



## **DoD Inspector General Exposes Improper Activities to Repeal Gays in the Military Law (Don't Ask, Don't Tell)**

*With White House "Spin" the Fix Was In — at Expense of the Troops*

A previously-undisclosed investigation conducted by the Department of Defense Inspector General strongly suggests that the so-called Pentagon "study" of gays in the military in 2010 was a publicly-funded pre-scripted production put on just for show. The 30-page, DoD IG report, completed on April 8, 2011, reveals improper activities and deception that misled members of Congress in order "to gain momentum in support of a legislative change during the 'lame duck' session of Congress following the November 2, 1010, elections." (DoD IG Report, p. 20)

In 2010 the Defense Department's Comprehensive Review Working Group (CRWG) commissioned an official survey of over 400,000 troops and families, and conducted scores of focus groups worldwide to seek opinions on the law usually called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." Uniformed personnel who participated in good faith were led to believe that their opinions would be heard and respected. But as early as July 4, 2010, even before the official survey of troops began, CRWG Co-Chair and DoD General Counsel Jeh Johnson was seeking advice from a "former news anchor" on how to write the report's Executive Summary more "persuasively."

The [DoD IG report](#) concluded that someone who "had a strongly emotional attachment to the issue" and "likely a pro-repeal agenda" violated security rules and leaked selected, half-true information to the *Washington Post*. On November 11, 2010, the *Post* published a highly-misleading story suggesting that "70%" of active-duty and reserve troops surveyed were not concerned about repeal of the law. The DoD did not correct the unauthorized "spin," which was widely publicized and cited on the floor during Senate debate. The ultimate result of this travesty was a rushed vote to repeal the law regarding homosexuals in the military, with delayed implementation, during the December 2010 lame-duck session of the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress.

Investigators interviewed 96 of 101 people with access, but stopped short of questioning five named White House officials who met to discuss the draft report on November 9 — just before the carefully-spun leaked story appeared in the *Washington Post*. One of these was James Messina, Deputy Chief of Staff for President Obama and the designated "liaison" to LGBT activists. Messina, hailed by gay activists as an "unsung hero" in the drive to repeal the 1993 law, is now the campaign manager for President Obama's Chicago-based re-election effort.

The purpose of the contrived CRWG process was to neutralize military opposition to repeal of the law by manufacturing an *illusion* of support. The administration misused military personnel, funds, and facilities to help President Obama to deliver on political promises to gay activists at the expense of trusting troops who became unknowing props in the pro-repeal campaign. The 112<sup>th</sup> Congress should question White House officials who were not interviewed previously, and do everything possible to repair the damage done to our military.

## Excerpts from DoD Inspector General Report:

“On or about July 4, 2010, three days before Service members received the CRWG ‘Don't Ask, Don't Tell’ survey, **Mr.[Jeh] Johnson read portions of ‘an early draft’ of the executive summary of the draft Report to a former news anchor, a close personal friend visiting Mr. Johnson's home.** As ‘a personal favor’ the news anchor provided advice regarding syntax, sentence structure, and suggestions for persuasive writing...[T]he former news anchor testified, **‘I was very pleased that finally the United States was getting around to...[repeal of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell,'], and I was struck by how many members of the United States Armed Services thought this was just fine.’**”

\* \* \* \* \*

“Witnesses testified that the key leaked data point cited in the *Washington Post*, as well as other media outlets and politicians following the improper disclosure, was the survey statistic that *‘more than 70 percent of respondents ... said the effect of repealing the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy would be positive, mixed or nonexistent.’* According to one public affairs officer, ‘This 70 percent figure got everybody's attention.’ **We observed that the 70 percent figure reported in the media, while present in the draft Report's executive summary, was derived from just one of the 102 survey questions submitted to Service members.** The relevant survey question asked the following:

*‘If 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' is repealed and you are working with a Service member in your immediate unit who has said he or she is gay or lesbian, how, if at all, would it affect how Service members in your immediate unit work together to get the job done?’*

“The survey inquiry yielded the following responses:

Very Positively	6.6%
Positively	11.8%
Mixed	32.1%
Negatively	18.7%
Very Negatively	10.9%
No Effect	19.9%

(DoD IG Report, p. 15, emphasis added)

“[T]o reach the conclusion that 70 percent of respondents said repeal would have positive, mixed, or no effect on a unit's ability to work together to get a job done, the CRWG combined four survey results categories to derive the 70 percent figure: Very Positively; Positively; Mixed; and No Effect. **If Mr. O'Keefe's and Mr. Jaffe's sources had desired to further an anti-repeal bias for the article, he/she could likewise have combined four results categories from that same survey question to conclude that "82 percent of respondents said the effect of repealing the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy would be negative, mixed or no effect': Very Negatively; Negatively, Mixed, and No Effect.**” (DoD IG Report, p. 21, emphasis added)

\* \* \* \* \*

“Early evidence suggested that the primary source of the information was someone who had a **strong emotional attachment to the issue of furthering a repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," and probably had ‘assumptions going in’ that the CRWG's findings would ultimately reveal that repeal would not be supported by a majority of Service members.** In addition, e-mails from the *Washington Post* reporters suggested that the source was not a ‘disinterested party,’ and other evidence showed **the source carefully disclosed specific survey data to support a pro-repeal agenda.** **We consider it likely that the primary source disclosed content from the draft Report with the intent to shape a pro-repeal perception of the draft Report prior to its release to gain momentum in support of a legislative change during the ‘lame duck’ session of Congress following the November 2, 2010, elections.”** (DoD IG Report, p. 20)