.

Dr. HENDERSON. Very briefly, if you go and ask soldiers why they fight, they mention the reasons we have been talking about—the small group interest, and the attraction to the leader, and so on. They do not mention patriotic things like love of country and so on until you ask them, and then they say, oh yeah, that is understood, and that has been described I think by Charlie Moskos in his book and his research in Vietnam.

In other words, the broad cultural values—love of country, and so on—are there. They are just unspoken and on that basis, these broad cultural values, on that basis you go ahead and build your small group norms.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Maybe that is true of the three of you, that we are all assuming that that is a priority.

Dr. Korb.

Dr. KORB. I think that that is necessary, but not sufficient. In order for the unit to operate effectively in combat you have to go beyond that, but it is necessary. I cannot see people getting involved in what they believed was an unjust war and performing effectively on the battlefield.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Dr. Marlowe.

Dr. MARLOWE. Senator, I think it was best put by a soldier I knew once who said, the flag, patriotism, mom and apple pie are what bring you into the Army. When the first bullet comes down range, the only thing you are concerned with are your buddies.

Probably the most seminal study, if you will, on this was Janowitz & Shils' study of the Wehrmacht in World War II, where



you had an extraordinarily effective fighting force, the majority of which despised their Government, the Nazi Party, and their leadership, and they fought for each other, which is what soldiers have always done.

Senator LIEBERMAN. So let me ask you, Dr. Marlowe, and you, Colonel Henderson, because you are raising questions about the removal of the ban on homosexuals serving in the military, obviously homosexuals are certainly as capable of love of country and support of a cause.

Insofar as that is a precondition to getting to unit cohesion—that is what brings soldiers in, and then the unit cohesion affects how they fight—to what extent does that common value that I presume we all agree you do not have to be homosexual or heterosexual to share, diminish some of the concerns you have about the impact of homosexual soldiers on unit cohesion?

Dr. MARLOWE. I think, Senator, once again that common value needs to be looked at in context. Where unit cohesion is made or not made is in the dynamics of the relationship of the small group, and to me the question is what are the behaviors of those individuals who are part of those small groups and their leaders?

If they are behaviors that are consonant with the group's perception of its structure, its need to take care of itself, the love its members will bear for each other when they go into combat, which is what keeps them alive, then the group will be cohesive and successful. If values are being interjected that polarize the group or diminish the possibility of that love, cohesion will be injured.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Colonel Henderson, did you want to add anything to that, or is that basically your feeling also?

Dr. HENDERSON. Yes. Just one thought, and that is that in addition to love of country there are other broad cultural values you have to have congruence on, you have to have broad agreement on, and you are talking about the basic morality that is put forth in the culture that is important.

There is a variation, of course, we all know that, but that is a significant thing, and also there are privacy values you grow up with, so these other values come to the fore on this issue, not so much love of country.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Dr. Marlowe, your testimony, I think, presents us with a dilemma in terms of how to make policy here. Insofar as I have heard you, you have said that a homosexual soldier would not diminish unit cohesion, which is so important to military success, if his or her homosexuality was not the primary personal identity but if that soldier was identified primarily as a soldier.

And the problem with that in making policy, obviously, is the uniqueness of every individual. It depends on how—both on how each homosexual soldier conducts himself or herself and, of course, to some extent on how the others in the unit respond to that homosexuality.

And so how can we build a policy, assuming that you are correct for the moment, how can we build a reasonable policy on that?

Dr. MARLOWE. My thesis, Senator, would be that the policy has to be built not on the primacy of the individual, because the primacy of the individual ceases once one becomes a part of the military service. The individual who behaves in terms of self coming

before the group is an individual who will be excluded by the group. The issue in terms of policy is what are those conditions that lead to maximum strength for the group.

From my point of view, whatever those conditions are, they must lead to maximum strength because that, in the final analysis, gives us the fewest long-term combat psychiatric casualties and the fewest broken bodies. And I guess that is where I have to draw the line because it is the group that is responsible for the survival of the individual in combat.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I may, just a final follow-up question on that, and it may have been touched on before but I just want to see if I can understand it. Do you believe it would be possible to allow homosexual soldiers to partially remove the ban to the extent that the Chairman suggested the other day, not ask the question but develop a code of conduct that could prevent against what you fear would inhibit unit cohesion, which is that a soldier would be identified primarily for his sexual orientation as opposed to the fact that he is a member of a unit and a fighting soldier?

Dr. MARLOWE. Senator, I think you were out of the room when I said in response to I believe it was Senator Exon that I pretty much would come down the way Charlie Moskos did in his article in the New York Times, that I do not think the military should ask or look in people's personal lives, and I do not think the homosexual coming into the service should flaunt or talk about his orientation.

I think that, from my point of view, pretty well describes what is going on at present in terms of ceasing to ask, and from my personal point of view, not asking and relying upon the discretion of people to behave as mature adults and to understand the needs, values, and desires of others in the group would represent perhaps the furthest point I would be willing to go.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Lieberman. Senator Warner?

Senator WARNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To my good friend and colleague Senator Lieberman I would like to read this quote. "When men go into battle and fight, they do not fight for God, country, mom, or apple pie. That is maybe what got them into the battle field, but generally, it is the unit cohesion. It is your buddy on your left and your right and your not wanting to let the unit down that causes you to really end up fighting the enemy." General Schwarzkopf.

Dr. Korb, you and I have known each other a long time, and I wonder if you would agree with the following: I view the military as sort of a giant pyramid. There are approximately nine persons in the base of the pyramid supporting the one that is in a combat unit. Would that be about a fair generality?

Dr. KORB. As you and Senator Nunn have discovered over the years, sometimes we have had too much support.

Senator WARNER. But that is a sort of a graphic?

Dr. KORB. Yes.

Senator WARNER. And to me, this hearing is about the following narrow issue: Is there a body of evidence on which the Congress

of the United States could make a rational, not a political but a rational decision, to compel young men and women of nonhomosexual orientation and homosexual orientation to serve side by side in that narrow little apex in combat units?

History has shown that they have served side by side in many capacities, and in my experience in the Department of the Navy I think most of those services which were quite commendable, I said the other day it took a special type of patriotism going in knowing you are violating the law and subjecting yourself to humiliation from your fellow servicepersons and indeed being tossed out. But most of them were in the base of the pyramid.

Now, it seems to me one by one the arguments supporting a change in policy are falling. And the first, and I regret Senator Kennedy is not here, I disagree with him that this chapter in our military history, the integration of the blacks into the full equality in the military is a precedent. I think General Powell, who is eminently qualified, answered that argument in response to a letter from Congresswoman Schroeder. I would like to put in the record, Mr. Chairman, his letter in full.

Chairman NUNN. Without objection.

[The information follows:]

DEAR PAT: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the position I took before Congress in February concerning homosexuals serving in the armed forces. I have given a great deal of thought to my position and continue to hold the view that the presence of homosexuals in the military is prejudicial to good order and discipline.

This is the policy of the Department of Defense and is supported by all of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is also a view held by experts who have studied the sociology of the military for many years. I am including a recent article by Charles Moskos on the subject. ("Why Banning Homosexuals Still Makes Sense," *Navy Times*, 30 March 1992—Ed.)

I am well aware of the attempts to draw parallels between this position and positions used years ago to deny opportunities to African-Americans. I know you are a history major, but I can assure you I need no reminders concerning the history of African-Americans in the defense of their nation and the tribulations they faced. I am a part of that history.

Skin color is a benign, non-behavioral characteristic. Sexual orientation is perhaps the most profound of human behavioral characteristics. Comparison of the two is a convenient but invalid argument. I believe the privacy rights of all Americans in uniform have to be considered, especially since those rights are often infringed upon by the conditions of military service.

As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as an African-American fully conversant with history, I believe the policy we have adopted is consistent with the necessary standards of good order and discipline required in the armed forces.

Sincerely,

COLIN POWELL.

Senator WARNER. And there is no question there is an adequate body of history and facts to support the conclusion reached by Congress that a black individual and a white individual or a Hispanic can build a bridge and can become a band of brothers. That is no longer a question.

The second issue that concerned me greatly when I first began to study intently on this some weeks ago was the foreign military experience. And there again, Dr. Korb, as you begin to peel back the rhetoric and the laws and whatever else is published and you get down to the actual fact situation, my research to date, and I intend to continue it, coincides with what Colonel Henderson described. And I must say that I respectfully disagree with you on that point.

But let us go aboard a ship. And you and I both served on ships, Dr. Korb. And it is curious. Last night I saw a documentary of the U.S.S. *Wisconsin*. And it showed one period when that ship was off the gun line in Korea, and day after day they were on firing missions. And all of the living conditions aboard ship under those intense conditions had disintegrated to where the men were virtually exhausted.

And they actually showed the care with which an individual at night had to creep back into the bunking area for fear that he might touch a fellow bunkmate who, because of his tension and fatigue, would just blow up and respond. I mean, the nervous tension aboard ships in prolonged combat, indeed, and storm at seas and other conditions. But let us go aboard ship together.

And I might say parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, I was privileged to go with the President, President Clinton, aboard the Theodore Roosevelt here a week or so ago, and despite press reports to the contrary I thought he was very well received aboard that ship. I thought he handled himself remarkably well. And the crew that I had the opportunity to visit with, and I followed him throughout that ship, I think responded very positively. I may have more to say about that at a later date on the floor.

But we got into the berthing area, and would you say that that table equates to about two bunks end to end?

Dr. KORB. Probably, yes.

Senator WARNER. And there is the next aisle over is a similar bunking area which is probably sometimes separated by 30 inches, less than a yard.

Dr. KORB. Yes, sir.

Senator WARNER. Now, I am going to follow on with Senator Cohen's very good line of questions. You talked about men and women and why you feel that they should not be put side by side in that bunking area, and would you repeat your answer?

Dr. KORB. I do not think that it is appropriate given the way we separate men and women all throughout their lives before they come into the military, and it is also, I think, for very practical reasons that have been elicited here.

Senator WARNER. Well, basically, it is because there are sexual tensions between the opposite sexes. They attract. Now, if you insert one or more, or say two or more homosexuals in that same cramped area, are not there comparable sexual tensions between those individuals?

Dr. KORB. There could be, depending upon, first of all—

Senator WARNER. I am talking about the homosexuals themselves. They have an attraction.

Dr. KORB. Well, I think there is a body of evidence that shows that not every gay man is attracted to every other man or that every lesbian is attracted to every woman. That is really what we are talking about here, that somehow or another there is a feeling that just because you are a homosexual you are attracted to everyone who happens to be your same sex.

Senator WARNER. But it seems to me that the same attractions or tensions that exist between male and female exist between two homosexuals or two or more, and that if you insert them in those cramped quarters, while they may for reasons not begin to trouble

or directly trouble the heterosexuals, it is the tension between themselves that would create a problem in those cramped areas.

Dr. KORB. It could, but again, I think I want to emphasize the word could as opposed to should, which I think is the direction you are leading, that just because they have this particular sexual orientation that there is this automatic tension or attraction. Research shows that in fact there is considerable dispute, even in the military regulations, as to what is a homosexual.

Under current regulations, a person could commit a homosexual act and be allowed to stay in the military if he or she could convince their commanding officer or the board that this was a one-time thing or something happened for some reason and that is not their true nature.

Senator WARNER. My time is up.

PREPARED STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN W. WARNER

I would like to refer to an article that appeared in the March 29 edition of the New York Times. The article entitled "Keep Gays Out" was coauthored by retired Lt. Gen. Bernard Trainor and Eric Chase, a Colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve. The authors in the article refer to an excerpt from William Manchester's book *Goodbye Darkness* and I would like to read a few words from the article and the quotation from the book.

Thirty-five years after his World War II service in the Pacific, William Manchester wrote in "Goodbye Darkness" that he walked away from the safety of a hospital in a secure area to return to his comrades in combat:

It was an act of love. Those men on the line were my family, my home. They were closer to me than I can say, closer than my friends had been or ever would be. They had never let me down, and I couldn't do it to them. I had to be with them, rather than let them down and me live with the knowledge that I might have saved them. Men, I now know, do not fight for flag or country, for the Marine Corps or glory or any other abstractions. They fight for one another. Any man in combat who lacks comrades who will die for him, or for whom he is willing to die, is not a man at all. He is truly damned.

Last night, on the Charlie Rose talk show, in a debate on this issue, Eric Chase described cohesion as follows and I will paraphrase his words. "The cohesion that bonds men together in combat units that causes them to risk their lives for each other and perform heroic acts in combat is really *love*; but it is a form of love that is totally inconsistent with *sexual attraction* among men."

I would like to read one other paragraph from the Trainor-Chase article.

With openly gay and heterosexual personnel together, sexual tension would fester 24 hours a day in deployed military units and ships. Romantic interests, even if unconsummated, would shatter the bonds that add up to unit cohesion. If the bonds that prompt men to risk all and die willingly for each other are lacking, combat performance will decline, with tragic consequences for people and missions.

Chairman NUNN. I believe Senator Levin is next.

Senator LEVIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, Dr. Henderson, I would like to ask you a question about the difference between this issue and an issue which will be created if a unit or members of a unit did not like a particular person's religion, and there was a real loss of unit cohesion because the person's stated religion, just the statement of that person's religion, created some real morale problems in that unit. Would you think then that the need for unit cohesion, which I think we all recognize is a very critical goal, would overcome that person's religious right? Or would you think that it would be up to the command to tell the guys who just are upset with that person's religion

you are going to have to live with it. Which would dominate in that situation?

Dr. HENDERSON. The issue of what binds a unit together is a broad issue of values, and you have just mentioned two, religion and homosexuality. I cannot think of any religion currently operative in the United States that would bring the same reaction that you would get to the homosexual issue.

Senator LEVIN. Well, say it did, or say someone's ethnic origin. Say at the moment it would be very unpopular to be an Iraqi American. I am just picking out a hypothetical. If someone's ethnic origin or religion created, the mere knowledge of it and statement of it, created unit dissension—would it then be up to the commander, in your view, to tell the unit you are going to have to live with it, or would it be up to that commander to say look, this is creating dissension in this unit, this person's statement of his religious beliefs. He belongs to that cult out in Texas or whatever it is. This person's statement of religious belief or his ethnic origin—I am giving your this hypothetical—in fact creates dissension and undermines cohesion. What is the obligation of the commander or the CO in that situation?

Dr. HENDERSON. If the commander believes it is a tactical problem, then he ought to deal with it as a leadership problem.

Senator LEVIN. How does he deal with it? Does he remove the person that is creating the dissension by reason of his acknowledgement of his religious belief or ethnic origin, or does he tell the rest of the folks in that unit you have got to live with this? Do you think he has the right to do either?

Dr. HENDERSON. This whole line of questions is not analogous to the homosexual issue. You know, we have got an institutional-wide problem here. You are dealing with one specific unit and a religious question and a very small population.

Senator LEVIN. I understand, but I am just asking you for the importance of unit cohesion, which I think all of us would acknowledge that it is an important goal that is critical, I am asking you whether or not that essential goal would overcome the person's right to a religious belief or that person's ethnic origin. That is my question.

Dr. HENDERSON. If the numbers involved are like 78 percent of the unit were against that particular individual, 81 percent felt that that individual would face violent behavior from the other members of the unit, and so on, then the commander probably would, for the safety of the individual and not on a moral ground, but the commander probably would take steps to safeguard that individual.

Senator LEVIN. By removing the individual instead of telling the other members of the unit who lived with it to live with it?

Dr. HENDERSON. I would say that is what would happen based upon the threat of physical violence.

Senator LEVIN. I am just saying there is dissension in the unit that is created and unit cohesion has been diminished by the person's statement of his own religious beliefs or his statement of his ethnic origin. That is what my hypothetical is. I am saying that there is an undermining of cohesion because of what that person has created by his statement.

And I am asking you, then, do you think the commander should have the right to do either and should he be able to do either, or should we tell that commander that you have got to protect that person's religious beliefs, and a mere statement of that is not going to be permitted to move that person out of a unit but rather you are obligated to lead that unit into accepting that person. Which do you recommend?

Dr. HENDERSON. In a combat situation?

Senator LEVIN. No, not in a combat situation first.

Dr. HENDERSON. Do you mean in some logistics unit or some depot?

Senator LEVIN. Right now, in peacetime. Right now.

Dr. HENDERSON. Well, first of all, you have to create cohesion during peacetime for wartime, and actions you take in peacetime have to be directed toward building cohesion. The primary responsibility is to produce a combat high effective fighting force or fighting unit.

Senator LEVIN. Should the Commander be able to do either, either remove the individual or insist that that person be allowed to remain and tell the other members of the unit you are going to have to live with this? Should the commander be able to do both?

Dr. HENDERSON. The commander ought to have the judgment as to what action he will take.

Senator LEVIN. And what would you take?

Dr. HENDERSON. Frankly, Senator, I do not know enough about the situation to really answer that question directly.

Senator LEVIN. Dr. Korb?

Dr. KORB. In my view there is no doubt about the fact you have got to protect the rights of an individual. What happens if somebody is pro-life or pro-choice, and that becomes a divisive issue? Dealing with that is what we call leadership. You are supposed to be able to ensure that you can handle that, and I would say if the commanding officer does not know how to handle it, he or she has not been properly trained and they ought to be replaced.

Senator LEVIN. Dr. Marlowe, do you believe that homosexuality, per se, implies impairment in general social capability?

Dr. MARLOWE. No, I do not.

Senator LEVIN. Do you believe that homosexuality per se implies impairment in stability?

Dr. MARLOWE. No.

Senator LEVIN. Do you believe that there should be any stigma attached to one being a homosexual?

Dr. MARLOWE. Do I personally believe there should be any stigma attached? No, Senator.

Senator LEVIN. Do you, Dr. Henderson?

Dr. HENDERSON. I do not approach this whole issue as a normative issue of right or wrong. I approach this whole issue in terms of effectiveness and unit effectiveness and the need to have that in order to avoid casualties and achieve a mission. That is my only purpose.

Senator LEVIN. I understand your purpose, but I am just asking you do you personally believe—

Dr. HENDERSON. I personally believe there should be no stigma attached to that behavior.

Senator LEVIN. Thank you. My time is up.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Levin. I believe Senator Smith is next.

Senator SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Korb, let us assume for a moment—make the assumption which you may disagree with, but just for the purposes of argument, that lifting the ban would undermine unit cohesion. Let us make that argument. Do you believe, then, as Senator Kennedy has stated, that homosexuals have a right to serve?

Dr. KORB. I believe, as I stated in my statement, that the burden of proof is on those who wish to exclude gays and lesbians from serving. Because, I think under our form of government you do have the right to serve your country unless there is some rational basis on which to exclude a person.

Senator SMITH. Would you make the same argument for a person who is severely handicapped?

Dr. KORB. Very definitely. And I think we have a very good reason to exclude that person. I mean, it is pretty obvious because we set standards for people when they enlist in terms of what we expect them to do. I ended up sitting in the back of the plane because my eyes weren't good enough to sit in the front of the plane, however much I wanted to do that. I was glad I was in the back rather than the front, given my eyesight.

Senator SMITH. If it came right down to it, in terms of a person in the military, and not a person that is now a member of society, but in the military. If it came down to rights versus national security, individual rights versus national security, which one should come first?

Dr. KORB. I think it is very clear the national security must come first because we do not allow military people other things like freedom of speech, when you are talking about classified matters, but again, let me emphasize, the burden of proof is on those who say that you can deny this right to show the connection to national security.

Senator SMITH. Well, if we assumed that the ban is lifted and those that profess to be homosexuals do enter the military. As long as the issue is there, and as Senator Coats asked in his line of questioning, the possibility of erotic love in a battlefield or combat situation is there, is that worth the risk to national security, in your mind?

Dr. KORB. Well, I think that what you need to do is take a look at the court cases we had where people have served in these units and they are being expelled primarily because of status rather than behavior. And when you talk about possibilities, there are all kinds of possibilities that could happen in any situation where people are under fire and they are living in close quarters.

As has been mentioned by Senator Levin, people may disagree over certain religious things, people may disagree over abortion or whatever it might be.

Senator SMITH. Right. I understand that. We are not really talking about issue disagreement in my estimation. And I also think that if you are out on the battlefield situation in combat you do not have time to go back and review court cases, with all due respect,



nor do you have time to have a philosophical dissertation prepared or discussed.

It is an issue that happens immediately. If, in fact, a relationship, an erotic relationship, or even a consensual erotic relationship occurs, it could make one make decisions that might be rational in terms of the individual but are actually to the detriment of the military unit, is that not correct?

Dr. KORB. Again, I would emphasize could, here, as opposed to should.

Senator SMITH. Right. But the point is if there are no homosexuals in the military this issue would not happen, correct? Theoretically?

Dr. KORB. Well, if we had all people of the same background and the same gender and the same sexual orientation and the same value system in the military, then none of these issues would arise. But we do not.

Senator SMITH. Senator Kennedy, in his opening remarks, referenced the discrimination to black soldiers in the 1940's and discussed the misperception, by the way, that blacks were somehow a health threat. I think that is obviously false, that they were not, and it has been proven so. However, in the case of homosexual communities there are studies, are there not, that sexually transmitted diseases are higher among the homosexual population than they are the heterosexual population?

Dr. KORB. But not among those homosexuals who are in the military. We are talking about those gay men and women who join the military. If you take a look at those who come in and stay in the military there is no significant difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals.

Senator SMITH. Dr. Marlowe, could I have your response to that question?

Dr. MARLOWE. As far as I know, first of all, we do not keep data in the military on who is gay and who is not because of the ban. The epidemiological data says that young gay males have the highest level of STD—sexually transmitted diseases—in the country. What it is for the Army, I could not tell you because the data is not kept by gender preference.

Senator SMITH. Dr. Korb, do you have any studies to substantiate your position?

Dr. KORB. No. What I am referring to is the fact that people have said that gay men and women have higher alcohol rates, have higher suicide rates generally in the population. As Dr. Marlowe said, it is pretty hard to generalize from that to talk about the people who come into the military or stay in the military because you are dealing with a different subset. But if you look at those who we discover are gay, either when they are there or when they leave, the data does not support the same conclusion.

Now, I do not have any studies. I read it, and I just cannot recall it now, but I would be happy to provide that for the record where people have said you cannot generalize from this population at large to those in the military. You have got to look at those who actually do come into the military. I think one of the things, if you are dealing with this, you have many people who because they are gay and lesbian are discriminated against, and this leads them to

do things and be more susceptible to lots of things than others in the population might be.

Senator SMITH. Well, Mr. Chairman, my time is expired. But I just want to make a final point. Just because a person who is either homosexual or heterosexual comes into the military does not, in and of itself, stop the interaction of that person with others who may be outside the military, is that not correct?

Dr. KORB. That is correct?

Senator SMITH. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Senator Faircloth?

Senator FAIRCLOTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would like to begin with Dr. Korb and follow up on the question of Senator Warner. If men and women cannot bunk together because of sexual tension, how can homosexuals bunk with heterosexuals without the same similar sexual tensions?

Dr. KORB. Well, your question has two-parts. One, we know that they do already because we have thrown out over 1,000 gays and lesbians in the last decade, and so we know that that is already the case.

The other part is that you are making an assumption that because a person is of the same gender of those in their unit, that there is going to be the sexual attraction. We know, for example, from police departments where they do shower and change together that they have been able to handle it. We also have the experience of athletic teams, we have some data on that which shows that it is not a problem.

Now, I am not going to stand here and say that any of those is comparable to the military. All I can tell you is we have indications that you can have this situation without it causing problems.

Senator FAIRCLOTH. Well, if I understand what you are saying, if there is anything I do not know much about it is homosexuality. But if I understand it, is men attracted to men. And you say because you could not put men and women together in this bunk because of a natural attraction, why are you saying that these homosexuals are going to control themselves with each other better than men and women would control themselves with each other, that the homosexuals have more ability or self control? Is that what you are saying?

Dr. KORB. No, sir. What I am saying is that in fact they do. And we have got evidence of people who have gone through their military careers without causing behavioral problems. Let me give you the case of Sergeant Perry Watkins who, when he was drafted during Vietnam was asked if he was gay and he said yes. They said we are going to draft you anyway because a lot of people are saying that to get out of going to this unpopular war.

He came in, he served on the battlefield, he served in units for the next dozen or so years, and each time he reenlisted they asked him if he was a homosexual and he said yes. He never kept it a secret and he had a splendid service record, so much so that when he went to the Supreme Court after he was denied reenlistment, the court said since they knew about it when you came in and since you performed so well, we are going to allow you to get your back pay and all your benefits that you are entitled to.

Senator FAIRCLOTH. Well, in this situation that Senator Warner described, what happens if they do not control themselves?

Dr. KORB. Then you throw them out, like anybody else who does not control themselves in a situation.

Senator FAIRCLOTH. All right. You are quoted as saying that the President cannot back off lifting the ban because, and I quote, he was specific about it during the campaign, closed quote. Number two, if he backs off from the pressure on military leaders he will be seen as giving in. Is that a correct statement and quote?

Dr. KORB. That is a statement that appears in the Baltimore Sun, and like any other statement, I spoke to the reporter for 20 minutes and that is what he put in.

What I was saying there is I did not think politically he could back off without losing some political credibility, and that if in fact he was seen as doing that then in fact it would impair his ability to carry out the duties of his office. And I am not the only one who has that opinion. The respected political analyst David Gergen said the same thing in Newsweek.

I was talking politically that it would be difficult because of the situation in which he found himself, much like President Reagan did when he fired the air controllers. I mean, once he threatened to fire them he could not back off without losing credibility, though there were those that urged us to let them back because of fear of what would happen.

Senator FAIRCLOTH. This does not have anything to do with what we are here about, but does that apply to all other campaign commitments?

Dr. KORB. Well, I think that any time any candidate backs off on a campaign commitment it undermines his or her credibility and ability to carry out the duties of their office.

Senator FAIRCLOTH. I am glad to hear that. No survey have I seen, whether taken inside or outside the military, had a majority supporting lifting the ban. You said in an interview, and I quote, people who do not want this to happen are really going to rely on these surveys. I take it from this statement you feel that the majority of Americans who do not agree with you are of no consequence. I therefore ask you to state for the record what weight you feel should be given to the majority of Americans who oppose your view.

Dr. KORB. That quote you referred to from the Los Angeles Times had to do with surveys among military people, not surveys among the population. And what I was saying in that particular quotation, that if you are opposed to this policy you are going to rely on that data to say why it should not happen.

I also said in that article there are lots of things that we do not ask the troops whether we want them to do. I am sure if you took a survey, military people might not want to get up at 5:00 in the morning or spend weekends away from home. That is the point that I was trying to make.

I also made the point earlier, now, that public opinion is split on this issue. During the eighties, support for dropping the ban and particularly for not throwing people out of the service who were discovered to be homosexuals and who were performing well increased. When this debate erupted, public opinion began to swing

back and forth, and it is somewhere in the neighborhood to 47 to 42 for or against it, according to the latest polls.

Senator FAIRCLOTH. Are you honestly telling me that you can weight lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military with the same level of importance as the wakeup time curfews and work schedule? Is that what you are saying?

Dr. KORB. No, I am not saying that, Senator. What I am saying is that if, in fact, you say we cannot do this even though we would like to, because the troops are against it, I think that you then, to be consistent, would have to say if the troops are against it we cannot do this or we cannot do that.

We made a discovery when we went to the voluntary military. The Army's first slogan was the "Army wants to join you." And what the Army basically did, and it darn near did us in, was try and conform the military's values to society's values. And that is the point I was trying to make, that you do not poll the troops about issues that you feel are right to do.

Senator FAIRCLOTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Faircloth.

I believe, if I am not mistaken, all members have had one round. Is there anybody who has not had one round? [No response.]

Okay, we will start a second round. And, Dr. Korb—well, let me ask Dr. Marlowe a question.

Dr. Marlowe, you put a lot of emphasis on behavior, and you distinguish between behavior and I believe you were distinguishing between behavior and thought?

Dr. MARLOWE. Yes.

Chairman NUNN. There is a provision in the regulations now that talks about someone's desire. That seems to me to get into mind reading, and I do not know how that is enforceable or whether it even should be enforceable. But there are other parts that get into intent, and that is a little different under the law, but you also seem to be saying—you mentioned you agree with Charlie Moskos and you seem to be coming down pretty close to the temporary policy we have now.

If I am reading you correctly, that is ask no questions and no one has to give any answers. But how do you judge someone who stands up and says I am gay or I am lesbian? Now, is that status or is that, in your term, behavior?

Dr. MARLOWE. That is behavior, speaking as behavior. The question that I would have to ask, looking at the group that person is a member of, is what are the consequences of that act for the group?

Chairman NUNN. But you do not consider that status, you consider that behavior?

Dr. MARLOWE. I consider that behavior, sir.

Chairman NUNN. Do you distinguish between that and if someone were asked by their commander without volunteering are you gay or lesbian?

Dr. MARLOWE. Yes.

Chairman NUNN. You make a distinction there?

Dr. MARLOWE. I make a distinction between that because, you know, while there is no real distinction between them, under the

present regulations when the commander asks that question there are very severe consequences for the answer one way or another.

Chairman NUNN. Okay. Dr. Korb, you equate—you made a fundamental distinction, I believe, between what your view is on the civil rights. You said that you do not believe that is an analogy in terms of civil rights and homosexual discrimination, am I reading you right on that?

Dr. KORB. Well, what I was saying is I think it is wrong to compare the two situations and say they are perfectly analogous. I think there is a difference. I can understand the concern of many African Americans who say because they were victims of discrimination, they must support the admission of gays into the military. I think there are some similarities in the sense that what we are talking about is a change to the social composition of the military. But I do not think that you can equate them.

Chairman NUNN. Do you believe, and you mentioned—all of you have mentioned the fact that there was some unit cohesion disruption during the racial—the transition into a racially integrated military. And all of you, and I would certainly agree with this, indicate that that was worth the price, that that was a price we paid to have equal opportunity in America. But we did spend an awful lot of time on equal opportunity seminars, sensitivity seminars, 10 years at least, maybe longer, in terms of real leadership, as you said, Dr. Korb.

Do you envision, if we do lift the ban Dr. Korb, that we will go through—we will have that obligation to go through that same kind of sensitivity training and that same kind of seminars on equal opportunity that will take 10 or 15 years? How do you visualize it?

Dr. KORB. Well, I expect that yes, we will have to expand the mandate of the defense equal opportunity management institute and all of the things that go with it to deal with this, because there is an awful lot of stereotyping and information that is not correct. My hope is that having learned from what we had to do in dealing with the issue of integration, as well as expanding opportunities for women, that we could make this less of a problem.

Chairman NUNN. Cut the cycle down so it will not be as long?

Dr. KORB. That is correct.

Chairman NUNN. But there is no doubt we will have to do that?

Dr. KORB. No doubt in my mind.

Chairman NUNN. Let me ask where you would draw the line on conduct. I think you made it clear on status, and I understand, I believe all three positions on status. But on conduct, you said that off-base behavior, you believe, should be basically irrelevant to the military code of conduct, is that right?

Dr. KORB. Off-base private behavior, yes.

Chairman NUNN. Private behavior? Distinguished between that and, let us say, drunken driving.

Dr. KORB. Obviously the military has a right to be concerned about people who drive while intoxicated.

Chairman NUNN. But off-base right now, that is a court-martial offense. Would you say everything off-base is—

Dr. KORB. Not everything.

Chairman NUNN. But you are distinguishing and you are saying sexual behavior?

Dr. KORB. Well, I am saying that I—what I am saying is that because drunk driving says a lot about the individual's character, because it does endanger himself, that that—you can make regulations about that and we quite probably—

Chairman NUNN. Okay, well, let me try to get it down to what you are really saying should not be any of the military's business off base. Is that sexual behavior, or do you draw the line broader than that?

Dr. KORB. Well, I mean, there are other forms of behavior that have no bearing. I think the burden of proof is to show that that behavior is relevant to the military mission.

Chairman NUNN. All right. How about fraternization? Officer having sex with enlisted personnel, heterosexual?

Dr. KORB. We do know that that is proscribed—because it would undermine unit cohesion—

Chairman NUNN. So you would say that is something the military ought to have jurisdiction over?

Dr. KORB. I think so, yes, sir.

Chairman NUNN. Would you say the same thing with homosexual fraternization?

Dr. KORB. If it is fraternization in the sense that it upsets the chain of command, yes.

Chairman NUNN. All right. How about adultery between military members off base? Should that be something subject to military—

Dr. KORB. Not in my view.

Chairman NUNN. Even if it involves other members of the military's family. Because that would change very substantially the whole military code of conduct now because that is subject to, and people are discharged frequently for adultery off base with members of the military.

Dr. KORB. Well, again, I think frequently is sort of in the eye of the beholder. I do not know how frequently it is.

Chairman NUNN. Well, whether it is frequent or once every year, you would not have that in your code of conduct that would be enforced?

Dr. KORB. No, sir, I would not. I would rely, if, in fact—I would rely on conduct unbecoming an officer, for example, rather than specifically prescribing that. That is my own personal view.

Chairman NUNN. Okay. Let me get down to what kind of code of conduct you would envision. Right now, having relationships with other members of the military, as long as it is not an abuse of power, fraternization, is perfectly permissible. Holding hands on the base is permissible, dancing on the base is permissible, having dates on the base is permissible, the base, in many cases, becomes the social home of many of our military people.

Now, if we are going to basically change the ban and move in a different direction, do you believe that heterosexual behavior between men and women should be treated the same as homosexual behavior between men and women on the base, or would you have a different code of conduct for gays and lesbians than for heterosexuals on the base?

Dr. KORB. I think if you take a look at the experience of the Canadians and Australians, they seem to be evolving in that way.

Chairman NUNN. Which way?

Dr. KORB. Which is as was quoted in the Washington Post where they talked about the issue that you are raising. They have not yet evolved a code of conduct, even though they have made the decision.

I think we have to take a look on whether in fact that behavior would be disruptive to military order.

Chairman NUNN. If it would be disruptive to have the same standards for heterosexuals and homosexuals, would you then have two different codes of behavior?

Dr. KORB. I think initially you might have to do that. And my understanding is that according to the gays and lesbians in the military, that they would accept that, the vast majority.

Chairman NUNN. What about family housing? Would gay and lesbian couples be given the same family housing privileges as heterosexuals?

Dr. KORB. I think if you take a look at that, the military is a reflection of society, and when society accepts that legally I think the military would have to take a look at it and see if, in fact, that would cause problems. But right now, I do not see it as an issue because it is not something that society generally accepts.

Chairman NUNN. It would be an issue the first time there was a law suit brought if the policies change.

Dr. KORB. Well, it certainly would be.

Chairman NUNN. That usually takes about 30 days, in our society.

Thank you. My time has expired. Senator Thurmond?

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Korb, I believe in your opening statement you attributed a statement to General Mundy, Commandant of the Marine Corps, which indicated that Marines would be able to accept homosexuals with no adverse impact on cohesion if the ban was lifted. I am aware of an all-Marine message in which General Mundy urged all Marines to stand tall. As this issue is debated, the message urges Marines not to quit and says the Corps will continue to be Marines, not individuals. Is this the source of your attribution? And if so, I do not think your inference is accurate. If not, can you provide us your source for the record?

Dr. KORB. Yes, sir, Senator. I am quoting from a Reuters News dispatch of the 9th of March, 1993, and it is headlined Marine leader says integration of gays will not damage Corps. And what it refers to is an article that General Mundy authored in Leatherneck Magazine. And the body of the article supports that headline. That is what I am referring to.

I have not seen anything other than that statement, and that is why I did not include it in my prepared statement. I did say that I do think that that is a hopeful sign.

Senator THURMOND. Let me ask you a simple question: In your opinion, then, do you think General Mundy favors lifting the ban on homosexuals?

Dr. KORB. I have no idea what he said. All I can say is he says the strict standards on sexual behavior that exist in the military

today will continue, General Mundy's statement said, and as in the past, all individuals who enter the military must be prepared to accept necessary restrictions on behavior, many of which would be intolerable in civilian society.

Senator THURMOND. Now, do you, yourself, favor lifting the ban on homosexuals?

Dr. KORB. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator THURMOND. That is what I wanted to know.

Colonel Henderson, do you favor lifting the ban on homosexuals?

Dr. HENDERSON. If the behavior is kept private, I have no problem. I am against lifting the ban for open serving in the military.

Senator THURMOND. Under what conditions do you favor lifting the ban on homosexuals, Colonel Henderson?

Dr. HENDERSON. Basically, I do not favor lifting the ban.

Senator THURMOND. You do not favor lifting the ban?

Dr. HENDERSON. That is right.

Senator THURMOND. That is what I wanted to know.

Dr. Marlowe, do you favor lifting the ban on homosexuals?

Dr. MARLOWE. What I will say is what I said before, Senator. What I favor is not looking at private behavior.

Senator THURMOND. Speak out. I cannot hear you.

Dr. MARLOWE. What I favor is not looking at private behavior and not holding someone accountable for what is in his or her head. Do I favor lifting the ban on the open proclamation of homosexuality within the military unit? No.

Senator THURMOND. So you do not favor lifting the ban?

Dr. MARLOWE. I do not favor lifting the ban at that level.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, very much. I thank all the witnesses.

Chairman NUNN. Thank you, Senator Thurmond. Senator Robb is recognized.

Senator ROBB. Mr. Chairman, I thank you. I have been chairing a confirmation hearing for the last 3 hours and hence I have not been able, other than the first 30 minutes of the opening statements, and I am afraid that if I begin asking questions at this point I would probably be repetitive. Let me pass for the moment, and if there is something that I would like to follow up on, I would like to request that opportunity, but let me get into the flow of things before I do so, if I may.

Chairman NUNN. All right. I believe then that gets us back to Senator Kennedy.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I understand, earlier in the morning there was some reference to the comparison between discrimination based on race and also on sexual orientation. I understand that in February, the NAACP Chairman William Gibson pledged his organization to support lifting the military ban on gays, saying "no citizen should be excluded from any aspect of life because of race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation." The civil rights leader drew direct parallels between the battle to desegregate the military and today's battle to win inclusion for the gays.

Here is the quote: "They said whites would not shower with blacks, they would not sleep in the same barracks, they would not take orders from black superiors. I have a deep sensitivity that dis-