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Content Standards
11.9.3 Trace the origins and geopolitical consequences (foreign and domestic) of the Cold War and containment policy, including the following: The Vietnam War.

11.11 Students analyze the major social problems and domestic policy issues in contemporary American society.

CCSS Standards
Reading
RH.1 (11-12): Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, connecting insights gained from specific details to an understanding of the text as a whole.

RH.9 (11-12): Integrate information from diverse sources, both primary and secondary, into a coherent understanding of an idea or event, noting discrepancies among sources.

Writing
WHST.1 (11-12): Write arguments focused on discipline-specific content.

Speaking and Listening
Sl 1: Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 11-12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

(A) Come to discussions prepared, having read and researched material under study; explicitly draw on that preparation by referring to evidence from texts and other research on the topic or issue to stimulate a thoughtful, well-reasoned exchange of ideas.

(B) Work with peers to promote civil, democratic discussions and decision-making, set clear goals and deadlines, and establish individual roles as needed.
(C) Propel conversations by posing and responding to questions that probe reasoning and evidence; ensure a hearing for a full range of positions on a topic or issue; clarify, verify, or challenge ideas and conclusions; and promote divergent and creative perspectives.

(D) Respond thoughtfully to diverse perspectives; synthesize comments, claims, and evidence made on all sides of an issue; resolve contradictions when possible; and determine what additional information or research is required to deepen the investigation or complete the task.

Overview of Lesson

Students will use a variety of primary and secondary sources to understand the LGBT experience during the Vietnam War. Students will also consider how sexuality and social conditions impacted both LGBT Americans who served in the military during Vietnam, as well as LGBT Americans on the home front. Students will use the evolving hypothesis strategy to answer the inquiry question, by first analyzing primary sources using historical thinking skills of sourcing, contextualization, close reading and corroboration. Students will then be asked to form an initial hypothesis. Subsequently students will be presented with multiple rounds of evidence. With each new round of evidence, students return to the inquiry question to either adjust or defend their evidence-based answer. The lesson will culminate with students working in groups to finalize clear, concise historical arguments in response to the inquiry question.

Sources

B. "Lesbians and Gay Men in the U.S. Military: Historical Background," 2016
C. "Gay Pioneer Leonard Matlovich First TV Interview - May 26, 1975."
Procedures

1. The teacher will introduce the lesson by reminding students that Americans experienced the Vietnam War, both on the battlefield and on the homefront, in diverse ways. Today students will examine how LGBT Americans responded to the Vietnam War.

2. Shows students the photograph of Leonard Matlovich’s gravestone (Source A). Without giving further biographical context on Matlovich, ask students how they would initially answer the inquiry question, “How did LGBT Americans experience the Vietnam War?” based on this photograph. Ask them to consider what is included on the gravestone, and what is missing. Why is this significant?

3. Show students the video “Gay Pioneer Leonard Matlovich First TV Interview - May 26, 1975.” (Source B). Also ask students to read “Lesbians and Gay Men in the U.S. Military: Historical Background” (Source C). Then lead students in a brief discussion regarding the timeline of gays and lesbians serving in the US military, with specific attention to the Vietnam War era. If students are familiar with the post-World War II desegregation of the US military, ask them to compare the experiences of gay and lesbian soldiers with black soldiers after World War II. How can they compare the US military’s attitudes towards race and sexuality during the second half of the 20th century? Important vocabulary includes:
   ○ Homophile movement
   ○ Vietnam Veterans Against the War
   ○ Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell policy

4. Next, introduce students to the annotation strategy they will use for the activity. Choose one document from those attached and demonstrate how to annotate and label the historical thinking skills of sourcing, contextualization, close reading and corroboration (Handout 1).

5. The teacher will now create groups of 3-4 students. Introduce and review the directions for the Evolving Hypothesis activity (Handout 2).

6. Evolving Hypothesis Round 1: give each group excerpts from the US Army’s 1966 Regulations on Homosexuality (Source D) and information on the 1966 Los Angeles parade to end the ban on gays in the military (Source E and Source F). Ask students to collectively annotate the documents, and label the historical thinking skills. Then students will compose a 2-3 sentence hypothesis that answers the inquiry question, based on these sources.
7. Ask each group to share their hypotheses. Discuss any similarities or differences in their arguments. Some questions to guide the discussion: Which LGBT Americans are represented in these sources? Which LGBT Americans are not represented? How is your argument complete/incomplete?

8. Evolving Hypothesis Round 2: give each group the photograph from a 1970 Gay Liberation Front protest against the Vietnam War (Source G) and an article about a 1971 gay vets meeting from the Vietnam Veterans Against the War (Source H). Again, ask students to annotate these documents and label the historical thinking skills. Then, ask students to modify their existing hypothesis based on these new documents.

9. Ask each group to share their hypotheses. Discuss how their hypotheses changed from Round 1. Some questions to guide the discussion: Did your hypothesis change after reading the new documents? Why/why not? Whose voices are now included in your argument? Which voices are still missing?

10. Evolving Hypothesis Round 3: give each group the documents relating to Leonard Matlovich, a Vietnam War veteran who purposely outed himself in 1975 to challenge the military's ban on gays (Source I and Source J). Again, ask students to annotate these documents and label the historical thinking skills. Then, ask students to finalize their existing hypothesis based on these new documents.

11. Ask each group to share their final hypotheses. Compare and contrast their final hypotheses, both among groups as well as compared to previous versions. Some questions to guide the discussion: Did some documents influence your hypothesis more than others? Why and how? Did you discount any documents? Why? Are any perspectives still missing? An important historical understanding that should emerge is the variety of ways in which LGBT Americans responded to the Vietnam War, from joining the war effort, to protesting the war, to seeking equality within the context of the US military.

Assessment

Each student will individually identify 6-8 pieces of textual evidence that support their group’s final hypothesis. Students should submit each piece of text with an abbreviated citation: author, title of document, date or title of document, publisher, date.
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In contrast to its escalating efforts to promote racial integration and its increasingly nonrestrictive policies concerning gender, opposition in the armed forces to admitting and retaining gay male and lesbian members has intensified since World War II. Historically, the military did not officially exclude or discharge homosexuals from its ranks. However, throughout U.S. history, campaigns have purged military units of persons suspected of engaging in homosexual acts.

Homosexual Americans were allowed to serve, however, when personnel shortages necessitated it. As expansion of the war effort required that all available personnel be utilized, screening procedures were loosened and many homosexual men and women enlisted and served. This shift was temporary. As the need for recruits diminished near the war's end, antihomosexual policies were enforced with increasing vigilance, and many gay men and lesbians were discharged involuntarily. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, acknowledging a homosexual orientation barred an individual from military service.

In the 1970s, however, a new movement emerged in the United States that pressed for civil rights for gay men and lesbians. The military policy was one target of this movement, dramatized by the legal challenge to the policy mounted by Leonard Matlovich.... Although largely unsuccessful, they highlighted the wide latitude of discretion allowed to commanders in implementing existing policy, which resulted in considerable variation in the rigor with which the policy was enforced.

In 1981, the DOD formulated a new policy which stated unequivocally that homosexuality is incompatible with military service (DOD Directive 1332.14, January 28, 1982, Part 1, Section H). According to a 1992 report by the Government Accounting Office (GAO), nearly 17,000 men and women were discharged under the category of homosexuality in the 1980s...

By the end of the 1980s, reversing the military’s policy was emerging as a priority for advocates of gay and lesbian civil rights. Several lesbian and gay male members of the armed services came out publicly and vigorously challenged their discharges through the legal system. In 1992, legislation to overturn the ban was introduced in the U.S. Congress. By that time, grassroots civilian opposition to the DOD’s policy appeared to be increasing. Many national organizations had officially condemned the policy and many colleges and universities had banned military recruiters and Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) programs from their campuses in protest of the policy.
By the beginning of 1993, it appeared that the military’s ban on gay personnel would soon be overturned... After lengthy public debate and congressional hearings, President [Bill Clinton] and Senator Sam Nunn (D-GA), chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, reached a compromise which they labeled Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Don’t Pursue. Under its terms, military personnel would not be asked about their sexual orientation and would not be discharged simply for being gay. Engaging in sexual conduct with a member of the same sex, however, would still constitute grounds for discharge....

The policy remained in effect until 2011, although the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network and other organizations monitoring its implementation repeatedly pointed out its failures. Discharges actually increased under the policy, and harassment of gay and lesbian personnel appeared to intensify in many locales....

Throughout this time, public opinion appeared to favor allowing service by openly gay personnel. A December, 2003, Gallup poll registered 79% of US adults (including 68% of self-described conservatives) in favor of allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly. It would be another seven years, however, until Congress repealed the policy, and nearly another year before the repeal took effect. Meanwhile, the "Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell" policy – and broader questions concerning whether and how gay men and lesbians should serve in the military – remained volatile issues with great symbolic potency.


A few Los Angeles homophile groups were even bolder. In 1966, thousands of bemused Angelenos witnessed the first gay parade on record, which was part of the “First National Homophile Protest” to end the ban on gays in the military. On May 12, a long line of cars bearing on their hoods signs four feet tall that declared “Ten Percent of all GI’s are Homosexual” and “Write LBJ Today!” wound a twenty-mile route from downtown Los Angeles to Hollywood. The protest, one of five demonstrations in cities across the nation, was planned by the National Conference of Homophile Organizations, though Los Angeles was the only city to stage a parade. The energy behind the march came from the old

Though the impact of this first gay parade was minimal—and more than forty years later gay people were still fighting the same battle over homosexuals in the military—Harry Hay observed that the homophile movement had “never had so much news coverage before.” The coverage was inconsistent at best. For example the Los Angeles Times declined to send a reporter to cover the parade “unless someone was hurt.” Homophiles, however, coming from an era in which the media would keep mum about them if there was nothing bad to say, were thankful for crumbs of attention that were not unmitigated vilification. The homophiles did not understand what the gay revolutionaries of the next generation would figure out brilliantly: how to manipulate the media.

A group of Gay members of the VVAW recently met together at the National Gay Conference in Madison, Wisconsin. The meeting was called in order to discuss the problems of Gays both in the military and the veterans' anti-war movement.

In a statement, the group said: "Gay veterans served side by side with our brothers, but had to endure a special form of psychological oppression. A prime example is basic training, where 'fag baiting' is used to brainwash GIs into a state of mind in which committing an atrocity is proof of manliness. As Gay Vietnam Veterans we see the military as based not only on racism, but on sexism and anti-Gay paranoia as well. The oppression that a Gay soldier experiences leads him to skag just as surely as his realization of the injustice of the war."

The ad-hoc Gay caucus is planning an investigation of military anti-Gay attitudes and persecution to be held in conjunction with national Gay Pride Week in Washington, D.C., in June, 1972. They seek the aid of all veterans in obtaining testimony and information for the hearings.

The Gay veteran's problem can be summed up by one vet's statement: "I got a medal for killing two men and a dishonorable discharge for loving one."

If you have testimony or questions, contact Vince Muscari VVAW, 25 W. 26th Street, N.Y.C., 10010.


Gay Activist Leonard Matlovich, 44, Dies
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Gay Activist Leonard Matlovich, 44, Dies

When I was in the military they gave me a medal for killing two men and a discharge for loving one.

--- Inscription on tombstone that will mark the grave of Leonard Matlovich.

By BURT A. FOLKART, Times Staff Writer

Leonard Matlovich, a decorated war hero in Vietnam who later fought a battle in the courtrooms of America for his right to remain in the military as a homosexual, died Wednesday night of AIDS at the home of a friend in Hollywood.

The Air Force veteran with an exemplary service record was forcibly discharged after he professed his homosexuality. He was 44.

Matlovich, who won the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart for wounds suffered in Vietnam, had been diagnosed with AIDS in September, 1986, and had lived in San Francisco until the end of April, when he moved to Hollywood.

Matlovich had moved to Los Angeles, said his longtime friend Michael Bedwell, "because the hills made it too difficult for him to get around in his deteriorating condition."

A political conservative with a lifelong faith in God, duty and country, Matlovich was a career serviceman, as was his father. He had volunteered for three tours of duty in Vietnam and was decorated when he killed two attacking Viet Cong guerrillas while on sentry duty. He was considered an outstanding technical sergeant when, on March 8, 1975, he wrote a letter to his commanding officer at Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, confessing his homosexuality but asking that he be permitted to remain in the service.

He thus embarked on a path that propelled him into a symbol for the gay community throughout America, placed him on the cover of Time magazine and made him the focus of a praised 1978 TV docudrama, "Sgt. Matlovich vs. the Air Force."

Leonard Matlovich

MATLOVICH: Gay Activist Dies; Fought Expulsion From Military

Continued From Page 2

"I would never have chosen this life style," Matlovich said of his homosexuality when pleading with an Air Force board to let him remain in service. "But I didn't have that choice. I have to live with myself," the then-12-year veteran said in September, 1975.

He had come out of the closet originally, he explained, "because I was a warrior and you ultimately had abandoned your campaign for reinstatement in exchange for a $160,000 settlement."

In November, 1983, U.S. District Judge Gerhard A. Gросс in Washing- ton had ordered the Air Force to reinstate Matlovich with back pay at the rank and salary he would have obtained had he not been discharged. Gross ruled that Matlovich's discharge was invalid because the Air Force had failed to explain the policy on the retention and discharge of homosexuals in the service.

But an out-of-court settlement, filed by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, vacated Gross's order to take Matlovich back in the Air Force. It gave him $388,200 in compensation beyond the $160,000 in back pay he had accumulated since his discharge which then was upgraded from general to honorable.

Matlovich was particularly sympathetic to blacks and liberal to release how a singlet of black servicemen at Langley had been his only supporter when he first went public with his homosexuality.

"He was a man of a great many ethics, and very intense about his human rights beliefs, says he could never put down."

Matlovich was particularly sympathetic to blacks and liberal to release how a singlet of black servicemen at Langley had been his only supporter when he first went public with his homosexuality.

"He was the average American, but he took the Constitution a little more seriously than most people, and that's why he sacrificed his Air Force job for the sake of rights for gay and lesbian people," Bedwell said.

"In the intervening years his name continued to surface. Last year he helped xxxx change its guidelines which xxxx the note or the effect of the film," Bedwell said. "He was xxxx to the xxxx of the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations."

"xxxx said xxxx of the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations."

A memorial Mass will be xxxx at 7 p.m. today at Divine Reilexite Metropolitan Community Church, 386 Riverdale Drive, Glendale.

# Historical Thinking Chart

Handout 1: Historical Thinking Chart


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Reading Skills</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Students should be able to . . .</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sourcing                  | • Who wrote this?  
• What is the author’s perspective?  
• When was it written?  
• Where was it written?  
• Why was it written?  
• Is it reliable? Why? Why not? | • Identify the author’s position on the historical event  
• Identify and evaluate the author’s purpose in producing the document  
• Hypothesize what the author will say before reading the document  
• Evaluate the source’s trustworthiness by considering genre, audience, and purpose | • The author probably believes . . .  
• I think the audience is . . .  
• Based on the source information, I think the author might . . .  
• I do/don’t trust this document because . . . |
| Contextualization         | • When and where was the document created?  
• What was different then? What was the same?  
• How might the circumstances in which the document was created affect its content? | • Understand how context/background information influences the content of the document  
• Recognize that documents are products of particular points in time | • Based on the background information, I understand this document differently because . . .  
• The author might have been influenced by _____ (historical context) . . .  
• This document might not give me the whole picture because . . . |
| Corroboration             | • What do other documents say?  
• Do the documents agree? If not, why?  
• What are other possible documents?  
• What documents are most reliable? | • Establish what is probable by comparing documents to each other  
• Recognize disparities between accounts | • The author agrees/disagrees with . . .  
• These documents all agree/disagree about . . .  
• Another document to consider might be . . . |
| Close Reading             | • What claims does the author make?  
• What evidence does the author use?  
• What language (words, phrases, images, symbols) does the author use to persuade the document’s audience?  
• How does the document’s language indicate the author’s perspective? | • Identify the author’s claims about an event  
• Evaluate the evidence and reasoning the author uses to support claims  
• Evaluate author’s word choice; understand that language is used deliberately | • I think the author chose these words in order to . . .  
• The author is trying to convince me . . .  
• The author claims . . .  
• The evidence used to support the author’s claims is . . . |
Handout 2: Evolving Hypothesis Activity

1. Examine and discuss the inquiry question: How did LGBT Americans respond to the Vietnam War? Determine what the question is asking, and discuss relevant historical context for this question.

2. Together with your group, read and analyze the Round 1 documents. Annotate and label the Historical Thinking Skills.

3. Compose a 2-3 sentence hypothesis that answers the inquiry question. Base your hypothesis on the Round 1 documents and historical context.

4. Share your hypothesis with the class, and note similarities or differences with other groups in the class.

5. Together with your group, read and analyze the Round 2 documents. Annotate and label the Historical Thinking Skills.

6. Revisit your hypothesis. Modify it to incorporate evidence from the Round 2 documents. You may need to make minor additions, or completely rewrite the hypothesis.

7. Share your hypothesis with the class, and note how other groups’ hypotheses changed.

8. Together with your group, read and analyze the Round 3 documents. Annotate and label the Historical Thinking Skills.

9. Make final changes to your hypothesis. Modify it to incorporate evidence from the Round 3 documents.

10. Share your final hypothesis with the class. Consider how each group’s argument evolved between rounds. Which documents did groups seem to prioritize? Did they discount any documents? Did LGBT Americans respond to the Vietnam War in uniform ways?
The ONE Archives Foundation, Inc. is the oldest continuously operating LGBTQ organization in the nation, and a critical resource for showcasing trailblazing and diverse LGBTQ+ history and culture. The ONE Archives foundation provides programs and resources for students, educators, and the public, supporting inclusive learning environments and providing gateways to learn about the LGBTQ communities’ contributions to society, in conjunction with the FAIR Education Act.

For more information, contact Erik Adamian, Associate Director of Education at eadamian@onearchives.org

www.onearchives.org

The UCLA History-Geography Project is one of the sites of the California History Social Science Project. The UCLA History-Geography Project collaborates with educational researchers, historians and practitioners to design and lead professional development programs that enrich K-12 history-social studies instruction.

For more information, contact Daniel Diaz, Director, at ddiaz@gseis.ucla.edu.

www.centerx.gseis.ucla.edu