

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RHETORIC OF THE RAND NATIONAL DEFENSE
RESEARCH INSTITUTE DOCUMENT: SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND U.S.
MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY: OPTIONS AND ASSESSMENT
PREPARED FOR THE OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE 1993

by

Jonathan R. Snow, B.A., M.P.A.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
with a major in Technical Communication
May 2022

Committee Members:

Miriam F. Williams, Chair

Christopher Dayley

Octavio Pimentel

COPYRIGHT

by

Jonathan R. Snow

2022

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Jonathan R. Snow, authorize duplication of this work, in whole or in part, for educational or scholarly purposes only.

DEDICATION

To those who served and suffered at the hands of hatred.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Any work such as this thesis is always a work of more than just one. The pursuit of this degree has been attained only with the assistance and support of the professors in the Department of English and Technical Communications. These are the professors who cared about the student first and foremost without whom I would have floundered. Dr. Aimee Roundtree for inspiring me to look beyond and introducing me to grant-writing, Dr. Christopher Dayley, for providing guidance and assistance upon entering the degree program at Texas State University, Dr. Octavio Pimentel, for his work addressing the critical issues of minoritized individuals, and Dr. Miriam F. Williams, for her valuable guidance and inspiration while working on this degree. Finally, to my family I acknowledge their love, support, and endurance throughout the pursuit of this degree, to Bella, Adie, Obie, my children, I am so proud to be your father, and to my husband, David, I can never thank you enough for your constant support, encouragement, and dedication to challenging me and making me a better person each and every day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
History of Homosexuals Serving in the U.S. Military	5
History of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” and Resulting Fallout	9
The Influence of the Psychology of Prejudice	18
Support for Examination of a Report as a Technical Document and Utilizing Rhetorical Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis	22
Literature Concerning Technical Communication’s Role in Addressing Queer-tech Communications	27
3. METHODOLOGY	31
Technical Communication Artifacts to be Examined	32
Theoretical Perspective	34
Using Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Analysis to Examine the Artifacts	39
4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	43
RAND Report Executive Summary, Implication Issues	45
RAND Report Chapter One, Sexual Orientation and the U.S. Military Policy: Policy Options and Assessment—Study Overview: Implications of the Research	46
RAND Report Chapter Two, Sexual Orientation and Sexual Behavior: Conclusion	47

RAND Report Chapter Three, Analogous Experiences of Foreign Military Service: An International Comparison.....	48
RAND Report Chapter Four, Analogous Experience of Domestic Police and Fire Departments: Implications for Implementing Policies of Non-discrimination	49
RAND Report Chapter Five, Potential Insights from Analogous Situations: Integrating Blacks into the U.S. Military, Implications Allowing Acknowledged Homosexuals to Serve in the Military	50
RAND Report Chapter Six, Relevant Public Opinion, General Conclusions on Public Opinion	51
RAND Report Chapter Seven, Relevant Military Opinion: Conclusions.	52
RAND Report Chapter Eight, Issues of Concern: Effect of Allowing Homosexuals to Serve in the Military on the Prevalence of HIV/AIDS: Conclusions.....	53
RAND Report Chapter Nine, Issues of Concern: Anti-Homosexual Violence: Conclusions	54
RAND Report Chapter Ten, What is Known About Unit Cohesion and Military Performance: Conclusions	55
RAND Report Chapter Eleven, Sexual Orientation and the Military: Some Legal Considerations: Conclusions.....	56
RAND Report Chapter Twelve, Implementing Policy Change in Large Organizations: Conclusions	57
RAND Report Chapter Thirteen, Potential Effects on Military Recruitment and Retention: Policy Implications.....	58
Congressional Record, February 4, 1993: Discussion of Section 1: Review of Department of Defense Policy Concerning Service of Homosexuals in the Armed Services, The Senate Chamber.....	59
Selected Testimonies Given Before Congress, May 11 & 12, 1993 Given in Consideration of the Proposed Lifting of the Ban Prohibiting Homosexuals from Openly Serving in the U.S. Armed Forces	62
 5. CONCLUSIONS	 72
 6. IMPLICATIONS	 80
 REFERENCES	 85

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sections of RAND Report Analyzed	32
2. Executive Summary Analysis	46
3. Chapter 1. Implications of the Research	47
4. Chapter 2. Sexual Orientation and Sexual Behavior	48
5. Chapter 3. An International Comparison	49
6. Chapter 4. Implications for Implementing Policies of Non-discrimination	50
7. Chapter 5. Implications Allowing Acknowledged Homosexuals to Serve in the Military	51
8. Chapter 6. General Conclusions on Public Opinion	52
9. Chapter 7. Relevant Military Opinion: Conclusions.....	53
10. Chapter 8. Issues of Concern: HIV/AIDS: Conclusions.....	54
11. Chapter 9. Anti-Homosexual Violence: Conclusions.....	54
12. Chapter 10. Unit Cohesion and Military Performance: Conclusions	55
13. Chapter 11. Legal Considerations: Conclusions.....	56
14. Chapter 12. Implementing Policy Change: Conclusions	57
15. Chapter 13. Recruitment and Retention: Policy Implications	58
16. Policy Input from Selected Senators, February 4, 1993	62

17. Selected Testimonies before Congress, May 11 & 12, 1993 71

1. INTRODUCTION

In the United States from as far back as Colonial America in 1624, homosexual people have suffered, endured, and received harsh treatment by their fellow human beings simply because they lived different lives (Byard 1997). During Colonial times, members of the LGBTQ community suffered from extreme acts of violence against them for homosexual behavior. Author Richard Godbeer (2004) writes that Jamestown was originally established as an all-male settlement. He raises doubt that these men were celibate. He relates how many of the men paired off to form households in the 17th century Chesapeake area. Furthermore, Godbeer suggests that many of those men were coupling sexually (2004). Richard Cornish was executed in Virginia for his alleged homosexual acts with a servant and Elizabeth Johnson was fined and whipped for “unseemly practices with another maid attempting to do that which man and woman do,” (Godbeer). In 1652, Joseph Davis of Haverhill, Hew Hampshire, was fined for “putting on women’s apparel” and made to admit his guilt to the community. Nicholas Sension of Windsor, Connecticut, was put on trial for sodomy, and a French explorer among the Illinois Indians relates on the number of “berdaches” (men living as women) and the prevalence of homosexual activity, (Byard). Religious leader Steven Gorton, a married Baptist minister, was suspended from his position in New London, Connecticut, for “unchaste behavior with his fellow men when in bed with them,” (Godbeer). Even statesman and one of the founding fathers of the United States, Alexander Hamilton, writes of a romantic friendship with another man (Byard). Since its inception in 1775 and up until the 1980s, the United States military had no formal or written policy prohibiting members of the homosexual community from serving. After the Vietnam War, however,

the military enacted a policy that banned gay men and lesbians from their ranks (Military One Source, March 19, 2021). This policy forced many people who were currently in the military to hide their homosexual behavior in order to serve their country.

During his 1992 presidential campaign, Bill Clinton made a promise to end the discrimination and ban against homosexuals from serving in the U.S. military (Baer, 1992). In an effort to keep that promise, then President Clinton directed Secretary of the Defense Les Aspin to submit research that could be used to draft an executive order (EO) ending discrimination in the armed services on the basis of sexual orientation. Secretary Aspin, in turn, called upon the RAND National Defense Research Institute (NDRI) to provide research and a recommendation to be used in writing and issuing the executive order (Rostker, B. D., Harris, S. A., & Rich, M. (Eds.) 1993).

The NDRI conducted extensive and exhaustive research including visiting the militaries of seven countries that allow gays to serve in their militaries; visiting the police and fire departments of six American cities; examining historical records focusing on integration of blacks into the U.S. military; reviewing public opinion of current active duty military personnel and scientific literature on group cohesion, sexuality, and related health issues; and examined legal and enforcement issues as well as the literature addressing implementing change in large organizations (Rostker, Harris, & Rich. (Eds.) 1993). The findings in the NDRI report submitted to Secretary Aspin, President Clinton, and the 103rd Congress indicated that no significant negative impact upon military's ability to fulfill its recruitment and service requirements would be forthcoming if the ban were to be lifted. The research findings addressed each area of concern the president had in wanting to formulate his Executive Order (EO). The conclusions and recommendations

by the NDRI provided a solid foundation for President Clinton to move forward with his EO and lift the ban prohibiting gays from serving in the military (Los Angeles Times 1993).

High-ranking military officers, however, opposed lifting the ban on homosexuals serving in the armed forces and voiced their favor for its continuance. The resulting policy, known as “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” (DADT) (10 U.S.C.§ 654), did not provide the intended relief for homosexuals currently serving in the military. Instead, the policy forced gay service members into secrecy and did little to combat the prejudice against them. The military continued to discharge thousands of gays and lesbians from service, many who were experts and valuable assets to the military during their time of service.

With such a compelling and strongly supportive document as the 1993 NDRI report, several questions emerge:

- Within the NDRI report, what rhetoric was not strong enough to support lifting the ban on homosexuals serving in the military?
- What rhetoric in the oral testimonies of military officers negated the NDRI report?
- What rhetoric was so significant that led to the compromise eventually known as DADT and had only minimal impact on President Clinton’s push for lifting the ban on gays serving in the military?

Research into the psychology of prejudice reveals some interesting and possible reasons for the strong impact of testimony upon the decision and compromise leading to “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.” Religious freedom is a fundamental American value that is cherished and defended vigorously (ACLU 2021). Homonegativity is found

predominantly in individuals with early year experiences with religion of any type, experiences relating to threats present in their hometowns, and impacting individual and personal opinions and decisions (Leach 2018). The influence of religion and belief systems on forming prejudices against people groups is evident when it comes to making decisions (Rowatt 2015).

This paper will attempt to answer the question, “what aspects of the rhetoric of the 1993 RAND NDRI report were unable to withstand rebuttal from Congress and the U.S. Military and led to the compromise known as Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell?” The effect of rhetoric in the written document of the RAND report juxtaposed with the verbal rhetoric in the testimonies provided before the 103 Congress as it took up President Clinton’s request to lift the ban on homosexuals serving in the U.S. military may help provide a clearer understanding of the psychology of rhetoric and prejudice as it impacted this historical document. This understanding may be useful in the future as technical communicators and writers frame and construct documents that could possibly have a double entendre effect instead of the true impact intended by the author.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In an attempt to answer the questions , “in the 1993 negotiations involving the RAND NDRI document between the Clinton administration, Congress, and the U.S. military, where was the power, and what rhetoric was powerful enough to enact a one-sided compromise? An abundance of literature exists on the subject of the 1993 National Defense Research Institute report. Public records of the transcripts of Congressional Testimony concerning the subject of homosexual individuals serving in the U.S. armed services is less than generous. To provide the reader with an organized presentation of literature addressing the topic of this paper, the Review of Literature is organized as follows: History of homosexuals serving in the U.S. military, History of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” and resulting fall-out, The Influence of the Psychology of Prejudice in Decision Making, Support for Examination of a Report as a Technical Document and Utilizing Rhetorical Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis as tools for examining the above mentioned documents.

History of Homosexuals Serving in the U.S. Military

A review of literature addressing homosexuals serving in the U.S. military is generous, tracing homosexual involvement from the American Revolutionary War. Dubill (2017) relates those issues and resentment leading to abusive military treatment of homosexuals has been recorded since the 1700s. Wansac (2013) discusses that engagement in sex acts with other males has occurred among some of the world’s greatest military leaders of all time—from Alexander the Great to Julius Caesar. Sinclair (2009) and Shilts (1993) have written extensively of the treatment of homosexuals by the U.S. military throughout history. Blakemore (2018) relates that upon the recommendation

of Benjamin Franklin, George Washington hired Prussian military officer Baron Friedrich Wilhelm August Heinrich Ferdinand von Steuben, who served as inspector general and a major general of the Continental Army. Von Steuben formed very close and intimate relationships with his 17-year-old personal secretary and young officers in their 20s, formally adopting the latter two, making them both his heirs. Hari (2011) writes that the gay and bisexual communities existed in America before Columbus's discovery. While the American right presents homosexuality as alien to people, it has been on this continent more than 500 years (Hari). Bronski (2011) writes from the 1500s through current day there have been gay people who have had a prominent role in shaping our country and society. In 1778, Lt. Gotthold Frederick Enslin was court-martialed by the U.S. Army after he was discovered in bed with another soldier (Baume 2021; National Archives Foundation 2021). Congress designed the Articles of War of 1916 and listed "assault with intent to commit sodomy" as a punishable offense (Naval Institute Staff 2018; Human Rights Watch 2003). In 1920, Congress revised the document to expand the offense to include "consensual sodomy by servicemembers as a crime." The Uniform Code of Military Justice was adopted by Congress in 1951 to replace the Articles of War; the Code maintained the issue of sodomy as a criminal act (Naval Institute Staff 2018; Human Rights Watch 2003). Eaklor (2011) writes that in the 20th century, the medicalization of homosexuality provided Americans the opportunity for one to identify as homosexual or lesbian based on particular criteria, therefore only beginning a history at that point. Katz (1976) focuses specifically on gays among American Indians. He relates the custom of cross dressing, homosexual relations between two apparently "normal" males, and special friendships and "blood brotherhood" and intimate relations

between two males, all of which can be found in his study, which focused on Native Americans from 1528–1976.

Prior to World War II, no policy prohibiting homosexuals from serving in the U.S. armed forces existed. Brekke (2015) writes that after initiating the draft, the U.S. military began screening people in the early 1940s for homosexuality, a term many Americans had never heard before. Brekke (2015) relates that through the context of war, soldiers were placed in all-male or all-female environments. Eventually many of these soldiers began to “find each other.” Chris Love (2012) writes concerning the impact upon gay and lesbian life in America caused by World War II. That war spawned the gay rights movement (Love 2012). Love relates that when Pearl Harbor was bombed, the military was not so concerned whether a person was gay or lesbian, but only whether they could fill the ranks within the military and support the cause of winning the war against Germany, Italy, and Japan. Yet, military psychiatrists warned that “psychopathic personality disorders” made homosexual individuals unfit to fight. In 1942, the military issued the first formal regulations to list homosexuality as an excludable characteristic (Naval Institute Staff). The U.S. Army published the first regulation regarding homosexuals with Army Regulation 600-443 identifying three categories of homosexuals and making the offense subject to general court-martial, dishonorable discharge, or forced resignation, if they were officers (Naval Institute Staff). Throughout the Korean War and the remainder of the 1950s, several military codes of conduct and actions against homosexuals serving in the military were adopted and enforced, including Eisenhower’s Executive Order 10450, which prohibited federal employees from being members of a subversive group, such as homosexuality (Naval Institute Staff). However,

in 1957, Captain S. H. Crittenden chaired the U.S. Navy Board of Inquiry, which issued a report concluding, there is “no sound basis for the belief that homosexuals posed a security risk (WordPress 2021). After World War II, people remained in those same-sex relationships created when the military placed soldiers in same-sex environments and found comfort in resettling in cities rather than returning to their previous communities (Brekke, 2015). This movement created gay communities.

Castor and Goldbach (2018) examine the DOD 1982 policy of same-sex activity and its incompatibility with military service. They note the continued fight for military representation of gay people and transgender people (Castor and Goldbach 2018). Pruitt (2018) examines the expulsion and exclusion of gays in the military. The military psychiatrists devised certain examinations to screen potential servicemembers for certain homosexual characteristics, such as limp wrist or effeminate posture. Herek (2012) covers racial integration into the military during WWII. Herek (2012) relates those homosexuals could be integrated successfully into the military. Prominent news reporting agency Reuters (2021) provides a chronology of the U.S. military’s stance on homosexuals in the military and the eventual repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” (DADT). Collins (2003) provides insight into uniform discrimination in the military. While DADT was supposed to benefit gays by ending unwarranted official reports of their sexual orientation, the military instead discharged more and more gays with fervor (Collins).

While the U.S. has never accepted homosexual acts with its own military, the evolution of the U.S military policy toward gays continued with the impact of DADT and its repeal in that both provide a way forward as the military works to include the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ) community among the military ranks.

Castor and Goldbach (2018) write that while the LGBTQ community has seen an increase in representation in the U.S. military, strides are still being made to improve acceptance, integration, and health for gay, lesbian, and transgender service members.

History of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” and Resulting Fallout

Many articles and books addressing the formation of DADT are readily available in print form and equally accessible from the internet. Evans (2017) delineates attitudes and policies concerning homosexuals in the U.S. military writing that before World War I, the military did not maintain regulations about homosexuality among service members but gave individual commanders discretion over the conduct, control, and discipline of their soldiers. Evans (2017) further writes that The Articles of War of 1916 addressed the issue of homosexual conduct for the first time with “assault with the intent to commit sodomy.” In 1919, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin D. Roosevelt requested an investigation into “‘vice and depravity’ in the sea services,” which resulted in a sting operation, court-martial, and jailing of 17 sailors (Naval Institute Staff 2018). By 1920, Congress had approved a modified Articles of War, which made the act of sodomy a crime in itself, a separate offense from that of assault with intent to commit sodomy (Naval Institute 2018). In 1941, the U.S. Selective Service System included “homosexual proclivities” as a disqualifying condition for inclusion in the military draft (Naval Institute 2018). After World War II, President Truman issued an Executive Order 9835 “Loyalty Order” designed to root out communist influence in the federal government (National Archives, Truman Library & Museum 2021). This was the impetus for the creation of the Attorney General’s List of Subversive Organizations, of which

homosexuals were included (National Archives Federal Register 2021). The State Department in 1955 quickly began to fire suspected homosexuals under Truman's Loyalty Program. More than 1,200 men and women lost their jobs with the federal government. President Dwight D. Eisenhower concerned about national security, counterespionage, and "sexual perversion" in the federal government, issued Executive Order 10450 revoking Truman's Executive Order 9835 (National Archives, Federal Register 2021). This order charged the heads of federal agencies with investigating federal employees to determine whether they posed security risks. Thousands of gay and lesbian civil servants quietly accepted the shame of losing their careers, while some chose suicide (Engardio, J. 2013, May 23).

The existing anti-gay policy when President Bill Clinton came into office was explicitly status-based (Halley 1999). The Department of Justice in the Clinton administration was the source of "the most alarming innovation in the new policy—a new set of rules" (Halley 1999). These new rules essentially allowed homosexual conduct to be inferred from supposed homosexual status. Any reform Clinton proposed that would have moved away from status toward conduct regulation were essentially eliminated or deleted from the final adoption of the policy by Congress (Halley 1999). Every part of the new policy was designed to appear as addressing conduct regulation to hide the fact that it turns, very decisively, on status. The policy was written to discriminate against LGBTQ community by providing "plausible, smooth-sounding constitutional justification" which the courts blatantly accepted without investigating (Halley 1999). Examining the policy, Fielding (1996) writes that while applicants were no longer asked their sexual orientation, they were allowed to be investigated under new guidelines. This, in and of itself, is only a

small difference between the Clinton policy and the former policy, which banned any homosexual from serving in the military.

According to the Congressional Record of Senate Hearing of February 4, 1993, testimonies were heard concerning Amendment No. 17, Section 1, Review of Department of Defense Policy Concerning Service of Homosexuals in the Armed Forces with the majority of testimony in opposition to lifting the ban on allowing gays in the military (103 Cong. Rec. [Bound]). Feder (2009) discusses the new laws and regulations pertaining to homosexuality and the U.S. military. Feder's writing relates that the presence of persons in the armed forces who demonstrate a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts creates an unacceptable risk to the high standards of morale, order, conduct, and discipline (2009). Unit cohesion effectiveness may be compromised and is of concern among military leaders (Feder 2009). This point of contention remained throughout the policy's existence. The policy, while a compromise between gay right activists and the military, did not curtail or decrease the number of service members being discharged for homosexuality but, in fact, increased it until 2001 (Feder 2009). Burrelli (2010) would appear to agree with Feder (2009). While the law itself does not prevent service members from being asked about their sexuality, it does not prevent nor change attitudes among many members of the military from their reluctance to possibly serving alongside homosexual members. Amendments H.R. 1283 and S. 3065 to the policy were introduced in the 111th Congress, which limited how enforcement of the 1993 policy would be implemented and provided for third-party information to be done under oath (Burrelli 2010). Feder (2013) provides an analysis of DADT. He states that the policy was not only contentious, but it also led to its own repeal. Kendall Thomas and

Judith Baxter each describe the new anti-gay policy (DADT) “as a massive inscription into the law of paranoid psychic and scopic structure of heterosexuality” (Halley1999).

In wake of the 1993 laws and regulations, there were numerous challenges to DADT. Significant were two U.S. Supreme Court rulings, *Bowers v. Hardwick* and *Lawrence v. Texas*. In *Bowers v. Hardwick*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Constitution does not protect the right of a homosexual adults to engage in private, consensual sodomy. *Lawrence v. Texas* the Supreme court ruled that intimate sexual conduct between consenting adults is a liberty interest protected under the 14th Amendment’s Due Process Clause. In *Log Cabin Republicans. v. United States*, a federal district court held for the first time that DADT was unconstitutional on its face but later dismissed the case as moot when DADT repeal became effective. The Title 10 of the US Code, § 654, according to Parco & Levy (2013), expressly forbid open homosexuality in the U.S. military. They relate those members were forcibly separated from military service if they had either engaged in, attempted to engage in, or solicited another to engage in a homosexual act or acts. Parco & Levy (2013) further write that if someone admitted to being homosexual or bisexual or had married or attempted to marry a person known to be of the same biological sex, they were immediately relieved from their military duties and dishonorably discharged. Wasnac (2013) focuses on the evolution of the United States military policy towards homosexuals and the implementation of DADT, which at the time of its issuance was a recommended path the U.S. military could follow to provide an equal opportunity for success of openly homosexual service members. Wasnac’s (2013) research evaluates the level of acceptance for openly homosexual service members in a post-DADT world. The findings, compared with the adjustment of troops in Great Britain and Canada,

were used to recommend actions the U.S. could take to help better the adjustment of soldiers to non-exclusionary policy.

Jaffe (2014) relates that the Clinton White House was painfully aware of the political damage done to former President Clinton's agenda when his healthcare reform failed. Jaffe (2014) quotes white house health adviser, Ira Magaziner, in placing blame squarely upon himself, First Lady Hillary Clinton, and to some extent, the president himself, for the health care debacle. Because of this defeat, the possibility of finding a clear path to lifting the ban on homosexuals from serving in the military was on a direct path for being a victim of healthcare failure. De La Garza (2018) further drives this point by reiterating the fallout of the failed healthcare reform and the eventual not-so-good compromise of President Clinton's desire to remove the ban on homosexuals serving in the military and how this behavior was similarly reflected in President Donald Trump's sudden Twitter announcement of banning transgender people from serving in the military in any capacity—an abrupt reversal of President Obama's administrative decision to allow transgender people to serve openly (Phillip, Gibbons-Neff, and DeBonis 2017). Many of the issues that existed at the time of forming the DADT policy continued to exist as Donald Trump was ascending to the presidency, even with the repeal of DADT (De La Garza 2018). Pruitt (2018) writes that, while prior to DADT the U.S. military did not officially exclude LGBT service members from its ranks, homosexual activities were grounds for discharge even as far back as the Revolutionary War. Sodomy was officially made a criminal act and subject to punishment by a court-martial (Pruitt 2018). At the time of actual implementation, DADT began to suffer from attacks and eventual bleeding

of its effectiveness. The amount of research, much of which repeats the same points, can be found throughout the internet and other searches.

Many articles and books exist discussing the events leading to the forming of the policy Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Just as many articles and books may be found discussing the events that chipped away at DADT and eventually led to its repeal in 2011. Sexual orientation and military service was discussed first by Herek (1993) as, at that time, the current debate leading to Don't Ask, Don't Tell was addressed. Once the onerous "problem" recognizing that gays and lesbians are not inherently unfit for military service, the focus shifts immediately to heterosexuals (Herek 1993). The heterosexuals are incapable of overcoming their prejudices against gay men and open lesbians and their sexual orientation. Herek points out that historical and social science data dispute their assumptions. Military has proved in the past that it is willing and able to attack prejudice and stereotypes based on race and gender within its ranks (Herek 1993). Herek (1993) challenges the 1990s to continue this tradition by eliminating barriers based on sexual orientation. Aaron Belkin (2003) discusses the point of whether the gay ban is based on military necessity. Belkin relates a debate on National Public Radio, during which neither type of evidence provided is hard proof that gays and lesbians undermine military performance (2003). Perceived threats to heterosexuals are not hard scientific evidence to substantiate the concept that gays in the military undermine cohesion and ability to provide support to fellow soldiers on the battlefield. If the federal administration, Congress, and the Pentagon were to reconsider the evidence that is used to justify the gay ban, or if political and military leaders are unwilling to join most of the rest of the world, they should have the integrity to admit that their current policy is based on prejudice, not

military necessity (Belkin 2003). A group of retired military generals, the current chief of the Joint Chiefs, and a majority of returning soldiers say full disclosure should replace the DADT law, according to Knickerbocker (2007).

Adler (2010) looks beyond the DADT policy and examines the expanded rights of gays in the military. He relates that the repeal of DADT is only the beginning. While military benefits that accrue to military spouses will not be extended to gay partners, even those who are legally married in their home, laws protecting them against employment or public-accommodation discrimination leave gays exactly where they were before (Adler, 2010). The American Psychological Association (APA) (2010) publicly opposed the U.S. policy of discrimination against lesbian, gay, and bisexual persons in military service. In its Policy Statement on Sexual Orientation and Military Service, the APA Council of Representatives expressed its commitment to disseminating scientific knowledge to force the government to rescind or repeal current policy or DADT (APA 2010). In the Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” the Honorable Jeh Charles Johnson and General Carter F. Ham of the Defense Department issued their report of November 2010 (United States Department of Defense 2010). The Department stated that based on their observations and hearings, the risk of the repeal of DADT to military effectiveness is low. Their report emphasized the U.S. military can and will adjust and accommodate the incorporation of known homosexuals into the military and not compromise the commitment to core values of leadership, professionalism, and respect for all.

Cuthbertson (2010) discusses the passion of the American opinion with regard to DADT. With a complicated history the issue continues to resonate with Americans

interested in privacy rights, gay rights, and in the unparalleled demands of military service. Even with the court case *Log Cabin Republicans v. United States of America*, while the lower court found in favor of LGBTQ that DADT violates the First and Fifth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, it also violates LGBT personnel's right of association, higher courts found in favor of the appeal of the Justice Department and a Supreme Court decision of 2-1 vacated the decision to keep the DADT in place as it was written (Cuthbertson 2010).

During the Senate Hearing 111-546, of Testimony Relating to the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Policy (March 18, 2010) General John J. Sheehan, USMC (Ret.), former Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, and Former Commander in Chief; U.S. Atlantic Command, Michael D. Almy, Former Major, U. S. Air Force; and Jenny L. Kopfstein, former Lieutenant Junior Grade, U.S. Navy, provided testimony of their belief that nowadays, everyone can and should serve this great country in some variety of way or reason. However, that does not mean that everyone should be allowed to serve in the military for a variety of reasons including age, health, education, and so on. There is no constitutional right to serve in the military.

Regarding military teaching, one cannot be honest as required by military code and hide sexuality as forced to under DADT. Huffman and Schultz (2012) collected essays from four scholarly studies and 25 essays from diverse group of gay and straight, current and former military members from the army, navy, air force, and marine corps about the impact of living under DADT. Berman (2014) relates of the awkward Clinton-Era debate over DADT. Senior-level officials in the Justice Department weighed whether the DADT would withstand legal challenges. Handwritten notes from the White House,

including notes from the first days of the Clinton Administration to include Vice President Al Gore and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell, debated with Pentagon officials about changing the ban. The document indicates Powell in favor of sustaining the ban despite being a part of the Clinton Administration.

Croft (2015) writes that same-sex sexual assault in the military is as much a concern for the Defense Department as Sexual Assault in general. In recent years, efforts to improve the handling of sexual assault cases have been implemented. In the past, service members, homosexual or otherwise, have been concerned with having connections to homosexual acts and possible removal from the military. DADT repeal afforded the open service of homosexuals in the military and reports from the Defense Department indicated a rise in the number of sexual assault reports. This report analyzes the affect that policies from the Department of Defense and legislation have upon same-sex sexual assault and the impact of treatment of same-sex sexual assault reports (National Research Council 2014).

Brodeur (2017) provides the account of Major Margaret Witt whose court case virtually helped repeal DADT. A 20-year air force career veteran, Witt was a decorated flight nurse. When the air force learned she was in a relationship with a civilian woman, the dismissed her for her homosexual conduct. In favor one day and out the next. Witt brought suit against the air force, challenging the DADT policy as discriminating against LGBT members of the military. Stahl (2018) relates the results of a comprehensive working group that had considered the effectiveness of a ban on open service. The findings reported that allowing LGBT people to serve openly would have no significant impact on military readiness or morale (Stahl 2018). Hunsinger (2019) discusses the

improvements made in rights for homosexuals serving in the military from World War II through the year 2018. As of 2015 LGBTQ men and women serving in the military have the same rights as their brothers and sisters in arms. Laws are in place to protect them as they protect their heterosexual counterparts. They are free to marry whomever while also serving their country. Finally, Belkins and Gibbons (2021) discuss the dismantling of DADT in the Palm Center report overturning a discriminatory pentagon policy. As the many documents and research attesting to the repeal of DADT reveal that the original report from the RAND Research Institute was not only on point in its recommendation, but it was also ahead of its time, waiting for much of the “good ol’ boy club” to catch up with the research and technology (Belkins and Gibbons 2021).

The Influence of the Psychology of Prejudice

The safety of a republic depends essentially on the energy of a common national sentiment; on a uniformity of principles and habits; on the exemption of the citizens from foreign bias and prejudice; and on the love of country which will almost invariably be found to be closely connected with birth, education and family.

Alexander Hamilton

As noted in the history of homosexuals in the military section, prejudices against members of the LGBTQ community have continued to suffer at the hands of prejudicial people and laws. In the debate over changing the Defense Department’s directive banning homosexuals from openly serving in the military, prejudices held by the important actors in the debate had a significant impact upon the decision-making process and ultimate determination regarding any change. Literature addressing the psychology of prejudice and its impact upon decision-making relate how unconscious bias is in play in every aspect of the workplace (Davis 2018). Moreover, the responsibility of

overcoming this problem lies with senior leadership (Davis 2018). Biases, such as affinity, attribution, beauty, confirmation, gender, halo effect (focusing on one particular impressive feature about a person), and horns effect (focus on one particularly negative feature about an individual) are a part of human nature (Davis 2018). Jones (2014) discusses how bias or prejudice, whether conscious or unconscious, override one's rational thinking and subtly sneaks into everyday thinking, thereby affecting the decision-making process. According to the Association for Psychological Science, prejudice stems from a basic human need and way of thinking (2011). Ilan H. Meyer (2011, October 11) writes that even trivial or insignificant things in everyday life impact the prejudice in the lives of not only heterosexual people but the LGBTQ community as well.

Authors Ng and Gervais (2017) relate how one's religion has a profound and considerable influence upon prejudice that affects decision-making. Research on antigay prejudice is replete with evidence of positive relationships between religiosity and prejudice against gays (Finlay and Walther 2003). The effects of stereotypes on the decision-making process are discussed by Bodenhausen and Wyer (2014). The authors write that it is best to examine stereotypes in the sense of cognitive terms. Standard processing strategies of the human cognitive system successfully account for stereotyping phenomena (Bodenhausen and Wyer 2014). Bergh and Akrami (2017) find that prejudice toward one group indicates an increased tendency to harbor prejudice toward other groups. Burch-Brown and Baker (2016) describe the influence of religious communities and church bodies upon attitudes to either reduce or promote prejudice toward any given target group. Sarwar (2018) writes about how various religious groups' prejudices, presumptions, and public behaviors toward specific people groups have lasting negative

impacts. Sarwar (2018) also relates the impact of mass media and the role the media plays in perpetuating some of the presumptions and prejudices toward people groups through religious eyes. Moreover, membership in a social group (i.e., military officers, enlisted soldiers, Masons, civic clubs) provides a common language, which has implications for intergroup relations and stereotyping (Maass, Salvi, Arcuri, and Semin 2014). Research consistently has demonstrated that simple categorization of people into groups leads to favoritism toward the in-group and discrimination against the out-group (Maass, Salvi, Arcuri, and Semin 2014). Religion is at the core of prejudice and bias, writes L. Ron Hubbard (2014). Hubbard wrote “a sense of community occurs by reason of mutual experience” to show how the civilization of the West would export its culture to the rest of the world. Religion influences upon legislation and constitution making is discussed by Douglas (2021). Religion impacts every aspect of society from shaping habits and norms to laws to education to development of antisocial groups to human thought (Douglas 2021). Moreover, religious upbringing or indoctrination may subconsciously impact a person’s decision-making and affect their thinking logically or may inhibit fairness for all (qizi Sodikova 2020; Shapiro and Stefkovich 2016).

People’s beliefs about gender and their affect upon stereotyping and prejudices are discussed with respect to distribution into social roles (Eagly and Steffen 2014). The authors conducted five experiments to ascertain whether the various attributes associated with social roles are reflected in the ingrained personality traits and the abilities characteristic of the typical occupants of the roles (2014). In addition, Eagly and Steffen (2014) looked into stereotypes by employers and found employers’ stereotypes of women were not as favorable as were those of men. Moreover, any change in these stereotypes is

largely motivated by a general social change of acceptance of different genders being able to fill these stereotypical roles without any prejudice against them (Eagly and Steffen 2014).

The need for social connection and the psychology of prejudices as a detriment or barrier to social connection is related by Walton and Cohen (2014). Among mankind's basic needs is to ask and try to answer the question, "Where do I belong?" (Walton and Cohen 2014). The authors conducted experiments to investigate social connectedness with regard to race and/or gender. The results indicated that people who are uncertain as to their "place" within an organization's structure perceive ambiguous behavior from others in that organization as evidence of lack of support or acceptance. Inequality, especially social inequality, takes the form of disparities of treatment. This disparity of treatment is manifested in decision-making opportunities (Walton and Cohen 2014).

The psychology of prejudice and its permeating into thoughts and social influence influences decisions and actions by each individual. The literature review presented in this section supports the rhetorical examination of the documents at the focus of this paper. The exacting research and recommendation from the conclusions of the National Defense Research Institute and the ensuing compromise in DADT lead to the question of why a compromise was negotiated between the president's administration and Congress and the military in light of the researched and scientific findings and recommendations to the secretary of defense and the president of the United States. Those questions may be answered by future research. The main question to answer remains, "what aspects of the rhetoric of the RAND document were unable to withstand rebuttal from Congress and the US. Military?"

Support for Examination of a Report as a Technical Document and Utilizing Rhetorical Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis

McMurrey (2017) says that papers written that make recommendations, provide feasibility, or evaluate a topic qualify as reports. Also, technical background reports are among the report genre (McMurrey 2017). Melgoza (2021) also provides characteristics and disciplines of documents that may be considered as technical reports. When a document contains data, procedures, literature reviews, research history, or research developed by government agencies (i.e., NASA, Department of Defense, Department of Energy, etc.), it qualifies as a technical document (Melgoza 2021).

St. Amant and Meloncon (2016) state that when technology communicators conduct research using interviews or testimonies to provide data or supportive evidence, the researcher may encounter a conflict between academic research and its practical use for technical communicators. The research conducted for this study examines the RAND document (the academic side) and the oral testimonies and how these testimonies weighed in the final decision of the Defense Department (the practitioner side). St. Amant and Meloncon (2016) further state that key to bridging information within the field of technical communications is for technical communicators to communicate and collaborate in ways that help all members of the field, not just those conducting research. This is important in executing a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as it contributes to the framework for reporting the findings from the examination. Sanchez (2016) notes that research conducted in the field of technical communicator has implications for many other fields and, therefore, calls for research which can unify the field by using a more

systematic and cohesive research, hence, supporting using the narrative of current literature and using CDA to examine an artifact or document.

Cook (2000) and Rude (2009) address reports, both scientific and nonscientific, and provide implications for the field of technical writing. Technical communicators have an obligation to be aware that selecting information to include in a report is a powerful feat (Cook 2000). Technical writers should understand that what they write is shaped by choices that are never completely objective or neutral (Cook 2000). Rhetorical choices in light of ethics affects human lives and should be given grave consideration (Cook 2000). Becoming aware of one's own decision-making process and the social context in which the document is written will assist future writers to become more responsive and to represent individuals who are affected by the policies but are not empowered to speak. Using mapping strategies, the technical writer will employ a method of conscious reflection that facilitates making ethical decisions about the reports' map, both content and recommendations (Cook 2000). Rude (2009) also is supportive of effective teaching of reports as an effective means of addressing issues of use and social responsibility along with topics of form and method. Rude (2009) examined two Union of Concerned Scientists (USC) reports on energy and the effects of fossil fuels and to make a case for alternatives. The reports reflect activist and social values of the organization as well as sound science involved in the research for the reports. Rude (2009) concluded that distinguishing characteristics of a report qualify it as a document to be considered for examination as a technical communication document. These characteristics include 1) document as a strategic tool in field work and technical assistance use, 2) a strong orientation toward the future, 3) forward-looking planning for policy and technological

change, 4) using science to make a convincing case for policy change but findings interpreted through the lens of social responsibility, and 5) style and visuals encourage reading, and organization emphasizes upon issues and options instead of methods and results of research (Rude, 2009). Earlier, Rude (1995) provided a discussion of using a report as a technical communication document in the decision-making process. Rude writes that textbooks providing a topic on use of reports for decision-making are varied in advice provided and the textbooks “tend to contradict one another” (Rude 1995). Reports are considered a genre for decision-making in the technical and professional writing arena, and while reports for decision-making vary in their methods, purposes, and outcomes, the theoretical, empirical, and advocacy models of genres available to students are imperfect for inquiry for practical decision-making (Rude, 1995). Rude (1995) suggests that defining a method and genre suited to the problem and intended action instead of suggesting unrealistic and unproductive strategies on problem solving. Selecting a problem-solving strategy should depend on the investigator’s understanding of the tasks in research and writing (Rude, 1995).

The U.S. Geological Survey has published a document providing guidelines for reviewing a technical report (2019). Jones and Williams (2017) also contributed to the idea of developing guidelines that provide for authors to consider different types of audiences, a human-centered approach, and use of plain-language that is void of prejudice or biases and reducing inequity. Furthermore, the development of guidelines for examining a document, using plain language and the purpose of the language used, and incorporating Critical Discourse Analysis in those guidelines will result in communication that is void of bias and prejudice and will cause the reader to be more

objective and avoid reading with built-in prejudices (Jones and Williams 2017). Examining and analyzing a document is, in and of itself, a form of qualitative research where the document is interpreted by the researcher and provides voice and meaning around an assessment topic (Triad 3 2016). As a social research method, document analysis is important as a research tool especially when used in a combination of methodologies used in studying the same phenomenon (Triad 3 2016). To seek corroboration, qualitative researchers use at least two resources via different data sources and methods. However, before actual document analysis takes place, the researcher must embark upon a detailed planning process to ensure reliable results (Triad 3 2016).

Employing rhetorical analysis requires that the work of nonfiction be broken into parts and then explaining how the parts work together to create a certain effect (University Writing Center 2021). Huckin (2002) provides main features of CDA. Huckin (2002) further writes that the “main purpose of critical discourse analysis is to show how public discourse often serves the interest of powerful forces over those less privileged.” This will be most useful considering the testimonies of powerful military and Congressional leaders. Rhetorical analysis explores the rhetorician’s goals, techniques, and examples of those techniques as well as their effectiveness. Building a proof helps make the case by appealing to the reader for an agreement or approval using either the pathetic, ethical, or logical appeal approach (University Writing Center 2021). Moving forward in the examination and analyzing rhetoric used in the NDRI report and Congressional testimony requires an acute awareness of one’s own beliefs, prejudices, and perspectives that subconsciously impact the interpretation of key elements of the analysis of rhetoric.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a methodology enables a “vigorous assessment of what is meant when language is used to describe and explain” (Institute for the Public Understanding of the Past, 2007), and is an “ideal way to examine the language used” (Jones and Williams 2017). CDA aims to understand how language is used in real-life situations and is a common qualitative research method in many humanities and social science disciplines (Luo 2019). To conduct critical discourse analysis upon the report and testimonies three interrelated dimensions are considered 1) the object of analysis (including verbal, visual, or combination of verbal and visual, 2) the processes by which the object is produced and received (writing/speaking/designing and reading/listening/viewing) by human subjects, and 3) the socio-historical conditions that govern these processes (Janks 1997). By using the critical discourse analysis approach to examining the rhetoric involved in both the report and the testimonies focus may be upon the significant text, specific linguistic selections and compare the rhetoric of the actors involved for strength or persuasive words and/or phrases, (Janks 1997).

Giving consideration to the prejudices of the testimonies along with the impact of social mores of the times and the psychology impacting the testimony in juxtaposition with the objectivity of the NCRI report will provide a social perspective in which the RAND report was written. Using these elements along with conducting CDA of the RAND report may help to understand the break-down in the lack of significant impact upon members of Congress in President Clinton’s effort to lift the ban against homosexuals openly serving in the U.S. military.

Literature Concerning Technical Communication's Role in Addressing Queer-tech Communications

The emergence of communities of minorities, disenfranchised, and oppressed people has created a new field for technical communicators to address. Providing information concerning sub-topics such as cultural rhetorics, the unenfranchised or disenfranchised cultural sites, and separating subculture groups from large collective culture groups to gain recognition presents a new area for research and study and eventual open, honest dialogue about various people groups through technical communications.

Hierro, Levy, and Price (2016) write about the need to develop spaces where cultural rhetorics could both recognize “the hostility of the academy and to disrupt it.” Technical communicators need to allow for space where cross-cultural competence can grow and build by working through dissent and to allow for spaces to retreat with our colleagues and begin to build a framework for sustainable alliances and community, (Hierro, Levy, & Price 2016).

People have a tendency to shove unfamiliar things aside or to pigeon-hole them believing that the issue will either go away or resolve on its own, (Agboka 2012). Technical communicators have a vital role in raising social justice concerns, (Agboka 2013). He writes that social justice encompasses and connects with an “advocacy for those in our society” who are not only less fortunate than the average person but are also “underresourced.” He advocates for technical communicators to address issues of social justice on both a domestic level and an international one, (Agboka 2013).

Addressing queer identities and making curriculum more inclusive, Barrios (2004) writes that it is not enough to simply address the identity of LGBT community but also views teachers and students as political actors engaging not with issues specific to the LGBTQ community but “issues important to all citizens in a democracy” in ways that acknowledge the complexities of those issues within differing communities while avoiding the simplistic framework of a pro or con debate. Developing a pedagogy around imagined political action of LGBTQ concerns is the idea offered by Barrios (2004). Barrios emphasizes that the focal point for such discussion is not identity but to tackle elements of the topic in a different manner. Discussion of what it means to be queer in community and current culture, how are these issues formed, how they operate, exploring new and different facets of the topic is an approach or a pedagogy that Barrios utilized which led to students writing and calling for specific action, (2004).

Matthew B. Cox (2018) addresses the importance of LGBTQ rhetorical approaches in technical and/or professional communication. He relates the need to keep an open mind while learning and studying queer rhetorics, cultural rhetorics, and social injustice. He points out that working for a company that makes efforts and strides to be inclusive presets its share of disappointments and complexities. However, the big difference in the success of a company with regard to including the LGBTQ community openly, is the company’s efforts to keep moving forward and to embrace all employees, (Cox 2018).

The current dominant narrative in technical communication addresses objective, apolitical, acultural theories and practices (Jones, N., Moore, K., & Walton, R. 2016). These authors write that technical communicators should be cognizant of the need to

provide social justice approaches in their writing. However, they do acknowledge that much more work is needed to better define how that is accomplished. Being inclusive demonstrates the profession's desire and attempts to advocate for social justice. By promoting social justice approaches and inclusivity, the technical communications profession will provide a call to action and move forward, beyond criticism for having inclusivity, and allow the true, authentic stories to be told, (Jones, Moore, & Walton 2016).

Edenfield, Holmes, and Colton discuss a new approach to tactical technical communication, "a queer new materialist approach," (2019). They write concerning the barriers for the transgender community to have access to affordable trans-gender care. The rise in online user-friendly instruction for self-administration of hormone therapy, prompts the need for the technical communicator to become more interested in social justice. They state that "in terms of subject matter, the broader field of technical and professional communication has limited its research on" LGBTQ populations with a primary focus on AIDS/HIV research and communication, (Edenfield, Holmes, & Colton 2019). The authors offer research on distinguishing between queer and LGBTQ+ research in technical communication field. They also offer suggestions on the use of supplementary ethical frameworks to identify given tactics as ethical or unethical. With the "trans" community turning more and more to online "do-it-yourself hormone replacement therapy) technical communicators must first and foremost understand that queer is not about identity alone and draw hasty conclusions. Technical communicators would do well to conduct research to understand the complexities of queer tactical

technical communication and to re-imagine what queer means and then to align identity politics and tactical activity, (Edenfield, Holmes, & Colton)

3. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the documents that were primary and critical to the compromise between the Clinton Administration and Congress that resulted in Defense Directive 1304.26 “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.” This thesis will attempt to answer the question, “What aspects of the rhetoric of the RAND report were unable to withstand rebuttal from Congress and the U.S. Military resulting in the Department of Defense Directive known as Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell?”

A closer examination of the policy and the various facets impacting the lifting of the ban presents many questions as to why President Bill Clinton’s proposed plan went awry. What effect did prejudices from key participants in the decision-making process have upon Congress, the testimonies from military officers, key leaders, and the researched report issued on behalf of the secretary of defense by RAND’s National Defense Research Institute (NDRI)? The RAND report overwhelmingly provided support for the complete lifting of the ban against homosexuals serving in the military (Rostker, B. D., Harris, S.A., and Rich, M. 1993). RAND researchers investigated similar policies in at least seven foreign countries and the attitudes and policies among police and fire departments in six American cities. The 500+ page report from NDRI provided figures and tables, including 53 pages of research references cited within the document itself, to present to the administration and to Congress. Ultimately, the report offered strong, sound rationale for lifting the ban and restrictions and would allow homosexuals to openly serve within the military. In addition, the RAND report offered strategies for addressing any legal opposition (Rostker, B.D., Harris, S. A., and Rich, M. 1993). A final remark in the document, however, informed the audience that lifting the ban is still a

matter of a policy choice and not to be considered a legal imperative (Rostker, B. D., Harris, S. A., and Rich, M. 1993).

Technical Communication Artifacts to be Examined

Key documents to examine include *Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Options and Assessment* (Rostker, B. D., Harris, S.A., and Rich, M. 1993) the researched report on the impact of lifting the ban on gays serving in the military as requested by Secretary of Defense Les Aspin in the directive issued by President Bill Clinton. Of the 500-plus pages in the RAND report, 40 pages are used in the analysis in addition to excerpts from testimonies of William Henderson, Former Commander, Army Research Institute; Dr. Lawrence J. Korb, Director, Brookings Institution – Center for Public Policy Education; Dr. David Marlowe, Analyst, Walter Reed Army Medical Center – Psychiatry; and Congressional Record of February 4, 1993 to include letters from both General Colin Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf. Table 1. Sections of Rand Report Analyzed includes a description of the pages selected and the rationale for selecting these pages.

Table 1. Sections of RAND Report Analyzed

Section	Function	Pages	Rationale
Executive Summary	Provides an overall summation of research procedure and possible outcomes of various scenarios presented.	xvii - xxviii	Sets tone for audience and provides overall conclusion drawn from research
Chapter One, Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Policy Options and Assessment—Study Overview: Implications of the Research	Provides synopsis of research and possible outcome applications on U.S. policy regarding homosexuals serving in the military	31 - 40	Provides analysis of research conducted and impact upon U.S. policy
Chapter Two, Sexual Orientation and Sexual Behavior: Conclusion	Addresses concern of potential health risks for members of armed services	271 - 272	Presents a major concern of military health issues and provides responses and possible outcomes

Section	Function	Pages	Rationale
Chapter Three, Analogous Experience of Foreign Military Services: An International Comparison	Addresses anti-homosexual violence issues inherent with the proposed policy	281 - 283	Considers a potential major issue within the military regarding hate crimes against homosexuals
Chapter Four, Analogous Experience of Domestic Police and Fire Departments: Implications for Implementing Policies of Non-Discrimination	Addresses main concern among military officers; core of military performance	327 - 329	Military officers ' belief that cohesion and performance will be largely negatively impacted, thus eroding a strong military
Chapter Five, Potential Insights from Analogous Situations: Integrating Blacks into the U.S. Military: Implications for Allowing Acknowledged Homosexuals to Serve in the Military	Legal ramifications of lifting the ban	366 - 368	Need to understand what legal ramifications are presented by lifting the ban and by not lifting the ban
Chapter Six, Relevant Public Opinion: General Conclusions on Public Opinion	Steps to implementing lifting the ban against homosexuals serving in the military	392 - 395	Provides a rationale and procedure for changing a policy from strongly held to one less popular but necessary
Chapter Seven, Relevant Military Opinion: Conclusions about Focus Groups Conducted by RAND	Considers reenlistment and recruiting efforts in light of new policy	405 - 408	Examines scenarios of possible impact on recruitment and retention of soldiers in light of new policy
Chapter Eight, Issues of Concern: Effect of Allowing Homosexuals to Serve in The Military on the Prevalence of HIV/AIDS: Conclusions	Looks at potential impact of possible introduction of disease AIDS into military	271	Provides a rational for determining the seriousness of this disease and likelihood of it spreading through the military ranks
Chapter Nine, Issues of Concern: Anti-Homosexual Violence: Conclusions	Potential for possible violent physical harm to LGBTQ service members	282	Addresses attitudes and possible violent physical harm to gay troops
Chapter Ten, What is Known About Unit Cohesion and Military Performance: Conclusions	A key to military effectiveness is unit cohesion	329 - 331	Discusses impact upon unit cohesion when gays are among unit members
Chapter Eleven, Sexual Orientation and the Military: Some Legal Considerations: Conclusions	Legal challenges military inherent with either lifting the ban or keeping it in place	366 - 367	Section provides various scenarios and possible outcomes as well as possible responses to circumvent potential lawsuits
Chapter Twelve, Implementing Policy Change in Large Organizations: Conclusions	How to implement a major change in a large organization	392 - 394	Provides insight and possible solutions for consideration
Chapter Thirteen, Potential Effects on Military Recruitment and Retention: Possible Effects of	A general conclusion and recommendation for lifting the ban	405 - 407	The research is brought to its logical conclusion, outcome

Section	Function	Pages	Rationale
Removing the Ban, Policy Implications			and provides a recommendation
Transcripts from Senate Hearing of 103 rd Congress, May 11, 1993	Compare testimony rhetoric to RAND document rhetoric.		Provides insight upon implementing new policy
Transcripts from Congressional Record: Testimony Concerning lifting ban, February 4, 1993	Examine rhetoric of Senators with respect to Clinton’s proposed policy change.	2161 - 2191	Provides information on Senate debate regarding the issue of LGBTQ openly serving in Military

Theoretical Perspective

The theoretical perspective around which this thesis is framed is that of the influences of prejudices and religion and the impact of both on the testimonies and strategies used in the negotiated policy of Defense Directive 1304.26, “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.” Religious influence may be evidenced through language and words used (Alsohaibani 2017). Alsohaibani writes that both language and religion have been considered as distinguishing and influential components of culture and that they interact and influence each other (2017). In addition, religious expressions play a major role in the performance of certain speech acts and greatly influence those speech acts (Alsohaibani 2017). Language also contributes to intergroup biases and to the persistence of social stereotypes (Maass, Salvi, Arcuri, and Semin 2014). Therefore, a close scrutiny of the language used in the documents from the NDRI, and a close scrutiny of the language used in the testimonies before Congress will serve to provide an understanding of the impact and subsequent outcome of the decision that altered the original proposed policy of lifting the ban of homosexuals serving in the U.S. armed forces as proposed by the Clinton administration. An underlying assumption with regard to the compromise is the role prejudices played among those persons who provided testimony before the 103rd

Congress. To what extent did an individual's religious identification, race, and social context background impact the written and spoken word?

To better understand the perspectives of written documents and the transcription of the oral testimonies provided, an understanding of the psychology of prejudice is necessary. Did childhood religious influences factor in the emotions and decision-making process of personal testimonies given before Congress? Moreover, how do these factors translate into everyday behavior and choices? Eagly and Steffin in *The Psychology of Prejudice*, edited by Kerry Kawakami (2014), discuss the role of gender stereotypes and the pigeonholing of men and women into certain societal roles. Sng, Williams, and Neuberg, in *The Cambridge Handbook of The Psychology of Prejudice*, edited by Chris G. Sibley and Fiona Kate Barlow (2017) make a case for the powerful impact emotions have in shaping prejudices. Also, articles and publications concerning attitudes and social action to combat prejudices including the APA's own admission and public apology for contributing to systemic racism (2021) will provide knowledge and understanding about prejudices and the influence of religious communities and church bodies upon attitudes that either reduce or promote prejudice. Articles from Joanna Burch-Brown and William Baker (2016) provide more information which guides the examination and recognizing early religious influences upon adult developed prejudices.

In the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, the statement, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," is used to form the textual basis for the U.S. Supreme Court's interpretations of the "separation of church and state" doctrine. The founding fathers document specifically expresses the desire to keep religious influence out of government.

Yet these documents were written by white men, most of who affiliated with Christian, Episcopal, Catholic, and Presbyterian churches. According to Williams (2006), documents that have been largely assumed to be free of bias and prejudice and written for all mankind have for decades actually “disproportionately affected African Americans and the historical contexts in which [they] were written.” Williams (2006) further points out that much rhetoric has little to do with ethnicity, yet upon further examination, the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution is far from being flawless with respect to ethnicity, or religion, or other regards. Azerrad (2015) writes:

[M]any Americans who are resolutely opposed to racism unwittingly agree with Chief Justice Roger Taney’s claim in *Dred Scot v. Sandford* (1857) that the Founders’ Constitution regarded blacks as “so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect, that the negro might justify and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit.

The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence do not mention or refer to the concept of race. While “our founding principles are colorblind . . . our history, regrettably, has not been “(Azerrad 2015). One may conclude that the founding documents were written not for all but for only those whom the framers considered worthy of inclusion, people who were respected by white men and who conformed to the standards set by them.

Milow Kershaw writes about America’s national identity and how it has been influenced by religion which, in turn, influences decision-making and framing national policies (2018). Therefore, it stands to reason that even though the Constitution tries to prevent the government from demanding that the citizens of the United States worship a specific god and in a specific manner, the Constitution, nonetheless, is not a document completely free from religious influence and is based upon the ideas that were largely

influenced by religion through the childhood religious affiliations of the various writers and contributors thereof. The First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, specifically the Free Exercise Clause, prohibits the government from interfering with a person's practice of their religion. However, no federal law exists that expressly forbids a person's religious background and upbringing from influencing making or structuring policies and/or laws.

There is no mention of God in the U.S. Constitution, but God is found in the Declaration of Independence, the Pledge of Allegiance, and U.S. currency. However, individual state laws reference either God or the divine (Fahmy, 2020, July 16). People in key positions of power express their opinions and decision-making skills based on their self-formed cultural and religious upbringing planks that serve as a personal foundation (Howarth, Lees, Sidebotham, Higgins, and Imtiaz 2008). The political history of the United States is deeply rooted in religion with the president "embodying amalgamated ideological and theological ideals" (Yamashiro 2017). Social and community context have a great influence upon association with various religious organizations or denominations. That religious organizations can have a narrowing effect upon its members' perspective of society and may cloud one's concept of right and wrong is found in works by Parsha Shaira Sarwar and by Maass, Salvi, Arcuri, and Semin in *The Psychology of Prejudice*, Kerry Kawakami, Editor (2014).

Another facet of this paper will attempt to understand what the role of prejudice of the "unknown" or "not understanding" of people groups different from one's own culture. Most of the individuals giving testimony had never talked with members of the gay community or had any type of contact with anyone from the homosexual community

(transcripts from C-SPAN, 1993 and Senate Arms Committee Hearing, 1993). Media reports represent snap shots of information (Vanderwicken, P. 1995). From Hollywood or from fabricated rhetoric pontificated by church pulpits, to hate groups or from law enforcement, journalists and politicians have become entangled in a symbiotic type of spider's web of lies purposed to mislead the public (Vanderwicken, P. 1995). The RAND report conducted interviews among members of police and fire departments in six U. S. cities and seven foreign countries (Rostker, B. D., Harris, S. A., and Rich, M. 1993). Congressional testimonies of more than forty people, each influenced by religion, culture, and social context gave their own belief and concept of homosexual people and what they believed would be the result of interacting with a gay person to include beliefs of myths and mistruths about gay people (Strong Family Alliance, 2021; Case Western Reserve University, 2021; Schlatter, E., and Steinback, R., 2011; Swier, R. 2021).

To resolve the concerns of prejudicial perspectives, this research is framed around the perspectives of cognitive dissonance, agenda-setting, and social exchange theories. The cognitive dissonance theory helps to understand the testimony considering past behaviors and speech that do not align with present-day behaviors. The agenda-setting theory helps to understand the impact the social media have had upon key decisionmakers in this scenario (Alvernia University 2018). Mass media's influence upon the actors in this scenario and weighing the costs of implementing the president's plan against the weight of repercussions of the social context of one's own family and professional arenas are given some consideration. Also included will be consideration for the tension that the outcomes from testimonies had and the impact of the final decision upon most members of the organizations represented by each person providing testimony.

The social exchange theory aids in understanding human relationships and how individuals form, maintain, and terminate those relationships (Tulane University 2018). How people feel about interactions or relationships when basing those relationships on a preconceived or perceived outcome is important when examining testimonies of both heterosexual and homosexual actors in this scenario of DADT. In other words, how much did one's own preconceived idea of gays and openness to the community's served in the military affect one's own testimony or written report?

Using Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Analysis to Examine the Artifacts

One of the more effective methods to examine the previously listed documents is through critical discourse analysis in conjunction with rhetorical analysis (Huckin, T., Andrus, J., and Clary-Lemon, J. 2012). Given the complexity of this problem, and with the intricate connection to the culture, social, economic, political and material aspects of life, a multidimensional approach to the examination will provide a methodological framework for the task of understanding documents and will assist in reaching a conclusion toward how technical communicators can better identify hidden prejudices and correct a document when possible or necessary.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is used on large volumes of materials (Huckin, T., Andrus, J., and Clary-Lemon, J., 2012; Janks 1997). Both the report and the numerous testimonies, in addition to written reports submitted into evidence during the Congressional hearings, are voluminous in pages of printed evidence presented and of transcripts of testimonies before Congress. Examining the language used, specific works that provided special emphasis to the subject in addition to examining the social contexts of the Congressional hearings to gain an understanding of the various social groups

within the military and Congress will help to understand the emotions surrounding how each topic was communicated to those sitting in judgement of the testimonies and the report. Moreover, understanding the context of the negotiators of the resulting United States Military Policy No. 10 will provide additional rationale for the final negotiated compromise, DADT. The printed testimonies from various Congressional Hearings in addition to video recordings of the testimonies will be examined. Also using research on the various elements that create prejudices in decision-making will further provide clarification to the language and words provided in both the RAND document and the transcripts from the testimonies and other documents provided during the Congressional hearing. CDA examines the use of the language in a social context or social practice, which are tied to specific historical contexts (Huckin, T., Andrus, J., and Clary-Lemon, J. 2012; Janks 1997). Questions that Janks (1997) suggests asking when examining a large document include 1) what the relations of power are, 2) whose interests are negated, 3) what the consequences of this positioning are, and 4) where analysis seeks to understand how discourse is implicated in relations of power. Janks (1997) also includes questions from Fairclough's works of 1989 and 1995. Listing three dimensions of different kinds of analyses includes 1) the object of analysis (including verbal, visual, or both), 2) processes by which an object is produced and received (whether that is by speaking, designing, writing, or reading/listening/viewing) by human subjects, and 3) the socio-historical conditions that govern these processes. Each of the dimensions requires a different type of analysis: 1) text analysis (description), 2) processing analysis (interpretation), and 3) social analysis (explanation). Among the elements to understand are the proofs of the RAND report, the appeal to the readers, the resulting substantiation for the appeals, and

the persuasiveness of the report to the readers. Using CDA to ascertain the language used and how it differentiates the presentation of facts from the emotional impact of voice and language used in providing persuasive testimony will provide clearer understanding of the elements in technical communication that played a key role. CDA also may suggest different approaches to provide a more substantially persuasive argument (Huckin, T., Andrus, J., and Clary-Lemon, J. 2012; Janks 1997).

Rhetorical analysis provides the tools to understand and convey intended messages to the particular audiences, the author's goals, and tools used to persuade the audience to be sympathetic and empathetic to the author's cause (University Writing Center, 2021; Huckin, T., Andrus, J., and Clary-Lemon, J., 2012;). While everyone has some bias about one thing or another, prejudice is usually based on insufficient facts, often those arrived at through unfavorable or intolerant means. From studying the impact of religious upbringing upon individual people provides another facet of understanding the possible why or rationale for decision-making and the subtleties of religious influence upon a person's rational and logical thinking and cognitive processing (qizi Sodikova, 2020). Two approaches will be used in analyzing the selected documents. First, CDA will be conducted to obtain the general tone and intent of the RAND selections, the oral testimonies given before Congress on February 4, May 11, and September 28, 1993, and President Clinton's announcement of July 19, 1993. Constructing a table to illustrate the words used indicative of religious influence, bigotry, discrimination, enmity, injustice, preconception, racism, and sexism will allow a comparison of the types of words used in the RAND report and the Congressional hearing. Next, conducting Critical Discourse Analysis will illustrate the author/speaker intent in providing information either based on

fact and data or based on emotion through experience or through a confluence of religion, culture, and/or racial prejudice. A survey of overall language of the testimonies and comparing testimony language against language of the written report will aid in the identification of each document's strength in persuading its audience and provide a clearer understanding of what happened with lifting the ban and the resulting negotiated compromise.

Many words that are synonyms with the word "prejudice" will provide a bank for ascertaining the meaning behind the testimonies and the report. Included is a look at the individual testimonies and identifying the type of language used to persuade the intended audience, the examination of the documents against credibility, logic, and appeal to the emotions (ethos, logos, pathos), and the establishment of the strength of persuasiveness (University Writing Center 2021). By identifying those elements of persuasiveness, a contrast and comparison of the rhetoric will provide evidence to technical communicators to guard against to produce a document that is bias and prejudice free.

Recognizing an author's intent, whether the author was cognizant of the intent or not, allows the technical communicator to produce a document more closely aligned to the author's original idea and purpose. Removing unnecessary prejudice and biases in documents will result in clearer, concise, and more truthful communication instead of "fake news" so evident and so often found in today's news and in various documents of persuasion.

4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The research question for this study is, *what aspects of the rhetoric of the RAND NDRI report were unable to withstand rebuttal from Congress and the U.S. Military and resulted in DADT?*”

In his 1992 campaign, then-former governor of Arkansas, William (Bill) Jefferson Clinton, made a campaign promise to lift the current U.S. military policy that bars known homosexuals from serving in the armed forces of the United States. Reeling from the economy of previous decades and from the spending on social programs that many Americans believed were ineffective, as well as following twelve years of conservative Republican leadership (Ronald Reagan, 2 terms, George H.W. Bush, 1 term), which saw the surge of materialism and consumerism along with the rise of the evangelical Christian movement, voters opted for a change in their government by electing Bill Clinton to the White House with a very large support based from the gay community, who supported his campaign promise.

One of the first actions taken by then-President Clinton shortly after his election was to sign a memorandum directing the Secretary of Defense Secretary, Les Aspin, to “submit . . . prior to July 15, 1993, draft of an Executive Order ending discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in determining who may serve in the Armed Forces” (Peters, G., & Woolley, J.T. 2022).

Over the ensuing year, the 103rd Congress took issue with the President’s executive directive and held debates and eventually hearings to determine whether or not the current military policy prohibiting homosexuals from openly serving in the military should remain in place, as is, or whether changes were necessary. The secretary of the

defense turned to the National Defense Research Institute of RAND to conduct thorough research concerning the impact upon U.S. armed forces by allowing homosexual individuals to openly serve their country. The official report forthcoming from RAND concluded “no empirical basis for fearing a low in enlistments if homosexuals are permitted to serve in the military” (Rostker, B., Harris, S., and Rich, M. 1993, p.405). With that conclusion provided by RAND to Secretary Aspin, the final outcome was Defense Directive 1304.26, which became known as, “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” a phrase coined by Charles Moskos, a military sociologist (Wikipedia 2022). Even though the new policy was a statutory policy, and the previous policy was a regulatory policy, this new directive was not much different from the military policy issued in 1982 which stated that “homosexuality is incompatible with military service” (Woodruff, W. A. 1995).

An examination of the rhetoric of selected sections of the chapters of the RAND document are compared with selected statements from Congressional debates on the subject at issue and oral testimony from selected military personnel and from former military personnel to ascertain why the RAND document was not accepted at face value, recommending the gays be allowed to openly serve in the military. Listing each section of the RAND document for key words and phrases and examining the rhetoric and the impact of the selected testimonies and comparing the verbiage of the report with the verbiage of oral statements and testimonies will illuminate the strengths and weaknesses of the efforts of the way and how we communicate through technical media.

RAND Report Executive Summary, Implication Issues

The section, “Implications Issues,” of the Executive Summary presents the overall findings of the research conducted by the RAND team about the impact of allowing homosexuals to serve in the military. The section was chosen due to its culmination of the research conducted. The section was examined for both negative and positive connotations in the rhetoric and whether that rhetoric was thought to inform, instruct, or persuade the audience toward the idea or conclusion presented. Table 2 provides the results of this section’s examination and analysis.

The section begins by providing bulleted points that highlight the current military policy, the potential issues that might arise, and suggestions for addressing and resolving those issues. The report is concerning homosexuals in the military; therefore, a reasonable expectation for the term “homosexual” is assumed. This brief section only makes reference to homosexuals, sodomy, or the phrase “sexual orientation” three times. While only three occurrences of those words are evident in this section of the document, they are provided in a negative context. The word heterosexual is not found in this section.

Next, words indicating a positive reference concerning the issue addressed were identified. The use of terms, such as “key,” “successful,” “reassurance,” “consistent,” and “empowered” provided an upbeat outlook to the findings and provided a positive slant for a part of the section. These positive words occurred eight times.

The identification of negative words and phrases was conducted. Selecting words such as “opposing,” “behavioral dissent,” “will not be permitted,” “stressful,” “draw

down,” and the like occurred fourteen times, putting the remainder of this section in a very negative tone.

Table 2. Executive Summary Analysis

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual/sodomy/sexual orientation	Inform	3	Negative
Heterosexual		0	
Key, successful, reassurance, consistently, empowered	Inform	8	Positive
Opposing, behavioral dissent, will not be permitted, stressful, draw down, declining, not germane, tolerant	Inform	14	Negative

RAND Report Chapter One, Sexual Orientation and the U.S. Military Policy: Policy Options and Assessment—Study Overview: Implications of the Research

This concluding section of Chapter One provides some interesting insights. Table 3 provides an illustration of the words and impact of the rhetoric used in this section. The word “homosexual” and phrase “sexual orientation” are used most frequently. With the word “sodomy,” the terms “homosexual” and “sexual orientation” have over forty-three occurrences in this concluding section alone. All of the occurrences are in conjunction with a negative slant or statement about homosexuals.

The term “heterosexual,” is used three times, each time with a positive slant. Words of support or encouragement within this section are “assuring,” “successful implementation,” “promising,” and “effective,” “teaching tolerance or sensitivity,” “psychological safety,” messages of reassurance,” “empowered,” “useful,” “consistent,” and “empirical research.” The occurrence of these type words happened twenty times.

The use of these words was to help inform and persuade the reader to look at the inclusion of homosexuals in military service as a positive thing.

The use of negative words, whether the intent was positive or negative, provide the reader with a negative frame of mind. Words such as “not,” “resistance,” “incompatible,” “hostile,” and “harassment” are used forty-seven times in this ten-page section. The purpose of this section was to inform the reader of the impact the current military policy has had on the ranks and the potential impact a new policy might have. Yet, the potential impact is provided in a negative light.

Table 3. Chapter 1. Implications of the Research

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual orientation	Inform	43	Negative
Heterosexual	Inform	3	Positive
Assuring, successful, few, small, easier, promising, effective	Inform/Persuade	20	Positive
Not, is not, will not, resistance, incompatible, hostile, refuse, harassment, inappropriate, abuse, lack of, punishable	Inform	47	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Two, Sexual Orientation and Sexual Behavior: Conclusion

In Table 4, references to homosexual, sexual orientation, or the often solely contributed homosexual activity—sodomy—is mentioned thirty-three times in this concluding section, while heterosexual is mentioned only four times. This stark contrast is supportive of keeping the ban in place. Again, the use of words to paint a positive slant on the issue, “fortunately,” “exclusively,” and “strong correlation” is overshadowed by the number of words that give a negative impression: “limit,” “cannot,” and “cautious,” which occur 10:17 as evidenced from the corresponding table.

Table 4. Chapter 2. Sexual Orientation and Sexual Behavior

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual orientation	Inform	33	Negative
Heterosexual	Inform	4	Positive
Fortunately, exclusively, higher than, prevalence, strong correlation	Inform/Persuade	10	Positive
Limitations, cannot, not needed, cautiously report, underreported, much smaller, less is known, not synonymous, not identify.	Inform/Persuade	17	Negative

**RAND Report Chapter Three, Analogous Experiences of Foreign Military Service:
An International Comparison**

The information provided in this chapter, which discusses how foreign military services have addressed the issue of homosexuals serving in their respective armies, made references to homosexuals, sexual orientation, or homosexual activities forty-two times. Again, all of the contexts in which the words “homosexual” or similar words or phrases are used are only used in negative connotations. The report’s use of words to invoke feelings of positivity for this section equal twenty-four. However, again, the words used which invoke negative images number thirty.

Table 5. Chapter 3. An International Comparison

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual orientation	Inform	42	Negative
Heterosexual	Inform	2	Positive
Tolerated, majority, change, acceptance, appropriate, choice, comfortable, benefit, effective, strong, acceptable, etc.	Inform/Persuade	24	Positive
Not, problem, disruption, clash, prohibit, deviation, none, minority.	Inform/Persuade	30	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Four, Analogous Experience of Domestic Police and Fire Departments: Implications for Implementing Policies of Non-discrimination

Chapter Four of the RAND report provides the reader with a summary of the findings from interviewing personnel from the police and fire departments of six major cities in the United States. Including statements from police officers and firefighters, the chapter provides information based on people who work with homosexuals. Not unexpected was the number of references to the homosexual population and or homosexual activities. One of the highest number of references, twenty-three, populates this section of Table 6.

With positive references about gays' service in the police and fire departments at twenty-seven, with words such as "support," "acceptance," and "privilege," this report is not necessarily overshadowed by the negative words as has normally been done previously. The occurrence of negative words such as "stereotypes" or "hostile" are only twenty-six, one less than the positive occurrences as illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6. Chapter 4. Implications for Implementing Policies of Non-discrimination

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual Orientation, HIV/AIDS	Inform	23	Negative
Heterosexual	Inform	4	Positive
Support, insight, effectively, agreed permit, good, privilege, acceptance, essential.	Inform/Persuade	27	Positive
Stereotypes, not, inconsistent, hostile, offend, harassment, etc.	Inform/Persuade	26	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Five, Potential Insights from Analogous Situations:

Integrating Blacks into the U.S. Military, Implications Allowing Acknowledged Homosexuals to Serve in the Military

Since the U.S. military had previously undertaken the task of integrating a people group, African-Americans, into their service, this chapter makes the analogy of using similar approach and techniques to integrate another people group, homosexuals, into their ranks. What is interesting to note is the few references to homosexuals or homosexual behavior: nine references only. While all of these references are in a negative context, the fewer number, in and of itself, is positive because it does not constantly remind the reader of the negative connotation the report so often employs. Heterosexual references are only two.

The positive wording in this section includes “change,” “strong,” and “vigilant,” among the many words. This, again, provides a bright and positive framework for the reader. A total of fourteen occurrences not only provide critical information about the possible implications for allowing acknowledged homosexuals to serve in the military but also make an effort to convince and persuade the reader that these positive aspects of this part of the recommendation outweighs the negative aspect. Even though more negative

occurrences are found than positive ones, the inclusion of these selected words “swift,” “focus,” and “clear” come together in this section of the report to provide a more substantial foundation for a positive consideration of the issue.

Table 7. Chapter 5. Implications Allowing Acknowledged Homosexuals to Serve in the Military

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual orientation	Inform	9	Negative/Positive
Heterosexual	Inform	2	Positive
Change, strong, vigilant, clear, swift, focus, effective,	Inform/Persuade	14	Positive
Resistance, opposed, non-compliance, against, destroy.	Inform/Persuade	19	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Six, Relevant Public Opinion, General Conclusions on Public Opinion

The RAND report took into consideration the public’s view toward homosexuality and having homosexuals openly serve in the country’s armed forces. The culmination of the information gathered through surveys and interviews is addressed in this section of Chapter Six. With nineteen occurrences of the word or term “homosexual,” “sodomy,” or “sexual orientation,” the public provided compelling evidence for keeping the ban in place. In fact, no references to “heterosexual,” “heterosexual sex activity,” or “heterosexual/homosexual activity” were mentioned in this survey (the subject will come up in the testimony given before Congress).

Words of support for the positivity of the survey and a leniency toward homosexuals serving in the military is mentioned eleven times. Words “acceptable,” “supportive,” and “majority” among the reporting of the survey results provide an encouraging aspect to the report and the research efforts used to obtain the information.

In Table 9, a listing of the occurrences of negatively charged words indicate, again, the overall connotation of this section of Chapter Six of the report is negative.

Table 8. Chapter 6. General Conclusions on Public Opinion

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual orientation	Inform	19	Negative
Heterosexual		0	Positive
Majority, acceptable, supportive, equal rights, allow	Inform/Persuade	11	Positive
Disapprove, difficult, wrong, weakens, less, incompatible, etc.	Inform/Persuade	15	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Seven, Relevant Military Opinion: Conclusions

The Conclusions section of Relevant Military Opinion, Chapter Seven, provides strong evidence of the U.S. military’s dislike and distrust of the possibility of a change in the current policy regarding homosexuals in the military. Again, the number of times the word “homosexual” is mentioned in this section is thirteen, and with negative regards, while the word “heterosexual” is mentioned only once and positively.

While the words to indicate positivity—“diverse,” “proud,” “confident,” “strong,”—occur sixteen times throughout the section, the occurrences to the negative aspects of this issues are more than twice the negative, forty-five. Overwhelmingly, words such as, “conflict,” “difficulty,” “deviation,” and “opposed” appear throughout this section relating soldiers’ responses to the thought of lifting the ban. Couple those words with the fact that these responses are coming from the very men and women who serve in the military, and those words provide an added foundation of support negatively impacting the proposed lifting of the ban. Table 9 illustrates this point.

Table 9. Chapter 7. Relevant Military Opinion: Conclusions

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy. sexual orientation	Inform	13	Negative
Heterosexual	Inform	1	Positive
Diverse, successful, proud, confident, value, can do, strong.	Inform/Persuade	16	Positive
Conflict, problems, uncertain, reluctant, strayed, consequence, difficulty, could not, deviation, opposed..	Inform/Persuade	45	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Eight, Issues of Concern: Effect of Allowing Homosexuals to Serve in the Military on the Prevalence of HIV/AIDS: Conclusions

Prior to the time during which the research for the RAND report was conducted, the AIDS epidemic had been on everyone’s mind since the first case was reported in 1981 (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2021). Therefore, the results of this section’s analysis are not surprising. References to homosexuals and/or HIV/AIDS numbered fourteen in this brief report. No references were made to “heterosexual” activity or behavior.

Very few positive things were related in this section, with the only two words of positivity being “increase” and “potential.” The military was certainly concerned about the prevalence of the disease occurring among the troops by removing the ban and allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military. With only three references to those two words, the seriousness of this consideration is underscored.

Conversely, negative influencing words “infected,” “discharged,” “serious,” and “not possible” are strong words and are found ten times within this very short narrative section (see Table 10).

Table 10. Chapter 8. Issues of Concern: HIV/AIDS: Conclusions

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual Orientation, HIV/AIDS	Inform	14	Negative
Heterosexual		0	
Increase, potential	Inform/Persuade	3	Positive
Infected, discharged, not possible, serious.	Inform/Persuade	10	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Nine, Issues of Concern: Anti-Homosexual Violence:

Conclusions

Another concern researchers learned was the military’s fear of physical violence being inflicted upon homosexuals who were open about their sexuality among the troops. The use of words labelling homosexuals, to include “anti-homosexual,” had only seven occurrences. No references were made to or about “heterosexuals.”

Positive references “exclusively,” “sufficient,” or “high rate” only numbered four, while words like “failure,” “violence” “victim,” and “penalties” numbered sixteen. The rate of negative against positive was four times, a very high rate, 8-to-1 negative to positive.

Table 11. Chapter 9. Anti-Homosexual Violence: Conclusions

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual. sodomy, sexual Orientation, anti-homosexual	Inform	7	Negative
Heterosexual	Inform	0	
Exclusively, sufficient, regularly, high rate	Inform/Persuade	4	Positive
Failure, violence, victim, penalties, not.	Inform/Persuade	16	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Ten, What is Known About Unit Cohesion and Military Performance: Conclusions

This chapter presents positive arguments for integrating homosexuals into the military. References to and about homosexuals, to include other references related directly to homosexual behavior and sexual identity, occurred seventeen times in this conclusion. The term “heterosexual” had only four occurrences. Words indicating positivity toward the issue, “potential,” “beneficial,” “reliable,” and “cohesion,” “values” occurred twenty-seven times, providing strong, positive support to the issues of homosexuals serving openly. Interjected throughout this conclusion were words, “problems,” “insurmountable,” “ostracism,” and “dangerous consequences,” among others, totaling to thirty-six occurrences in this section (see Table 12). The margin between negative words and positive words is only nine occurrences, a small number by comparison.

Table 12. Chapter 10. Unit Cohesion and Military Performance: Conclusions

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual orientation	Inform	17	Negative
Heterosexual	Inform	4	Positive
Potential, effect, can, beneficial, reliable, cohesion, important, competence, values.	Inform/Persuade	27	Positive
Groundless, problems, concern, insurmountable, no direct, ostracism, dangerous consequences, conflict.	Inform/Persuade	36	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Eleven, Sexual Orientation and the Military: Some Legal Considerations: Conclusions

Table 13 presents the occurrences for this chapter on legal considerations suggested for the U.S. military to consider if the proposed policy changes were to become a reality. From the opening sentence of this conclusion, the audience encounters many, many negative words and phrases about integrating homosexuals into the military. While only eight occurrences to “homosexuals” or “sexual orientation” in this section, and only one reference to “heterosexual,” the negative impact is far greater than the previous chapter.

Words indicating positivity about the subject matter—“defensible,” “persuasive,” and “survive,”—number thirteen, small amount compared to the use of negative implications from words “threat,” “undermine,” “red herring,” and “absent,” which total thirty-two occurrences, giving dramatic emphasis to the negative legal outcomes possible from lifting the ban.

Table 13. Chapter II. Legal Considerations: Conclusions

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual orientation	Inform	8	Negative
Heterosexual	Inform	1	Positive
Defensible, persuasive, withstand, survive, rational.	Inform/Persuade	13	Positive
Threat, undermine, red herring, no appellate, ban, absent.	Inform/Persuade	32	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Twelve, Implementing Policy Change in Large

Organizations: Conclusions

Suggestions presented for the military to make changes in the current policy on homosexuals serving in the military are provided in Chapter Twelve of the RAND report. While the section offers specific, methodical steps for changing the procedure of a large organization, it does so by employing words and phrases that provide a “less painful” read to integrating homosexuals into the military. The employing of the terms “homosexual,” “sexual orientation,” and “sexual identity” occurs five times with the term, “heterosexual” not occurring at all.

The positive words and phrases used in this conclusion, such as “success,” “importance,” “fairness,” and “support,” are used thirty-six times. This outnumbers the frequency of negative words “antagonism,” “discrimination,” and “failure,” and more by twelve occurrences for a total of twenty-four. The abundance of positive references provides the read that it is possible to integrate homosexuals with little adverse repercussions (see Table 14).

Table 14. Chapter 12. Implementing Policy Change: Conclusions

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual/sodomy/sexual orientation	Inform	5	Negative
Heterosexual		0	
Success, importance, fairness, support, compliance.	Inform/persuade	36	Positive
Antagonism, discrimination, eroded, criticized, failure, violated.	Inform/persuade	24	Negative

RAND Report Chapter Thirteen, Potential Effects on Military Recruitment and Retention: Policy Implications

The final chapter to the RAND report provides the impetus for moving the policy change forward. Referring to “homosexuals” only five times and making no references to “heterosexual,” the section on Policy Implications wastes no time in making the point that there is no “empirical evidence” that would suggest allowing homosexuals into the military would be detrimental to the military and the United States security. Again, the low number of occurrences of “homosexual” among this conclusion of Chapter Thirteen indicates that although these references are in the negative, the number of occurrences suggest a positive overall impact.

The number of occurrences of words used to imply positive slant on the findings is less than that of words used to imply negative. Words such as “permitted,” “importance,” “lifting the ban,” and “positive” number twenty-six. Within the body of Policy Implications, the use of words implying a negative note to the conclusion, “no firm evidence,” “unaffected,” “impinge, and “retention” number thirty-nine. The majority of negative words in this conclusion could leave the reader a little confused concerning the support of the RAND report for the President’s Executive Directive.

Table 15. Chapter 13. Recruitment and Retention: Policy Implications

Word(s)/Phrase(s)	Purpose	Occurrences	Analysis/Impact
Homosexual, sodomy, sexual orientation	Inform	5	Negative
Heterosexual	NA	0	
Permitted, importance, consideration, lifting the ban, job security, quality of life, positive.	Inform/Persuade	26	Positive
No firm evidence, unaffected, removing restriction, impinge, unknowable, retention, limited, decrease.	Inform/Persuade	39	Negative

Congressional Record, February 4, 1993: Discussion of Section 1: Review of Department of Defense Policy Concerning Service of Homosexuals in the Armed Services, The Senate Chamber

On February 4, 1993, the U.S. Senate took up the issue of the Presidential Memorandum of January 29, 1993, directing Defense Secretary Les Aspin to provide information to him for his Executive Directive concerning changing the policy of the service of homosexuals in the Armed Forces of the United States. The Congressional Record of the 103rd Congress provided a hard copy of the speeches each Senator gave that day in support of two proposed amendments to the current military policy regarding homosexual service in the military. The speeches may be found on pages 2167 – 2190 in the Congressional Record – Senate, February 4, 1993 (pkisupport@gpo.gov). An examination of the speeches made on the Senate floor that day provide an understanding of the compromise between Congress, the U.S. Military, and the White House administration, which came to be known as “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” a slight change from the 1981 policy that stated, “homosexuality is incompatible with military service” (Naval Institute Staff 2018).

During the session, a total of twenty-one Senators spoke either for or against, based on party lines. One distinction, however, was that not every Senator from the President’s political party fully supported his policy change or his method used to bring about proposing the change to the military policy concerning the service of homosexuals in the military. Breaking down each Senator’s speech, using the criteria for the RAND report will provide an understanding of the contributions leading to a compromise of the president’s proposed changes in policy. Table 17 provides this analysis of information.

After examining the speeches of the twenty-one Senators for references to the homosexual community, homosexual activities, sexual orientation, heterosexuals, religion, statements, or phrases indicating support for the original military policy and/or support for the proposed change to the policy, it was evident that support in favor of the amendments, either the Dole amendment to keep current policy or the Mitchell amendment to change the policy, ran directly along party lines with the Dole amendment favored by the Republicans and the Mitchell favored by the Democrats.

References to homosexuals, gays, lesbians, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS, same sex, and male on male sex were made 278 times from the twenty-one Senators, an average of ten references about homosexuals per Senator. Only one Senator, Smith, made two references to heterosexuals in contrast to homosexuals. Families looking to Congress for moral leadership, moral traditions, and discrimination based upon religion was mentioned twelve times. The references to religion could be construed as an involvement of religion in the affairs of Congress.

References supporting the 1981 military policy that states “homosexual activity is incompatible with the military” occurred 189, with more references put forth by Senators Wallop, Murkowski, and Nickles. Mr. Wallop reminded the Senate that many of them had not served in the military and President Clinton has not served in the military; therefore, they lack the understanding of the very nature of serving in close quarters and needing to trust your fellow soldier with your life. Mr. Wallop alluded to giving more credence to those people providing testimony from those who have previous military service. Senator Murkowski reminded the Senators that serving in the military is not a right, not just for anyone who decides one day they want to “play army,” but a privilege.

This privilege is why the military has criteria for entering into service and the homosexual lifestyle does not fit those criteria. Senator Heflin, a Democrat, cast his support for the original policy.

In voicing support for changing the policy, a total of 208 references were made with Senators Nunn and Glenn providing the most among those points. Senator Nunn makes points about not rushing to judgement but to thoroughly examine the issues inherent with the current policy and proposed changes. He draws examples from the previous sexual harassment scandal, Tailhook, and the U.S. Navy's reaction by announcing a new policy with regard to sexual harassment and other aggressive behaviors. Senator Glenn draw upon his experiences in the military to provide perspective and to encourage support of the Mitchell amendment, requiring investigation before voting on the matter.

Table 16. Policy Input from Selected Senators, February 4, 1993

Senator	Reference to Homosexuals	References to Heterosexuals	References to Religion	References in Support of Original Policy	References in Support of Policy Change
Dole – R	6	0	0	0	0
Mitchell – D	4	0	0	0	0
Coats – R	3	0	4	15	0
Smith – R	24	2	0	8	0
Nunn – D	56	0	0	0	105
Cohen – R	7	0	1	4	0
Wallop – R	24	0	0	33	0
Murkowski – R	34	0	0	23	0
Exon – D	7	0	0	0	13
Heflin – D	6	0	0	20	0
Braun – D	25	0	0	0	15
Lott – R	13	0	0	11	0
Feinstein – D	9	0	0	0	9
Glenn – D	8	0	0	0	40
Gorton – R	0	0	0	14	0
Boxer – D	7	0	0	0	16
Gramm – R	8	0	4	18	0
Nickles – R	27	0	0	31	0
Wellstone – DFL	3	0	3	0	10
Warner – R	7	0	0	12	0
	278	2	12	189	208

Selected Testimonies Given Before Congress, May 11 & 12, 1993 Given in Consideration of the Proposed Lifting of the Ban Prohibiting Homosexuals from Openly Serving in the U.S. Armed Forces

During 1993, the Senate Armed Services Committee held debates and hearings about lifting the ban prohibiting homosexuals from openly serving in the Armed Forces. One of these hearings was held in May of 1993. Over two days, testimony was heard concerning a change in military policy of 1981. Members of this Senate committee were Sam Nunn,- D (Chairman), representing the majority party (Democrat) James Exon, Carl Levin, Edward Kennedy, Jeff Bingaman, John Glenn, Richard Shelby, Robert Byrd, Bob Graham, Charles Robb, Joseph Lieberman and Richard Bryan. Members from the minority party (Republican) were Strom Thurmond, John Warner, William Cohen, John

McCain, Trent Lott, Dan Coats, Bob Smith, Dirk Kempthorne, Lauch Faircloth, Kay Baily Hutchison. Arnold Punaro and Richard Reynard, Staff Director for the Majority and Minority, respectively. Members of President's cabinet, high-ranking military officers, and representatives from the army, navy, marine corps, and air force provided personnel accounts of their experiences, considerations, and, for some people, their experiences of separation from the military (C-SPAN 1993).

For this examination, testimonies of Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, Joint Chief of Staff Colin Powell, General Norman Schwarzkopf, Col. Fred Peck, Col. Margarethe Cammermeyer, Chief Petty Officer Steven Amidon, Sergeant Justin Elzie, and Staff Sgt. (Former) Thomas Paniccia will be examined and analyzed. Using a similar grid and criteria, the examination of the testimonies will provide information regarding positive and negative points concerning the issue, words referencing unit cohesion and unit morale, and treatment by the military toward known homosexuals. This information will be compared to information previously discussed in this paper to ascertain weak or damaging rhetoric leading to the compromise of President Clinton's original policy proposal (see Table 17).

The first to testify was Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin. Secretary Aspin's entire testimony was in favor of changing the current policy. During the testimony, thirty-eight references were made concerning homosexuals, sexual orientation, gays, or homosexual orientation. Not all of the references made concerning homosexuals were negative. Some very positive emphases were made about homosexuals serving their country and serving with distinction. Secretary Aspin made two casual references to heterosexuals.

In providing positive support for a change in the military's original policy toward homosexuals, the Defense Secretary provided forty-nine references. He used words such as "new policy is balanced," "major decisive steps," "dealt honestly and constructively," "consulted the Justice Department," and "policy must maintain the high morale and cohesiveness," to emphasize the credibility of the proposed policy change. Secretary Aspin helped the listeners follow his points using ordinal words "first," "second" as he introduced and discussed each facet of the proposed changes.

Secretary Aspin concluded his testimony with words, "I believe . . . the president has achieved most of his goal," and "Under the new policy, they [homosexuals in the military] will have to work to get on the radar screen. That's progress."

After Secretary Aspin's testimony, General Colin Powell was asked to provide his testimony regarding the current policy. The Joint Chief of Staff opened his testimony by relating that he was there representing his JCS colleagues, and he along with all of them, fully supported the president's new policy on homosexuals in the military. In his opening remarks, General Powell made four references to homosexuals or gays, all in a positive light. All total, General Powell made nineteen references to homosexuals and three references to heterosexuals. While he was there in support of President Clinton's proposed policy change, General Powell made references to the current policy by selecting certain elements of the old policy that worked very well. His speaking to "those of us who believe that the presence of open homosexuality would have an unacceptable, detrimental, and disruptive impact on cohesion, morale, and spirit of the armed forces" alludes to the original policy. General Powell also made reference to the original policy when he used the phrases "military exists to fight the nation's wars," "we create cohesive

teams of warriors who bond so tightly that they are prepared to go into battle and give their lives,” and “we cannot allow anything to happen which would disrupt that feeling of cohesion,” to underscore his point that the original policy had some very good aspects.

The references of support for the change in policy occurred nine times throughout General Powell’s testimony. Words and phrases like “an accurate reflection of the society at large,” “successfully mixed rich and poor, black and white, urban and rural,” and “we won’t witch hunt,” pointedly emphasized his support for the proposed changes. General Powell concluded his testimony with words of agreement and support for Secretary Aspin and President Clinton: “I believe . . . displayed a great deal of courage in dealing with the issue head-on and forthrightly. . . I also believe that they have made a correct choice.”

The testimony of General Norman Schwarzkopf was next at this hearing. General Schwarzkopf prefaced his testimony with a statement about his being “misquoted” more about homosexuality in the military. Evoking a laugh from the listeners, perhaps this was a tactic to disarm the audience. Then General Schwarzkopf launched into his testimony, stating his position. In all, the General made twenty-six references in support of the original military policy. Mixed among his points of support General Schwarzkopf made references to homosexuals or homosexual behavior fifteen times. General Schwarzkopf provided testimony that his accusers labeled him a “fascist homophobe” and “gay basher.” However, most of his references about homosexuals were concerning his experiences dealing with homosexuals in the military. The general referred to his observations with phrases “homosexuals in a small unit immediately polarizes that unit,” “homosexuals haven’t served honorably,” and “homosexual polarization occurred, and violence sometimes followed.”

General Schwarzkopf continued his testimony of support for the current policy with phrases, “I completely reject,” “I’m also concerned from the standpoint today in our country we have the finest military units I have seen,” “all volunteer armed forces initiatives,” and “result was top quality recruits.” The General provides an alarm of sorts with the phrase “result of this decrease in quality of enlistees” and “we even retire brilliant, handsome general officers after thirty-five years of service,” referencing his impending retirement, when he wouldn’t be in command.

His testimony draws to a conclusion with “one last point,” of his stand and support of the current policy, mentioning “already overburdened military”: “they oppose allowing homosexuals in the military” providing a serious, cautionary advice to the listeners about what he believes would be disastrous for the military to “accept the lifestyle of a very well-organized, well-financed and very vocal but what turns out to be a very small minority of our society.”

The next person called to provide testimony was Col. Fred Peck. Col. Peck, in his testimony, had forty-two references to homosexuals, the largest number of references to homosexuals among the testimonies given during this hearing. Col. Peck used words “gay men,” “lesbians,” “sexual orientation,” “homophobe,” “coming out of the closet,” and “their personal worth is less.” In making his twenty-six references in support of the original policy, Col. Peck used words and phrases “very best armed forces in the world,” “best military in the world,” “you’re tinkering with a very finely turned and very high-performance machine,” and “fearful of his life” the ban were lifted.

Col. Peck’s testimony was a huge point in favor of maintaining the policy. He then focused on his family and the personal stake he has in keeping the original policy.

Col. Peck admitted, “I’m a father of a homosexual boy” and emphasized his support as he continued, using words such as “I would be very fearful that his life would be in jeopardy from his own troops,” and “something that exists out there . . . people who would put my son’s life at risk in our own armed forces.” Col. Peck brought his testimony to an end with the words “speaking personally about my own son to counsel him not to go into the military.”

Col. Margarethe Cammermeyer testified next. Her very personal testimony referred to homosexuals thirteen times and heterosexuals thirteen times. Col. Cammermeyer’s testimony did not openly or blatantly provide support for changing the policy. She provided, through her testimony, a brief biography of her life, from the time her family immigrated to the United States from Norway, to the time she enlisted in the army, meeting her husband through the army, and adhering to the policies regarding women, women with dependents, and the changes the policies went through during her tenure with the army.

Col. Cammermeyer related her realization of her sexuality and resulting impact on her husband and four sons. She used words to describe her journey like “became very dedicated to how to serve America, “I met my husband to be,” and “was married to an Army officer.” Col. Cammermeyer and her husband each served tours in Vietnam at separate times. Her “seeing some of the horrors of war,” “certain sense of guilt,” and “not having done enough because so many died,” related the beginning of her feelings of being “abandoned.” She related to “feeling extremely fragmented,” her “tremendous personal struggle,” and feeling “something wrong with me.” Phrases to indicate her support of a policy change included “I’ve been a part of the military that had changed

their regulations a number of times . . . I hoped that when my case was looked at that regardless they would see that I was a good soldier,” “discharge proceedings against me,” “I chose to remain,” “challenge” “no one was aware of my sexual orientation,” and “regardless of conduct or without conduct being retained in the military.”

Margarethe Cammermeyer’s feelings of being separated from the military were conveyed when she employed the words and phrases “the regulation does not permit people who say that they are homosexual . . . being retained in the military,” “those of us who have served can continue to do so without loss of their jobs,” and “when I was asked . . . about my sexual orientation . . . it was a very, very painful process.” Col. Cammermery’s testimony contained no fewer than twenty-three references of her feelings regarding being separated from the military.

Chief Petty Officer Steven Amidon testified next. He was adamant in the beginning of his testimony that everyone understood that he was a heterosexual. Throughout his testimony Amidon makes five references to heterosexuals and twenty-one references to homosexuals. Chief Petty Officer Amidon stated his position of support for changes to the current policy. He provided eleven references of support for the change. Amidon used the questions that were brought up by members of the Senate Armed Services Committee in the beginning of the hearing. He used “first,” “secondly,” and “finally” to help listeners follow his points interspersed with examples.

In the beginning of his testimony Amidon said, “I support lifting the ban,” and “I come to you, I come before this committee because I support lifting the ban.” His references of support for the change are evident in the words and phrases “previous testimony has made it clear these individuals [homosexuals] have served . . . with

distinction . . .” In answering the question, “Will the presence of openly gay members disrupt the mission by serving aboard submarines?” Amidon employed words and phrases describing “two shipmates [who] serve their country well,” “perform their duties . . . in a professional manner,” and “neither sailor disrupted the ship’s mission.” He further uses words and phrases, “leadership experience,” “I counselled both sailors,” “entitled to their religious beliefs,” and “for the sake of unit cohesiveness” to emphasize the way he would handle the issues that others were concerned might occur if the policy were changed.

Chief Petty Officer Amidon related the risk he undertook to provide his testimony in favor of policy changes, saying he had to “risk [his] career” and that he had a “lot of other concerns,” indicating that his fellow sailors were not pleased with his posture on the subject. In closing, CPO Amidon used, “don’t ask our sailors to hide their sexual orientation is if it were a dirty secret,” and “the military can more than survive the lifting of this ban . . . with the leadership of our officers . . . the military can thrive.”

The next testimony to be examined is that of Sergeant Justin Elzie. Elzie began his testimony by providing his history in the marine corps, the honors and accolades he had received since boot camp. Sgt. Elize also provided biographical information to frame his testimony with events that influenced his decision to enlist.

Among his seventeen references to homosexuals, Elize began his first reference by informing everyone he was “gay.” He used words “gay,” “homosexual,” “sexual orientation,” and “lesbian” as his references. Elize made no references to heterosexuals. Using words and phrases “I’m here today as a United States Marine who supports a lifting of the ban,” “I have some suggestions,” and “I am not General Schwarzkopf.” He

gave “specifics about how to carry out lifting the ban,” helping emphasize his supportive points in support of policy change. Using cardinal words “one,” “two,” and “three,” Elize made certain the listeners followed his suggestions and rationale behind those suggestions. Employing the phrases “support the chain of command,” “lay the law down,” and “clear and strict rules of conduct need to be enforced fairly and equally for everyone” provided clear understanding of his suggestions and in support of policy change.

Sgt. Elize expressed his feelings about his impending separation from military service. “I am an exemplary marine,” “but because I said three words, I am gay . . . I [will be] discharged from the marine corps.” He further stated “doing [this] to me is wrong,” “I ask all to judge me as those who know me best have judged me as a professional,” and “Senators, to me, being a marine means being a marine first, regardless of sexual orientation.”

The final person providing testimony was Staff Sergeant (former) Thomas Paniccia. He opened his testimony by informing everyone of his discharge for acknowledging he was gay. Paniccia made references to homosexuals a total of fourteen times, including his admission of being discharged because he was gay. He also use the terms “lesbian,” “bisexual Americans,” and “come out of the closet” among his references to homosexuals. Pannicia made three references to heterosexuals. One was in response to his question, “what is a homosexual,” and “what is a heterosexual,” in his explanation that he is an “airman first” and “then a man who is gay.” His next two references were in conjunction with the couple he was befriended by and their son.

SSgt. Panicia’s testimony, while not outwardly supporting the policy change, provided twenty references of his feelings concerning being separated from the air force due to his acknowledging his homosexuality. Words and phrases, “people I worked with did not mind working with me,” “I knew I was still the same person,” “difference was that they were now aware of another facet of my personality,” “I will be the same age as my mother at the time of her death,” “my father does not talk to me,” “disowned me,” “what took me nearly twenty-eight years to come to terms with,” “compromise still forces people like me to live a lie,” and “my actual identity is being taken away, severed” convey his grief at being separated, especially when he is no different from when he joined the air force.

Table 17. Selected Testimonies before Congress, May 11 & 12, 1993

Name	References to Homosexuals/ Activity	References to Heterosexuals/ Activity	References in Support of Original Policy	References in Support of Policy Change	References Concerning Separation from Military
Aspin	38	2	0	49	0
Powell	19	3	6	9	0
Schwarzkopf	15	0	26	0	0
Peck	42	0	26	0	0
Cammermeyer	13	13	0	6	23
Amidon	21	5	0	11	0
Elize	17	0	0	9	27
Panacea	14	3	0	0	20
TOTAL	179	26	58	84	70

The information from this chapter will provide conclusions to learning the strengths and/or weaknesses of the RAND rhetoric, which led to the compromise of President Clinton’s original policy change. These conclusions are presented in the next chapter.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of this paper are simple: the document under consideration offered facts but no momentum nor emotion behind the presentation that might have helped persuade key persons in negotiating a stronger compromise more favorable to the proposed policy change by then-President Clinton. Juxtaposing the content of the RAND document with the transcripts from senatorial debate of February 4, 1993, and transcripts of testimonies provided before the Senate Armed Services Committee of May 11 and 12, 1993, indicate the weaknesses in the rhetoric of the RAND report against the rhetoric of those speeches and testimonies.

The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) conducted on the selected chapters and their concluding sections provided an overall view of the embedded negativity in the document. Critical Discourse Analysis allowed for close scrutiny of the description of the text used, an interpretation of that text, and an explanation of its meaning during that time period. While the purpose of the report, *Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Options and Assessment* was meant to support then President Clinton's proposed change in the Department of Defense Directive 1324.14 to allow homosexuals to serve openly in the U.S. armed forces, it did little to bring about the desired change.

The RAND document, Congressional Hearing testimonies, and Senate debate rhetoric:

- Researched information pertinent to the subject of allowing homosexual citizens to serve openly in the armed forces was presented succinctly and orderly without any bias or prejudice.

- Ethical principles for the profession appear to be closely adhered to by the writers of this document.
- RAND provided information in narrative form, tables, graphics, and ending appendices which allows for a thorough presentation of the facts.
- Except for Chapter 12, Implementing Policy Change in Large Organizations, every chapter, including the Executive Summary, presents findings using cold, neutral, or ambiguous words and phrases.
- The selection of words in this document is important to note:
 - Certain words may make the difference in the outcome of an event or decision.
 - The connotation of certain words impact the reader's emotional connection with the content, and either accepts/rejects proposals, moves forward, or ceases action.
- The RAND document addresses meaning and change
 - The general, overall meaning of the document is simple: here are the facts based on the research, take them or leave them.
 - The lack of change brought about by the document did little to effectuate the desired change of President Clinton.
 - The report presented facts succinctly and with order no weight or emotional emphasis was given to the rhetoric used unlike the oral testimonies and debates.
 - The report provided comparisons and drew conclusions.

- The report, however, does not indicate that it is related to or has any goal other than to present the facts.
- The document does not teach anything and does not add to the current knowledge but only provides foundational and substantiating evidence in support for then President Clinton's policy change.
- The preponderance of the content within the report submitted to Secretary of Defense Les Aspin and to the Senate Subcommittee on Armed Services overwhelmingly states support for changing the policy to allow homosexuals to serve openly in the U.S. Armed Forces.
- The connotation of the words and phrases used was largely negatively interpreted and, therefore, did not provide a strong foundation for a total change in the Department of Defense Directive 1324.14.
- Another important facet was that of emotional impact as conveyed through sound or oral spoken speeches or testimonies.
- The speeches given in the Senate chamber on February 4, 1993, were interspersed with words which conveyed the person's support or condemnation of President Clinton's proposed changes.
 - Words and phrases refer to strong and compassionate pleas to leave current policy as is and not entertain the proposed changes.
 - Negative remarks made about homosexuals and the homosexual community were also used in conjunction with words "incompatible, seriously impairs, exacerbate this hardship and

transgress upon, offensive and corrupt, reckless, callous, brutal,” to indicate a strong desire to keep the ban in place.

The testimonies given before the Senate Armed Services Committee also provided strong emotional testimony.

- Weight and impact of the position of high-ranking military officers, General Norman Schwarzkopf, General Colin Powell, and Colonel Frank Peck led the way with emotional arguments against lifting the ban and in favor of keeping current policy.
- Emotionally charged testimonies from Colonel Margarethe Cammermeyer, CPO Amigo, Sgt. Elize, and Staff Sgt. Paniccia, all gay, either then-current members of the military about to be discharged or already discharged due to their sexual orientation, may have not carried as much weight with members of Congress who attended those hearing as the weight of the outranking military officers.

In considering the lack of impact the RAND document had upon President Clinton’s proposed change in military policy toward gays, the first question that comes to mind is this: What other elements came into play in the rejection of the document and the negotiated compromise resulting in Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell? Perhaps the elements of religion, prejudices, societal pressure, and a type of “good ol’ boys’ club” mentality within the military and government had an impact upon the decision-making process of the negotiations.

The general public and the U.S. military attitude towards homosexuals.

- From the surveys conducted by the RAND researchers, both the American public and the U.S. Armed Forces were in favor of not allowing homosexuals to serve in the military, and some did not want them in mainstream society.
- With the results from the RAND document of public and military opinion running against the homosexuals serving, the opposition had a strong hold to keep policy in place.

Religious influences may also have played a large part in the decision-making process.

- The U.S. Constitution does not mention God.
- Congress has always been overwhelmingly Christian, and roughly nine-in-ten representatives (88%) in Congress identify as Christian.
- Almost all U.S. presidents have been Christian, many either Episcopalian or Presbyterian.
- Roughly half of Americans feel it is either very or somewhat important for a president to have strong religious beliefs.
- Americans are divided on the extent to which the country's laws should reflect Bible teachings.
 - More than six in ten Americans say churches and other houses of worship should stay out of politics.
 - Only about a third of Americans say government policies should support religious values.

- Even though the Supreme Court ruled in 1962 that it is unconstitutional for a teacher to lead a class in prayer at a public school, 8 percent of public-school students ages thirteen to seventeen say they have experienced this.
- The likelihood of the influence of religious upbringing upon the decision-making process involving the subject of homosexuals may have had a negative impact on the negotiations of the proposed policy change.
 - It is ironic that Christian churches profess love of their fellow human being (albeit as long as the fellow human being looks like and acts like their leader), but so many heinous crimes against homosexuals have been committed by members of the Christian faith community (e.g., Westboro Baptist Church, Abiding Truth Ministries, American Family Association, American's for Truth About Homosexuality, Coral Ridge Ministries, Dove World Outreach Center, Faithful Word Baptist Church, Family Research Institute, Heterosexuals Organized for a Moral Environment, National Organization for Marriage, and Traditional Values Coalition, etc.)

The development of communication technology:

- Has allowed religion to permeate its doctrine into the psyche of its membership.
- Prejudicial attitudes and stereotypic beliefs may be reflected in the language and daily conversations of people.

- Social media has brought changes in the attitudes and beliefs of some of those who voraciously use and rely on that platform for their information and these religious posts to social media does have an impact upon the receivers of those messages.
- Communication technology goes toward the impact of religion upon on the debate and the negotiations concerning homosexuals in society during the 1980s and 1990s, and the reason for the formation preconceived negative ideas concerning the LGBTQ community.

Prejudices influence decision-making actions:

- In relation to the positive side of religious decision-making, negative qualities increase. Religious upbringing, doctrine, rituals, and other religious traditions play a significant role in decision-making although subconsciously at times.
- Binding aspects of cultural environment and ethno-psychological features of decision-making connect the influence of religious psychological features to those decision-making aspects.
- Societal pressure weighs heavily in the decision-making process.
 - These societal pressures can be witnessed through social and/or religious groups:
 - Women’s organizations of towns or villages, such as the one in the DreamWorks Pictures and Touchstone released motion picture, *The Help*, based on the play by the same name written by Kathryn Stockett,

- Men's organizations:
 - The Petroleum Club,
 - The American Freedom Party,
 - Council of Conservative Citizens,
 - National Association for the Advancement of White People,
 - The Marines Memorial Club,

Other similar organizations provide a place for “like-minded” people to have a sense of “belonging” and thereby influence members’ decision-making processes.

The size of the report may have been a deterrent in and of itself with its 518-page volume. The fact that much of the report used negative connotations to make its points within the thirteen chapters attests to its lack of acceptance and weighty support of President Clinton’s proposed policy change. Perhaps if a more careful procedure for word selection and sentence composition had been given, the result would have been a powerful substantiation to forming a new policy allowing homosexuals to serve in a military and representing their honest, authentic selves.

6. IMPLICATIONS

The examination of the 1993 RAND document concludes that the presentation of facts relating to President Clinton's desire to lift the ban and allow homosexuals to serve openly in the armed forces was presented logically and with substantiating information to support the findings and recommendations made within the report. Those findings were not fully supported by Congress and military officials is evidenced by the slight difference from the original policy. This slightly different policy came to be known as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." The lack of full acceptance of the research conducted by RAND on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, the Senate Subcommittee on Armed Services, and the president of the United States showed that either the research was not strong, or the rhetoric used to communicate the research was weak. The examination and analyses conducted on selected sections of the RAND document revealed a negative connotation of words and phrases used in presenting the research. The written document was considered along with the oral debates from the Senate chamber and the oral testimonies of high-ranking military officers both on active duty and discharged from the Armed Forces. The final result was a change in the original policy prohibiting homosexuals from serving in the military, to just don't ask if one is homosexual. If one was learned to having engaged in homosexual behavior, the punishment was immediate—dishonorable discharge—even if the person had an exemplary service record. Previous policy was that recruits or enlistees could be asked if they had homosexual tendencies. This subtle change in the policy continues to cause hundreds of gays to be separated from the military service simply because of their sexual orientation.

This study had two limitations in conducting the examinations and analyses. Limitations of this study were 1) lack of access to all homosexuals in the military who could have testified positively of their interaction with fellow soldiers and the nonimpact upon unit cohesion and unit morale due to the weight of the penalty they would have suffered had they testified, and 2) documents resulting from the meetings and sessions during the negotiations. The testimonies provided by Generals Schwarzkopf and Powell were largely based on hearsay from other people and at no time did either mention their own known acquaintance with people of the homosexual community. Homosexual members of the armed forces could not volunteer to testify nor admit to anyone within the military community without fear of being discharged immediately. This very act of penalizing people for providing honest testimony naturally deterred many people from coming forward to testify positively about homosexuals serving in the military. Without having necessary top-level, top-secret clearance, access to some information and records was not allowed. Notes from committee meetings, negotiations between various groups, administration, Congress, and the military were not provided to learn of discussions during those negotiating sessions.

Recordings of the testimonies before Congress were grainy and sometimes inaudible. Technology in 1993 relied on a computer transcribing words spoken. Differing accents caused the computer to transcribe a word that was not spoken but was “interpreted” to be the word. This created problems in transcribing the exact words of the oral testimonies.

As a result of this examination and analysis several questions arise for the technical communications profession and professionals.

1. If President Clinton requested researched information to support his desired policy for lifting the ban against homosexuals openly serving in the military, as technical communicator, did RAND have an obligation to provide a document not only of information but presented in a manner to withstand scrutiny of emotional diatribes from Congress and the military?
2. Did the length of the RAND report actually act as a deterrent from fully reading and understanding the content? Do technical communicators need to monitor and suggest proper length of a document in order to facilitate quick and easy understanding and comprehension of content? (Psychologically, what is the word length an average adult will spend actually reading information from a document before ending actual processing and continued engagement of the document?)
3. As a profession, do technical communicators have a responsibility to simply write or transcribe technically the content of the task at hand or should the professional seek to incorporate nuances inherent or necessary to achieve the author's desired audience response? Do technical communicators have an obligation or a responsibility to convey strong emotion through the written word?
4. How can technical communication professionals incorporate emotional emphasis into a document to have the same significant impact as verbal, emotional statements upon the audience, like those provided to Congress through testimony, speech, or presentation? Is it a matter of word selection? Is it a matter of graphic manipulation using ALL CAPS, **bold type**, **OR**

BOTH? Do those cosmetic manipulations of type convey the true emotions desired by the author?

Technical communication is an ever-growing professional field and continues to strive to improve the ever-broadening field of work and study. In a critical area such as national policy, the technical communicator conveys the intended message of the author to the intended audience. The author may desire that the message be conveyed with as much emotional emphases as possible. Herein lies the problem, a problem for future research.

The simple, yet concise and succinct presentation of facts and figures as found in the RAND document do convey the information as the research revealed. This document was to be used to bring about support for changing a Department of Defense Directive. It did not. Could the report have been written differently to convey the emotion or the plea to invoke change of this very volatile subject?

The experiences and influence of social, cultural, and religious childhood upbringing do influence our perspectives upon the world. Peeling away these layers of influence to present the actual truth or to view information in the clear light free from bias and prejudice is ideal. Yet, do we as a powerful influence upon readers have an obligation to write and communicate without those biases and prejudices? People of minority groups, and the homosexual community is part of the minority groups, can only move forward and gain equal access in all areas of life if information is communicated accurately without influence of religion, culture, or social class.

The field of technical communication is expanding, especially with technology improvements, and providing more devices over which communication may occur. The

need for more people in this field also increases. The complexities of communicating in this field should cause us to continuously execute our jobs with the utmost of care, integrity, and honesty. Learning how to become more persuasive with more than words is an area ripe for investigating further.

REFERENCES

- Agboka, G. (2013). Participatory localization: A social justice approach to navigating unenfranchised/disenfranchised cultural sites. *Technical Communication Quarterly* (22)3, 28-49.
- Agboka, G. (2012). Liberating intercultural technical communication from “large culture” ideologies: Constructing culture discursively. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* (42)2, 159-181.
- ACLU. (2021). Religious Freedom. Retrieved from:
<https://www.aclu.org/issues/religious-liberty>
- Adler, B. (2010, December 22). Looking beyond don't ask, don't tell. *Newsweek*. Retrieved from: <https://www.newsweek.com/looking-beyond-don-t-ask-dont-tell-68959>
- Alsohaibani, Ali. (2017). Influence of religion on language use: A sociopragmatic study on the influence of religion on speech acts performance. Master's thesis. University of East Anglia. EThOS. Retrieved from:
https://www.ueaeprints.uea.ac.uk/id/eprint/66553/1/Ali%27s_thesis-final_version.pdf
- Alvernia University. (2019, February 19). The Agenda-Setting theory in mass communication. Retrieved from: <https://www.online.alvernia.edu/articles/agenda-setting-theory/>
- American Psychological Association. (2021, October 29). APA apologizes for longstanding contributions to systemic racism. Retrieved from:
<https://www.apa.org/news/press/release/2021/10/apology-systemic-racism>

- American Psychological Association. (2010). Guidelines for Psychological Practice With lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Clients. Retrieved from:
<https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/amp-a0024659.pdf>
- American Psychological Association. (2006, April). Rethinking racial stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. Retrieved from:
<https://www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2006/04/maddox>
- Association for Psychological science. (2011, December 19). Research States that prejudice comes from a basic human need and way of thinking. Retrieved from:
<https://www.psychologicalscience.org/news/releases/research-states-that-prejudice-comes-from-a-basic-human-need-and-way-of-thinking.html>.
- Azerrad, D. (2015, December 15). What the Constitution Really Says About Race and Slavery. The Heritage Foundation. Retrieved from: www.heritage.org/the-constitution/commentary/what-the-constitution-really-says-about-race-and-slavery.
- Baer, S. (1992, November 11). Clinton reaffirms his promise to end military's ban on gays. Retrieved from: <https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/bs-epm-1992-11-12-199217161-story.html>
- Barkawi, T. Dandeker, C., Wells-Petry, M., & Kier, E. (1999). Rights and Fights: Sexual Orientation and Military Effectiveness. *International security* (24)1, 181-201.
- Barrios, B. (2004). Of flags: Online queer identities, writing classrooms, and action horizons. *Computers and Composition* (21)2004 341-361. Doi: 10.1016/j.compcom.2004.05.003

- Baume, M. (2021, September 2). It's been 243 years since the first man was thrown out of the army for being gay. Retrieved from:
<https://www.hornet.com/stories/hotthold-enslin-gay-colonial-america/>
- Belkin, A. (2003). Don't ask, don't tell: Is the gay ban based on military necessity. *The U.S. Army War College Quarterly, Parameters* (33)2, 108-119. Retrieved from:
<https://www.comnetwork.org/resources/dismantling-don't-ask-don't-tell>
- Belkins, A., and Gibbons, S. (2021). Case study: Dismantling "don't ask, don't tell". *The Communications Network*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.comnetwor.org/resources/dismantling-don't-ask-don't-tell/>
- Bergh, R., and Akrami, N. (2017). Generalized prejudice: Old wisdom and new perspectives. In Sibley and Barlow (Eds.). *The Cambridge handbook of the psychology of prejudice*, 2017 (p. 441).
- Berman, R. (2014, October 10). The awkward Clinton-era debate over don't ask, don't tell. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/10/the-awkward-clinton-era-debate-over-don't-ask-don't-tell/381374/>
- Blakemore, E. (2020, February 6). The revolutionary war hero who was openly gay. Retrieved from: Retrieved from <https://www.history.com/news/openly-gay-revolutionary-war-hero-friedrich-von-steuben>.
- Bodenhausen, G. V., and Wyer, Jr. R. S. (2014). Effects of stereotypes on decision making and information-processing strategies. In Kerry Kamakari (Ed.). *The psychology of prejudice* (pp. 295-321). Sage. Los Angeles.

Bowers v. Hardwick. 478 U.S. 186. Retrieved from:

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/478/186>.

Brekke, Kira. (2015, October 13). How WWII started the modern gay rights movement.

Huffpost. Retrieved from: https://www.huffpost.com/entry/modern-gay-rights-movement-wwii_n_561d103ce4b0c5a1ce607d4b

Brodeur, N. (2017, October 10). The women who helped end “don’t ask, don’t tell is telling her own story now. *Seattle Times*. Retrieved from

<https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/the-woman-who-helped-end-dont-ask-dont-tell-is-telling-her-own-story-now/>

Bronski, M. (2011). *A queer history of the United States*. Beacon Press. Boston.

Burch-Brown, J. and Baker, W., Religion and reducing prejudice. (2016, March 9). *Sage Journals*. (19)6, 784-807. Retrieved from:

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1368430216629566>

Burrelli, D. F. (2010, October 14). Don’t ask, don’t tell: military policy and the law on same-sex behavior. Retrieved from: <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/R40782.pdf>

Byard, E. (1997). *A Timeline of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History in the United States*. www.pbs.org/outofthepast. Retrieved from: <https://gsafewi.org/we-content/uploads/US-LGBT-Timeline-UPDATED.pdf>.

Case Western Reserve University. (2021). *Sexual Orientation Myths & Facts*. Retrieved from: <https://www.case.edu/lgbt/safe-zone/sexual-orientation-myths-facts>

- Castor, C. and Goldbach, J. (2018, August 28). A brief history of lgbt military policy and improving acceptance, integration and health among lgbt service members. Retrieved from: <https://dwarakpeck.usc.edu/news/brief-history-of-ligt-military=poliicy=and-improvoing-acceptance-integration-and-health-among>
- Collins, A. (2003), Jan. 5). Uniform discrimination: “The don’t ask, don’t tell” policy of the U.S. military. Retrieved from: <https://www.hrw.org/report/2003/01/95/uniform-discrimination-dont-ask-dont-tell-policy-us-military#>
- Cook, K. C. (2000). Writers and their maps: The construction of a GAO report on sexual harassment. *Technical communication Quarterly* (9)1, 53-76. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10572250009364685>
- Cox, M. (2019). Working closets: Mapping queer professional discourse and why professional communication studies need queer rhetorics. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* (33)1, 1-25
- Croft, L. (2015). Same-sex sexual assault in the military. (Master’s Thesis, University of Central Florida), Orlando, Florida, USA. Retrieved from: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?refer=&httpsrediiir-1&article-2700&context-honorsthesis1990-2015>
- C-SPAN. (1993). Homosexuals in the Military, Part 1. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span/video/?40573-1/homosexuals-military-part-1>.
- C-SPAN. (1993). *Homosexuals in the military, part 1*. <https://www.c-span.org/video/?46104-1/homosexuals-military-part-1&showFullAbstract=1>

Cuthbertson, W. (2010, September 30). The long debate over “don’t ask, don’t tell.”

Retrieved from: <https://cubgovpubs.bolgsport.com/2010/09/long-debate-over-dont-ask-dont-tell-html>

Davis, R J. (2018), April). 7 Ways unconscious bias impacts your daily interactions at work. *Learnlight*. Retrieved from:

<https://insights.learnligh.com/en/articles/unconscious-bias-impacts-work/>

Dawson, S. (2015, September 8). The Religious Resurgence: Problems and Opportunities for International Relations Theory. *E-International Relations*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.e-ir.info/2015/09/08/the-religious-resurgence-problems-and-opportunities-for-international-relations-theory/>

De La Garza, A. (2018, July 19). “Don’t ask, don’t tell” was a complicated turning point for gay rights. 25 Years later, many of the same issues remain. Retrieved from:

<https://time.com/5339634/dont-ask-dont-tell-25-year-anniversary/>

Douglas, C. (2021). Impact of religion on society. *Imbas*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.imbas.org/impact-of-religion-on-society/>

Dubill, N. (2017). Homosexuality and the U.S. military. Retrieved from:

<https://medium.com/lgbttq-american-hisotry-for-the-people-and-the-us-military-aea79cae740c>

Eagly, A. H. and Steffen, V. J. (2014). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. In Keri Kamakari (Ed.). *The psychology of prejudice* (pp. 111-141). Sage. Los Angeles.

Eaklor, V. (2011). *Queer America: A people’s lgbt history of the United States*. New York: Press People’s History. Howard Zinn, Series Editor. New York.

- Edenfield, A., Holmes, S., & Colton, J. (2019). Queering Tactical Technical Communication: DIY HRT. *Technical Communication Quarterly* 28(3) 177-191.
- Engardio, J. (2013, May 20). How Eisenhower's ban on gays backfired. *Column*. Retrieved from: <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2013/05/20/gay-bashing-like-ikecolumn/2343963/>
- Evans, R. (2017). U.S. military policies concerning homosexuals. Development, Implementation and Outcomes. Report prepared for: the Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military. University of California at Santa Barbara. Retrieved from: <https://www.palmcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/evans1.pdf>.
- Fahmy, Dalia. (2020, July 16). 8 facts about religion and government in the United States. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from: <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/07/16/8-facts-about-religion-and-government-in-the-united-states/>
- Feder, J. (2009). Don't ask, don't tell: A legal analysis. Library of Congress Washington DC Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from: <https://www.apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA522906.pdf>.
- Feder, J. (2013, August 6). "Don't ask, don't tell": A legal analysis. Retrieved from: <https://www.sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/R40795.pdf>.
- Fielding, I.R. (1996). Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue: A critical examination. *Journal of gay, lesbian, and bisexual identity* (1)2, 111-127.

- Finlay, B., & Walther, C. S. (2003). The Relation of religious affiliation, service attendance, and other factors to homophobic attitudes among university students. In Sibley and Barlow (Eds) *The Cambridge handbook of the psychology of prejudice*, 2017 (p. 357).
- Fisk, S. T. (2017, October 3). Prejudices in Cultural Contexts" Shared stereotypes (Gender, Age) Versus variable stereotypes (Race, Ethnicity, Religion). Retrieved from: <https://www.journals.sagepub.com/eoi/abs/10.1177/174569167708204>
- Godbeer , R. (2004). Sexual revolution in Early America (Gender Relations in the American Experience). John Hopkins University Press.
- Halley, J. E. (1999). *Don't: A reader's guide to the military's anti-gay policy*. Duke University Press.
- Hari, J. (2011, June 27). The hidden history of homosexuality in the US. Retrieved from <https://www.transend.ort/tms/2011/o6/the-hiddeh-history-of-homosexuality-in-the-us/>
- Herek, G. M. (1993). Sexual orientation and military service: A social science perspective. *American Psychologist*, 48(5), 538-549. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.48.5.538>
- Herek, G. M. (2012). Lesbians and gay men in the U.S. military: Historical background. Retrieved from: https://lgbpsychology.org/html/military_history.html.
- Hierro, V. D., Levy, D., and Price, M. (2016, April 20). We are here: Negotiating difference and alliance in spaces of cultural rhetorics. *Enculturation*. Retrieved from: <https://www.enculturation.net/we-are-here>.

- Howarth, J., Lees, J., Sidebotham, P., Higgins, J., and Imtiaz, A. (2008, November 28). Religion, beliefs and parenting practices. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Retrieved from: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/religion-beliefs-and-parenting-practices>.
- Hubbard, L. R. (2014, December). Religions influence in society. Freedom. Retrieved from: <https://www.freedommag.org/issue/201412-expansion/1-ron-hubbard/religious-influence-in-society.html>
- Huckin, T. (2002). Critical discourse analysis and the discourse of condescension. In, E. Barton and G. Stygall (Editors) *Discourse studies in Composition*.
- Huckin, T., Andrus, J., and Clary-Lemon, J. (2012, September). Critical discourse analysis and rhetoric and composition. National Council of Teachers of English. (64)1, pp. 107-129.
- Huffman, J. F., and Schultz, T. S., Eds. (2012). The end of don't ask, don't tell: The impact in studies and personal essays by service members and veterans. Marine Corps University Press, Quantico Virginia. Retrieved from: https://www.usmcu.edu/Portals/218/HD%20MCUP/MCUP%20Pubs/The%20End%20of%20Don't%20Ask%20Don't%20Tell_Web.pdf?ver-2018-10-11-094152-513
- Human Rights Watch. (2003). Gays and the military before "don't ask, don't tell" Retrieved from: https://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/usa0103/USA0103FINAL-02.htm#P158_20128
- Hunsinger, R. (2019, June 27). Homosexuality in the military Retrieved from: <https://www.goodfellow.af.mil/Newsroom/Article-Display-Article-1888609?homosexuality-in-the-military/>

Institute for the Public Understanding of the Past. (2007). 1807 Commemorated: Critical discourse analysis.

<https://www.archives.history.ac.uk/1807commemorated/media/methods/critical.html>

Jaffe, A. . (2014, June 6). Clinton white house was concerned with healthcare backlash.

Retrieved from: <https://thehil.com/blog-briefing-room/news/208558-clinton-white-house-concerned-witih-health-care-reform-backlash>.

Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education* (18)3, 329-342.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0159630970180302?journalCode=cdis20>

Jones, Dawna. (2014). *Decision making for dummies*. Wiley. New York.

Jones, N., Moore, K., & Walton, R. (2016). Disrupting the past to disrupt the future: An antenarrative of technical communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly* (25)4, 211-229.

Jones, N. and Williams, M.F. (2017). The social justice impact of plain language: A critical approach to plain-language analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communicator* (60)4, 412-429.

Katz, J. N. (1976). Native Americans/gay Americans 1528-1976. Retrieved from:

https://outhistory.org/oldwiki/index.php?title=Native_Americans/Gay_Americans_1528_-_1976

Kawakami, K.(Editor). (2014). *The Psychology of Prejudice (Volumes 1-4)*. SAGE Library in Social Psychology. London.

- Kershaw, M. (2018, August 7). How National Identity Influences US Foreign Policy. E-International Relations. Retrieved from: <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/08/07/how-national-identity-influences-us-foreign-policy/>
- Knickerbocker, B. (2007, December 4). U.S. military more open to gays serving openly. Retrieved from: <https://www.csmonitor.com/2007/1204/p03s01-usmi.html>
- Lawrence v. Texas. 539 U.S. 558 Retrieved from: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/02-102.ZS.html>
- Leach, E.C.D. (2018). Culture, Religion, and Homonegativity. Online Theses and Dissertations 572. Retrieved from: <https://www.encompass.eku.edu.etc/572>
- Literary Devices. (2022). Retrieved from: <https://literarydevices.net/connotation/>
- Log Cabin Republicans v. United States et al. 658 F.3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2011). Retrieved from: <https://www.casetext.com/case/log-cabin-republicans-v-us>
- Los Angeles Times. (1993, June 22). Mystery memo offering compromise on gays in military is making rounds. Baltimore Sun. Retrieved from: <https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/bs-xpm-1993-06-23-1993174214-story.html>
- Love, C. . (2012, May 25). Remembering lgbt history: How world war ii changed gay and lesbian life in America. Retrieved from: <https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2012/5/25/1094817/-Remembering-LGBT-History-How-World-War-II-Changed-Gay-and-Lesbian-Life-in-America>
- Luo, A. (2019, August 23). What is discourse analysis? *Scribbr*. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/discourse-analysis/>
- Maass, A., Salvi, D., Arcuri, L., and Semin, G.(2014). In Kerry Kawakami (Ed.). *The psychology of prejudice* (pp. 293 – 320).

McMurrey, D. (2017). Types of technical documents: Which one is your type? *Prismnet*

<https://www.prismnet.com/~hcexres/textbook/otherep.html>

Melgoza, P. (2021). What is a technical report? Research guides. Texas A & M

University Libraries.

<https://www.tamu.libguides.com/c.php?g=604517&p=4189873>

Meyer, Ilan H. (2011, October 11). The little things: The impact of prejudice in the

everyday lives of lgbt people. *Huffpost*. Retrieved from:

https://www.huffpost.com/entry/lobt-prejudice_b_1004408

Military One Source. (2021, March 19). LGBTQ in the Military: A Brief History, Current

Policies and Safety. Retrieved from: [https://www.militaryonesource.mil/military-](https://www.militaryonesource.mil/military-life-cycle-friends-extended-family/lgbtq-in-the-military/)

[life-cycle-friends-extended-family/lgbtq-in-the-military/](https://www.militaryonesource.mil/military-life-cycle-friends-extended-family/lgbtq-in-the-military/)

National Archives Federal Register. (2021). Amending America: LGBTQ human and

civil rights. Retrieved from: [https://www.archives.gov/amending-](https://www.archives.gov/amending-america/explore/lgbtq-human-and-civil-rights-transcript.html)

[america/explore/lgbtq-human-and-civil-rights-transcript.html](https://www.archives.gov/amending-america/explore/lgbtq-human-and-civil-rights-transcript.html).

National Archives Foundation. (2021). Court-Martial Record of Lieutenant Frederick

Gotthold Enslin, March 10, 1778. Retrieved from: [https://www.](https://www.https://www.archivesfoundation.org/amendingamerica/court-martial-record-lieutenant-frederick-gotthold-enslin-march-10-1778/)

[https://www.archivesfoundation.org/amendingamerica/court-martial-record-](https://www.archivesfoundation.org/amendingamerica/court-martial-record-lieutenant-frederick-gotthold-enslin-march-10-1778/)

[lieutenant-frederick-gotthold-enslin-march-10-1778/](https://www.archivesfoundation.org/amendingamerica/court-martial-record-lieutenant-frederick-gotthold-enslin-march-10-1778/)

National Archives, Truman Library & Museum. (2021). Executive Order 9835, 3 C.F.R.

200 (1954). Retrieved from: [https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/executive-](https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/executive-orders/9835/executive-order-9835)

[orders/9835/executive-order-9835](https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/executive-orders/9835/executive-order-9835).

- National Research Council. (2014). Estimating the Incidence of Rape and sexual Assault. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.17226/18605>.
- Naval Institute Staff. (2018). Key Dates in U.S. Military LGBT Policy. Retrieved from: <https://www.navalhistory.org/2018/03/26/key-dates-in-u-s-military-lgbt-policy>.
- Ng, B.K.L. and Gervais, Will M. (2017). Religion and prejudice. In Chris G. Sibley and Fiona Kate Barlow (Eds). *The Cambridge handbook of the psychology of prejudice* (pp.344-371).
- Nordquist, R. (2018, July 18). The Power of Connotations: Definition and Examples. Thought Co. Retrieved from: [https:// www.thoughtco.com/what-is-connotation-words-1689912](https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-connotation-words-1689912)
- Parco, J. & Levy, D. (2013, February). The Rise and fall of dadt. *Journal of Homosexuality*. (60)2-30: 147-51.
- Peters, G. & Wooley, J.T. (2022). The American Presidency Project: Memorandum on Ending Discrimination in the Armed Forces. Retrieved from: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/memorandum-ending-discriminatino-the-armed-forces>
- Phillip, A., Gibbons-Neff, T. and DeBonis, M. (2017, July 26). Trump announces that he will ban transgender people from serving in the military. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/trump-announces-that-he-will-ban-transgender-people-from-serving-in-the-military/2017/07/26/6415371e-723a-11e7-803f-a6c989606ac7_story.html

Pruitt, S. (2018, Apr 25). Once banned, then silenced: How Clinton's dadt policy affected lgbt military. Retrieved from: <https://www.history.com/news/dont-ask-dont-tell-repeal-compromise>

qizi Sodikova, G.O. 2020. Religious-psychological characteristics of decision-making. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*. (8)12, 178-181. Retrieved from: <http://www.idpublications.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Full-Paper-RELIGIOUS-PSYCHOLOGICAL-CHARACTERISTICS-OF-DECISION.pdf>

Report of the Department of Defense working Group that Conducted a Comprehensive Review of the Issues Associated with a Repeal of Section 564 of Title 10, U.S.C., "Policy Concerning Homosexuality in the Armed Forces." 111th Congress (2010). Retrieved from: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-111shrg65073/pdf/CHRG-111shrg65073.pdf>

Reuters Staff. (2010, October 19). Timeline: Chronology of "don't ask, don't tell" policy. *Reuters*. Retrieved from: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-use-military-gays-timeline-idUSTRE6916BP20101019>

Rostker, B. D., Harris, S. A., and Rich, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Options and Assessment*. National Research Defense Institute. RAND. California.

Rowatt, W. (2015). *The Social Psychology of Religion, Prejudice and Intergroup Processes*. American Psychological Association. Retrieved from: <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2015/05/religion-prejudice>

- Rude, C. (1995). The Report for decision making: Genre and inquiry. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* (9)2. 170-205. Retrieved from:
<https://www.journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1050651995009002002>.
- Rude, C.D. (2009). Environmental policy making and the report genre. *Technical Communication Quarterly* (6)1. 1997. Pp. 77-90. Retrieved from:
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/s15427625tcq0601_5?journalCode=htcq20
- Sanchez, F. (2016). The roles of technical communication researchers in design scholarship. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* (47)3, 359-391.
 Retrieved from: <https://www.journals-sagepub-com.libproxy.txstate.edu/doi/full/10.1177/0047281616641929>.
- Sarwar, P. S. (2018). Stereotyping effects in religions. Bangladesh University of Professionals. Retrieved from:
https://www.academia.edu/24736700/Stereotyping_Effects_in_Religions
- Senate Hearing 111-546. (2010, March 18). Testimony relating to the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. Retrieved from: <https://www.govinfo.gov/pkg/CHRG-111shrg5749jt;CHRG-111shrg57495.htm>
- Shapiro, J. P., and Stefkovich, J. A. 2016. Ethical leadership and decision making in education. Routledge. New York.
- Shilts, R. (1993). Conduct unbecoming: Lesbians and gays in the U.S. military, Vietnam to the Persian gulf. St. Martin's Press. New York.
- Sibley, C. G., and Barlow, F. K. (Eds.). *The Cambridge Handbook of The Psychology of Prejudice*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.

- Sinclair, G. D. (2009). Homosexuality and the military: A review of the literature. *Journal of Homosexuality*. (56)6, 701-718. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00918360903054137?scroll=top&needAccess=true>
- St. Amant, K., and Meloncon, L. (2016). Reflections on research: Examining practitioner perspectives on the state of research in technical communication. *Technical Communication* (63)4, 346-363. Retrieved from: https://www.tek-rtr.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/stamant_meloncon_practitioner_research_TechComm.pdf.
- Stahl, S. (2018, September 20). A look back: The fall of “don’t ask, don’t tell” and the continued fight for transgender military service. Retrieved from: [https://www.freedomforallamericans.org/a-look-back-the-fall-of-don't-ask-don't-tell-and-the-continued-fight-for-transgender-military-service/](https://www.freedomforallamericans.org/a-look-back-the-fall-of-don-t-ask-don-t-tell-and-the-continued-fight-for-transgender-military-service/)
- Strong Family Alliance. (2021). Myths that stigmatize LGBTQ people. Retrieved from: <https://www.strongfamilyalliance.org/parent-guide/essential-info/myths-that-stigmatize-lgbtq-people/>
- Swier, R. (2015, August 30). The top 10 myths about homosexuality. Retrieved from: <https://drrichswier.com/2015/08/20/the-to-10-myths-about-homosexuality/>
- Triad 3 (2016, March 9). An introduction to document analysis. *Research Methodology in Education*. <https://www.lled500.trubox.ca/2016/244>
- Tulane University. (2018, April 20). What is Social exchange theory? Retrieved from: <https://www.socialwork.tulane.edu/blog/social-exchange-theory>

- U. S. Geological Survey. (2019). Guidelines for reviewing technical reports.
<https://www.pubs.usgs.gov/unnumbered/7000088/sta26.pdf>.
- U.S. Naval Institute Staff. (2018, March 26). U.S. Naval Institute. Retrieved from:
<https://www.navalhistory.org/2018/03/26/key-dates-in-u-s-military-lgbtq-policy>
- U.S. Senate Committee on Armed Services Hearing, 103rd Congress (1993, February 4).
Congressional Record (139), 2167 – 2426.
- United States Department of Defense. (2010). *Support plan for implementation: Report of the comprehensive review of the issues associated with a repeal of “don’t ask, don’t tell.”*. [Web.] retrieved from the Library of Congress,
<https://www.iccn.loc.gov/2011507488>.
- University Writing Center. (2021). Rhetorical analysis. Academic Affairs. Texas A & M University. Retrieved from: <https://www.writingcenter.tamu.edu/Grads/Writing-Speaking-Guides/Alphabetical-List-of-Guides/Academic-writing/Analysis/Rhetorical-Analysis>
- Vanderwicken, P. (1995, May-June). Why the News Is Not the Truth. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from: <https://www.hbr.org/1995/05/why-the-news-is-not-the-truth>
- Walton, G. M. and Cohen, G. L. (2014). A Question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. In Keri Kamakari (Ed.). *The psychology of prejudice*. (pp. 405-435). Sage. Los Angeles.
- Wansac, A. (2013). Don't ask, don't tell: A history, legacy, and aftermath. HIM 1990-2015. 1513. Retrieved from: <https://www.stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015>

Wikipedia. (2021). Critical discourse analysis. Retrieved from:

https://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_discourse_analysis

Wikipedia. (2022). Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Retrieved from:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Don%27t_ask,_dpm%27t_tell#:~:text=The%20Clinton%2-ad,omostatopm%20on%20December,Charles%20Moskos%2C%20military%20sociologist

Williams, M.F. (2006). Tracing W. E. B. DuBois' "color line" in government regulations.

Journal of Technical Writing and Communication (36)2 141-165.

Williams, M. F. (2012). Reimagining NASA: A Cultural and Visual Analysis of the U.S.

Space Program. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* (26)3 368-

289.

Williams, M. F. (2014). Introduction. In Williams, M. F. and Pimentel, O. (Eds.),

Communicating race, ethnicity, and identity in technical communication (pp. 1-4).

Routledge.

Williams, M. F., & Pimentel, O. (2012). Introduction: Race, Ethnicity, and Technical

Communication. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* (26)3, 271-

276.

Woodruff, W. A. (1995). *Homosexuality and Military Service: Legislation*

Implementation, and Litigation (64), 121. Campbell University School of Law.

Retrieved from:

https://scholarship.law.campbell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1037&context=fac_sw

WordPress (2021). Gayzed and confused. Retrieved from:

<https://www.dadt2wordpress.com/history/>

Yamashiro, D. K. M. (2017). Religious Influences on Crisis Presidential Decision-Making: A New Belief in the Operational Code Analysis of George W. Bush.

Master's thesis, Harvard Extension School. Retrieved from:

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:33826499>