



SCORECARD FOR EQUAL AND OPEN SERVICE

KEY STANDARDS FOR MEASURING 'EQUAL AND OPEN'
SERVICE BY GAY TROOPS IN THE PENTAGON WORK-
ING GROUP'S IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

SEPTEMBER 15, 2010

Scorecard for Equal and Open Service

Key Standards for Measuring 'Equal and Open' Service by Gay Troops in the Pentagon Working Group's Implementation Plan

Introduction:

The Palm Center has dedicated its attention in this Scorecard to the Pentagon Working Group's comprehensive report on the implementation repeal of 'don't ask, don't tell.' While additional legal and legislative questions remain in 2010, a constant in this debate continues to be the December 1st deadline under which this report is due to the Secretary of Defense. Identifying the key standards for measuring what equal and open service means for gay troops is essential given that the Working Group's implementation plan will serve as the guiding document for the transition to a new policy for gay service members.

Findings in brief:

Based on the evidence and data provided by service members, veterans, experts and foreign militaries, the standard of equal and open service in any implementation plan should be addressed as a simple process and must include three factors: a.) an affirmative non-discrimination policy; b.) one standard of conduct and facilities; and c.) leadership at all levels.

KEY INDICATORS SCORECARD		
Indicators	Yesterday	2 days ago
1) Affirmative non-discrimination policy		
2) One standard		
3) Leadership at all levels		

* Updated Mon-Fri only

Background:

The issue of equal and open gay service in the military has been among the most publicized issues in domestic policy since President Obama took office in 2009. In that time, significant changes have taken place. The President stated during his State of the Union Address on January 27, 2010 that, "[t]his year, I will work with Congress and our military to finally repeal the law that denies gay Americans the right to serve the country they love because of who they are. It's the right thing to do."

On February 2nd, Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen announced that a Working Group would be formed to provide a comprehensive review of issues related to the implementation of repeal of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ law and policy. Secretary Gates also issued new regulations on March 25 adjusting the standards for investigations and discharges under the current law.

Conditional repeal of ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ was passed by the House of Representatives and Senate Armed Services Committee on May 25. This legislation requires submission of the Working Group’s report prior to final certification and repeal of ‘don’t ask, don’t tell.’

Instructions to the Working Group, headed by Pentagon General Counsel Jeh Johnson and General Carter Ham, were issued by the Secretary in a memorandum on March 2. The memo states that the “[d]eliverables” should of the Working Group should include two items:

- A. *A Report addressing the areas above will be delivered to the Secretary of Defense not later than December 1, 2010. Prior to the delivery of the report to the Secretary of Defense, each Service Chief shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment.*
- B. *The Review will provide a plan of action to support the implementation of a repeal of the law. The Review shall identify areas for further study.*

In addition there are seven areas that cover the “[o]bjectives and scope” of the review by the Working Group, which include to:

1. *Determine any impacts to military readiness, military effectiveness and unit cohesion, recruiting/retention, and family readiness that may result from repeal of the law and recommend any actions that should be taken in light of such impacts.*
2. *Determine leadership, guidance, and training on standards of conduct and new policies.*
3. *Determine appropriate changes to existing policies and regulations, including but not limited to issues regarding personnel management, leadership and training, facilities, investigations, and benefits.*
4. *Recommend appropriate changes (if any) to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.*
5. *Monitor and evaluate existing legislative proposals to repeal 10 U.S.C § 654 and proposals that may be introduced in the Congress during the period of the review.*
6. *Assure appropriate ways to monitor the workforce climate and military effectiveness that support successful follow-through on implementation.*
7. *Evaluate the issues raised in ongoing litigation involving 10 U.S.C § 654.*

Finally, within the “methodology” section of the memo, it states that the Working Group should, “[r]eview all DoD directives, instructions and other issuances potentially impacted by a repeal. Identify where new directives and instructions may be needed.”

For our part, the Palm Center committed on February 3rd to aiding the Working Group where possible, stating that we are “ready to offer any assistance that General Ham or Jeh Johnson might request.” Since that time, we have provided both unsolicited and solicited information. On February 17, the Palm Center submitted initial recommendations for consideration. On February 23, the Palm Center’s Senior Fellow

Nathaniel Frank released updated research on gay service within foreign militaries. In addition, the Palm Center released a detailed account of current empirical research on openly gay service on March 3 and a memo addressing legal questions for active duty gay troop communications on April 1.

On May 20, a joint forum by the Palm Center and the Brookings Institution titled, “What Our Military Allies Can Tell Us About the End of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” featured senior military leaders from the Canadian, Australian and Dutch militaries as well as British and Israeli experts on those militaries. They gave evidence on the experiences of foreign militaries in implementing openly gay service. Members of the Pentagon’s Working Group and staff at the Government Accountability Office were among those who attended this forum.

Despite areas of disagreement (such as the language and use of the recent troops and family survey) it is clear that the Working Group has put forward a professional, dispassionate and methodical approach to this review. We hope this document is transparent and useful as they complete their deliberations and prepare the final drafts of their report and implementation plan.

Key Standards: Measuring Equal and Open Service in the Working Group’s Implementation Plan:

The Palm Center has relied on feedback from service members, veterans and government sourced literature and data, including the 1993 RAND Report “Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy” (MR-323-OSD) to address these priority areas. For this analysis, we have assumed that the Working Group’s report will be consistent with all previous evidence-based research in concluding that openly gay service would not be a detriment to military readiness or unit cohesion. The key standards for measuring equal and open service in the Working Group’s implementation plan include the following:

I. A policy of affirmative non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation

The Pentagon Working Group’s recommendations must include an affirmative non-discrimination policy on the basis of sexual orientation. Two areas of its charge direct this action including the objective to “appropriate changes to existing policies and regulations” and the methodology to “[i]dentify where new directives and instructions may be needed.”

Moreover, asserting non-discrimination is the core element upon which this transition and implementation plan rests. All other changes respond to this new policy of open service. In 1993 RAND noted that, “It is very important to convey a new policy that ends discrimination as simply as possible and to impose the minimum of changes on personnel (Levin and Ferman, 1986). Further, the policy should be decided upon and implemented as quickly as possible and should include both pressure and support for change.”

The affirmative non-discrimination policy recommendations should include be included in the three principal Department of Defense implementing regulations in force. They include the:

- Department of Defense Instruction 1304.26, “Qualification Standards for Enlistment, Appointment, and Induction” (July 11, 2007);
- Department of Defense Instruction 1332.14, “Enlisted Administrative Separations” (August 28, 2008); and
- Department of Defense Instruction 1332.30, “Separation of Regular and Reserve Commissioned Officers” (December 11, 2008).

As noted in the Palm Center’s 2009 “Roadmap,” each of the military services has in turn issued regulations to implement Department of Defense guidance. Addressing non-discrimination within these instructions establishes the framework for each service.

II. A single standard and rules of conduct and facilities for all service members

The objective outlined by Secretary Gates instructs the Working Group to, “[d]etermine leadership, guidance, and training on standards of conduct and new policies.” The military should maintain its current single code of conduct and single provision of facilities. No edits to the code are needed as sexual orientation should be considered a “non germane” consideration of service.

This issue was addressed clearly by RAND in 1993 and was also addressed by the recently announce group “OutServe” made up of active duty gay service members. The 1993 RAND report stated that “Military experience with blacks and women argues for a simple policy under which homosexuals are treated no differently in terms of work assignments, living situations, or promotability... They should be assigned to serve in all positions and at all levels, according to their skills.”

On July 26, OutServe addressed this issue in a statement (see appendix for full statement) that noted, “[f]ollowing the lifting of the ban, it will be business as usual” adding, “[w]e are here to fight and win wars, serve with integrity and honesty and protect the people fighting next to us.

Again, these statements are consistent with a recommendation for no changes to living arrangements and specifically note that all positions and job specialties be open to gay service members. We would also note that existing training already covers many potential areas of concern and could be adapted within existing frameworks for addressing openly gay service.

III. Leadership at All Levels for the new policy

On his testimony on ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 2nd Admiral Mullen stated unequivocally, “this is about leadership.” On March 2, Secretary Gates’ memorandum to the General Counsel states that, “[s]hould

Congress take this action, strong, engaged and informed leadership will be required at every level to properly and effectively implement a legislative change.”

These statements set a crucial note in achieving equal and open service. The 1993 RAND Report concluded in 1993 that “[m]ilitary leaders can and must become a major driving force for change.”

Measuring this across the board leadership within the Working Group’s implementation plan may not be easy, but it should be apparent. Leadership will be seen in the manner in which policies are structured and the speed with which they are executed. Leadership will send the strongest message and may be the most important element in a smooth transition.

Additional Consideration: Timeline

The 1993 RAND report notes that, “the new policy regarding homosexuals in the military should be decided upon and implemented as quickly as possible.” It states that waiting periods can undermine the certainty of the process and outcomes; show a lack of leadership and allow those opposed to the policy change to mobilize.

During the recent Palm Center and Brookings Institution forum, the issue of timing and speed in transition was addressed by the British, Canadian and Australian representatives:

United Kingdom – (Commander Jones): “I think it’s certainly fair that -- I believe it needs to be done swiftly. In the UK, in August, ’99, the ban was suspended, and it took about six months after that for the Armed Forces Code of Social Conduct to be implemented.”

Canada – (Karol Wenek, Director General, Mil. Personnel): “In Canada, the change was implemented quickly; it was unequivocally supported by senior leadership; the process was low key and explicitly communicated an expectation of normality in the work environment.”

Australia – (General Willis): “You should do it as quickly as you can no matter what circumstances. And I believe in the Australian circumstance, the rapid nature of it was one of the reasons why it was so successful.”

Conclusion:

Throughout this process, the good intentions of parties on all sides has been clear. It is recognized that the role of the Working Group is not to establish “equal and open” service for gay troops specifically. Nonetheless, the policies recommended by the Working Group in its implementation plan will only be provide equal and open service to gay and lesbian troops if they include an affirmative non-discrimination policy, a single standard of conduct and facilities as well as leadership from all levels. The standard set by President Obama and Admiral Mullen is one of integrity and equality, this suggests an appropriate standard that is nothing short of equal and open for all gay and lesbian service members.

Appendix:

Palm Center Recommendations Aim to Assist and Speed Pentagon Working Group

SANTA BARBARA, CA – Feb. 17, 2010 -- The Palm Center has released eight key recommendations to the Pentagon Working Group on gays in the military. These recommendations are intended as a first step in providing full support to the Working Group and acknowledging the importance of a thorough and timely process.

The Palm Center has more than ten years of experience studying gays in the military at home and abroad as well as on the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy specifically. Housed at the University of California, Santa Barbara, the Palm Center has published over thirty books, book chapters, and journal articles on gays in the military. Nine of our studies have been published in peer-reviewed journals including *International Security*, *Armed Forces and Society*, and *Military Psychology*; others appeared in respected publications such as *Parameters*, the official journal of the U.S. Army War College.

While noted in full below, the key recommendations include:

Consulting existing literature as a roadmap; Assessing the Impact on Unit Cohesion Properly; Consulting troops for relevant information rather than to ask their permission for reform; Sending study teams to Britain, Israel, Australia, and Canada; Using an appropriate standard for assessing the likely impact of change; Consulting research on the timing of implementation; Noting that leadership and consistency are more important than second-order effects; and Correcting for biases introduced by “don’t ask, don’t tell.

“Although our independent findings—as well as the vast majority of other government, military, and academic research—have concluded that ending the gay ban will not harm military effectiveness, our offer of support and recommendations below do not assume any outcome,” stated Dr. Aaron Belkin, Director of the Palm Center. “We hope to be one of many resources that the working group considers. The recommendations below reflect our “lessons learned” from extensive work within this field.”

Recommendations to Pentagon Working Group on Gays in the Military

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) Consult existing literature as a roadmap. Research on openly gay service is extensive, and includes over half a century of evidence gathered by independent researchers and the U.S. military itself, as well as the study of the experience of foreign militaries. The U.S. military’s own researchers have consistently found that openly gay service does not undermine cohesion. While some opponents of gays in the military have published material asserting links between gay service members and perceived harm to the military, no research has ever shown that allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly impairs overall readiness. This fact has been acknowledged by the

Pentagon, which has said that the rationale for its gay ban is “inherently subjective in nature” and is rooted in “professional Military judgment, not scientific or sociological analysis.” Existing literature also provides helpful “lessons learned” about the implementation of a policy to replace the ban on openly gay service. The Appendix lists the major studies on gays in the military over the past fifty years. We recommend that the Pentagon working group consult the existing literature.

(2) Assess the Impact on Unit Cohesion Properly. The unit cohesion rationale, the claim that allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly would undermine cohesion, must be assessed rather than assumed. Asking service members their opinion about whether openly gay service would harm cohesion is not an empirical assessment. Rather, to test the unit cohesion rationale, the working group should derive a measure of “outness” for a sample of units by asking members of each unit whether they have gay peers. The “outness” of each unit should then be correlated with independent measures of the unit’s readiness and cohesion after controlling for other determinants of unit quality. If a unit’s “outness” is uncorrelated or negatively correlated with unit quality, then this would cast doubt on the plausibility of the unit cohesion rationale. (This was the approach of Dr. Laura Miller, a RAND scholar, and Dr. Bonnie Moradi, a University of Florida professor, who published their findings in *Armed Forces and Society*. Their study appears in the Appendix.)

(3) Consult troops for relevant information rather than to ask their permission for reform. It is important to be sensitive to the concerns and anxieties of military members as options are weighed about lifting the ban on openly gay service. Yet it is crucial that, when uniformed personnel are consulted on this matter, the purpose of the consultations be made clear: Polls or anecdotes about the personal preferences of enlisted personnel and junior officers should not be used as a basis to determine policy, and they do not constitute evidence about the critical question of what impact lifting the ban will have on cohesion, recruitment, and effectiveness. In Britain and Canada, approximately two-thirds of troops surveyed said that they would not work with gays, yet when inclusive policies were implemented, just a handful of service members actually retired.

(4) Send study teams to Britain, Israel, Australia, and Canada. Twenty-five nations allow gays and lesbians to serve openly. None has reported any overall detriment to cohesion, morale, recruiting or retention. Internal reviews by the British and Canadian militaries found no negative impact on readiness, despite expectations that the policy transitions would cause substantial disruptions (see Appendix). American military culture is distinct from that of its allies, but the lessons from other countries are nevertheless instructive. We recommend that the Pentagon working group send research teams to other nations that allow gay men and lesbians to serve openly to determine what worked and what did not.

(5) Use an appropriate standard for assessing the likely impact of change. Some participants in the conversation over gays in the military have sought certainty about what will happen when “don’t ask, don’t tell” is repealed. Yet this is not consistent with

how public policy assessments are made. By the standard of absolute certainty, we cannot know for sure whether the continuation of “don’t ask, don’t tell” could jeopardize readiness, just as we cannot know the future impact of any policy change before it happens. The appropriate criterion for any policy decision is not certainty, but a preponderance-of-evidence standard. A similar point must be made about measurability. Some insist that “don’t ask, don’t tell” has no *measurable*, negative impact on the armed forces, and that repeal poses an unacceptable risk to the military, without specifying how or how much repeal would harm the military. The working group should of course assess the impact of policy continuity and change with as much precision as possible; however, the question of measurability must be asked in an even-handed way when attempting to compare the impact of retaining “don’t ask, don’t tell” to the impact of repeal.

(6) Consult research on the timing of implementation. Secretary Gates has announced that, even after Congress repeals “don’t ask, don’t tell,” the military could require a year to implement an inclusive policy. Extensive research on the topic, however, including the 1993 RAND study, concludes that, once a decision is made to allow gay men and lesbians to serve openly, the policy transition should be implemented quickly. As RAND found, “The policy selected should be implemented immediately. Any sense of experimentation or uncertainty invites those opposed to change to continue to resist it,” which adds to uncertainty and anxiety about the change. This is also the lesson of foreign militaries. The working group should assess the wisdom of Secretary Gates’s proposed one-year implementation timeline.

(7) Leadership and consistency are more important than second-order effects. A closely-related issue is the question of imagined second-order effects. Research has found that there are only two major factors that determine the success of a transition to an inclusive policy. First, senior leaders must send clear signals of support for the new policy, and ensure that commanders discipline those who disobey it. Second, the military must have a single code of conduct that applies irrespective of sexual orientation, and that holds every service member to the same behavioral standards. (The U.S. military already has such a code.) Other factors have negligible or minimal impact. For example, much has been made of whether lifting the ban will require base housing and spousal rights for same-sex partners. Yet as a government entity, the military is governed by the Defense of Marriage Act; hence, partners of gay troops will not be accorded benefits. Substantial research has found that transitioning to an inclusive policy is less difficult in fact than is currently portrayed. Pretending that it is difficult, however, could invite the very divisiveness that participants of good faith on all sides of the conversation seek to avoid.

(8) Correct for biases introduced by “don’t ask, don’t tell.” “Don’t ask, don’t tell” shields itself from analysis in at least three ways. First, because gay troops cannot acknowledge their sexual orientation to researchers, it is difficult to assess the policy’s effect on them. Second, evidence suggests that many commanders are ignoring the presence of gay service members in their units in an effort to retain personnel, a fact which reflects belief among field officers that “don’t ask, don’t tell” actually hinders their

jobs rather than helping cohesion. That said, they are unlikely to acknowledge this information given their side-stepping of the law. Finally, by sending a signal that gay troops are not equal, “don’t ask, don’t tell” sustains the appearance that military culture is less hospitable to gay troops, and less amenable to change, than is actually the case. A student study at the Naval Postgraduate School found that the majority of service members polled believe that they are more tolerant of homosexuality than their peers (a statistically impossible situation). Research shows that service members are, in general, tolerant of gay and lesbian peers but often feel they must pretend to be intolerant in front of others. When scholars fail to correct for this bias, they may mischaracterize the degree of tolerance among service members.

Historic Endorsement of Openly Gay Service by Joint Chiefs Chairman Frames New Debate

Palm Center Questions Year-Long Study on Gays in the Military, Pledges Support to Working Group

SANTA BARBARA, CA – February 3, 2010 -- Today the Palm Center noted the historic nature of remarks delivered by Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, during a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ law and policy. “The personal military adviser to the President of the United States has stated that he supports the inclusion of openly gay troops as a matter of moral integrity,” stated Dr. Aaron Belkin Director of the Palm Center. “This is a game-changer at the Pentagon.”

Belkin added, “Yet even with the historic progress today, there are concerns from the hearing.” Secretary Gates announced a year-long Working Group on gays in the military. The Secretary stated that the Working Group would survey military personnel and draft implementation guidelines to be enacted following Congressional repeal and that full implementation of the new policy would take at least a year.

Palm Center Senior Research Fellow Nathaniel Frank stated, “It is important to be clear that the government’s data from all sides on gays in the military is overwhelming and conclusive. There have been twenty studies on gays in the U.S. military and RAND is currently updating its 1993 report. We would have hoped that the volumes of very recent data could be used to address implementation questions, but we understand that the Working Group has been announced. In turn, the Palm Center is ready to offer any assistance that General Ham or Jeh Johnson might request.”

“Today is a new day for gays in the military,” stated Christopher Neff Deputy Executive Director of the Palm Center. The President’s direction on this issue has created room for a new dialogue and Senator Levin’s hearing today showed the difference that leadership makes. Moving forward, with continued strong leadership, post repeal implementation should be minimal. The 1993 Rand Corporation report on implementing openly gay service stated that a successful new policy should be “decided upon and implemented as quickly as possible” with strong leadership from the top.

1993 RAND Report Conclusion regarding implementation of a new policy allowing openly gay service (pg. 393-394):

To promote change, planners should:

- Convey the policy as simply as possible and build in supports for change. The most important support for change is a code of professional conduct that clarifies the criteria for behavioral compliance and stresses universal responsibility for respecting the feelings and sensitivities of others. In addition, high level individuals should be designated as responsible for successful implementation.
- To the extent possible, convey the change in terms compatible with military culture. These terms might include a focus on the submersion of individual preferences, the obligation to follow orders, and the military's "can-do" attitude.
- Stress behavioral compliance and create sanctions for compliance failures. Policy messages should make clear that leaders are responsible for their own behavior and for the behavior of their subordinates. Communication upward about compliance failures should be encouraged.
- Create a change process that allows members to voice their views and concerns and to know that these have been heard, even if they do not agree with the ultimate policy. The change should make clear that leaders have developed the policy and the implementation plan in a fair manner.
- Ensure top leadership support, at least behaviorally. Set in place the means through which top leadership can send signals of support for the new policy, including continuing involvement in implementation, and frequent messages about the implementation process.
- Involve leaders at all levels. Even in a top-down organization, implementation remains a problem of the smallest unit. Leaders at all levels must come to see that successful implementation is in their self-interest, and their ability to lead will be assessed in part by their own compliance with the new policy and the compliance of those under their command. They must also be provided with training designed to make them successful implementors. Such training should include practice in identifying threats to implementation, guidelines for behavior, and sufficient discretion so that they can begin to feel some ownership for the change.
- Set up monitoring mechanisms, including oversight committees, that will assess the implementation process. Monitoring efforts should capture as many aspects of the change as possible.

Out Serve STATEMENT

We are active duty and veteran gay, lesbian, and bisexual soldiers, sailors, Marines, airmen, and members of the Coast Guard who are currently serving and who have served some in silence, some with the open support of our comrades in defense of our nation. We include service men and women who graduated at the top of our classes at the service academies and enlisted at recruitment centers around the country. Some of our members have lost their lives in service to their country.

There have been many predictions regarding how gay, lesbian, and bisexual service members will behave after "don't ask, don't tell" is repealed and fully non-discriminatory standards of behavior are implemented. These predictions represent, in some cases, fear mongering and lack of understanding. We submit the following to clarify what service members should expect from their gay, lesbian, and bisexual brothers and sisters in arms, and to articulate what we believe to be reasonable expectations about our ongoing professionalism in defense of our nation:

- (1) We are service members first. Our overriding operational imperative is to do everything in our power to sustain team cohesion, to maintain trust and loyalty between Commanders and those they command, and to provide positive examples of ethical behavior to all of our fellow service members.
- (2) We believe that sexual orientation is merely one facet of individual identity. As a consequence, we seek to be accepted as equals while conducting ourselves with the same professionalism regarding our personal lives. Those actions, which serve to create an uncomfortable or hostile work environment, are as wrong when coming from a gay individual as from a heterosexual.
- (3) Social conventions regarding public displays of mutual affection should apply equally to couples of the same and opposite sexes. Military couples recognize that open displays of affection can be viewed as inappropriate in any context and that service men and women have a responsibility to represent themselves in discreet ways.
- (4) Breaches of professional decorum can and should be handled at the Command level, as individuals can be counseled about appropriate behaviors in the Service environment. As service members grow in their role as leaders, Command should afford them the opportunity to grow and learn about what it means to be a military professional.
- (5) As with any repeated unprofessional behavior, if inappropriate conduct by heterosexuals or gays and lesbians continues, other options can and should be considered, particularly in instances in which Commanders view the behavior as a consistent breach of commonly accepted norms of professionalism.
- (6) These values of professionalism should extend to the full range of military functions, including official and semi-official functions, overseas deployments, training

environments, and any context in which service members and their partners might interact with one another in the spirit of collaboration, camaraderie, service, and mutual support. Contrary to those who would spread fear about the consequences of change, we value unit cohesion and aim to do everything in our power to support it. Upon certification and repeal of “don’t ask, don’t tell” and the subsequent implementation of fully non-discriminatory standards of behavior and enforcement, all service members can expect that their gay, lesbian and bisexual colleagues will continue to conduct themselves in the same exemplary fashion that has governed our conduct thus far.

JD Smith, Co-Director, OutServe* Ty Walrod, Co-Director and civilian spokesperson, OutServe* Jeff Petrie, USNA '89, Chair, Service Academy Gay and Lesbian Alumni Association** Becky Kanis, West Point '91, Chair, Knights Out***, Greg Mooneyham USAFA '87, Executive Director, Blue Alliance**** (August 13, 2010).

*OutServe is a network of approximately 450 active-duty soldiers, sailors, Marines, airmen, and members of the Coast Guard. JD Smith is a pseudonym.

**SAGALA is a professional network of 435 gay, lesbian, transgender and bisexual cadets, midshipmen and alumni who attended one of the five federal Service Academies.

*** Knights Out is an organization of West Point alumni, staff and faculty who are united in supporting the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender soldiers to openly serve their country. The group has 203 members and graduate supporters and 462 allies.

****Blue Alliance is an organization of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender graduates of the U.S. Air Force Academy.