

## **Request for Investigation -- Attachment B**

### **Participant Observations on CRWG Focus Groups**

#### **Communication A**

The note below is from an officer who participated in a DoD CRWG focus group to his father, a retired general officer. The writer is a colonel in command who trains about 20,000 young men and women just out of basic each year and has a pretty good feel for what his soldiers are thinking. His assessment of their casual attitude toward homosexuality is not unusual, and based on what CMR has heard from others we suspect that his assessment of the CRWG is probably correct.

The colonel comes from second-generation military family and has fought twice in the desert wars of late. He has commanded an infantry battalion in the far reaches of one of the toughest neighborhoods in Iraq and has consistently been screened for command and further schooling. But the current debate, which appears to be predetermined by the administration, now has caused this colonel to look forward to retirement. If he and others like him do leave prematurely, that would be a great loss to the nation compared to whatever number of homosexuals have been discharged in recent times.

His voice is typical of the voices of military people whose views and interests are being ignored in order to indulge the president's views on gays in the military.

Dad,

I am concerned for two reasons. In brief, here is what has me worried:

1. Most of the "troops" including junior officers, have grown up around some number of confused kids alleging homosexuality in high school, or have been indoctrinated sufficiently by our public schools that they essentially treat the issue as "I don't have a problem if you want to be gay; it doesn't affect me" without thinking through the second and third order effects of the potential change, or its impact on unit cohesion. I know this because of our own discussions on the topic here, where I have a representative population that spans a lot of these groups. Until you have someone guide the discussion to the real implications of open homosexuality, many are ignorant and make a snap judgment without logical thought. That's not entirely uncommon for them on a variety of topics, so I'm not surprised! But, it is a little dismaying for an issue with so much at stake.
2. The "focus groups" came through here last week, and I had a few officers participate in them. The feedback I got was that a few of the DOD reps who were here to lead the discussion seemed to have a personal interest favoring repeal of the law. But, more disappointing, was that one group leader started asking the question about repeal of the DADT policy, etc, etc. One of my commanders asked if she was discussing a change in the DADT policy, or the actual repeal of the law, and she was dumbfounded--apparently not aware of the difference. There was a Navy captain helping her, and she had to ask him to clarify. I know that is limited feedback from only a few officers of mine who went to a couple of groups, but I'm worried that their experience may be

indicative of how badly off track this effort to "talk to the troops" may go if the right people aren't facilitating it, and the right people--knowledgeable--aren't there to participate.

If everything goes badly, at least I'm closing in on retirement!!

v/r  
xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

### **Communication B**

The following notes were sent to CMR by the wife of a Marine, both of whom participated in a CRWG focus group in May. Her notes provide insight into the bias that may have skewed the process and its "Information Exchange Forum" right from the start:

**From:** a Marine wife, June 02, 2010, 7:30 PM

**Subject:** CRWG Focus Group Experience

"Elaine,

"I want to thank you tremendously for the work you are doing to help our military. I think it is a good idea to leave our comments anonymous, so his job is not at risk if this does pass.

"We did not have rules for the forum in advance; we did not know what to expect, except that the FRO said they wanted our input. Well, they said they were mostly concerned with mitigating problems and addressing concerns rather than gathering our opinions. They started with an explanation of what the Obama administration is trying to do and opened it up to our concerns. The goal seemed to be to tell us it was a good thing, it was going to be okay if/when it passed... sometimes they just contradicted what we said, as if that would make it true.

"One spouse mentioned her concern about cross-dressing and trans-genders on base. They replied with, "that is not what we are talking about, today." Trying to make us feel like that would not happen as a natural result of this legislation. I said to everyone, that it would only make sense that, that would be a next step. If homosexuals can be open about their sexual practices, why would these people not be able to. It was as if people lost their sense to reason out logical consequences. General Ham said "it's not like there is going to be a gay pride parade down the main street on base." and I thought to myself, why not? if they are going to be a "protected group" they would insist on being able to do just that. Why can't these people reason out the natural consequences of this legislation? it is not going to stop here.

"Sorry, I am getting off topic. They did not have any real answers. One conclusion they came to were that people need to be "educated," a.k.a. indoctrinated into thinking that there is nothing wrong with a homosexual lifestyle. I am not happy with that conclusion

as it goes against my personal religious beliefs and is at direct odds with it. I am not going to want our future children to even go to school on base if that happens. There were many concerns that were not addressed because we only had an hour to talk to them and they spent half of that time telling us that this was going to happen, and patronizing our legitimate opinions and concerns.

“Anyway, thank you again for *your* service to our country through supporting the military.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

---

The following two notes were sent to a columnist by the same Marine wife. The columnist referred her to CMR.

**From:**  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 29, 2010 3:27 PM  
**To:**  
**Subject:** RE: DADT article

Dear \_\_\_\_\_

“I told my husband that I wrote you a letter and he wanted me to forward this to you as well:

‘This issue is starting to really bother me, also. You can tell the author that his comment about recruitment and retention is absolutely true. Tell him this:

‘I have been in the military for 12 years, I have served overseas and aboard Naval vessels. I have done 4 deployments; 1 in support of OEF and 1 in support of OIF. I have always loved the Marine Corps and military. I have never thought twice about making this a career and doing it for AT LEAST 20 years. I have learned to deal with the beauracracy; I can set aside my feelings about women in combat; I spend months upon months away from family, and I put up with combat operations and combat equipment being managed from Washington ... but welcoming open homosexuals may be the last straw for me. It may be the only thing that would push me to get out of the military before the 20 year mark. I just couldn’t do it.

‘Even if I got along with the gays I would serve alongside, I just couldn’t support those kind of policies anymore. I will fight to defend the God-given rights of homosexuals as citizens and as God’s creation, but I would not feel comfortable defending a government that just doesn’t care about us. They will ask the media; they will ask the politicians; they will ask high profile leaders; and they will probably do their token surveys; but they will push their agenda anyways. Most Marines I serve with right now despise the idea (I estimate 1 of every 9 or 10 don’t). Morale would be destroyed. Violence would increase. Distractions in combat would be out of control. But why should that matter if we can please those few socialists who cry the loudest. “The squeaky wheel gets the oil” is NOT American policy!

‘Our military is great because of its discipline and combat effectiveness, not because of its social agenda or “Everybody is Welcome” door mat. Do we understand what we are getting ourselves into? In recruit training (boot camp) we take showers with nearly 50 men in one shower room, no stalls. Allowing a gay man in there would be like allowing a straight man to

take a shower with 50 naked women. Is that next? So instead we are going to cater to the extreme left agenda, and completely rethink the way we train and prepare the worlds greatest fighting force for its next battle. And if anyone thinks that we won't have to change our military training, and even our culture, they are COMPLETELY misinformed and blinded.

'I pray that I make it to 20 years, at least. But I will not fight in a socialist military, and lifting the ban would just be a step in that direction... probably the final step for me. And I know that I am not the only one. I will give my guarantee that our nation stands to lose much more than it will gain by allowing gays in the military.'

"I know it makes a difference for us to just feel like someone is listening and actually cares.

"Thank you again for your time and commitment to sharing the truth.

Sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

---

**From:** (Marine Wife)

**Sent:** Friday, May 28, 2010 6:40 PM

**To:** Columnist who wrote about the issue of homosexuals in the military

**Subject:** DADT article

Dear Mr. \_\_\_\_\_,

"I just wanted to thank you for writing this article. I am outraged that even the conservative media is not covering this. I wanted to share my perspective with you, because I am sure you are probably interested. As a military spouse, this is something that will greatly affect my personal life and my husband's job and career. My husband has served for almost 12 years and before this happened our plan was to stay in till retirement. I am not so sure now.

"The most prevalent social problems my husband encounters are sexual in nature; inappropriate relationships between males and females. He has to document and deal with sexual harrassment, rape, false allegations, and court marshalls . These problems are going to increase exponentially with the repeal of the ban.

"I attended a "working group" forum Wednesday on base about open homosexuality in the military. I know this is not compatible with military life, goals, retention, safety, or readiness. The group was basically a meeting to tell us that this is going through and we need to make the best of it. General Ham, who works directly for Secretary Gates used phrases like, "contingency plan" and "mitigate problems". I could tell from his facial expressions and body language that he does not support repealing the ban, but he looked defeated.

“The all-Marine forum that met before the spouse group was very vocal and upset throughout their meeting. Their consensus was obviously against repealing the ban; their privacy being a huge concern. The military is not like a business or a team. The single marines cannot leave work at work; they live in close relationship with their "co-workers." This makes sexual tensions and those kinds of problems incredibly difficult to escape.

“In the spouse forum in which I participated, there was some discussion from both sides of the debate, but even many with liberal views see no reason to change this policy, due to the safety risk to homosexuals and troop morale being seriously disrupted. A member of the panel from the Air Force told us that repealing the ban would not mean that the government endorsed or condoned homosexuality. At his statement, a volley of cries went up from around the room, "Yes, it would," "YES, IT WOULD!" He went on to talk about the fear a homosexual experiences wondering each and every day that he may be discovered and kicked out. I am wondering each and every day if my husband is going to come home ALIVE or not! Personal sacrifice in the military is high, many people know they cannot handle the stress, and therefore, do not join.

“The present policy works fine because the homosexuals that are currently serving are able to do so, and in a way that puts the country first, before their personal views. In order to serve in the military, that is a key attitude. All of us make personal sacrifices in order to serve the country. If ANY person, homosexual or not, cannot put the needs of the military and the safety of the country before their personal lives, they don't belong in the military. Repealing the law will allow homosexual activists to join the military and tear it to shreds, effectively disrupting every day activities and silencing those who disagree with homosexuality and its indoctrination.

“Thank you for writing and informing the public about the importance of keeping the repeal from going through. Homosexual activists will not stop here. Thank you for taking the time to read my experiences and educate the public. I am incredibly grateful that there are some civilians who want to support the military in the most important way right now; by not repealing this legislation.

Most Sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

### **Communication C**

The note below was sent to CMR by a naval officer who participated in a CRWG focus group at the Naval Postgraduate School, near Monterey, California. In his initial phone call and a subsequent email, this officer mentioned that there were written ground rules for all participants in the focus group. CMR requested a copy of the documents in

question with several emails to a CRWG staff member. The request was acknowledged, but the documents requested were not provided.

### **Participant Notes on Monday, 26 April DADT focus group - *Naval Postgraduate School* –**

*These are excerpts, with emphasis added*

“A call was put out to the staff and student body at both a mandatory student lecture and on the mandatory student “check-in” webpage that the focus group would be held, and that all active duty students, faculty, and staff could “self-nominate,” or essentially volunteer to participate in the study. I volunteered, due to my concern about the potential negative consequences of the repeal. From the makeup of my group, it appeared that approximately 10% of my group was staff who directed to go in order to get the numbers required for each group.

“The session was run and moderated by VADM Ferguson. He introduced his team: Sec Ginsberg; a Marine Col. (to represent both the Marine and Officer perspective); a Fleet Master Chief (to represent the enlisted perspective); and a civilian woman who I believe he said was a personnel specialist of some sort. He began by briefing the group on the ground rules, taking great pains to reiterate that no statements should be made regarding one’s homosexuality, as the law and DADT policy are still in effect; all comments were non-attributable, and all identities would be kept private.

**“The discussion’s purpose and focus was to discuss what policy changes would need to take place *should* the law be repealed, NOT to discuss *whether* the law should be repealed.**

“He then opened the floor to comments and/or questions. The first topic discussed was billeting, and how homosexuals would be berthed, both at sea and ashore, in different environments and situations (ship, sub, tent, barracks, etc.), given that we now segregate men and women due to the concerns with sexual tension and harassment. **A very lively debate ensued where some asserted that straight military members would feel very uncomfortable berthing with a homosexual of the same sex, just as they would berthing with a member of the opposite sex, while others asserted that they had berthed with “known” homosexuals in prior assignments with no issues.**

“The idea that living and serving with homosexuals in the past was workable in those individuals’ experiences due to the chilling effect on the homosexuals’ behavior by the DADT policy was pooh-poohed by several.

“At one point, in response to a comment that members could “opt out” of berthing with certain individuals as a possible policy measure, the Marine Col. on the team stated that Marines berth by unit, and that would have to remain policy to maintain unit cohesion.

This comment caused quite a stir based on the notion that straight individuals would be “forced” to berth with homosexual individuals. **Several times when the discussion would reach an impasse with the numerous irresolvable berthing issues that were raised, The VADM would ask, “So what do you recommend...What policy should we adopt.” There was no consensus and no clear recommendations.**

“The discussion next focused on benefits and the issue of same-sex marriage with the differing laws on the issue from state to state in which service members would be stationed. VADM Ferguson was adamant that any discussion of “DADT” repeal would assume that the federal **Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA)** would still be in effect and the law of the land, and that any policy would have to take this into consideration. He re-stated again and again that NO monetary benefits, such as housing, medical care, insurance, etc., would be available to same-sex partners/spouses of military members under DOMA.

“This set off quite a debate on the extreme problematic nature of this situation where the military recognizes a same-sex marriage as a matter of policy in recognizing the homosexual individual (thereby “federalizing” that relationship), and yet not be allowed to offer any like-kind benefits to homosexual “spouses” as with their heterosexual counterparts. This disparity was again seen as an untenable issue and one that would have a huge negative impact on morale, as well, as vast amounts of time and money expended in legal challenges, personnel issues, etc.

**“Again, rather than acknowledging the impossible situation this presents, the VADM asked for policy recommendations from the group...there were none, other than to repeal DOMA, which was offered by the progressives, but understandably repugnant to the conservatives.**

**“This also segued into a discussion of whether or not the military should be forging ahead of society on this issue that would force the issue of legal challenges to DOMA and numerous other voter-enacted state and federal laws, with no appreciable military benefit.** Of course parallels were drawn to racial and gender desegregation initiatives and several members disregarded the potential of “DADT” repeal to have such far-reaching consequences. The VADM then directed the group to move on.

“The next major topic was the issue of religious discrimination and the potential attack on religious liberties of service members of faith whose religious doctrine or tenets teach against homosexuality. **There was widespread ignorance in the group of the proposed LGBT law’s provisions regarding “non-discrimination/non-harassment” of homosexuals that would pose a direct and immediate quashing of the religious expression of both service members and Chaplains of various faiths, namely Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.**

“About half of the group was very outspoken that service members would be able to freely express their disagreements with any and all behavior, including homosexuality, due to the fact that service members currently serve with people from all walks of life and differing opinions, so serving with open homosexuals should be no different. They asserted that service professionalism and standards of conduct established by the UCMJ will prevent overly offensive or harassing behavior.

“Additionally, the idea that homosexual members would have a heightened sensitivity to criticism and would swiftly and vociferously report or complain to superiors about other members (religious or not) making any negative or disparaging comments regarding their behavior or relationships was met with much scorn. **The VADM tried to quickly move off this topic, but not before an officer implored him to ensure that any policy enacted would protect the Constitutional rights of members of faith and conscience who recognize the harmful and debilitating nature of the homosexual lifestyle to be able to speak freely on the matter in any circumstance.**

**“The last topic that arose was the consistent repeal proponent argument of the loss of trained individuals, as well as the loss of a certain segment of society from eligibility to serve due to DADT.** The point was made, both by the VADM and one of the participants, that a relatively small number of members have actually been discharged under DADT. An officer in the group noted that this concern of lost expertise and training dollars would be alleviated if the policy were adopted TODAY of screening potential recruits for homosexuality before ever entering the service. He also mentioned that a far greater segment of society would be restricted or highly discouraged from serving, should the law be repealed.

“The VADM asked the group if they felt that recruiting is more negatively affected now, with DADT in place (which was kind of silly, since all the services recruiting numbers have been very high, even in the midst of two ongoing wars), or in the future, if DADT were repealed. The consensus was that certainly some people, mostly homosexual, now were discouraged from serving, but that number would be low.

“Sadly, however, there was almost unanimous consent that the repeal of the homosexual ban would have almost no negative effects on recruiting or retention, and that, despite all the “hype,” allowing open homosexuality would not have much of an impact on the military. Indeed, a parallel was made to Y2K and how that scare turned out to be a non-event. This attitude was very surprising, given all the previous debate about all the unsolvable problems that would arise from the repeal.

“There was this almost “Pollyanna” view that the UCMJ is robust enough to handle any and all potential discipline problems that might arise from the repeal, and that the military would adapt and overcome, just as it has with all the changes that it has weathered in the past. **There may be some truth in this, but what was not thoroughly talked about, nor allowed to be, was the discussion of “at what cost?”**

“The VADM then wrapped up, due to having to attend another session at the **Defense Language Institute**, and stated that we all would have the opportunity to input any further comments or comments that we did not feel comfortable sharing with the group on a website that would be established for that purpose. To date, we have not received any information in regards to the site or the ability to offer further input.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Name Known but Withheld by Request

**Communication D:**

The portions of email correspondence below are from an infantry officer who fought in several deployments to Iraq, who is now in the National Guard. This officer contacted CMR to express frustration with the DoD Survey system for making additional comments. In this note, received in August, he commented on an article by a gay blogger who claimed to have crashed the DoD system and voted several times:

**From:** T  
**Tue 8/17/2010 1:28 PM**  
**Subject:** DADT Survey

Elaine,

That was precisely how the dialogue box looked. The homosexual activist blogger in that link also made it clear that it was a chat dialogue, and not just a comment box. I didn't think that you could log on multiple times, but then again, I did not try. He said you did not need anything special to get into this program. I thought that I needed my ID card, but perhaps that was just for the first part.

There were two parts to the survey. The first part was a simple online "inbox" in which I left a short, and tersely worded comment on the repeal of DADT. But from there, I was able to access this online chat dialogue. If anyone can access it without an ID on a DoD computer, then this is clearly subject to a tremendous amount of fraud. The blogger seems concerned that the "bigots" will ram their views through in this venue, but in actuality, most troops are too busy and disconnected from the politics to do this thing multiple times. The fraud would come from the side of people like this blogger who have the time and inclination to post their distorted views over and over.

T

---

From: elaine@cmrlink.org  
To: T  
Subject: RE: DADT Survey  
Date: Thu, 12 Aug 2010 23:24:28 -0400

Hi T,

Can you tell me, did the screen and dialogue look like this? The link is to a gay blogger, who claimed to have logged in several times:

<http://gay.americablog.com/2010/07/i-just-took-dods-secret-dadt-survey-of.html>

Westat is doing the survey that was sent to 400,000 troops. Did you get one? Here's what I wrote about that: <http://bigpeace.com/edonnelly/2010/07/25/pentagon-survey-catches-a-tiger-by-the-tail/>

Thanks and best wishes to you and J,

Elaine

**From:** T

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 11, 2010 7:03 PM

**To:** elaine@cmrlink.org

**Subject:** RE: DADT Survey

Elaine,

They asked about deployments, but not necessarily combat experience per se. To the interviewers, I do not think that they differentiate between deployments and actual combat experience because I am sure they don't know the difference. I had to make a point of typing out a description of the living conditions I experienced in combat with the men I led. They didn't ask about "zero tolerance" policies, but I hammered that constantly. I repeatedly explained that the military would take a hard line approach on this and anyone who crossed the new "taboo" about serving with gays would be made an example and have their career ruined. I told "her" (whoever it was) that I would have to resign as an officer because:

- 1) I would have to uphold this order with the authority of my rank and I cannot uphold what I believe to be an immoral order.
- 2) I know that I would face persecution for my religious beliefs if I followed through with the dictates of my values and conscience or I would have to set aside my deeply held convictions, which I cannot do.

They did not ask how to train to increase acceptance. They simply asked how repeal could be implemented. They never mentioned the other side of the coin with bisexuals and transgenders.

As I said, some of the questions were awfully personal. I almost refused to answer a couple of times due to questions about family, etc., but I didn't think they quite crossed the line. They asked if I associated with homosexuals, etc. But yes, I had the feeling (unsubstantiated as of yet) that if I had religious convictions and had never met or associated with a homosexual, then my views would be thrown out. "Fortunately", my uncle was one and my wife has a number of gay friends, so it didn't appear as though I crawled out of a hole to these people.

I was definitely able to answer candidly. I had a screen name, but I have no idea if the DOD is taking information off of the CAC/ID login.

T