

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Protected Veterans: The Use of Positive Intersectionality in Achieving Legal Change

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/60q2s4bz>

Author

Sherman, Nicole

Publication Date

2016

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Protected Veterans: The Use of Positive Intersectionality in Achieving Legal Change

THESIS

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in Social Ecology

by

Nicole Sherman

Thesis Committee:
Assistant Professor Keramet Reiter, Chair
Professor Susan Bibler Coutin
Associate Professor Geoff Ward

2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND: The LGBT/Military Struggle	4
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Intersectionality and Identity	8
Social Movements and Framing Identity	10
METHOD	14
Sources of Data	16
RESULTS: The Veteran Identity and Social Movements	17
General Newsletter Topics	18
Positive Intersectionality in the <i>Reveille!</i>	20
Internal Framing Using Positive Intersectionality	21
Positive Intersectionality and the Public Image	30
DISCUSSION	35
REFERENCES	41

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My infinite gratitude goes to my committee chair and faculty advisor, Professor Keramet Reiter, for handling endless drafts of this document and pushing me to explore the kind of research I find most fascinating. Without the countless sessions spent discussing this thesis with her and the insight she provided, completion of this thesis would have been immensely more difficult.

I would also like to express my thanks to my thesis committee members, Professor Susan Coutin and Professor Geoff Ward. Their guidance and thoughtfulness in commenting on drafts of this thesis were invaluable in its completion.

Finally, I would like to thank the UCI Special Collections and Archives for their assistance in this archival research. I appreciate every question answered and box of rich materials provided for this research endeavor.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Protected Veterans: The Use of Positive Intersectionality in Achieving Legal Change

By

Nicole Sherman

Master of Arts in Social Ecology

University of California, Irvine, 2016

Assistant Professor Keramet Reiter, Irvine, Chair

This paper examines how the LGBT Veteran organization, Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Veterans of America, has framed their advocacy for LGBT veterans' rights, including their unique deployment of joint LGBT and military/veteran identities to strengthen their cause. Specifically, this research explores the way that the positive veteran/military identity that intersects with the less positively viewed LGBT identity facilitates both the cause and potential outcomes of their advocacy. While many social movements mobilize around a primary identity, LGBT veterans use their status as "protected veterans" to pursue rights for the LGBT community, both in the military and out. I argue that recognition of the elevated status enjoyed by military veterans is seen in the framing techniques of the LGBT veteran social movement and what I am calling "positive intersectionality". Theories of intersectionality typically regard intersecting identities as limiting in an individual's ability to fight discrimination, but this addendum to intersectional theory that I am proposing encompasses the full spectrum of identity, examining positive outcomes of intersectional identities rather than only negative outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

For nearly two decades the military claimed that joining the military would enable you to “be all that you can be”. However, during these same twenty years the military actively persecuted LGBT servicemen and women. From the 1970s to 2014, recruitment-oriented military slogans evolved from embracing individualism to mottos that more fully focus on the military identity. For example, the United States Army utilized “Today’s Army Wants to Join You” from 1970-1980, “Be All That You Can Be” from 1980-2001, “Army of One” from 2001-2006, and “Army Strong” from 2006 and onward. During the “Be All That You Can Be” period, LGBT military members were ironically characterized as unfit for service, suggesting that perhaps it was possible to only “be” oneself if one conformed to heterosexual norms. While this slogan was among the military’s longest running taglines, it may be the battle cry the military embraced the least. This paper grapples with the repercussions of dual identities pertaining to military service and sexual orientation, and how an LGBT-Veteran organization with the LGBT social movement utilized the intersectional identities to frame their advocacy.

In 1990, amidst the turmoil brewing in the military sphere concerning military policy regarding LGBT membership, a national organization formed, entitled the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Veterans of America (GLBVA). Known today as the American Veterans for Equality (AVER), the GLBVA was devoted to defending dishonorably discharged veterans and championing equal rights for LGBT military personnel. In their early years, the GLBVA focused their efforts on promoting President Bill Clinton’s attempt to end military discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Despite these efforts, Congress implemented the more progressive, yet still very restrictive policy known colloquially as “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” (DADT) in 1993. DADT represented the compromise between continuing the ban on homosexual conduct, but

directed that military personnel “don’t ask, don’t tell, don’t pursue, and don’t harass” other personnel on a basis of sexual orientation. With DADT in place, LGBT military personnel were allowed to serve so long as they did not declare their sexual orientation openly (Rimmerman, 1996) The GLBVA was dedicated to providing support, fundraising, and publicity for military members who were discharged upon discovery of alleged homosexual conduct, both before and after DADT implementation.

This paper examines how GLBVA has framed their advocacy for LGBT veterans’ rights, including their unique deployment of joint LGBT and military/veteran identities to strengthen their cause, and the way that the positive veteran/military identity that intersects with the less positively viewed LGBT identity facilitates both the cause and potential outcomes of their social movement. In this case, one direct outcome of social movement organization on behalf of LGBT Veterans was legal change, in the form of DADT. However, DADT did not signal the end of the LGBT movement, as further legal change was still a primary motivation for their social movement.

While many social movements mobilize around a primary identity, such as general LGBT organizers using non-heterosexual pride as the basis of their call to arms, as in the Orange County/Long Beach ONE newspaper, *The Post*, LGBT veterans use their status as “protected veterans” to pursue rights for the LGBT community, both in the military and out. Typically, “protected veterans” refers to non-discrimination policies in employment. However, I contend that this employment-based definition can be extended to include the ways in which society generally protects veterans, including the added layer of protection from other discriminatory categories a veteran identity provides. I argue that recognition of the elevated status enjoyed by military veterans is seen in the framing techniques of the LGBT veteran social movement and

what I am calling “positive intersectionality”. Theories of intersectionality typically regard intersecting identities as limiting in an individual’s ability to fight discrimination. This addendum to intersectional theory that I am proposing encompasses the full spectrum of identity, examining positive outcomes of intersectional identities rather than only negative outcomes.

This paper presents a close analysis of the framing techniques of one specific LGBT veterans’ organization: the Orange County/Long Beach chapter of the Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Veterans of America (GLBVA). By investigating the GLBVA in depth, I am able to focus investigation on their framing mechanisms over a long period of time. By examining the years directly before, during, and after the implementation of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”, I analyzed the GLBVA during a peak activity period for LGBT, and especially LGBT veteran rights. While this analysis provides a detailed look at how the LGBT and veteran identities intersect in a positive manner for the LGBT veteran constituents, I also compare this framing technique to those used in two non-veteran LGBT organization: Orange County chapter of Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG) and the Long Beach newspaper for ONE¹, *The Post*. Generally, I seek to answer the following questions: How does an organization that bridges veteran and LGBT concerns frame its advocacy? In what ways does this compare to organizations that typically use broader frames? What are the implications of veteran framing for non-veteran LGBT groups?

In addition to the analysis of *how* the LGBT veteran social movement is framed, this paper examines the role of intersectionality as a *mechanism for framing*. While intersectionality is typically used to explain the multiple marginality an individual with two or more negatively stereotyped characteristics faces (Crenshaw 1991) I find that intersectionality has potentially

¹ ONE, Inc. is a national gay rights organization and home to one of the largest archives on LGBT rights and the LGBT movement in Los Angeles.

positive ramifications as well. That is, this paper explores the ways in which the intersection of a characteristic that has been a basis for discrimination can interact with a more positively perceived characteristic to boost the status of the negatively perceived identity. In this case, I argue that the protected status of the veteran identity interacts with the more negatively recognized LGBT identity (at the time of the organization's proliferation) and provides leverage to LGBT veterans as they navigate the social movement geared towards LGBT and veteran rights. Additionally, once the veteran identity is integrated and recognized in light of the LGBT status, the LGBT institution is bolstered as well.

Section one presents a brief history of LGBT-related military struggles. Section two provides an overview of the relevant social movement and rights framing literature. Section three outlines the process and motivation behind the current research, and the importance of Orange County/Long Beach as a case study. The fourth section presents analyses of my findings. I demonstrate how identity can be utilized in social movements, specifically how the veteran identity interacts with an LGBT identity, and then, in Section Five discuss the implications for theories of intersectionality. Finally, this paper concludes with a consideration of future plans for this project, including future research sites and topics to be explored as part of the larger framework I propose, concerning intersectionality and social movements.

BACKGROUND: THE LGBT/MILITARY STRUGGLE

The earliest attempts to regulate homosexual behavior in the military occurred in the early 1990s (Belkin and Bateman 2003)². In 1919, homosexual activity in the submarine subculture of the Navy spurred an investigation, which resulted in the dishonorable discharge

² According to historian Timothy Haggerty (from which this brief history is derived; for a more complete history, see his chapter in *Don't Ask Don't Tell: Debating the Gay Ban? in the Military*)

and punishment of an unknown number of the sailors found “guilty” of homosexual conduct and/or tendencies. This widely and negatively publicized event led to a Senate investigation and a movement towards persecuting homosexuality in the military. Most servicemen accused of homosexual behavior in the first half of the 20th century were dishonorably discharged, rather than criminally prosecuted under sodomy laws. Generally, before World War II, the regulations for handling these cases were varied and lacked uniformity, both within and between branches of the military. By 1941, many branches of the military were simply instructed to screen for homosexual tendencies, and to deem individuals so identified as unfit to serve.

On October 11th, 1949, military regulation of homosexual behavior was finally made uniform. The Department of Defense reiterated the “unfit for service” mentality that had diffused throughout the military. In 1950, a period politically conservative thinking and homophobic persecution of LGBT members, Truman ordered the Uniform Code of Military Justice revised to include discharge rules of homosexual military servicemen. In 1956, Captain S.H. Crittenden conducted an evaluation of homosexuality in the Navy and the practices of the Navy with regard to separation rules. The Crittenden Report was largely dismissive of the policies and recommended making many changes to the classification and discharge criteria, but the Navy put few of their recommendations into action.

The persecution of LGBT service-members ebbed and flowed with the larger LGBT struggle in the 1950s and 1960s, finally reaching new heights in the 1980s. By the early 1980s, the gay rights movement concerning military-related issues had reached several district courts. *Berg v. Claytor* (1978, Navy), *Ben-Shalom v. Secretary of the Army* (1980, Army), and *Maltovich v. Secretary of the Air Force* (1980, Air Force) all alleged that homosexuality was wrongfully classified as incompatible with military service. These cases represented a turning

point in legal proceedings concerning the LGBT in the military, because in these cases the plaintiffs openly admitted homosexuality. Rather than focusing the trial on establishing the heterosexual orientation of the plaintiff, the goal of the litigation was instead to challenge the assumptions about gays being unfit to serve in the military. Plaintiffs in each case won in some regard (cash settlements, honorable discharge upgrades), but the most significant victory was in the reframing of the earlier notion that homosexuality was incompatible with military service. As definitions of homosexuality as a disease were retired and as awareness in the general public of homosexuality evolved, the rationale for excluding LGBT service members from the military changed too. Rather than basing exclusion on a moral basis, the military reframed exclusionary rules to blame the incompatibility issues on heterosexual service members, suggesting that straight military members would not respect LGBT military members, causing issues in-group cohesion.

1981 was another landmark year for the military struggle of LGBT servicemen, as military persecution of LGBT members became more severe. In a directive issued by the federal government that would affect all military branches, the definition of “homosexual” was reworked to include those who merely think about engaging in homosexual acts, rather than applying only to physical expression. In another directive a year later, Ronald Reagan made clear that homosexuality was incompatible with the military. Those that engaged in acts or stated they were gay were to be immediately discharged. The military operated under this order for the next decade, but Bill Clinton once again upended policies surrounding gays in the military when he assumed the presidency in 1992.

After being sworn in as President, Clinton promised to lift the ban on the military's restrictive policy concerning gays in the military. But Clinton backed down on his promise following backlash from the conservative and exclusionary military contingencies. Congress enacted the policy commonly referred to as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT) in December of 1993 (Borch 2010). DADT essentially codified the military policies in place before Clinton's Presidential tenure, but added language that restricted the impetus for investigation of suspected homosexuals. While on one hand this restriction made it more difficult to open investigations based off of pure hearsay, it standardized the discharge procedure following investigations that established homosexuality into federal law (Embser-Herbet 2007). Though upheld in several Courts of Appeal over the next decade and a half, DADT was repealed by President Obama in 2011 (Bumiller 2011). As of this writing, homosexuals are allowed to openly serve.

While the events of the LGBT military struggle are captured in a variety of eye-opening texts, this paper focuses on an often-ignored subset of the movement – the grassroots veteran organizations that played an integral role in pushing LGBT rights to where they are today. Focusing on the GLBVA offers insight into a momentous time period for the LGBT movement, in the days before, during, and after DADT, which was quickly followed by ongoing debates about other LGBT rights of participation, especially in the social institution of marriage. Furthermore, while most historical research conducted on this movement has analyzed opinions for and against DADT (Belkin and Bateman 2003; Belkin 2003; Wolff 1997), this paper moves beyond reactionary opinions and into an examination of *what* the GLBVA was involved with during this tumultuous time for LGBT veteran rights. That is, rather than examining only how

the GLBVA debated DADT and rationale behind opinions, it focuses on how the GLBVA constructed identity and utilized identity as a mechanism for its advocacy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

I propose an extension of the literature to include consideration of an additional frame alignment device (Benford and Snow 2000; Snow et al. 1986): “positive intersectionality.” The GLBVA not only engaged in traditional framing techniques of bridging with and amplification of military identity, but they leveraged their respected status as veterans in society in order to strengthen their advocacy. In this sense then, the intersection of military with LGBT identities not only amplifies, bridges, and defines the frame for the movement, but also potentially situates the constituents of the LGBT veteran movement to reach their resource and policy goals more readily than without the positive veteran identity. Drawing on the intersectionality literature, which examines the interplay of competing identities, such as gender, race, and/or class, I will illustrate how one organization used the intersection of identities differently, to connote an overall positive framing to promote legal change (Crenshaw 1991). For the purpose of this paper, I will call this frame alignment device “positive intersectionality”.

Intersectionality and Identity

This paper considers the relevance of notions of intersectionality for the literature of social movement framing. That is, by utilizing intersectionality theory, we can better understand how identity is deployed to facilitate success (or lack of success) in social movements that have identity-oriented and/or resource-oriented goals. Introduced by Crenshaw ((Crenshaw 1991), intersectionality refers to the multiple marginalization faced by those that exhibit more than one commonly discriminated against identity. For example, a black woman faces the multiplicative effects of being marginalized along more than one categorical axis, and society and research

oftentimes both fail to recognize the structural disadvantages faced by those at that axis. This elision puts the doubly minority-identified subject at a multiplicatively increased disadvantage and can obscure their experiences. For example, a white woman's struggles in feminist discourse speaking out against sexism may obscure the multiplicative effect of being a black woman in a similar situation. Based on a theory of intersectionality, if both women spoke about gender issues, the black woman's voice and struggles would be obscured on a basis of the white privilege enjoyed by the white woman. Intersectionality has been tested in the context of Equal Employment Opportunity litigation, and Crenshaw's claims about multiplicative discrimination based on race and gender were supported (Best et al. 2011). In fact, Best et al. purport, based on their results, that plaintiffs who base their claims on intersectionality are unlikely to win their cases, and that non-white women are the least likely to win their cases.

Intersectionality can be explored at a variety of levels depending on how researchers define and observe categories of identity. McCall loosely categorizes three approaches as anticategorical complexity (deconstructing the categorization of identities), intracategorical complexity (looking across social groups and boundaries) and intercategorical complexity (examining differences between groups at multiple axes) (McCall 2005). It is within the intracategorical approach that this research is loosely composed, focusing on the experiences of groups and transcendental characteristics. Investigating the ways in which LGBT veterans mobilize the observed dimensions upon multiple axes that the participants in the social movement identify: as veteran rather than non-veteran, and LGBT rather than heterosexual. Research that examines the relationship between intersectional framings and movement goals tends to focus on the ways in which an intersectional identity (i.e., being a woman) can hurt a cause (Bredström 2006; Hankivsky 2012); but my advancement of positive intersectionality

switches the focus to how identity can be activated to assist a cause. By pushing the veteran and more positively received identity to the forefront, LGBT veterans can use that garnered respect in their activism. Thus, this paper proposes an expanded definition of intersectionality to include not only the multiplicative effects of multiple discriminated-against identities, but the incorporation of the complex ways that *positively* viewed identities interact with *negatively* viewed identities.

Previous research has focused almost entirely on the ways that marginalized identities interact either in generally discriminatory ways or in specific institutions. A common rhetoric in feminist discourse, intersectionality is often utilized as an explanation for the disadvantage faced by women along class and race/ethnicity lines (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1983; Anthias 2002; Bowleg 2008; Brah and Phoenix 2013). As such, accepted intersections typically fall along social divisions (race, class, gender) and the debate surrounding what intersectionality embodies and the politics and repercussions of differentiation is complex (Yuval-Davis 2006). Other identities that researchers have pushed forward in the intersectional context include disability (Meekosha and Dowse 1997) and citizenship (Yuval-Davis 2007) and the literature is trending towards a more inclusive definition of intersectionality (Choo and Ferree 2010; Davis 2008; Ken 2008; Prins 2006; Staunæs 2003). Though intersectionality has expanded to theoretically examine not only disadvantage, but potential advantages an identity axis might have, my own research pushes this expansion even further by examining a less innate identity that can be activated when desired. Rather than investigating the spectrum of gender, for example, which is typically apparent in a social movement, this research explores how a less obvious identity is *made obvious* for the purposes of using its positive reception to push a movement forward.

Social Movements and Framing Identity

This paper suggests the importance of mobilizing multiple identities in social movements for civil rights. This paper examines the impact of activating multiple frames encompassing a second identity and the complexity the intersection of the identities brings to a social movement. More specifically, I examine how a veteran status facilitates the social mobilization of LGBT rights and has implications for rights more generally as well. The activation of a secondary identity, particularly one that is respected in society, represents a critical strategy that some groups use to reframe their social movement. My contribution to the literature encompassing social movement theory involves three interwoven dimensions. First, I will demonstrate that the manner in which the GLBVA leverages identity goes beyond simple frame amplification and frame bridging processes, which will be discussed shortly. Second, the GLBVA's technique in leveraging the interaction of multiple identities that lends itself to increasing the status of a group should be considered as an extension of the intersectionality literature, in what I am calling "positive intersectionality." Third, I suggest that this positive intersectionality is particularly useful for social movements that have both resource-oriented and identity-oriented goals, as exhibited by the LGBT veteran social movement.

Generally, this paper examines the GLBVA and LGBT veteran social movement in light of its framing devices and I argue that the use of framing techniques is more complex than the literature's categorization might suggest. Erving Goffman pioneered the concept of utilizing frames to push forth identity and experiences ((Goffman 1986). He proposed that one's identity is composed of different frames, one of which is a social frame. This frame is subject to change and is driven by who and what defines a given situation. Goffman's portrayal of frames typically refers to an individual and how one navigates his/her life within his/her interpretation of a frame. Extending this analysis, social movement scholars embrace this dynamic process of constructing

meaning and identity, to examine how collective action frames are developed (Benford and Snow 2000; Snow et al. 1986). Collective action frames both reflect and shape the beliefs of a group and are structured to mobilize people for support in their cause (Snow & Benford, 1988). In this sense, collective action frames represent a system of shared values and beliefs between constituents involved with the movement. These frames facilitate constituent identification of: what the purpose of a social movement is, who targets might be, how to motivate others to take part in the movement, and what demands of the movement might look like. Once these parameters are set, the collective is moved into action, motivated by a sense of consensus typically brought on by the agreed upon collective action frame (Klandermans 1984). If the collective action frame involves calling attention to victimization, the frames are often referred to as injustice frames (W. A. Gamson 1982). These frames refer to the righting of a social injustice, and are often contrasted with legitimating frames, or those that accept the inevitability of the status quo. Often times, injustice frames are considered essential for the collective action framework to mobilize politically (W. A. Gamson 1992; Moore 1978).

While the preceding paragraph encompasses the general understanding of how frames are utilized in social movements, the core of my argument lies in the conceptualization of identity in framing. In social movements, such as the LGBT veteran movement where two separate identities are utilized by the group's constituents, framing strategies are more complex than the traditional categorizations of frame articulation, amplification, and bridging, instead representing a blend of these processes (Snow et al., 1986). Frame articulation, considered a discursive process of social movements, refers to the communication between members of the movement, or how the frame is discussed by its constituents and/or amplified. Articulation of a frame typically occurs by connecting experiences of members in a cohesive manner and the

interpretation that shapes the mission of the movement. Amplification, on the other hand, involves spotlighting certain experiences over others, making the particular viewpoints more salient for the movement, both between members and to the outside culture. Counterframes may develop to undermine the movement's progress, and thus a reframing to better position the movement's appearance is necessary (Benford and Hunt 1992). Finally, strategic processes of framing, focus on the ways in which frames are deployed in ways that link constituents and potential sources of funding or support. In this category, frame bridging, or linking frames of a movement to other frames or even other social movements occurs to widen the possible net of support for the cause.

Levitsky reconciles social movement frameworks with the other dominant contingency in rights mobilization – the socio-legal perspective of naming, blaming, and claiming, which map onto the framing processes of social movements as described above at various stages of the rights mobilization (Levitsky 2008). The socio-legal model of grievance formation examines how the perception of injury is transformed into a legal process. This process can be shaped by a range of experiences that relate to social positions, knowledge of legal norms, familiarity with rights and third party contact (Engel 2003; Felstiner, Abel, and Sarat 1980; Levitsky 2008; Mather and Yngvesson 1980). The general transformation of the process occurs in shifts from naming what the perceived injury is, identifying a target for the injury, and identifying a remedy for the injury (Felstiner, Abel, and Sarat 1980). Levitsky argues that the conceptualization of this process, that is, the individual transformations that lead to naming an injury, develop within resources available to the individual, such as collective action frames. This identification of resources, she argues, is crucial to comprehending how social movements generate support.

In both the social movements framework, and the “naming, blaming, claiming” paradigm, scholars describe movements to activate rights that rely heavily on mobilizing a primary identity, be it disability, gender, race, sexuality, etc. (Albiston 2005; Bernstein 1997; Enck-Wanzer 2006; Ferree and Roth 1998; Levitsky 2008; Scotch 1988). Social movement research typically focuses on the use of identity and the way that it is deployed in a movement and its reception by the public, successes, or shortcomings. For example, while Taylor (1999) explores the mutual construction of gender within social movements, and the impact of social movements on the construction of gender, the research falls along a singular axis, implicating only the gender spectrum. Perhaps more closely aligned with this paper, gender has been investigated thoroughly in light of its impact on social movements, commonly as a tool of collective identity formation (Barnett 1993; Einwohner, Hollander, and Olson 2000; Robnett 1996). In fact, while numerous studies take into account how collective identity is formed and re-formed (Nagel 1994; Verta Taylor and Rupp 1993), few disentangle collective identity complexity in light of a particular social movement (J. Gamson 1995).

Finally, in this paper I argue that a positive intersectionality framing device is particularly useful when the social movement in question is a hybrid of identity-oriented social movements and resource-oriented social movements. Identity-oriented social movements are mostly focused on harboring a transformation of perceptions of a particular identity in mainstream culture ((Bernstein 1997; Cohen 1985; Melucci 1985). Resource-oriented social movements, on the other hand, are geared by their constituents to focus on a tangible outcome as the end goal, usually in the form of policy implications. including change and access to policy (Bernstein 1997; Jenkins 1983). Examination of how identity is deployed in social movements - through empowerment, as a goal, or as a strategy - is woven throughout these general categories of social

movements, and I encourage the incorporation of intersectionality theory within these deployment orientations. Exploring how identity framing falls in line with particular goals of a social movement will be explained by examining how identities are spotlighted to reach a specific end that advocacy hopes to achieve.

METHOD

The focus of this paper is on the GLBVA, analyzed through *Reveille!*, the Orange County/Long Beach chapter monthly newsletter. The UCI Special Collections is host to eighteen issues of this newsletter, spanning 1993-1996. The newsletters begin just before the implementation of DADT, and extend through the initial reactions and first attempts to repeal the act. Because these newsletters are produced by the Orange County/Long Beach chapter, the scope of the newsletter is both local (pride parades, fundraising, meetings) and national (coverage of court cases, recent news, national GLBVA meetings and progress). I oriented my analysis to better understand the GLBVA using social movement research. I began my analysis of these newsletters with the following research questions in mind:

- 1) How does the GLBVA frame experiences? What kind of language is used to promote activity? How often is a veteran identity invoked? In what ways is it invoked? How was the veteran identity connected to the LGBT identity?
- 2) What kinds of mechanisms/processes identified in the social movements research are used by the GLBVA? Were there other kinds of framing being used?
- 3) What was the main goal of the article? How much of the newsletter is devoted to promotion of activities versus news?

These research questions loosely guided the way I coded the newsletters. After familiarizing myself with the newsletter, I developed a coding system that allowed me to focus my analysis

more concisely to explore the various ways the veteran identity was invoked. Utilizing a grounded theory method (Abbott 2004; Strauss and Corbin 1990), I open-coded the newsletters and other organizational material for themes that illuminated identity deployment.

Source of Data

Deciding to focus my examination of the LGBT veteran social movement on the Orange County/Long Beach area, I extended my search for other organizations and contextual information of the more general LGBT movement in the 1990s. In doing so, I elected to examine other organizations to compare how issues were framed, what kinds of issues were covered, and how, if at all, their voices related to the GLBVA. To this end, I analyzed newsletters from the Parents and Friends of Gays and Lesbians (PFLAG) Orange County chapter (1990-1994), *The Post* (the official newspaper of the Long Beach ONE organization), Orange County Cultural Pride (OCCP) fliers and Pride Parade souvenir programs (1990-1998), and American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California, Lesbian and Gay Rights Chapter newsletters (1989-1994). Each of these pieces of the Orange County/Long Beach LGBT movement puzzle provided glimpses into the organizations' efforts in 90s.

While many of these organizations are chapters of a larger, national organization, this project focuses almost exclusively on the LGBT movement in Orange County, California and Long Beach, California (which is the southernmost part of Los Angeles County). A regional and specifically local exploration allows me to fine-tune the contextualization of this project within a clearly delineated scope of local politics and other local organizations rather than spreading the focus over large swaths of regional variations (Johnson 2006; Liebman and Clarke 2011; Lynch 2010; Merry 1997; Schoenfeld 2010). When politics and rights mobilization are involved, the nature of the social movement takes on a decidedly local flavor, even within the broader context

of the social movement, when you consider networking (Andrew W. Jones 2001) or resource mobilization (McCarthy and Wolfson 1996).

So, why the focus on Long Beach/Orange County? Southern California is a hotbed for military and veteran populations, home to several large military bases. In 2000, Orange County was home to 8.5% of the entire veteran population of California, the second highest population following only Los Angeles (American Community Survey, 2000). Based on the number of “unmarried partnered households” for both men and both women (the closest way the American Community Survey could capture LGBT relationships), Orange County contained the fourth highest population of LGBT households with 6.24% of the state’s LGBT household population, following Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego. While Los Angeles County is home to the largest population in California, its politics and history is complex. As part of Los Angeles County, the city of Long Beach has a rich and diverse history, yet is small enough to paint a nuanced portrait of its social movements. Orange County, California is a medium-sized Southern Californian county that has a sizeable veteran and LGBT population, and is situated adjacent to Long Beach. As such, many organizations combined their efforts into an Orange County/Long Beach chapter to encompass this region of Southern California. With active LGBT and veteran populations at this site, this project focuses on this region to provide a concise portrayal of OC/LB social movement framing.

RESULTS

The Veteran Identity and Social Movements

As the focus of this research, the LGBT Veteran social movement will be elucidated in light of its framing devices. This subsection will first provide an overview of the kinds of articles the OC/LB chapter of the GLBVA covered in their monthly newsletter to contextualize the

quotes pulled for analysis. The second subsection will elucidate the mechanisms the newsletter writers used to convey their messages and how the participants framed their movement. I will situate the processes utilized by the GLBVA in the social movement framework, identifying where common processes lay and where further evolution of our understanding of framing techniques is necessary.

In my analysis of how the LGBT veteran social movement was framed, I chose to also analyze newsletters and newspapers from other organizations to compare and contrast their framing techniques. Additionally, I was interested in how, if at all, the broader LGBT social movement was implicated by the LGBT veteran social movement, and vice versa. Throughout my analysis of the *Reveille!* quotes and stories will be juxtaposed against the GLBVA's material to discern what, if any, differences and similarities the various organizations possess.

General Newsletter Topics

Printed in black and white on standard sized paper and distributed by mail to members of the Orange County/Long Beach GLBVA, the *Reveille!* averaged four-to-six pages per issue. The archive I used included eighteen issues of the *Reveille!* printed between 1993 and 1996. In each issue, a large portion of space was devoted to rallying members to join the GLBVA cause. There were dozens of articles detailing upcoming parades, informational booths, meetings, rallies, and fundraising activities. For example, the first issue of the newsletter, published in 1993 included stories on the Long Beach Pride Festival, the national GLBVA march in Washington D.C., and speaker events by openly gay service members (*Reveille!*, June 1993). Subsequent issues provided in-depth coverage of what happened at the events, what was successful, what steps were taken towards advancing rights, and normally ended with a call to further action. The descriptions of these events provided the richest source of analysis for the mechanisms used in

framing the movement, including the way the LGBT and veteran identities intersected, which will be discussed shortly.

Another frequent topic of the articles in the *Reveille!* included educating the community about openly gay service members and their struggle within the military and upon discharge. These articles highlighted a particular individual and detailed his or her military career and the issues faced due to military constraints, and ended on a statement that advanced rights mobilization by claiming that sexual orientation did not impede the individual's ability to serve. Though these articles were few in comparison to event coverage, they appeared at least half a dozen times and references to rank always accompanied a story about an individual facing LGBT discrimination in the military. While the goal of each article varied from informing the GLBVA's constituents to providing an impassioned call to arms, the rank and achievements of the service member profiled in each instilled an underlying honor to the issue at hand.

In addition to the GLBVA, I analyzed resources for two other Orange County/Long Beach organizations that aligned themselves with the LGBT social movement: ONE and PFLAG. When reading the various materials in the archives that portrayed the goals and activities of these other organizations, I analyzed them in light of their perceived framing mechanisms and also how they related their priorities, if at all, to those of the GLBVA.

ONE was an LGBT community-based organization in Long Beach, and they produced the monthly newspaper *The Post*. *The Post* averaged thirty-five pages an issue and was distributed through the mail and in newspaper boxes on various streets in Long Beach. I analyzed the entirety of the collection of *The Post* in the archives (comprising four issues) for framing techniques and content covered. The content covered in *The Post* ranges from stories about

AIDS survivors, fundraising events, condom awareness, LGBT friendly local hangouts, advertisements for community events, and editorial columns.

The Orange County chapter of the Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG) was one of the organizations that closely aligned themselves with the framing strategies used by the GLBVA. I analyzed five newsletters that were distributed throughout 1990-91 to members, as well as a variety of pamphlets and informational handouts that were likely handed out during meetings/activities or within the newsletters themselves, which encompassed the extent of the archives materials for this time period. PFLAG focuses their efforts on parenting and assisting families and friends as they attempt to support their child/friend once they come out as LGBT.

While PFLAG was more focused on identity-oriented goals in their role of the larger LGBT social movement, they also promoted information about the LGBT veteran movement. In one newsletter, PFLAG reprinted a story from the San Jose Mercury News, which had also been reprinted in the newsletter of a different PFLAG chapter. This article utilized very similar language as the articles in the GLBVA. In this article, the author deconstructs a letter sent by an Admiral in the Navy's surface Atlantic fleet and his disparaging remarks about lesbian service members:

“...of the need to remove gay men and lesbians from Navy service. The letter warns that lesbians can be particularly difficult to deal with, because they are ‘more aggressive than their male counterparts’ and thus ‘intimidating’ to those who might turn them in. Adm. Donnell goes on to urge that investigations be vigorously pursued, noting that the officers’ past efforts have often been half-hearted, because lesbian sailors tend to be ‘hard-working, career-oriented, willing to put in long hours on the job and among the command’s top performers.’ These lesbians sure sound like the kind of people you’d want rooted out of your organization, don’t they?” (*PFLAG*, 1991).

While PFLAG typically focused on familial support and educational efforts, it is interesting that they chose to include this article in their newsletter. This article was one of the only resource-oriented articles printed in the PFLAG newsletter, focusing on policy-change

through identity-orientation rather than merely focusing solely on altering perceptions of LGBT members and generally informing the public about LGBT-related issues. Resource-oriented advocacy instead aligns its goals towards a tangible end, such as reforming policy. By turning the Admiral's words on its head, this article proliferates the identity of the lesbian military service member as no different than that of the heterosexual service member. The significance of this excerpt is two-fold: it pushes back against discriminatory policy in the military, and it seeks to reconstruct the way that the lesbian identity is perceived.

Positive Intersectionality in the Reveille!

In coding the four (incomplete) years of the *Reveille!*, I identified five broad mechanisms by which newsletter articles invoked a veteran identity to further the LGBT rights social movement. Each of these mechanisms represents different ways that positive intersectionality goes beyond typical framing techniques. First, a sense of **veteran pride** was displayed, to rally members and consistently inject the movement with a sense of purpose. Second, **spotlights on military careers** put faces to the cause, framing service as honorable and military discrimination on a basis of sexual orientation as immoral. Next, events often described the use of **military paraphernalia** to garner public attention and support. Fourth, the **military as a target** was often used to focus efforts of the organization. Finally, **military lingo** was frequently invoked, reminding members of their honorable service and inciting camaraderie. Each of these themes are representative of the way positive intersectionality may manifest in an organization where at least two identities are co-existing. The following paragraphs will provide examples of each category and relate the process to the social movement literature.

I organize these themes into two categories that reflect the utility of positive intersectionality as a framing device. The first section has implications for internal framing of the

LGBT veteran social movement. Veteran pride, military as a target, and military lingo offered frames to focus the social movement's efforts and to rally internal support. The second section makes the military and veteran identity more visible to allies to the movement or a more public audience. Spotlighting military careers and the use of military paraphernalia at public events brings the veteran identity to the forefront of the movement, and highlights the veteran aspect of the LGBT veteran identity to link the identities for the public image.

Internal Framing Using Positive Intersectionality

Theme 1: Pride

Military and veteran pride was the most commonly used mechanism to conjure a veteran identity within the LGBT movement. Rhetoric involving “honor”, “pride”, and “duty” were interwoven in nearly every article, in both informative and mobilizing articles alike. This powerful language can be seen in the following two quotes regarding the 1994 Pride Parade in Orange County:

“They are proud to see us Vets in the Parade, SO WE SHOULD CERTAINLY BE PROUD TO BE THERE!” (*Reveille!*, 1994, Page 1).

“Join us and show that you are all proud of serving your country and not afraid of being proud to be Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, or Transgendered” (*Reveille!*, 1994 Page 1).

The use of the word “pride” in the LGBT Veteran movement is multifaceted and powerful in both an emotional way and in its mobilizing capacity. Members of the GLBVA cull the weight of the word in two definitive ways, summoning pride both for being a veteran and as a member of the LGBT community. In addition to this dual use of pride in two identities, the pride in military service is derived in two ways: assuming pride in actual military service on a basis of patriotism and nationalism in addition to the symbolic use of the word pride, which it shares with other identity movements. At the same time, pride is a common word used across LGBT organizations. In fact, the festivals that celebrate LGBT membership are referred to as “Pride

Festivals”, which is the Parade alluded to in the first quote. In this sense, GLBVA specifically calls out the pride that members should bear on a basis of sexual orientation, which can be seen in the second quote. By reminding members that it is okay to be proud of the LGBT identity *and* military experience, the *Reveille!* specifically spotlights its unique position to utilize both identities as mobilizing tools for the LGBT Veteran social movement.

The complexity of these dual identities can be further examined in this quote from a member’s contribution:

“If there is any one group who should be Proud and ready to stand-up and FIGHT for our RIGHTS, it’s us VETS!! We know how to FIGHT!! (Not to mention MARCH!)...It is just as much our obligation to show our PRIDE in that we served our country proudly”
(*Reveille!*, 1994, Page 3)

Again, it is apparent that pride is something that is of utmost importance to this organization; this short quote uses various forms of the word three separate times, emphasizing it throughout. Pride in group membership and pride for serving the country are used as springboards for action.

Moreover, this quote represents a quandary that I will explain in a later section, but would like to touch on briefly here. To the extent that pride is used in this excerpt, the pride of military service is elevated to a higher status than LGBT pride of other organizations by saying that “if there is any one group who should be Proud...it’s us VETS!!” In framing the pride in this manner, it is possible that while the veteran status may lift the boat for LGBT Veterans, it may do so at the expense of non-Veteran LGBT organizations.

While the aforementioned quotes are representative of what the call to arms looks like in the newsletter, the following quote explicates a description of an event that already took place, reflecting on its impact. In an article about the OC/LB GLBVA’s presence in a West Hollywood parade, Smebye writes:

“Diane held high a sign that read: ‘What Part of ‘Liberty and Justice For All’ Don’t You Understand?’, which everyone in the stands cheered on. My own 15 year old daughter

marched carrying a sign supporting her ‘gay father that served’, and she received lots of applause and affirmation from the throngs lining the parade” (Smebye, 1993, 1).

Directly reporting on the event, including the “applause and affirmation” shows how military service is something one should be proud of, and being a member of the LGBT community does not change that. The power of this sign is once again two-fold. First, it delivers a message to parade-goers that not only are gay members of the military deserving of respect. Second, it demonstrates that the very foundation of our nation that the military serves compels an all-inclusive dessert of equality – sexual orientation does not change the honorable duty completed by those that served. Furthermore, this quote demonstrates that that message is well-received by those outside group membership and thus serves an inspirational purpose in the newsletter.

Also to note on the invocation of pride in service and LGBT membership, in addition to focusing on pride, the language also invokes an obligation of duty for the community. The language is action-oriented, using phrases like “stand-up”, “our obligation to show”, and “join us”. What’s interesting about this is that these articles appear in newsletters sent to current members only. While it may be expected that they potentially get shared with outside members, they serve the main purpose of rallying members to make sure attendance at events occurs. The substance of the content suggests that there is a priority to get people out to marches, demonstrations, tabling events and so forth. A large portion of the articles either report on the success of previous events, namely parades, or cite the necessity for attendance at events to promote their cause. Therefore, because most of the articles serve this purpose, it could be argued that the *Reveille!* is mostly a device of frame amplification for the LGBT veterans movement.

Examining these quotes using positive intersectionality helps us recognize the way that identity is leveraged in this organization, going beyond frame amplification. By calling for pride

in the collective veteran identity, the GLBVA is bolstering the status of the more marginalized LGBT identity. Not only does this technique amplify the veteran frame, but it simultaneously bridges the veteran and LGBT identities, lifting the status of the latter. Positive intersectionality helps us to disentangle this expansion of identity by conceptualizing identities upon categorical axes. The GLBVA operates at the intersection of LGBT and veteran identities. Unlike the general theory of intersectionality, however, rather than multiplying disadvantage by identifying along two or more marginalized axes, LGBT veterans have a less marginalized category to stand their ground in with their inarguable pride in military service.

Situated in the social movement literature, this particular mechanism might be seen as part of the frame alignment process, or orienting constituents to the beliefs of the movement, which includes four methods: bridging, amplification, extension, and transformation of frames. This analysis will focus on bridging and amplification as the particular methods employed by the organization. Frame bridging links two ideologically congruent frames, either between individuals in a movement, or between movements (see McCallion and Maines, 1999). Frame bridging can be seen in the previous series of quotes by linking the pride of group membership with both identities.

I propose an extension of the framing methods here, as something unique occurs within this particular organization. Frame amplification typically refers to the way an organization is able to cull support by reinforcing the more socially accepted or even celebrated cultural dimensions of the movement, while often suppressing the less dominant ideology. Frame amplification highlights the values and beliefs of the movement to increase resonance with constituents, drawing on culture, societal values and beliefs, and narratives, among others. This method appears to be amplifying the frame, or sending messages of reiteration of the cause to

link together members and potential members, and also potential funding sources. By bolstering the sense of pride and calling upon the patriotism culturally embedded in our society, the GLBVA is able to amplify its message. This particular strategy is of utmost importance to stigmatized and polarized groups with ideals that may obviously oppose dominant values (Berbrier 1998).

If an organization was solely about veterans, the movement might over-express the honor of military service and the protection offered by the institution, while under-expressing the tragedies of wars and means through which military members must utilize to secure national security, often perceived as unorthodox by some sectors of the general public. However, in the case of the GLBVA, the frame amplification is represented by lifting the status of one identity by invoking pride in military membership, which attempts to lift the status of the second identity of LGBT membership. That is, the LGBT veteran movement pushes for equal rights by amplifying the more well-respected identity of military service, often calling far less attention to pride in LGBT membership.

The framing devices that other organizations used were focused almost entirely on frame amplification and bridging. As mentioned earlier, the use of the word “pride” was also important in the broader LGBT movement. While analyzing the *Reveille!*, I examined the use of the word pride, noting that it had meaning beyond the more general use by the LGBT community to cull pride in LGBT identity. In particular, the editorial columns in *The Post*, which were featured in every issue examined, served as the “call to arms” to mobilize the LGBT community. Supplemented by articles from contributing writers, they often attempted to deconstruct the homophobic slurs and anti-LGBT propaganda witnessed in society. Take for example the following quote from editor Katie Cotter in her column titled “The Editor’s Page”:

“No one chooses to be a target of hate and discrimination, to suffer rejection. Slaves did not interview for the job. Children don’t choose to be teased, be born poor or be abused by their parents. We are all victims of our environment.

“The only choice we make is to throw ourselves in the fire and shout No!

“I was so proud to be among the more than 150 Gays, Lesbians and allies who showed up at Long Beach City Council to condemn Councilman Doug Drummond for hating use aloud. We chose to be united and strong.

“It is only when we choose to reveal ourselves to the enemy that we take control, that we have the power to stop the indignity flung at us by bigots” (Cotter, 1993).

In this column, Cotter is dismantling the then-popular conception that being gay is a choice. She utilizes empowering language like “throw ourselves in the fire” and “I was so proud” to invoke the passion in the community. Similar to the LGBT veteran community, *The Post* often called for pride in standing up to the ill-doers against the LGBT community. In this case, Cotter is calling specifically for the LGBT community to fight back against Councilman Drug Drummond, who was exposed as anti-LGBT and stirred a controversy when his disparaging words against the community were made public. While this article deploys a frame amplification device, empowering the membership in the community, most of the goals perpetuated by *The Post* were focused on identity-oriented transformations, rather than tangible resource-oriented goals.

Another example of how the broader LGBT movement during the 1990s was more identity-focused is the newsletters distributed by PFLAG . Each newsletter reiterated the PFLAG cause, which was to “provide a support system for families and friends of Lesbians and Gays to enable them to understand, accept and support their children with love and pride” and to “provide education or individuals and the community at large on the nature of homosexuality”, and finally to “support the full human and civil rights of Lesbians and Gays” (*PFLAG*, 1990). Most of their newsletters and pamphlets were dedicated to sharing narratives of support to show that being a parent of an LGBT child is possible to reconcile with contradictory religious and cultural beliefs. Similar to the GLBVA, PFLAG activated identities of being a parent as of

utmost importance to their movement and focused almost entirely on ways to educate people about the LGBT community. See for example:

“Most of us have heard people (parents and gay people alike) say in rap groups, ‘I’ve never known any gay people.’ We know that’s not actually true, though. They’ve known and met many gay people, they just didn’t realize it. Because of society’s repression of homosexuality, few gay people are open about their sexual orientation. And we all know that there’s no reliable way to ‘spot’ most gay persons as being different from anybody else. In the absence of actual personal experience with gays, most people can only fall back on shopworn stereotypes: the effeminate ‘sissy’ man and the masculine, ‘butch’ woman.

“The Speakers Bureau addresses this lack of knowledge by presenting students with men and women who are open, honest, and willing to talk about their lives. Each panel consists of two lesbians, two gay men, and one parent of a gay child.” (PFLAG, 1991).

This article, titled “PFLAG Speakers Bureau: Proof That Education is the Best Rx for Ignorance”, discusses how important it is to show people that the LGBT community is not just represented by caricatures of stereotyped personalities, but rather that they are our friends and families. These Speakers Bureau meetings were one of the ways that PFLAG mobilized their effort, offering a safe space to learn for those that needed guidance in familiarizing themselves with LGBT families. PFLAG understands the importance of the parent identity in this cause, explicitly calling for a parent of a gay child to attend these meetings.

Theme 2: Targeting the Military

A second method used by the *Reveille!* was to run stories that identified the military as a target for immoral actions. This tactic provided focus for the organization, and this focus on the military situates the military as attacking both the military and LGBT identity. One story in the newsletter that demonstrated this reprinted an article that covered a protest in Anaheim:

“...and several other protestors gathered outside a Marine recruitment office at Katella Avenue and Euclid Street, carrying signs with phrases such as ‘Betrayed by Bubba’ and ‘The Marines Are Looking For a Few Good Homophobes’” (Hertz, 1993).

This quote exemplifies how *Reveille!* sought out stories and used language that would, in a sense, ensure that the military was not let off the hook for its perceived injustice. This is one of the aspects that separates the focus of LGBT veterans from the LGBT community at large. While the gay rights movement was certainly concerned with the treatment of gays in the military and the policy that allowed for less than honorable discharges, the main focus of the movement was on equal rights more generally. While LGBT veterans were also concerned about gay rights generally, their focus was narrower in that most of the rallies, parade informational booths, and meetings were oriented towards rectifying the wrongs dealt out by the military. The President's Message columns were usually the source of these efforts:

“We MUST continue to make the people of this country realize that there are, and always have been, gay, lesbian, and bisexual members of the Armed Forces and they have served with dignity and valor which equals or exceeds that of their “normal” counterparts. We MUST continue to press the public, the Congress and the Courts with the fact that Our Rights are being trampled when the Pentagon says that the existing Prejudices of “straight” service members are more important than our right to exist and, more important, to Serve Our Country” (Thomas, 1994).

“There is still work to be done assisting service members who are being harassed under ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’, and we must still get the message out to the rest of the Gay and Lesbian community that our battle for civil rights in the military is the best chance we have at present to further the entire Gay Rights Movement. If we are beaten in the military, who will be next? Teachers, Firefighters, Police, Social Workers? If the government and the courts rule that discrimination is O.K. in the Military because it is a ‘special environment’ (read we must accommodate the prejudices of the majority) then in what arena will this same reasoning be applied next? Get the word out to your friends and associates that this is a battle for our entire community, not just those who want to serve in the military. And it is a battle we must win!” (Thomas, 1995).

Thomas frames this implication in terms of pride, honor and duty by not only showing the disparity in equal rights, but by contextualizing the struggle within service to the military. By highlighting the disparaging actions by the military and then demonstrating how gay military members are trying to complete their honorable duty, the frame of the movement is again amplified. While the call for equal rights in the larger LGBT struggle implicates society and the

equality of all people, the veteran LGBT movement is able to push this a step further by bringing the respect of service to the foreground.

Theme 3: Military Lingo

A third tactic the *Reveille!* uses to frame their social movement is the use of military lingo throughout their articles. Though this particular tactic could potentially fit in other categories, I believe it serves an individual purpose of providing a “battle cry” for the movement. In fact, much of the organization’s activities, forthcoming events, and the larger national news were framed using military terms. For example, one article calling for GLBVA participation in Long Beach Pride notes that “this is a great opportunity for us to gain exposure in the Long Beach community and build up our membership on the ‘western front’” (*Reveille!*, May 1995). Referring to the potential sites of expansion as “fronts” sounds strategic and recalls members’ military experience. Additionally, many of the articles referred to building membership or highlighting members as “soldiers”. This language seems like a useful tool to build the feeling of camaraderie and feeling like part of the “in-crowd”. Finally, this analysis would be incomplete without referencing the title of this newsletter itself: *Reveille!* A reveille is a bugle call, perhaps one of the most iconic pieces of the military boot camp identity. The bugle sounds every morning to call the soldiers to wake up and start their day of action. It is difficult to envision a more appropriate name for this newsletter, as it serves a “call to action, signaling members to push the LGBT movement, and specifically the LGBT veteran movement forward for equal rights. Uniting the constituents and reinforcing military culture, this again serves as a frame amplification within the organization.

Positive Intersectionality and the Public Image

A second category of framing tactics used by the GLBVA include tactics that help focus the public's attention on the military aspect of the LGBT veteran identity. While these tactics certainly hold meaning for internal framing as well, as they also help focus the efforts of the GLBVA constituents, they also serve a purpose for the public image of the movement.

Theme 4: Spotlighting Careers

Another tactic of the newsletter was to showcase a military career, and then demonstrate how the military infringed on the respect and honor the service member deserved. In at least six different articles, profiles of military careers, followed a specific pattern: name the service member, identify their rank; then outline the disservice done to those that served. This succinct narrative arc occurred throughout a majority of the articles that dealt with covering news events or spotlighting the biographies of specific personnel. This general narrative pattern clearly demonstrates the intersectional nature of the veteran and LGBT identities. In fact, it explicitly demonstrates the elevated status of the veteran identity. By detailing the military career, one is struck by a sense of pride and respect for the duty served by the military member. Then, in a sharp departure from the honor-ridden language, the GLBVA points out how the LGBT identity interacts negatively with the military/veteran identity. See for example:

“Tom was the Non-Commissioned Officer of the Year, Training Services Manager of the Year, and received the highest possible performance ratings during his career. For saying ‘I am gay,’ he was discharged 2 months later” (*Reveille!*, 1993).

This quote demonstrates the dramatic tone the newsletter takes to portray the negative impact of the military's LGBT policies. The story inspires instant respect for the accomplished, decorated officer. Then the article abruptly shifts to repercussions of the officer coming out in the military. The abrupt shift in tone and subject invokes the swift, severe action of the military policy that led to the officer's dismissal. These narrative arcs establish culturally respected traits first in the

military service, and then contrast these traits with the injustice of military action. This demonstrates how, despite the LGBT pride the GLBVA clearly believes in, the organization recognizes the problematic nature of the less dominantly accepted status of the LGBT identity. By showing how decorated the service members are, the GLBVA is effecting a reorientation of understanding the LGBT veteran identity. Not only are they noting that decorated military members *can* identify as LGBT, but they are also exhibiting how the military's reaction to the LGBT identity is unjust. Again, this is just one way in which the GLBVA's focus on the LGBT veteran social movement is both identity and resource oriented. The GLBVA attempts to alter perceptions of LGBT service members by detailing their honorable careers, representing the identity-oriented goals of the movement. The GLBVA also points out the injustice proffered by the military by discharging the men and women, calling for a change in policy and addressing the resource-oriented goals of the movement.

Similar to the amplification devices earlier explained, this quote brings the military service to the forefront. However, while it still only secondarily characterizes the subjects of the articles as LGBT members, they do so in a way that vilifies the reaction to the discovery of LGBT membership in the military service. That is, it does not approach the LGBT identity as out of place even though it is pushed to the background, but rather uses the LGBT identity to expose the offensive behavior of the military branches in attacking the rights of those that served.

This second quote has a similar effect:

“On July 30th, Don MacIver, former Green Beret and current member of GLBVA OC/LB was arrested at a protest in front of the White House. ‘I went to Vietnam to fight for human rights, and now I have to fight my own country for human rights,’ Don said on his return” (Smebye, 1993).

This quote is embedded in a particularly interesting story, which exemplifies the way in which the multiple identities of LGBT and veteran statuses are mobilized. Don MacIver was arrested

wearing his military uniform, adorned with service medals. When his group was taken into custody, the police officers, many of whom were veterans themselves, saved MacIver for booking last, apparently out of respect for his service. The police began taking the medals of the uniform, likely so they could not be used to secure freedom from his restraints. At this moment, Smebye describes how the crowd that had gathered began protesting that those were earned medals. This story demonstrates how a military veteran received respect – from both the crowd and law enforcement officials – above and beyond what the other LGBT protestors received, because of his service. The scene articulates the power of the veteran identity and its potential usefulness for framing the LGBT movement. Again, this acts as a frame amplification, pushing forth the beliefs and values of the organization and the social movement of which GLBVA is a part.

This article was particularly representative of the complex relationship between the LGBT and military identities because it exhibits a reaction outside of a more general society, outside parades and festivals. The power of this narrative lies in the nuanced way that the veteran identity demands respect, even in the face of blatant LGBT identification. By detailing how the officers shielded the veteran at first, out of respect for his service, almost as if they did not want to have to take MacIver into custody, despite the fact that the protest behavior he was engaging in was no different than his non-decorated fellow protestors around him. Similarly, by explaining how the crowd reacted when the officer began removing MacIver's medals, we are presented with clear evidence of how the veteran status is elevated above the LGBT status. When faced with the intersection of veteran and LGBT identities, MacIver, the only one that could apparently claim veteran status, was at an advantaged position over those that were non-veteran LGBT protestors.

Theme 5: Military Paraphernalia

The use of military paraphernalia serves as a fifth strategic mechanism the GLBVA is able to utilize, that the larger LGBT would not have access to. As stated earlier, one of the main topics covered in the *Reveille!* was events that the organization attended. The author (often anonymous) usually described what the booth looked like, what the attendees wore, and what activities took place. Almost every time one of these events was described, military-related items were used to make sure the GLBVA members stood out as military veterans. Members of the GLBVA often marched in the Color Guard for the parades, dressed in “military sharp” and carried American flags (*Reveille!*, 1993). The following excerpts from the newsletter identify a few examples of these paraphernalia-oriented descriptions:

“The booth was decorated with men’s and women’s uniforms, helmets, boots from Vietnam and Korea, ammo boxes and camouflage netting. Our beautiful banner graced the front of the booth. Flags representing the Navy and Air Force were waving...Angela let us use her platoon graduation photo from USMC boot camp, and that drew a lot of positive attention” (*Reveille!*, 1993)

“The mile long Rainbow Flag was breathtaking, and it never seemed to end. We marched up First Avenue with a 35 foot long American Flag that took 30 people to carry. We were preceded by our Color Guard which included many State and all the Service Flags” (*Reveille!*, 1994)

While the LGBT movement could certainly use props to promote the cause, few would be embedded with the same amount of political meaning and public sentiment as those associated with the military.

All of the items described above invoke an immediate sense of what the organization is about, what veterans have done in serving their country, and that, as a group, they stand out. Even if the items do not call for the immediate sense of respect and honor, they are certainly interesting and uncommon items that would draw interest to a booth set up with them. Additionally, seeing groups marching in military sharp in a parade would perhaps draw attention

that a typical parade-marcher would not. Furthermore, since the veteran marchers were usually instructed to march in step form, they would call even more attention to their unit. Using the items would represent frame amplification, reminding members and the public of the organization's values serves to promote their cause and garner positive attention. Furthermore, I imagine that using symbols of military service draws upon positive public sentiments of pride, loyalty, and patriotism. By situating them within the LGBT-oriented events, and by claiming LGBT membership in tandem with military identity, the pride, loyalty, and patriotism of the veteran identity becomes linkable to the LGBT identity. Associating these sentiments with the LGBT movement might serve to bridge these identities for the public, facilitating support.

In this passage, there is a clear relationship between LGBT and veteran identities. By marching with the mile long rainbow flag, a symbol, the GLBVA is offering their support to the broader LGBT social movement. However, by marching in step form and dressing in military sharp, the GLBVA is drawing on their status as former military members to evoke a response from the audience. This demonstrates how, in a sense, the GLBVA is marching for the broader LGBT cause as much as they are their own, but that their battle could be conceived of outside of on its own. This act of marching in military dress not only amplifies the veteran frame by endorsing military pride, and not only bridges the broader LGBT movement with the more specific LGBT veteran movement, but also demonstrates the complexities of identity politics and the way that different goals of social movements are reached. By utilizing the veterans as part of the LGBT parade, the identity of the LGBT movement is reconstructed to include a non-generic, but respected identity. This could alter the way that the LGBT perception is negatively perceived by calling upon the more positively received military identity. However, this also shows how the LGBT veteran movement has its own goal encompassing the inequities of DADT. By reminding

the general public that they are there and they are to be respected and that they take pride in their LGBT membership, they are also calling attention to their need to enact policy change.

DISCUSSION

While I have mostly analyzed this newsletter within the framework of the organization only (within the GLBVA), I would like to push the analysis to the relationship between GBVLA and the larger LGBT movement. Because the tactics used by the newsletter were typically used to rally the members into action, and not necessarily to gain constituents, most of the methods reflected frame amplification. That is, the processes described served the purpose of reinforcing cultural beliefs and values within the members to promote cohesiveness and the orientation of the movement aimed squarely at their goal of LGBT equality within the military. However, if you take one step back while analyzing this newsletter, another frame alignment process can be seen – frame bridging.

To reiterate what this process looks like, this often involves connecting values within social movements or between social movements. These are often linked between ideologically congruent lines. GLBVA is representative of linking LGBT veterans' rights (support upon discharge, health care for those that served) and LGBT rights of equality. In this sense, the LGBT cause is reframed to include veterans, possibly adding another respectable dimension to their movement, and the veterans' cause is able to situate itself within the momentum gained by the LGBT movement.

I argue further that the LGBT veterans' organizations represent a third process of frame alignment: frame transformation. Frame transformation is touted for its ability to turn stereotypes and myths around, a difficult reframing to achieve. In the case of LGBT veterans, military policy relied on myths of homosexual incompatibility with other members of the military. By framing

the military careers in their newsletter, at parades, and at speeches the way they did, LGBT service members were able to showcase that they had successful military careers that were unaffected by their sexual orientation, especially since many came out post-service. In this way, GLBVA was focused on transforming frames to show that the stereotypes were unfounded and that gay military members performed like straight military members. At the same time, having veterans as part of the larger LGBT movement facilitated a similar transformation of frames. By showing that LGBT identifiers had served, and done so honorably in most occasions, the social movement was able to transform the myths about the LGBT community and what they were capable of.

This research examines the way that identity is deployed within a social movement. While much of the above analysis shows that the GLBVA was focused mainly on problems faced uniquely by the veteran population of the LGBT movement, such as unreasonable discharge from military service on a basis of sexual orientation discrimination, it is important to note that the GLBVA acted within the confines of the larger LGBT movement. Their rallies were conducted at Pride Parades; their booths lined the walkways of the Pride Festivals. It is this distinction that makes categorization in social movement research difficult; it is at once both identity oriented, focusing on transforming cultural perceptions of the group, and also politically oriented, including the strategic mobilization of collective identity to reach a tangible end goal. In this case, the GLBVA is simultaneously pushing for a redefinition and acceptance of the LGBT service member, as well as pushing for an end to the discriminatory practices that the military perpetuated.

As such, if identity-oriented goals were the sole motivations for the movement, the intersection of the LGBT and veteran identities could be thought of in one of two ways. First, the

veteran identity could lend its respected status to the LGBT movement as a whole, leading to a more readily reconciled notion of positive cultural transformation. However, it could also lift the status of *only* veteran LGBT identifiers, which would suggest that this cultural transformation would take place at the expense of non-veteran LGBT members. That is, because the veteran status garners respect, those LGBT members that cannot identify as so are relegated back to second-class citizenship relative to veteran LGBT members. However, because the GLBVA mobilized behind resource-oriented goals *in addition to* identity-oriented goals, the question of collective action frames becomes more complex. Because the GLBVA mobilized around the effort to change military policy concerning the discharge of LGBT military members, the GLBVA could also be considered a politically or resource-oriented social movement. To this end, the LGBT veteran identity is both a goal and a strategy to better the lives of LGBT veterans by securing rights in military servitude and in reconstructing the stigmatized LGBT identity.

Moving past social movement classification, and noting that the LGBT veteran social movement encompasses the full spectrum of identity deployment, I would like to explain how the LGBT veteran movement represents the use of a framing device that I will call positive intersectionality. Returning to the discussion of intersectionality and how individuals that have more than one marginalized identity suffer multiplicative discriminatory steps, I will explain what the intersection of LGBT veteran identities look like. I suggest that the relationship between LGBT and veteran identities is best conceived of in the following way: If non-LGBT veterans are treated with the most respect (or have their status lifted in society i.e., through benefits, ceremonies, etc.), and LGBT non-veterans are faced with the most inequality and cultural barriers, then the Veteran LGBT members have their status as LGBT lifted, due to the higher level of cultural acceptance, and even praise, that Veterans receive. In this sense, being at

the intersection of a veteran identity and an LGBT identity is more useful for the goals of the social movement than those that cannot identify as veterans.

To better understand this, I would like to examine this intersection in light of a theory of intersectional invisibility. Based on social dominance theory, intersectional invisibility suggest that certain traits of “intersecting identities will tend to be defined as non-prototypical members of their constituent identity groups” (Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach 2008). Drawing on accepted tenets of androcentrism, ethnocentrism, and heterocentrism, invisible intersectionality suggests that when people have “two or more subordinate identities that do not fit the prototypes of their constituent subordinate groups,” their identities are not fully recognized and their voices are silenced to a degree far higher than those that fit the prototypical identity of the group (p. 381). For example, in the LGBT movement, the voices of minority women may be less recognized than those of white males, because they face discrimination along another axis of identity. Because of androcentrism and ethnocentrism, the white male voice will resonate more than the minority female voice within the subordinate LGBT group.

In particular, what I suggest with positive intersectionality is similar to the central idea of invisible intersectionality. Because LGBT veterans can activate their veteran identity, their voices may resonate louder than those that cannot. This again begs the question, though: does this framing device lift the boat for all, some, or none? My interpretation, like so many arguments, is that it depends on the goal of the organization. In the case of LGBT veterans, the goal of their movement was both policy and culturally oriented. As mentioned earlier, they wished to deconstruct popular notions of what LGBT members were capable of (i.e. breakdown stereotypes that they were NOT capable of being in the military), which lent itself to the policy-oriented goal of challenging the discharge of service members on a basis of sexual orientation,

and eventually, the implementation of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. So, within the context of the LGBT veteran social movement, drawing on stories, pride, and military service by LGBT members certainly lifts the boat for those invested in this policy and identity. When resource-oriented goals are the objective of the social movement, groups that can levy positive intersectionality to not only reframe the way a less positively viewed is perceived but also mobilize to enact policy change may very well see better results.

Limitations and Future Directions

The ultimate goal for this paper is to construct a more complete portrait of how, in a time of peak civil rights activity, a secondary identity is used to reframe a social movement. I have examined the LGBT movement and the role of veterans' organizations directly before and after the implementation of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, based on the historical analysis I have completed of the LGBT movement in Orange County/Long Beach. The early 1990s was a crucial period of time for building momentum, and much of the Southern California LGBT struggle was devoted to DADT. Throughout this paper, I have shown how the utilization of a secondary identity can be used to bolster the effectiveness of a social movement. While this paper elucidates the juncture of LGBT and veteran identities, future research should be composed to extend this addition of positive intersectionality to framing techniques utilized by social movements.

Additionally, future efforts should be focused on the outcomes of the processes I have described in my analysis. While this paper provides a foundation for a novel focus on multiple identity framing and positive intersectionality, at this point I am unable to conclude how successful these strategies actually are. That is, while the LGBT veteran movement clearly *utilized* the veteran status to strengthen the cause of equal rights, did the technique tangibly facilitate success? Furthermore, it would ultimately be prudent to determine what positive

intersectionality truly means within the broader social movement. In this paper, I show how a respected status of veterans lifts the discriminated status of LGBT members. However, the effect of this lifted status for veteran members should be investigated in terms of how it may interact more broadly with non-veteran LGBT goals.

Whatever the case may be, positive intersectionality and the veteran LGBT movement should be examined within a broader scope of LGBT social movement goals. One might argue that the rally to arms against DADT and unfair military discharge on a basis of sexual orientation was one of the first and most visible foci of the LGBT movement before the more recent LGBT marriage equality debate. It is possible that the eventual successful advocacy for military equality affected the journey to marriage equality, but this is certainly a trajectory worthwhile of thoughtful examination.

REFERENCES

- “A Member’s Opinion.” *Reveille!* Newsletter, June 1993, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Abbott, Andrew Delano. 2004. *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences*. Contemporary Societies. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Albiston, Catherine R. 2005. “Bargaining in the Shadow of Social Institutions: Competing Discourses and Social Change in Workplace Mobilization of Civil Rights.” *Law & Society Review* 39 (1): 11–50. doi:10.1111/j.0023-9216.2005.00076.x.
- Andrew W. Jones, Michele Companion, Richard N. Hutchinson, Nella Van Dyke, Leslie Gates. 2001. “Coalition Form and Mobilization Effectiveness in Local Social Movements.” *Sociological Spectrum* 21 (2): 207–31. doi:10.1080/02732170121587.
- Anthias, Floya. 2002. “Beyond Feminism and Multiculturalism:: Locating Difference and the Politics of Location.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 25 (3): 275–86. doi:10.1016/S0277-5395(02)00259-5.
- Anthias, Floya, and Nira Yuval-Davis. 1983. “Contextualizing Feminism: Gender, Ethnic and Class Divisions.” *Feminist Review*, no. 15 (December): 62–75. doi:10.2307/1394792.
- Barnett, Bernice McNair. 1993. “Invisible Southern Black Women Leaders in the Civil Rights Movement: The Triple Constraints of Gender, Race, and Class.” *Gender & Society* 7 (2): 162–82. doi:10.1177/089124393007002002.
- Belkin, Aaron. 2003. “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell: Is the Gay Ban Based on Military Necessity?”

- Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military*, July.
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0bb4j7ss>.
- Belkin, Aaron, and Geoffrey Bateman, eds. 2003. *Don't Ask, Don't Tell: Debating the Gay Ban in the Military*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Benford, Robert D., and Scott A. Hunt. 1992. "Dramaturgy and Social Movements: The Social Construction and Communication of Power" *Sociological Inquiry* 62 (1): 36–55.
 doi:10.1111/j.1475-682X.1992.tb00182.x.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (1): 611–39.
 doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611.
- Berbrier, Mitch. 1998. "'Half the Battle': Cultural Resonance, Framing Processes, and Ethnic Affectations in Contemporary White Separatist Rhetoric." *Social Problems* 45 (4): 431–50. doi:10.2307/3097206.
- Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (3): 531–65.
 doi:10.1086/ajs.1997.103.issue-3.
- Best, Rachel Kahn, Lauren B. Edelman, Linda Hamilton Krieger, and Scott R. Eliason. 2011. "Multiple Disadvantages: An Empirical Test of Intersectionality Theory in EEO Litigation." *Law & Society Review* 45 (4): 991–1025. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00463.x.
- Borch, Fred L. III. 2010. "History of Don't Ask, Don't Tell in the Army: How We Got to It and Why It Is What It Is, The." *Military Law Review* 203: 189.
- Bowleg, Lisa. 2008. "When Black + Lesbian + Woman ≠ Black Lesbian Woman: The Methodological Challenges of Qualitative and Quantitative Intersectionality Research." *Sex Roles* 59 (5-6): 312–25. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z.
- Brah, Avtar, and Ann Phoenix. 2013. "Ain't I A Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 5 (3): 75–86.
- Bredström, Anna. 2006. "Intersectionality A Challenge for Feminist HIV/AIDS Research?" *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 229–43. doi:10.1177/1350506806065754.
- Bumiller, Elisabeth. 2011. "Obama Ends 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Policy." *The New York Times*, July 22, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/23/us/23military.html>.
- Choo, Hae Yeon, and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. "Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities." *Sociological Theory* 28 (2): 129–49. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9558.2010.01370.x.
- Cohen, Jean L. 1985. "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements." *Social Research* 52 (4): 663–716.
- Cotter, K. "The Editor's Page." *The Post*, November 1993, Box 20, Folder 7, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–99.
 doi:10.2307/1229039.
- Davis, Kathy. 2008. "Intersectionality as Buzzword A Sociology of Science Perspective on What Makes a Feminist Theory Successful." *Feminist Theory* 9 (1): 67–85.
 doi:10.1177/1464700108086364.
- Einwohner, R. L., J. A. Hollander, and T. Olson. 2000. "Engendering Social Movements:

- Cultural Images and Movement Dynamics.” *Gender & Society* 14 (5): 679–99. doi:10.1177/089124300014005006.
- Embser-Herbert, Melissa Sheridan. 2007. *The U.S. Military’s “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” Policy: A Reference Handbook*. Contemporary Military, Strategic, and Security Issues. Westport, Conn: Praeger Security International.
- Enck-Wanzer, Darrel. 2006. “Trashing the System: Social Movement, Intersectional Rhetoric, and Collective Agency in the Young Lords Organization’s Garbage Offensive.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92 (2): 174–201. doi:10.1080/00335630600816920.
- Engel, David M. 2003. *Rights of Inclusion: Law and Identity in the Life Stories of Americans with Disabilities*. Chicago Series in Law and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Felstiner, William L. F., Richard L. Abel, and Austin Sarat. 1980. “Emergence and Transformation of Disputes: Naming, Blaming, Claiming ..., The.” *Law & Society Review* 15: 631.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and Silke Roth. 1998. “Gender, Class, and the Interaction Between Social Movements: A Strike of West Berlin Day Care Workers.” *Gender & Society* 12 (6): 626–48. doi:10.1177/089124398012006003.
- Gamson, Joshua. 1995. “Must Identity Movements Self-Destruct? A Queer Dilemma.” *Social Problems* 42 (3): 390–407. doi:10.2307/3096854.
- Gamson, William A. 1982. *Encounters with Unjust Authority*. The Dorsey Series in Sociology. Homewood, Ill: Dorsey Press.
- . 1992. *Talking Politics*. Cambridge [England] ; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1986. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Northeastern University Press ed. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Hankivsky, Olena. 2012. “Women’s Health, Men’s Health, and Gender and Health: Implications of Intersectionality.” *Social Science & Medicine*, Gender and health: Relational, intersectional, and biosocial approaches, 74 (11): 1712–20. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.11.029.
- Hertz, David. "Protestors in Anaheim March Against Policy." *Reveille!* Newsletter, August 1993, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Jenkins, J. Craig. 1983. “Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 9 (January): 527–53.
- Johnson, Brian D. 2006. “The Multilevel Context of Criminal Sentencing: Integrating Judge- and County-Level Influences.” *Criminology* 44 (2): 259–98. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2006.00049.x.
- Ken, Ivy. 2008. “Beyond the Intersection: A New Culinary Metaphor for Race-Class-Gender Studies.” *Sociological Theory* 26 (2): 152–72. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9558.2008.00323.x.
- Klandermans, Bert. 1984. “Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory.” *American Sociological Review* 49 (5): 583–600. doi:10.2307/2095417.
- Levitsky, Sandra R. 2008. ““What Rights?” The Construction of Political Claims to American Health Care Entitlements.” *Law & Society Review* 42 (3): 551–90. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5893.2008.00351.x.
- Liebman, J. S., and P. Clarke. 2011. “Minority Practice, Majority’s Burden: The Death Penalty

- Today." *Ohio St. J. Crim. L.* 9: 255.
- "Long Beach Pride: GLBVA OC/LB to Provide Color Guard, Help Staff OC Federation Booth." *Reveille!* Newsletter, May 1995, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- "Long Beach Parade Goes Wild for Color Guard." *Reveille!* Newsletter, July 1994, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Lynch, Mona Pauline. 2010. *Sunbelt Justice: Arizona and the Transformation of American Punishment*. Critical Perspectives on Crime and Law. Stanford, Calif: Stanford Law Books.
- "Major Success at LB PRide Festival." *Reveille!* Newsletter, July 1994, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Mather, Lynn, and Barbara Yngvesson. 1980. "Language, Audience, and the Transformation of Disputes." *Law & Society Review* 15: 775.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs* 30 (3): 1771–1800. doi:10.1086/signs.2005.30.issue-3.
- McCarthy, John D., and Mark Wolfson. 1996. "Resource Mobilization by Local Social Movement Organizations: Agency, Strategy, and Organization in the Movement Against Drinking and Driving." *American Sociological Review* 61 (6): 1070–88. doi:10.2307/2096309.
- Meekosha, Helen, and Leanne Dowse. 1997. "Enabling Citizenship: Gender, Disability and Citizenship in Australia." *Feminist Review*, no. 57 (October): 49–72.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1985. "The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements." *Social Research* 52 (4): 789–816.
- Merry, Sally Engle. 1997. "Global Human Rights and Local Social Movements in a Legally Plural World." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 12: 247.
- Moore, Barrington. 1978. *Injustice: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt*. White Plains, N.Y.; [New York]: M. E. Sharpe ; distributed by Pantheon Books.
- Nagel, Joane. 1994. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." *Social Problems* 41 (1): 152–76. doi:10.2307/3096847.
- "Naval Intelligence: Weed Out the Best; They Could Have a Bad Influence on the Rest." *PFLAG* Newsletter, February 1991, Box 22, Folder 6, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Osborn, Ken."New York, New York The Spirit of Stonewall." *Reveille!* Newsletter, August 1994, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- "PFLAG Speakers Bureau: Proof That Education is the Best Rx for Ignorance." *PFLAG* Newsletter, April/May 1991), Box 22, Folder 6, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Prins, Baukje. 2006. "Narrative Accounts of Origins A Blind Spot in the Intersectional Approach?" *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 277–90. doi:10.1177/1350506806065757.
- Purdie-Vaughns, Valerie, and Richard P. Eibach. 2008. "Intersectional Invisibility: The Distinctive Advantages and Disadvantages of Multiple Subordinate-Group Identities." *Sex Roles* 59 (5-6): 377–91. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4.

- "Rally Round the Flag, Vets!" *Reveille!* Newsletter, June 1993, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Rimmerman, Craig A., ed. 1996. *Gay Rights, Military Wrongs: Political Perspectives on Lesbians and Gays in the Military*. Garland Reference Library of Social Science, v. 1049. New York: Garland Pub.
- Robnett, Belinda. 1996. "African-American Women in the Civil Rights Movement, 1954-1965: Gender, Leadership, and Micromobilization." *American Journal of Sociology* 101 (6): 1661–93.
- Schoenfeld, Heather. 2010. "Mass Incarceration and the Paradox of Prison Conditions Litigation." *Law & Society Review* 44 (3-4): 731–68. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5893.2010.00421.x.
- Scotch, Richard K. 1988. "Disability as the Basis for a Social Movement: Advocacy and the Politics of Definition." *Journal of Social Issues* 44 (1): 159–72. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1988.tb02055.x.
- Smebye, Ron. "CSW Draws 300,000.", *Reveille!* Newsletter, July 1993, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Smebye, Ron. "Don MacIver Arrested in Protest at the White House.", *Reveille!* Newsletter, August 1993, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51 (4): 464–81. doi:10.2307/2095581.
- "Staff Sergeant Tom Panicia to Speak at Laguna Outreach.", *Reveille!* Newsletter, June 1993, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Staunæs, Dorthe. 2003. "Where Have All the Subjects Gone? Bringing Together the Concepts of Intersectionality and Subjectification." *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 11 (2): 101–10. doi:10.1080/08038740310002950.
- Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet M. Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Taylor, V. 1999. "Gender and Social Movements: Gender Processes in Women's Self-Help Movements." *Gender & Society* 13 (1): 8–33. doi:10.1177/089124399013001002.
- Taylor, Verta, and Leila J. Rupp. 1993. "Women's Culture and Lesbian Feminist Activism: A Reconsideration of Cultural Feminism." *Signs* 19 (1): 32–61.
- Thomas, Mack. "President's Message.", *Reveille!* Newsletter, August 1994, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- Thomas, Mack. "President's Message.", *Reveille!* Newsletter, March 1995, Box 7, Folder 13, Brad Brafford Papers, Special Collections and Archives, University of California, Irvine Libraries.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2000). *Marital Status by Sex, Unmarried-Partner Households, and Grandparents as Caregivers, 2000 American Community Survey*. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_00_SF3_DP2&prodType=table.

- U.S. Census Bureau (2000). *Selected social characteristics, 2000 American Community Survey*. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_00_SF3_DP2&prodType=table.
- Wolff, Tobias Barrington. 1997. "Compelled Affirmations, Free Speech, and the U.S. Military's Don't Ask, Don't Tell Policy." *Brooklyn Law Review* 63: 1141.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. "Intersectionality and Feminist Politics." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 193–209. doi:10.1177/1350506806065752.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2007. "Intersectionality, Citizenship and Contemporary Politics of Belonging." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 10 (4): 561–74. doi:10.1080/13698230701660220.