BBC: â€œUS military pondered love not warâ€•

Description

Yes, thatâ€™s right. The philosophy of the late â€™60s and â€™70s finally sunk in at the Pentagonâ€¦or maybe just with the Air Force.

Check out this article on the â€œGay Bomb.â€•

> The US military investigated building a â€œgay bombâ€•, which would make enemy soldiers â€œsexually irresistibleâ€• to each other, government papers say.
>
> Other weapons that never saw the light of day include one to make soldiers obvious by their bad breath.
>
> The US defence department considered various non-lethal chemicals meant to disrupt enemy discipline and morale.
>
> The 1994 plans were for a six-year project costing $7.5m, but they were never pursued. [â€¦]

default watermark

Ok, we, the US Military is constantly being beat up for using kinetic weaponry. There has been, for almost a decade that I know of, a push for â€œGreenâ€• weapons, too (I guess that means you have to file environmental impact statements from the cockpit, combat information center, or the tank commanderâ€™s hatch prior to firingâ€¦).

Along comes a non-lethal method, that falls in line with many posters and bumper stickers I have seen since the early â€™70s, and youâ€™d think the Left would be happy, wouldnâ€™t you?

From CBS 5 6/8/2007:

> [..]
> Gay community leaders in California said Friday that they found the notion of a â€œgay bombâ€• both offensive and almost laughable at the same time.
>
> â€œThroughout history we have had so many brave men and women who are gay and lesbian serving the military with distinction,â€• said Geoff Kors of Equality California. â€œSo, itâ€™s just offensive that they think by turning people gay that the other military would be incapable of doing their job. And its absurd because thereâ€™s so much medical data that shows that sexual orientation is immutable and cannot be changed.â€•

Somehow I donâ€™t think the gay community leaders understood the scope of the weapon. The plan would have called for an powerful aphrodisiac effect to provide the â€œdistraction.â€• I doubt seriously the plan was to just make people gay and let it go at that.

On the other hand, I am a little surprised that the gay community doesnâ€™t stand up and call for this to be fully developed, and then demand it be used not aboard in conflict, but generally for the entire US. It certainly would slove a few problems for them if everyone turned gayâ€¦

Other â€œnon-lethalâ€• plans included causing wasps and rats to attack the enemy troops, a method to cause extreme halitosis, so those blending with the local population would still stand out, and also one your dog would really hate, the â€œWho? Me?â€• flatulence producer.

As it turns out, some people were on this years ago. This post from 12/29/2004:

> Military Lab Proposed Gay-Aphrodisiac Chemical Weapon
>
> Thanks to a FOIA request from the Sunshine Project, a fascinating document has now come to light. In June 1994, the US Air Force Wright Laboratory wrote a proposal titled â€œHarassing, Annoying, and â€˜Bad Guyâ€™ Identifying Chemicals.â€• While listing the categories of chemical weapons they planned to develop, the military scientists wrote:
>
> Chemicals that effect [sic] human behavior so that discipline and morale in enemy units is adversely effected [sic]. One distasteful but completely non-lethal example would be strong aphrodisiacs, especially if the chemical also caused homosexual behavior.
>
> The Air Force Lab was quite serious about the proposal, listing a timetable and estimate of expenses for the overall project.
>
> Total cost through fiscal year 2000: $7.5 million
>
> Having enemy soldiers throw down their guns and start humping each other: Priceless

default watermark

Scientists. You gotta love them.

Media;

You gotta love how they can recycle news of old when it suits some agenda to raise the ire of someone.

Category

1. Humor
2. Military
3. Military History
4. Political
5. Technology

Date Created
June 12, 2007
Author
admin