

The Lamp Post

Shining the light in the dark
for trans service members + veterans



Issue No.

14

OCTOBER
2025



Addressing the Community

We are beginning to see the lights in the tunnel. Recent news from the *Shilling* case is promising, as are the shows of support from everyday people across the country. In a war of information, public opinion is the first major victory we can accomplish. We're already there, keep going.

Internally, TMH is shifting its mindset from solely being an internal support group to expanding our role to be an organization of veterans leading the broader struggle for LGBTQ+ equality & liberation. In that spirit, we are expanding our membership. LGB+ veterans, ally veterans, and LGBTQ civilians will be permitted to join our ranks. Those who join our us from outside of our immediate community will be subject to the same - and in some cases, expanded - vetting/scrutiny. By expanding our ranks, we build stronger communities, access more resources, and unite smaller struggles into a larger movement.

As Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines, Guardians, and Coastguardsmen, we served the American People and swore to defend the Constitution. This is how we will continue to do so. By lighting the torch for our compatriots, we will secure a brighter future for ourselves and for those who come after.

As I always say:

Expect the worst; Hope for the best; Fight to bridge the gap.

-Catie

TMH Updates

- Newsletter Tomorrow!
- Government Shutdown
 - RUMINT (High Confidence) that EOM pay for ADSMs will continue on time.
 - DFAS will release the funds but withhold LESSs until the LOAs are established.
- Army-Navy Game Watch Party
 - 1545EST on 13DEC25
- Volunteer Recruitment
 - <https://wkf.ms/4o68Xq8>
- militarytransrights.org
 - Coalition Site (TMH, SPARTA, ONS, MMAA, MV, etc.)
- 501 News
 - Paperwork processing
 - More grants/resources to continue our mission
 - Mission: veterans leading the fight for LGBTQ+ equality & liberation
 - Continuing community care
 - More focus beyond just military stuff
 - Veteran culture will remain central to the organization
 - Membership expanded to LGB+/Ally Veterans & LGBTQ Civilian
- Award System
 - Certificates w/ optional ribbons
 - More to follow

Threat Brief & Issues

- VA GAHC Updates
 - Prosthetics & voice training no longer covered.
 - HRT will only be covered under a legacy clause.
- Current Affairs
 - SECDEF Meeting w/ FOs: no definitive cause/agenda, more to follow
 - FBI Terrorism Declaration: Nothing's happened yet, but it is being seriously discussed. Prepare accordingly.
- J2 Assessment
 - *Full assessment will be published in the newsletter.*
 - We have to be strategic and covert about what we share and the message we send.
 - We're in the thick of a war of information.
 - Cover your tracks; Don't be an easy target to the opposition
 - Court Case Updates
 - 09OCT25 - *Shilling* Update
 - 20OCT25 - *Shilling* PI hearing
 - 23OCT25 - *Talbott* response
 - 03NOV26 - Big Fight on Ban Legality

TMH Town Hall



October 2025

J2 / Legal



Who

- **Panel:** A three-judge panel from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.
- **Parties:** Transgender service members (plaintiffs) vs. President Donald J. Trump and Department of Defense officials (defendants).



Where

- **Location:** Pioneer Courthouse, Portland, Oregon.



When

- **Date:** October 20, 2025.



What Happened

The hearing focused on whether the district court's preliminary injunction blocking Executive Order 14183 — which bars transgender individuals from serving in the military — should stand.

Why (Key Arguments)

Plaintiffs:

- **Argued the policy violates Equal Protection and Due Process rights.**
 - **Claimed irreparable harm from career disruption and stigmatization.**
 - **Asserted the military lacks a compelling interest for a blanket ban.**

Defendants:

- **Argued for deference to executive and military judgment.**
- **Claimed the policy is based on deployability and unit cohesion.**
- **Denied discriminatory intent, citing national security concerns.**

Judges' Questioning: Revealing Clues

- **Judge 1 pressed government counsel on the lack of individualized assessments, asking: "If these plaintiffs are deployable and have served honorably, what rational basis justifies excluding them?" — suggesting skepticism about the policy's blanket nature.**
- **Judge 2 questioned whether the executive order was motivated by animus, referencing prior statements by President Trump. This line of inquiry hinted at concern over discriminatory intent.**
- **Judge 3 focused on procedural fairness, asking whether the plaintiffs had any opportunity to challenge their removal before enforcement — indicating interest in due process violations.**

Overall, the panel's tone leaned critical of the government's position. Their questions emphasized constitutional scrutiny, individual rights, and the need for evidence-based policy — potentially signaling a favorable outcome for the plaintiffs.

-  **Additional Indicators of Policy Intent**
- **In related filings, the Air Force argued that transgender service members would not need discharge boards because their removal was a “foregone conclusion.” This raised alarms about due process violations and reinforced the plaintiffs’ claim that the policy targets identity, not readiness.**
 - **Following the Supreme Court’s emergency stay of the injunction in May 2025, the Department of Defense began issuing separation notices within 48 hours — suggesting a premeditated rollout.**
 - **Internal military memos reportedly instructed commanders to “prepare for administrative separation of all affected personnel by Q3,” supporting the idea of a systemic purge rather than a nuanced policy.**

What's Next

For This Case:

- **Decision expected within the next few months.**
 - **Possible outcomes:**
 - **Affirm the injunction: Transgender service members remain protected.**
 - **Reverse the injunction: Discharges resume immediately.**
- **Remand: Case returns to district court for further review.**

Related Cases:

- **Doe v. Austin (D.C. Circuit): Challenges the same policy for civilian Pentagon employees.**
 - **Stone v. United States (Fourth Circuit): May be revived if EO 14183 is struck down.**
 - **Karnoski v. Biden (Western District of Washington): Could be reopened depending on the outcome.**

Additional Resources

-  Watch the oral arguments on YouTube:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rJsOKaQFgN0>
-  Full docket and filings on CourtListener:
<https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/69811434/shilling-et-al-v-trump-et-al/>



[Project Ember Survey](#)

CONTACTS/LINKS

Elise, Pathfinders/VA: kelleyt2024@gmail.com

Berry Law: andy.blevins@berrylaw.com

PTSDlawyers.com

Benefits Delivery at Discharge: [BDD - Veteran Affairs](#) - NOTE: Due to the gov't shutdown, processes will be slower.

TLP Submissions: marcie.kulp.tmh@gmail.com / marcie.kulp.tmh@proton.me

Q'mmunity House: [Q'mmunity House](#)

Volunteer Recruitment Form: [Volunteer here](#)

Teepublic Merch Page: [Merch](#)

TMH Stickers/Patches/Coins: [Google Form](#)



Community Spotlight



Hawaii'i Gang back at it again! This time at a Pride Parade in Honolulu! Like the shirts? The link below is where they came from! (unsure if you can BUY the shirts though...)

Site: <https://www.hawaiianelectric.com>

Advocacy Corner:

Over the next week, take a moment to call your Senators and Representative. If you're still Active Duty, call for both the location you vote in and where you're stationed. Tell them you do not support an NDAA with anti-LGBTQ+ provisions, and to only vote for a clean NDAA.

(Bold)Who are my Senators and Representative:

(Bold)<https://www.congress.gov/members/find-your-member>
or<https://5calls.org/>

(Bold)Why it matters: (Bold)

While there have been many anti-LGBTQ+ policies since the start of this administration, they have all been Executive Orders. Including these provisions in the NDAA makes them law which would make it harder to repeal once the administration changes.

Why it matters:

While there have been many anti-LGBTQ+ policies since the start of this administration, they have all been Executive Orders. Including these provisions in the NDAA makes them law which would make it harder to repeal once the administration changes.

Here's a sample script to use for your call:

Hello, my name is <YOUR NAME> and I am a constituent/military service member/military spouse/veteran living in your district.

I do not support any anti-LGBTQ+ riders in the 2026 NDAA or any appropriations bills. I'm asking you to vote no on an NDAA or appropriations bill that includes anti-LGBTQ+ provisions.

Our military is facing a recruiting and retention crisis. Bills attacking LGBTQ+ service members and families will force tens of thousands of military families to re-evaluate their careers, and puts our nation's security at risk. Tens of thousands LGBTQ+ individuals serve our nation proudly. Please honor their commitment to this country by voting NO on any version of the NDAA that includes anti-LGBTQ+ provisions.

Upcoming Events

- **Friday Night Gaming**
 - TMH Discord - Every Friday @ 1800 EST

- **Pathfinders T4T**
 - Veterans Group | Hang-out Night
 - **Saturdays at 2100 EST**

- **TMH Town Hall Schedule**

(1530EST)

- 22NOV25
- 27DEC25
- 24JAN26
- 28FEB26
- 28MAR26
- 25APR26
- 23MAY26
- 27JUN26

- **The Lamp Post Publications**

- 23 NOV 2025
- 28 DEC 2025

- **ARMY-NAVY Watch Party**

- 13 DEC 2025 @ 1545 EST

FASHION AND COSMETICS

SKIN TINTS



By Marci/ie

Over the past couple of weeks, I've been trying out skin tints, rather than using my normal, full-coverage foundation. I find that 4-5 days of the week, when I'm going to be in uniform/working, I just don't really want to get up and do my face every morning. Don't get me wrong, I LOVE doing my makeup, I take pride in doing my makeup, but when I'm trying NOT to snooze alarms every 10 minutes starting at 0430, get up to get myself AND a baby ready, drive to daycare THEN to work? I've gotta cut corners somewhere, and one of those corners ends up being my makeup.

No, I don't HAVE to wear makeup to work, but I like to, I always do it within the regs, and it makes me feel put together. When my face is bare, all I can think of is how everyone that is capable of perceiving as an entity that exists, IS perceiving me, and they're thinking about any redness or acne or dry skin on my face, just like me.

While I do my best to keep up with my skincare, sometimes I need a little *something* to even out my face. I'm a pale girly, and redness isn't just a slight pink patch on my skin - it is swaths of raging red fire and it highlights my large pores. Not a good look for me.

So what's the difference between a skin tint and wearing foundation?

Foundations come in all kinds of ways: powdered, matte, dewy, light coverage, medium, full coverage, etc. *Skin tints*, however, pretty much stay on the lighter side. Think B.B. creams, C.C. creams.

Important things to note about this review:

- I am 27, age plays a factor into how things sit on your skin (my face is not pictured in this review)
- I am pale/fair, cool-toned
- This was done withOUT primer whatsoever, both in the references and when worn during the work day.
- I have reference photos included with my arm pictured to showcase the lighting differences/blending, but I wore it to work (not pictured)
- Shade-matching can be difficult in drugstores... no testers.
- All products were blended with a beauty sponge.
- These were all bought with my PERSONAL finances, not gifted nor given to me for free to review. This is not an ad or a partnership.

With all that being said, let's get into a little thrown together review of these products.



Covergirl “Nourishing Skin Tint”

- Retail price at Walmart: \$10.28 30 mL/ 1 fl oz.
- Range: 14 shades
- Cruelty-free, talc-free, formaldehyde-free
- Made with coconut milk and aloe extract
- Active ingredient: salicylic acid
- Subtle scent, though some claim it smells unpleasant, I did not notice a gross scent

Personal input: I purchased shade 520 “fair”. This was a nice consistency and very lightweight. It blended nicely, and covered just a little bit of red in my cheeks enough to my liking and at least blurred my pores around my nose area. Now whether the shade was the perfect match for my face/neck ...



Wet n Wild “Bare Focus Niacinamide Skin Tint”

- Retail Price at Walmart: \$6.98 for 32 mL / 1.08 fl oz
- Range: 27 on WnW website (retail: \$8.99), less at Walmart
- Cruelty-free, fragrance-free, paraben-free, vegan
- Made with 5% niacinamide, peony extract, hyaluronic acid, vitamin E.
- Scent: If you're familiar with the WnW “Photo Focus”, it's kinda like that?

Personal input: Shade I purchased: Fair. The consistency was a little thicker, but the pigment payoff wasn't to my liking, personally. I don't know if it just wasn't wanting to agree with my skin, or maybe I skipped a wash of my beauty blender, but it wasn't the vibe for *me*. I DID like that it's a dropper kinda bottle though!



e.l.f. “Halo Glow Skin Tint”

- Retail price at Walmart: \$18.00 30 mL / 1 fl oz
- Range 18 shades
- Cruelty-free, paraben-free, partnered with Fair Trade USA
- Non-comedogenic
- Niacinamide, bisabol, allantoin
- SPF 50, water-resistant up to 80min
- Scent: Kinda like the Wet n Wild? But not as strong

Personal input: I got shade “Light/Neutral” from this line. Not my best match but... I like this one! It looks more glow-y to me, and even though it DOES have SPF in it, it did NOT leave a white-cast! Felt lightweight as advertised (they all kinda do tbh), felt nice on the skinny, blended well. Did a decent job at covering those problem spots too.



L'Oreal "Lumi Le Glow Tint"

-
- Retail price at Walmart: \$12.47 25mL / 0.84 fl oz
- Range: 16 shades
- Couldn't find anything about it being cruelty-free? Or any other kind of -free?
- Water-based, and boasts of a 82% hydrating serum but doesn't specify the main ingredients in that claim.. Just lists ingredients
- DOES contain niacinamide though
- Relatively buildable from sheer to medium

Personal input: I think I got the lightest shade, "100, Cool"? This one seemed to be the runniest/thinnest. Which... That makes sense, considering it's water-based, I suppose. I did like how this felt on the skin. It claims to have blurring pigments and reflective pearls, but I mostly got the reflective/highlighting effect, and much less of the blurring. Maybe in the future with a blurring primer this could hide the crater of pores on the nose/cheek area for me.

A photograph of a person's forearm with four horizontal swatches of skin tint. From top to bottom, the swatches are labeled L'Oreal, e.l.f., Wet n Wild, and Covergirl. The forearm has several tattoos: a treble clef and a hand holding a pen at the top; a hand holding a bowl with three dots in the middle; and a floral design at the bottom. The background is dark with some out-of-focus lights.

L'Oreal

e.l.f.

Wet n Wild

Covergirl

Skin tints on forearm, unblended, lighted vanity mirror



L'Oreal

e.l.f.

Wet n Wild

Covergirl

Same light source, all products blended with a damp beauty sponge (excess water was squeezed out, yes, and cleaned in between blends)



Bathroom light source, same order of products



Natural light from the front of my house, same order of products

Overall verdict

In terms of price, your best bet is going to be Covergirl or Wet n Wild, as you AT LEAST get 30mL for \$10 or less. I cannot justify \$10+ on a product that has less product. While the e.l.f. Skin tint does have 30mL, \$18 is a little pricey for most people to take a chance on a new makeup product. If you have the money and want to try it, go ahead, as it IS a nice, glowy, dewy finish that I enjoyed. All the products were lightweight as they said they were, even with the thicker consistency of the Wet n Wild, or the really runny L'Oreal. Personally, I like the look of the L'Oreal and would recommend that over the e.l.f. brand, simply for the price point.

Overall, my money is going to Covergirl on this one. While it may not look like the best coverage, with a little L.A. Girl concealer for the spots I need it in, it'll buff. Make informed decisions about what makeup your money is going to, and don't forget to dampen your beauty sponges and match to your neck!

Thanks for reading my little Yap Sesh about some new makeup I tried. <3