

---

---

## Military Implementation Plan puts Women in Direct Combat and Foxholes

*"The time has come to rescind the direct combat exclusion rule for women and to eliminate all unnecessary gender-based barriers to service. The Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously join me in proposing that we move forward with the full intent to integrate women into occupational fields to the maximum extent possible."*

– General Martin E. Dempsey, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, January 9, 2013 Memo to Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta

Since a current social goal of the Defense Department is "*diversity as a strategic imperative*," the draft-women issue is being considered by the U.S. District Court for Central California. The case against the Selective Service System (SSS) and its director, Lawrence G. Romo and DOES 1 – 50, was filed by the 501(c)(3) National Coalition for Men (NCFM) and 18-year-old Texas resident James Lesmeister, who recently registered for the draft.

The plaintiffs claim sex-based discrimination against males, because females are exempt from a military draft. While women are not required to register, men who fail to register can be fined \$250,000, sentenced to five years in prison and disqualified from a number of government benefits, such as jobs, financial aid, citizenship and job training.

**The female combat exemption was rescinded.** On January 9, 2013, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Martin Dempsey sent a memo to Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta about the "Women in the Service Implementation Plan," that equalizes the roles of men and women in the military. The first sentence explained, "The time has come to rescind the direct combat exclusion rule for women and to eliminate all unnecessary gender-based barriers to service."

Fifteen days later on January 24, 2013, outgoing Defense Secretary Panetta announced the administration's intent to eliminate military women's exemption from direct ground combat in the Army and Marine infantry, armor, artillery, Special Operations Forces and navy SEALs. Elimination of that made females and males "similarly situated" in the military and eligible for the draft. The 1981 Supreme Court *Rostker v. Goldberg* decision explained the term as follows:

*"The purpose of registration was to prepare for a draft of combat troops. Since women are excluded from combat, Congress concluded that they would not be needed in the event of a draft, and therefore decided not to register them ... Men and women, because of the combat restrictions on women, are simply not similarly situated for purposes of a draft or registration for a draft."*

In 1992, the Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces noted: "The purpose of conscription is to induct what the Supreme Court called 'combat replacements' in a time of national emergency. *Therefore if women are not eligible for direct ground combat, Congress could exempt them from registering for the draft.*" (Emphasis added.)

**ACTION – Ask Congress to prohibit women in combat.** Congress is in recess, so call their local office as follows: Representatives Kingston (R-1<sup>st</sup>), Savannah: 912 352-0101; Bishop (D-2<sup>nd</sup>), Columbus: 706 320-9477; Westmoreland (R-3<sup>rd</sup>), 770 683-2033; Johnson (D-4<sup>th</sup>), Lithonia: 770 987-2291; Lewis (D-5<sup>th</sup>), Atlanta: 404 659-0116; Price (R-6<sup>th</sup>), Roswell: 770 998-0049; Woodall (R-7<sup>th</sup>), Lawrenceville: 770 232-3005; Austin Scott (D-8<sup>th</sup>), Warner Robins: 478 971-1776; Collins (R-9<sup>th</sup>), Gainesville: 770 297-3388; Broun (R-10<sup>th</sup>), Athens: 706 549-5988; Gingrey (R-11<sup>th</sup>), Marietta: 770 429-1776; Barrow (D-12<sup>th</sup>), Toll-free in Georgia: 1 866 890-6236; David Scott (D-13<sup>th</sup>), Jonesboro: 770 210-5073; Graves (R-14<sup>th</sup>), Dalton: 706 226-5320. NOTE: **Please make a separate call for each action suggested in this newsletter.**

## ***Christianity under Attack in U.S. Military***

*“In January, Obama objected to changes in the National Defense Administration Act (NDAA) that were already approved by Congress protecting evangelical chaplains from recrimination if they declined ministerial acts that contradicted their beliefs, such as providing premarital counseling to same-sex couples. At that time, Obama called those safeguards ‘unnecessary and ill-advised.’”*

– “Military Assault,” by Charles Chandler, *Decision Magazine*, July/August 2013

*“I’m not an activist, I’m not on a mission, and I’m not going on offense, but I’ll go to the mat on defense if required to in order to fight for the religious freedoms we have under the Constitution.”*

– Coast Guard Rear Admiral William D. Lee, *ibid.*

*“This is a very real issue. I think in a very short period of time – I’m talking about within the next year – you could see Christians in our military services just absolutely afraid of sharing their faith in any public forum. I can only conclude that the President has shown his true colors, he’s shown his real agenda and that the administration has a deliberate plan to reduce the impact that Christianity, in particular, has on our military services.”*

– Retired Lt. Gen. Jerry Boykin of the Family Research Council, *ibid.*

### ***Former Georgia Legislator Fights to Preserve Christianity in the Military***

While serving as a representative in the Georgia General Assembly, Military Chaplain Col. Ron Crews introduced H.B. 1580 to define marriage as “only the union of man and woman.” It passed and became law in 1996. In 2004, the Georgia Constitution was amended, likewise.

Currently, Col. Crews and retired Lt. Gen. Jerry Boykin of the Family Research Council are battling the attack on religious liberty in the military. Col. Crews cites an overall atmosphere of fear and concern among chaplains, pointing out that the head of chaplains at one military installation sent a note forbidding chaplains to pray in Jesus’ Name at certain ceremonies.

In January 2013, a cross and steeple were removed and cross-shaped windows were boarded up at a chapel on an Army base in remote Afghanistan.

In April 2013, a U.S. Army Equal Opportunity training brief listed evangelical Christianity first among “religious extremist” groups. Others on the list were al-Qaida, Hamas, the Ku Klux Klan, Muslim Brotherhood and the Nation of Islam. Also in April, an Army officer at Ft. Campbell, Ky. sent subordinates an email labeling the American Family Foundation and the Family Research Council as “domestic hate groups” for opposing homosexuality.

During a speech at a National Day of Prayer event on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, Coast Guard Rear Admiral William D. Lee said Christians in the military face the threat of oppression. He also stated that he had not, and vowed that he would not, run from his right to share the Gospel when appropriate. He further commented that younger military men and women of faith will be faced with a choice between two three-letter words – God and job.

Believing the direction of the nation hangs in the balance, Lt. Gen. Boykin said, “This is the anchor of our society. The military is the most respected institution in America. So if you want to change the rest of society, you have to target the military. If they do what they are trying to do, which is to totally change the culture and rob us of the Judeo-Christian values that still reside in the military, ... the consequences could be catastrophic.”

Crews and Boykin trace the current challenges to the 2010 repeal of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, which prohibited military personnel from openly expressing their homosexuality.

**ACTION – Ask congress to prohibit restrictions on Christianity in the military and elsewhere.** Use congressional contact numbers on page one. **Please make a separate call for each action suggested in this newsletter.**

## ***Negative Impact of Illegal Entry***

*“I dare to say that at any given time, daytime or nighttime, one can get on a boat and traverse back and forth between Texas and Mexico and not get caught. If smugglers can bring in tons of marijuana and cocaine at one time and can smuggle 20 to 30 persons at one time, one can just imagine how easy it would be to bring in 2 to 3 terrorists or their weapons of mass destruction across the river and not be detected. Chances of apprehension are very slim.”*

– Sheriff Sigifredo Gonzalez, “A Line in the Sand: Confronting the Threat at the Southwest Border,” Homeland Security Com., 2006

**Welfare.** The 2010-2011 Census found that 43 percent of immigrants living in the U.S. for 20 years get public benefits – nearly twice that of native-born Americans. One in five public school students are immigrants and one in four speak a language other than English at home<sup>1</sup>.

**Jobs.** The Center for Immigration Studies calculates that, during the five years before 2012, immigrants were hired to fill over half of all net new jobs. Meaning, the share of immigrant men holding a job is now higher than the percentage of native-born men who are employed.

**Drugs.** Federal law enforcement<sup>2</sup> estimates that only 10 percent to 30 percent of illegal aliens are actually caught and only 10 percent to 20 percent of drugs are seized. Total drugs seized at the southwest border in 2005 included 1,129,275 lbs. of cocaine; 6,866,465 lbs. of marijuana; and 16,790 lbs. of methamphetamine. Multiply that by eight or nine to determine the massive amount of drugs annually smuggled into the U.S. over the Texas-Mexico border.

**Gangs.** Along the border with Mexico are 43 Ports of Entry; 18 in Texas connect with major U.S. interstate highways<sup>3</sup>, that are substantially controlled by smuggling rings and gangs.

**Terrorists.** Terrorist infiltration, including members of Hezbollah, has been confirmed by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement that cite staging areas in Central and South America before Middle Easterners are smuggled into the U.S. An interim report included in *A Line in the Sand*, documents egregious criminal activity along the Texas-Mexico border.

**Crime.** In its 12-month study of sex crimes and murders by illegal aliens from January 1999 – April 2006, the Violent Crimes Institute documented the level of such crimes in 36 states with the most immigrants – California, Texas, Arizona, New Jersey, New York and Florida. Based on the estimated 12,000,000 illegal population, sex offenders comprised 2 percent of illegals apprehended. Meaning, about 240,000 illegal alien sex offenders were in the U.S. at that time.

**OTMs.** The number of illegal aliens other than Mexican (“OTMs”) was 30,147 apprehended in FY2003; 44,614 in FY2004; 165,178 in FY2005; and 108,025 in FY2006. Most were along the Southwest border, with no way to determine how many slipped into the U.S. illegally.

**From September 11, 2001 – 2006,** DHS reported a 41 percent *increase* in Special Interest Alien arrests at the Texas-Mexico border, with hundreds more having been apprehended in the South Texas region. That number included seven *Iraqis* in Brownsville; an *Afghani* man caught swimming across the Rio Grande River in Hidalgo; seven *Chinese* caught in the Texas Rio Grande Valley. A jacket from nations where *al Qaeda* operates was found in Jim Hogg County. Patches on the jacket depicted an *Arabic* military badge, an airplane flying over a building toward a tower and the words “martyr,” “way to eternal life” or “way to immortality.”

<sup>1</sup> “Good and Bad Immigration Proposals,” by Phyllis Schlafly, August 29, 2012

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Coast Guard, DEA, and FBI, FY 2005

<sup>3</sup> *A Line in the Sand: Confronting the threat at the Southwest Border*, House Committee on Homeland Security, 2006  
*Georgia Insight*

## *Senators Warn Against the Amnesty Bill, S.744<sup>1</sup>*

“When the Gang of Eight was first formed, a publicly stated principle was that enforcement would come first – before legalization. On the Sunday TV shows, Gang of Eight members admitted that they abandoned this principle and that, in fact, legalization – or amnesty – would come first. This plan is contrary to the commitment they made to the American people and raises the same core problem as the 2007 proposal that was rejected by the American people.

“The guest worker program in this proposal represents only a fraction of the increase in legal foreign workers that will be rapidly introduced ... this bill, over ten years, will result in at least 30 million new foreign workers – more than the entire population of Texas.

“While this may mean lower wages for the business lobby and more political power for AFL-CIO leadership, it will be bad for American workers – union and non-union. And it will expose taxpayers to enormous long-term costs, including trillions in unfunded liabilities for Medicare and Social Security from which low-wage foreign workers will draw more benefits than they pay in. ...

“Despite promised protections for U.S. workers, the bill would double the number of guest workers admitted annually. Such a large influx would be disastrous for the wages and job prospects of U.S. workers. On every major front, this legislation fails to deliver on its core promises. It delivers only for the special-interest groups who helped write it. Should it pass, it would represent the ultimate triumph of the Washington elite over the everyday citizen to whom Congress properly owes its loyalty.”

– The Dangers of Amnesty, by Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL)

### *S.744 Passed the U.S. Senate 68 – 32<sup>2</sup>, June 27, 2013*

In a joint letter to other Senate members, Senators Charles Grassley (R-IA), Jeff Sessions (R-AL), Ted Cruz (R-TX) and Mike Lee (R-UT) outlined the key flaws of S.744, as follows:

S.744 –

- provides immediate legalization without securing the border;
- rewards criminal aliens, absconders, and deportees and undermines the law; contains extremely dangerous national security loopholes;
- facilitates fraud in our immigration system;
- creates no real penalties for illegal immigration and rewards illegals with entitlements;
- delays for years the implementation of E-Verify;
- does not fix our legal immigration system; and
- rewards those who have broken our laws with a path to citizenship.

“We need immigration reform, but the American people deserve better than a 1,000-page bill that makes our immigration system more complex and less accountable without truly ensuring border security. Americans expect their government to end the lawlessness, not surrender to it. S.744 fails to deliver anything more than the same empty promises Washington has been making for 30 years.”

**ACTION – (a) Thank Senators Chambliss & Isakson for their NO vote and (b) ask congressmen to oppose S.744.** Recess numbers for congressmen are on page one; for Sen. Chambliss, 1 800 234-4208; Sen. Isakson, 770 661-0999.

<sup>1</sup> Phyllis Schlafly Report, June 2013

<sup>2</sup> S.744 passed the Senate 68 – 32, June 27<sup>th</sup>. Georgia Senators Chambliss and Isakson voted NO on S.744.