

Redefining History: An Analysis of Presidential Speeches

Regarding the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action

A Thesis presented in fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree

By

Art Munin

June 2004

Committee Members:
Kimberly Moffitt, Ph.D.
Alexandra Murphy, Ph.D.

Department of Communication
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
DePaul University
Chicago, IL USA

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION</u>	
Overview.....	3
<u>Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</u>	
G.I. Bill.....	6
Affirmative Action.....	10
Social Dominance Theory.....	13
<u>Chapter 3: METHODS</u>	
Methods.....	23
<u>Chapter 4: RESULTS</u>	
Results Overview.....	26
Theme I: Ethics.....	26
Theme II: An American Problem.....	28
Theme III: Equal Opportunity.....	30
Theme IV: Bill of Rights.....	33
Theme V: War Metaphor.....	36
Theme VI: Discourse Placement Within State of the Union Speeches.....	38
<u>Chapter 5: DISCUSSION</u>	
Discussion	40
<u>Chapter 6: CONCLUSION</u>	
Limitations and Response.....	50
Implications.....	53
Future Directions.....	54
<u>REFERENCES</u>	
Speeches for Analysis.....	56
Additional Speeches Reviewed.....	58
References.....	60

Chapter 1

Overview

At the essence of society is dominance. Whether it is through varying degrees of prejudice or oppression, the core of society is the minimization of “group conflict by creating consensus on ideologies that promotes the superiority of one group over others” (Pratto, et al., 1994, p. 741). In America we all take on varying roles in the degree to which we enhance the hierarchy as outlined by Social Dominance Theory (SDT) (Pratto, et al., 1994 & Sidanius, et al., 1994). Those who are more in support of the dominant ideology will have a greater social dominance orientation, thereby taking up roles that enhance the status quo. Conversely, those who find themselves in opposition to the dominant society have a lower social dominance orientation take on the role of hierarchy attenuators.

This document highlights an ironic twist to the fluidity of what is considered hierarchy-enhancing when considering two pieces of history: the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action (AA). It is clear at their essence that both programs are needed to fulfill America’s promise to all individuals desiring the equal access promised by our Bill of Rights, Constitution and the culture surrounding the belief in the American Dream. This research tests the contention that the G.I. Bill was the largest piece of Affirmative Action legislation ever set forth by the United States government. It will further be shown that society’s failure to classify the G.I. Bill as so is due to belief in hierarchy legitimizing myths.

The support of the aforementioned claim will first be upheld by an examination of the literature describing the theory and goals of Affirmative Action and the G.I. Bill. Additionally, this work entails an investigation of the discourse used to garner support for these societal movements. Specifically, twelve presidential speeches from Franklin D. Roosevelt and Lyndon B. Johnson will be analyzed utilizing Grounded Theory to reveal themes common to both, metaphors and other facets of the discourse. By detailing the analogous theoretical constructs and verbal styling between these two entities, the failure to classify them as similar becomes central. It is the contention of this document that the above assertion is symptomatic of how society can shift labels and control perception of societal constructs in fostering support of the hierarchy. In failing to label the G.I. Bill as AA throughout history supports the notion that the predominantly white men who were served by the former are somehow of a different social class than those commonly viewed as being served by AA (i.e. African-Americans, women). The importance of highlighting this hierarchy–enhancing myth as a fallacy of perception is explored as vital to the work of critical scholars.

This document will first cover the relevant literature of the G.I. Bill, Affirmative Action and Social Dominance Theory. Following this review, SDT will provide the baseline of understanding as to how the G.I. Bill and AA are related and by what means are they perceptually kept apart. Methods regarding this study will be detailed followed by results. A thorough discussion of the results in

light of the understanding Social Dominance Theory grants including this work's own implications, limitations and future directions will end the document.

Chapter 2

The G.I. Bill

One does not need to look further than the titles of many of the articles regarding the G.I. Bill to see that this is one of the most praised pieces of legislation in the history of American government. A couple examples are “The G.I. Bill and Higher Education: Success and Surprise” (Olson, 1973) and “The G.I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever Made by Uncle Sam” (Kiestler, 1994). It was on June 22, 1944 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law what was called the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act or Public Law 346. This signing was done without much of the country paying attention because all were enamored with Allied invasion into Europe. It was commonly thought that most veterans would not take advantage of this bill because of the little interest the middle and lower classes had in higher education before the war. The actual prediction was 8-12 percent (Kiestler, 1994).

Interestingly, it was Eleanor Roosevelt who greatly encouraged FDR to promote this program by saying the U.S. needed to “adjust our economic system so that opportunity is open to [veterans]...or we may reap the whirlwind” (Olson, 1973, p. 599). These veterans were removed from American society for years due to World War II and returned to their homeland in a disadvantaged state. This could very easily leave them on the bread lines with little hope. And, aside from the fear of veterans filling the ranks of the poor upon their return, there was a deep feeling that this country owed them something. These men had fought for

America and this legislation would be a small way to repay what they had sacrificed (Olson, 1973).

The specific educational rights outlined in the bill were that a veteran was guaranteed one year of higher education for every 90 days of service rendered. This also included a 1:1 ratio for every month of active duty capped at 48 months. A total of \$500 would be paid directly to any university, in addition to a \$50 per month stipend if single and \$75 if married. An interesting detail so as to relate this fiscal reality to present day higher education, the more expensive private schools of this time only charged about \$300 per year in tuition and fees (Kiestler, 1994).

Three additional provisions were attached to this bill. First, the United States Employment Service (USEF) was dedicated to finding jobs for all veterans. The service worked diligently to not only find work, but to find work which fit the veteran's talents and skills. The USEF began this first large scale use of vocational counseling. As a second provision, if no job could be found, the veterans were compensated for up to one full year at the rate of \$20 per week. Lastly, the G.I. Bill addressed the credit difficulties of returning veterans by federally guaranteeing a home or business loan (Onkst, 1998).

Kiestler (1994) wrote that many scoffed these benefits as nothing more than a handout and they "predicted that lazy veterans would capitalize on them to shrink jobs" (p. 131). However, the veterans saw this as a ticket to a better life for the children and their desire to do just that can be seen in how they swarmed the college campuses of America.

The numbers accepted at colleges and universities all across the country exploded in the late 1940's due to the influx of these veterans. The University of Wisconsin went from 9,000 enrolled to 18,000, Rutgers University grew from 7,000 to 16,000, and Stanford grew from 3,000 to 7,000. This dramatically affected the resources that universities had to manage all the new freshmen (Kiestler, 1994). Additionally the veterans were not expected to perform well at the college level as an effect of their age and the families they had to support. This turned out to be a shockingly wrong assumption: The G.I.'s excelled. An interesting statistic is that those veterans that faired the best were actually those who had been away from school the longest, were married, and were older (Olson, 1973). Olson (1973) quotes the New York Times as saying "The G.I.'s are hogging the honor rolls and the dean's lists; they are walking away with the top marks in all of their courses...Far from being an educational problem, the veteran has become an asset to higher education" (p. 606).

The G.I. Bill had an enormous effect on higher education as we know it today. Writers such as Clark (1998) have said that:

The presence of the veteran-everyman at typically elite institutions seemed to translate to college experience into more comprehensible conceptual terms, indeed, to democratize the image of higher education to a certain degree. The veterans blazed the path for others to follow, seeming remake American colleges to fit the practical needs of its citizens in a new corporate world (p. 177).

And, through the veterans participation in higher education they were now viewed as a part of a higher class of society. This type of upward mobility is exactly what the veterans desired for their children when they first partook of these benefits. And, as a function of these benefits received, these veterans were now more aligned “with the imperatives of a corporate world and a consumer class” (Clark, 1998, p. 189).

The description of the G.I. Bill’s purpose has thus far sounded like an equal opportunity program that all veterans could take advantage of; however, this was not the case. The federal government left the implementation of this bill to those on the state level and in the deep South, blatant racism was still a way of life and segregation was how all were organized. African American veterans were not afforded the same opportunities and every loop hole that could be found to take benefits away from them was sought (Onkst, 1998). One black veteran was quoted as, “To Negro veterans in Mississippi getting a G.I. loan is similar to seeking ‘The Holy Grail’” (Onkst, 1998, p. 523). And, as far as the on-the-job training was concerned, only 7 to 8 percent were allowed to enroll for such services. This is remarkable considering that one-third of the veteran population of the south was African-American. The ironic twist here is that this unchecked discrimination served as a catalyst for the leaders of the Civil Rights Movement (Onkst, 1998).

The last piece of historical data that must be reported is the numbers of those affected by the implementation of this bill and the final World War II G.I. Bill price tag. At the end of the WWII veteran’s tenure with the G.I. Bill, there were

“450,000 engineers, 240,000 accountants, 238,000 teachers, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, 22,000 dentists, 17,000 writers and editors, and thousands of other professionals” (Kiester, 1994, p. 130). The final price tag the government paid was 5.5 billion dollars (Kiester, 1994). If all of the veterans through the Vietnam era are included, that price tag jumps to 40 billion (Mattila, 1978).

The overall coverage of the G.I. Bill in American history is reported very consistently. This consistency is where I find the greatest criticism. No doubt, this bill did wondrous things in aiding the veterans returning from war. These veterans made tremendous sacrifices and were/are deserving of it all. However, history does not grant adequate voice to the socio-cultural implications of this program and its lacking of equal opportunity implementation.

This critique is about the implementation and longer term effects of this bill. In no way do I critique the theory behind assisting a portion of society because of their disadvantaged status. This will prove to be an important facet of this review now moving into greater detail of Affirmative Action.

Affirmative Action

The term Affirmative Action was first used in The National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of 1935 which said that the National Labor Relations Board was “empowered to remedy unfair labor practices by the issuance of cease and desist, and reinstatement and back pay orders, and by ordering affirmative action in effectuating the policies of the NLRA” (Turner, 1990, p.5). Then, in 1941, a second revelation was brought forward by the Julius Rosenwald Fund which

clearly exemplified how rampant race discrimination was. They studied a series of predominately white colleges across the country to find that there were only 2 African American professors employed. The universities defended their hiring by saying that no other African Americans possessed the necessary credentials or experience to undertake these positions. The universities were wrong. The Fund was able to provide an entire list of names of more than qualified African American candidates that had been overlooked. Furthermore, the Fund offered that if any of these candidates were hired, the Fund would pay their salary. This was not widely taken advantage of; only two African American faculty were hired (Woodhouse, 2002).

Historically speaking, many scholars believe that the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the first national policy that sought to actively combat racist hiring practices (Woodhouse, 2002; Moses, 2001; Steeh & Krysan, 1996). This is the event that tipped off the AA debate in American society and, as it occurred during Lyndon B. Johnson's administration, serves as a catalyst for much of the discourse to be analyzed herein.

There is a muddy history of case law and governmental interventions in this debate making clear cut legal decisions on this matter difficult. In the year 1978 the Regents of the University of California vs Bakke was a crucial court case in that U.S. Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell concluded it was of great government interest and benefit to have diversity in America's institutes of higher education (Gurin, et al., 2002). Specifically he wrote:

...so essential to the quality of higher education – is widely believed to be promoted by diverse student body...It is not too much to say that the nation's future depends upon leaders trained through wide exposure to the ideas and mores of students as diverse as this Nation of many peoples (Gurin, et al., 2002, p. 331).

In defiance of Justice Powell's mandate the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Texas denied that higher education benefited from the presence of a diverse student body. This ruling was then contradicted by the 2001 ruling in the case of University of Washington Law School vs Smith. Here the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the Bakke decision is still fully justified under the law (Gurin, et al., 2002).

This is by no means an exhaustive investigation into the US government's conflicted relationship with AA. The most recent decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in Grutter vs Bollinger and Gratz vs Bollinger have still yet to see their full implications. Lee Bollinger, the named defendant, former dean of the University of Michigan, and long time defender of AA said:

A core mission of the university is to help students see the world through multiple perspectives. Given the history of this country, there is a different life experience growing up White, growing up Black, Hispanic or Native American. Giving students a chance to cross those boundaries is the same kind of educational experience as sitting down and reading a novel that illuminates for you a

perspective on life that you had not seen before (Whitaker, 2001, p. 114).

The repercussions of this ruling are still evolving throughout higher education. However, the Supreme Court has at least painted the broad stroke that Affirmative Action, when done competently, is constitutional (Schmidt, 2003 & Schmidt, 2002).

One study of note which is bold in its assertions relating to AA (James, et al, 2001) draws a direct comparison to prejudicial attitudes whites hold and how that affects their views towards AA and Equal Opportunity Employment (EEO). There is a strong correlation between whites who are prejudice against African Americans and those who are strongly against AA/EEO. However, those whites who are labeled non-prejudice have more open views about AA/EEO and see these programs as attempts to level the playing field for all job applicants. While these results do add to an established portion of the AA literature, the groups defined in the study are problematic. Much research would refute the labeling of any group as non-prejudice. It is commonly believed that while humans have the potential to be open-minded, it is impossible for them to be free from all prejudices as this term implies (Kowalski, 2001; Schmader, 2001; Zuriff, 2002).

Social Dominance Theory

Social theories are grounded in the notion that there is a natural order enforced through one group's dominance over others. It is those social markers that "promote or maintain group inequality [with] tools that legitimize

discrimination” (Pratto, et al., 1994, p. 741). For these ideologies to be effective there must be hierarchy-legitimizing myths that provide authenticity to the social structure of the world. These myths continually reinforce the status quo and perpetuate the power shift towards the dominant group. Thus, if all, even those who are oppressed, believe in the hierarchy-legitimizing myths, the system is reinforced (Pratto, et al., 1994). An obvious example is belief in the simple notion ‘If you put your mind to it, you can accomplish anything’. Inherent in this myth told to every school child, is the idea that all people have equal opportunity to the full breadth of the American experience. However, there are scholars who believe that within our society there is a white/male privilege that grants unfair advantages to in-group members (McIntosh, 1989). These advantages translate into unearned privileges which are constantly cashed in and reinforced. Conversely, out-group members fall victim to prejudicial attitudes and public policy that do not value their attributes. Consequently, when the above myth is passed down to inner-city minority children, the oppressed are reinforcing the power of their oppressors.

Another example, more individual in nature, can be seen in the book, A Hope in the Unseen (Suskind, 1998). This is the true story of an inner-city African-American child, Cedric, who works his way off the streets and into the Ivy League. Upon first reading this book I was awed by this uplifting tale of hard work and sacrifice. However, upon further reflection, it is the author’s opinion that stories such as this are over used as a prototype for success rather than the true story of a child that made it in a world that set up every obstacle it could to

block his passage. It reinforces the conservative mentality that if this one child can make it, why can't they all. This becomes internalized by the oppressed in the mentality that there must be something inherently wrong with them that they can not 'make it out'. However, no one ever questions why these children had to be put in this position in the first place.

There are significant differences in the degree individuals perpetuate dominance. This is known as an individual's social dominance orientation (SDO) (Pratto, et al., 1998, Pratto, et al., 1994, Sidanius, et al., 1994). SDO is "the extent to which one desires that one's in-group dominate and be superior to out-groups" (Pratto, et al., 1994, p. 742). This generally relates to individuals attitudes towards the societal structure viewed from their vantage point. Individuals who rank high on SDO tend to value "hierarchy-enhancing institutions [that] allocate disproportionately greater positive social value to members...and greater negative social value" to those lower on SDO (Sidanius, et al., 1994, p. 340).

One such study examined the criminal justice system by examining the SDO orientation of police officers and public defenders (Sidanius, et al., 1994). The dual hypothesis which yielded significant results in this study were: police officers have a higher SDO and are classified as hierarchy-enhancers while public defenders fall at the lower end of SDO and are hierarchy-attenuators. Specifically, SDO measures were found to be strongly related to individual attitudes toward ethnic, national, racial, class groups, and social policies. Those

in opposition of AA were specifically measured and shown as a predictor of higher SDO (Sidanius, et al., 1994).

An additional finding is that a person's SDO seems to be significant even at a young age. College students were compared against the police and public defenders and those with similar scores to police officers (higher SDO) were more likely heading to a field that values group-dominance (Sidanius, et al., 1994).

A final intriguing finding was that of white police officers SDO compared to minority police officers. White officer scored higher on SDO, but minority officers had the highest scorings on punitiveness. This is a strange area that begs for further investigation because it is vexing why minority officers, who have a lower SDO, are more aggressive in maintaining society's values than their white counterparts (Sidanius, et al., 1994). As mentioned in the 'If you put your mind to it...' example, out-group members do play a role in maintaining the dominance of the in-group.

This previous article briefly touched on SDO predictive validity in regards to issues such as affirmative-action. Pratto, Stallworth, and Conway-Lanz (1998) investigated individual's "ideological justification on contemporary policy attitudes" and their relation to the social dominance theory (Pratto, et al., 1998, p. 1854). The contention that those of higher SDO would support hierarchy-enhancing social policies and those of lower SDO would support hierarchy-attenuating policies (AA) was upheld. "The present results indicate how important ideologies are in mediating the relationship between the desire for

group dominance or equality and support of group-relevant policies (Pratto, et al., 1998, p. 1870). Put simply, higher SDO yielded higher conservative ideologies which legitimize the perpetuation of social dominance (Pratto, et al., 1998).

The correlation between conservative ideologies and SDO are of particular interest when viewed in light of Sidanius, Devereux, and Pratto's (1992) which postulated that an individual's SDO will co-vary with their racial policy attitudes. Specifically, racial attitudes were found to be a powerful legitimizing myth as to the maintenance of the majority group's dominance. Blunt racist attitudes were not related to SDO since society has evolved in such away as to no longer support such beliefs. However, the embedded undercurrent of racism bent on white dominance does play an accepted role in civilized society (Sidanius, et al., 1992).

Levin, Federico, Sidanius, and Rabinowitz (2002) have further supported this body of literature by adding "that SDO would reflect a 'system-justifying' opposition to equality when the status hierarchy was perceived to be legitimate...and a 'group-justifying' desire for group-based dominance when the status hierarchy was perceived to be illegitimate" (Levin, et al., 2002, p. 153-154). The clear support for this hypothesis once again implies the all encompassing monopoly of dominance the hegemonic group has, even when it has been seized illegitimately (Levin, et al., 2002).

Much of the present research focuses on political beliefs or racial attitudes. Bates and Heaven (2001) investigated SDO and it's relation to attitudes towards women. As expected, "males' prejudice toward women

appears to be largely underpinned by SDO” (Bates & Heaven, 2001, p. 47).

While the core differences were not significantly different between the sexes, the prejudice exhibited by males once again highlights the hegemonic dominance control (Bates & Heaven, 2001). Additionally, this research was conducted in Australia lending credence to the notion that this SDO may be worldwide.

In all the research relevant to Social Dominance Theory, none could be found that discredits its theoretical constructs. There is a tendency for those in power to have an orientation that maintains the social dominance of their demographic. There also is evidence that shows that subordinate group members take part in this perpetuation of this power by the continual support of the legitimizing myths in society.

As previously stated, the G.I. Bill was implemented due to the disadvantaged state military personnel were in when they returned from World War II. Since these soldiers were removed from society for a period of time, they did not have the necessary education, skills, or experience to adequately compete in the job market. Simply put, they were in a disadvantaged state when compared to those who did not go to war. Even when compared to today's generation, the 18-22 year old time frame is one of the most pivotal. It is at this time when many are either in college preparing for a career or already employed within a trade so as to further their financial status. From a young age we are brought up in the capitalist mentality that it is a person's right and responsibility to work towards creating a career. The American Dream is never more evident than the desire of all Americans to buy their own piece of this country to call their

own. Therefore, it was of paramount importance to the government for these men to have greater equity of opportunity for themselves and their families.

Affirmative Action's purpose is to grant equal opportunity access to all Americans. Disenfranchised groups today are in dire need of assistance due to the system of privilege that governs American's upward mobility (McIntosh, 1989). However, the connection between Affirmative Action and the G.I. Bill has failed to surface in history: The G.I. Bill was the largest Affirmative Action program ever set forth by the U.S. government.

As reported earlier by Kiester (1994), the World War II G.I. Bill era yielded hundreds of thousands of jobs which, due to the blatant discrimination in the implementation of the bill's benefits, were occupied largely by whites (Onkst, 1973). This fostered the creation of a strong white working class. The ramifications of this today is that no group experiences the same rights and advantages as white men do when competing in the world of work and higher education; thus creating our current system of dominance.

Further expounding upon this system of dominance, it is necessary to debunk the blinded view most possess of the U.S. Without question there is a hierarchy where White heterosexual men from a Christian background are at the top of the pyramid. In steadfast hold of those in charge of the systems of our democracy (e.g. law, business, police enforcement, health care, rendering of G.I. Bill benefits, etc.) they further the progression of their own group's agenda at the cost of out group members. This is the most central principle to Social

Dominance Theory. The hegemonic group fosters support of their own dominance by any multitude of methods.

Since the Civil Rights movement, Affirmative Action has been a hot topic in society. The idea that disenfranchised groups should be granted assistance is met with either delight or hostility. There are few topics which have the ability to so polarize a society, exemplified earlier by our own courts inconsistency in rulings regarding this notion. It appears that systems such as this are much more concerned with how the playing field is leveled as opposed to the simple fact that it should be done.

Even when given all of the information and relieved of financial burden, the Julius Rosenwald Fund detailed where minority faculty are not being given suited opportunities. Failing to capitalize on such an offer is the greatest symptom of the clear dominance White America feels it has over all others. Through analysis via Social Dominance Theory, the related theoretical constructs of the entities from this document's first research question can be understood.

As covered previously, SDT would hypothesize that the dominant group in society is fully invested in the maintenance of their supremacy, as measured by their Social Dominance Orientation. Consequently, in-group members would be committed to adjusting the hierarchy to meet their own needs (Pratto, et al., 1994). Through initial exploration of this notion first, the expanded opportunities given largely to Whites via the G.I. Bill makes absolute sense. Well documented in the G.I. Bill literature is that these veterans were not so concerned about creating these opportunities for themselves. But rather, they wanted their hard

work to pay off for their children. Herein resides the perpetuation of dominance. Kiester (1994) details well the more than 3 million jobs created by the implementation of the G.I. Bill including such professions as engineers, doctors and accountants. When viewed within the scope that these jobs in addition to the 5.5 billion dollars which flooded into the aid given to veterans, it is incredibly clear how such a segment of the population could leap frog over all others. And, even though the G.I. Bill was meant for all veterans, including minorities, the literature is very clear regarding minority's plight in claiming said benefits. Obtaining this aid by men of color was a near impossible affair due to the system of state support racism seen in the segregation of the day.

Coupled with this view through SDT, with AA's purpose being to level opportunities for all in society, it makes perfect sense why White America would be less likely to support such a program. Covered earlier, James, et al (2001) details this notion further. As shown, whites are more entrenched in the need to preserve the status of their own group and have the greater likelihood of being against programs such as Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity. Although this is a finding that many would expect, it does specifically link prejudicial attitudes to those attempting to bring down such programs. Therefore, SDT would highlight the inherent need individuals have to further the agenda and dominance of the in-group at whatever cost to the out-group.

If we are to believe that the G.I. Bill is a form of Affirmative Action, the dedication to bringing down AA is confusing given that dominant group members are in power due to the G.I. Bill. SDT accounts for this paradox in its coverage of

hierarchy-legitimizing myths. Therefore, the maintenance of power in the U.S. by dismantling Affirmative Action is ultimately illegitimate due to the myth that the G.I. Bill, which created the current system of power, was not Affirmative Action itself.

The scariest reality of this whole system is that those who are in the role of being subjugated actually foster supportive roles of the hierarchy which oppresses them. This is exemplified in the research covering that black police officers do have a lower SDO but are more punitive in the enforcement of law (Sidanius, et al., 1994). Therefore, coverage regarding to hierarchy-legitimizing myths fits in perfectly. It is a fallacy that minorities today are of a different class of people than veterans were post WWII. So, failure to link the G.I. Bill as an Affirmative Action program is a myth whose sole purpose is to support the hierarchy.

Taken with this theoretical understanding, the following research questions guide this document in assessing the relationship between the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action:

1. What themes and metaphors exist relating to the presidential speeches of Roosevelt and Johnson surrounding the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action?
2. How could Social Dominance Theory help to understand the above relationships?

Chapter 3

Methods

The data used for this analysis is presidential public speeches given by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Lyndon B. Johnson. These two individuals were selected because they were the first presidents who brought to a national consciousness issues related to the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action. While the emergence of these two entities is separated by a minimum of thirty years of history, there was intention in limiting to speeches by these two presidents. First, there is value in analyzing the original presidential speeches regarding their respective social program. It relieves the political reality that the rhetoric surrounding both the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action have shifted in the last 50 years. In using this discourse, we have a clearer view into the original thought processes and formations of arguments to foster support for these programs. Second, it is true that there are many other politicians and professionals who have spoken on these issues (e.g. Congressional Hearings); however, none have the audience or scope of the president's office. This largely equalizes the target audience.

Together, Roosevelt and Johnson served in the office of president for a total of nineteen years and delivered numerous speeches; making the narrowing of this field of research vital. Public addresses with the intended audience being the entire country were first identified. Then this number of speeches was furthered narrowed to include those which made direct reference to the G.I. Bill or Affirmative Action programs. In sum, fifteen speeches were first identified, but

then 3 were removed due to their comments being merely tangential in nature. Of the twelve speeches which remained, there were four State of the Union addresses, three special addresses to Congress, two remarks upon signing of legislation, one inaugural address, one commencement speech, and one national radio address.

In developing the findings which follow, the analysis of these twelve speeches was done via the qualitative method described in Grounded Theory (Glasser, 1992 & Glasser, 1994). Essentially this qualitative method allows for the researcher to free her/himself of creating set assumptions pertaining to the research at hand before analysis is completed. Rather, the data is analyzed openly to allow for themes and metaphors to emerge on their own.

First the speeches delivered by Roosevelt were reviewed in chronological order followed by Johnson's. Consistent with the tenets of Grounded Theory, each speech was subsequently read again and analyzed in constant comparison to those previously read. Mapping was actively used so as to follow patterns and to compare those patterns to others found in the subsequent speeches. Upon completing the review and mapping of the speeches' similar themes, core categories emerged for the grouping and sorting of data (Dick, 2002).

In detailing the results of this piece, Grounded Theory further uses the literature review as emergent data (Dick, 2002). Thus, the literature review becomes important emergent data used to understand the researcher's finding of parallel discourse styles used in arguing for the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action. This then was followed by the subsequent data analysis of the emerging themes.

Upon completion, specific understandings of these results were analyzed using Social Dominance Theory.

Chapter 4

Results Overview

Six themes have emerged in the analysis of these discourses. The first is ethics which serves as an overarching theme and backdrop for support of the G.I. Bill and AA. Second, both of these issues are presented as pressing affairs of state essential to all of America. Third, there is coverage of these as issues relating to equal opportunity. Fourth, direct citation of the Bill of Rights is documented by both presidents. Fifth, war and battle metaphors are employed to foster support. Lastly, argument placement within the greater context the State of the Union speeches provides comparisons for the linguistic style analogous to both presidents. This document now moves into providing greater detail of these above listed themes.

Theme I: Ethics

Ethics is defined by Merriam-Webster Dictionary as "...dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation, a set of moral principles or values" (Merriam-Webster On-line Dictionary, 2004). While ethics is not specifically cited, nearly every speech centers on a degree of ethical/moral decision incumbent upon America. Exemplified herein by Roosevelt he said:

I believe that the Nation is morally obligated to provide this training and education and the necessary financial assistance by which they can be secured (Roosevelt, 1943, October 27, p. 1).

Equality depends...upon the force of moral right...(Johnson, 1965, March 15, p. 6).

The feelings relayed predominantly supported that both the G.I.s and minorities are owed something from society. Inherently described is a belief in the American Dream that all should have the same rights and advantages regardless of status within society (Johnson, 1964, January 8; Johnson, 1965, January 4; Johnson, 1965, March 15; Johnson, 1965, August 6; Roosevelt, 1943, July 28; Roosevelt, 1943, October 27, Roosevelt, 1943, November 23; Roosevelt, 1944, June 22).

As covered in the literature review, both sides, G.I.s and minorities, were placed in a disadvantaged state and these presidents argued that it was our ethical responsibility to assist these groups. For the G.I.s, an entire generation of 18-22 year old men were removed from a society for no less than 2-3 years. At a time in life when most men are either in school learning a trade or already working towards a life-long career, these men were cut off completely from the outside world. Without the opportunity to achieve a financially sound status, learn skills needed for a career and start the nuclear family of the day, these service personnel were undoubtedly placed in a very tenuous position. The above conditions were understood in their entirety by President Roosevelt and summed earlier by Eleanor Roosevelt.

Although in a similar position within society, minorities and women were placed in their role for very different reasons. As covered earlier, President Johnson understood the more than 400 year cycle of privilege and oppression

that encapsulated the U.S. making upward mobility by these disenfranchised groups the exception more than the norm. This was exemplified as such in the book A Hope in the Unseen (Suskind, 1998). As a politician with a front row seat through the Civil Rights Movements of the 1960's, President Johnson clearly understood the need to level the playing field, provide equal opportunity access in order provide opportunities for all Americans.

As can be seen, this is an American ethic steeped in a shared belief in capitalism that Americans have a right to claim a destiny free from outside world entanglements which put a halt to an individual's upward mobility.

Theme II: An American Problem

The next theme, labeled as an American Problem, cites the president's speeches which sought to elicit a nationalistic response regarding the difficulties encountered by the G.I.s and minorities. To begin with a quote from Roosevelt:

The American people will insist on fulfilling this American obligation to the men and women in the armed forces who are winning this war for us. (Roosevelt, 1943, July 28, p. 5).

Inherent within this phrase is the notion of the American Dream's opportunity for all. These veterans were placed in harms way during WWII and are now returning to society. But, when they were shipped back to their homeland and given back their life here, Roosevelt felt there was still a debt owed to them.

...the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifices and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us (Roosevelt, 1943, July 28, p. 5).

Remembering again that these veterans were removed from society, they had great difficulty obtaining work, education, and housing. Roosevelt insisted that “they are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems” (Roosevelt, 1943, July 28, p. 5; Roosevelt, 1943, October 27).

Furthermore, there is an interesting facet to the choice of words used by Roosevelt in the above quote. In reading the citation, simply by replacing the word “definite” with the word affirmative, the sentence structure and meaning are unchanged. It is in this unchanged meaning that the understanding of the parallels between the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action are further highlighted (Roosevelt, 1943, July 28, p. 5).

Example: “they are entitled to **definite** action to help take care of their special problems”

Changed Example: “they are entitled to **affirmative** action to help take care of their special problems”

A similar theme can be seen in a speech given by Johnson where he stated:

There is no Negro problem. This is only an American problem (Johnson, 1965, March 15, p. 2).

The issue of equal rights for American Negroes is such an issue. And should we defeat every enemy, should we double our wealth and conquer the stars and still be unequal on this issue, then we will have failed as a people and as a nation (Johnson, 1965, March 15, p. 1)

He states that "...Americans are struggling for the fruits of freedom" and that "their cause must be our cause too" (Johnson, 1965, March 15, p. 2). Johnson's goal was to convince Americans that the plight of African-Americans (the terminology of 'Negro' was common at this time) was directly tied to their own belief and struggle for freedom. Explicit in these remarks is a certainty that this is one unified country which must stand together when a segment does not have the same equality of access (Johnson, 1964, January 8).

Theme III: Equal Opportunity

The third theme pulled from this data is the notion of equal opportunity.

We cannot be content, no matter how high the general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people – whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth – is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure (Roosevelt, 1944, January 11, p. 2).

Roosevelt discusses at length that opportunities need to be available to veterans when they return from war. Coupled with the second theme analyzed above, there is a feeling of obligation to enlarging the scope of opportunity to this disadvantaged segment of society. So as to fulfill the notion of the American

Dream, it is necessary for an evening of the field so that this dream is equally open to all (Roosevelt, 1944, January 11). This rational linguistic device is covertly emotional in its utilization of what is a core belief to the U.S. - the American Dream.

This theme is carried over to the words Johnson employs when he states:

...that we [should] eliminate every remaining obstacle...to open for all Americans the opportunity that is now enjoyed by most Americas” (Johnson, 1965, January 4, p. 4).

He details how the disadvantaged state of African-Americans is one due to the lacking of opportunity to the rights and advantages privy to most Americans (Johnson, 1965, January 4). Johnson describes what he thinks Affirmative Action can secure:

This budget, and this years legislative program, are designed to help each and every American citizen fulfill his basic hopes—his hopes for a fair chance to make good; his hopes for fair play from the law; his hopes for a full-time job on full-time pay; his hopes for a decent home for his family in a decent community; his hopes for a good school for his children with good teachers; and his hopes for security when faced with sickness or unemployment or old age (Johnson, 1964, January 8, p. 2)

Additionally, both presidents highlight education as a means to equal expansion of opportunity. Roosevelt covers in the following two quotes that:

Vocational and educational opportunities for veterans should be of the widest range. There will be those of limited education who now appreciate, perhaps for the first time, the importance of general education, and would welcome a year in a school or a college (Roosevelt, 1943, October 27, p.1).

The money invested in this schooling program will reap dividends in higher productivity, more intelligent leadership and greater human happiness (Roosevelt, 1943, October 27, p.1).

He believed strongly that lack of money should not be a determining factor as to whether or not a qualified individual can continue his education; as Americans we are obligated to assist those veterans (Roosevelt, 1943, October 27; Roosevelt, 1943, November 23).

Aligned with this reasoning, Johnson quoted Thomas Jefferson in furthering his point:

...no nation can be both ignorant and free. Today no nation can be both ignorant and great (Johnson, 1965, January 4, p. 3).

Johnson is making the point that education is a fundamental precursor to the advancement of America. Without opportunities to educate people, we could not expect to continue progress forward.

Theme IV: Bill of Rights

The fourth theme pulled from the presidential discourses is reference to the Bill of Rights. Roosevelt spoke the following passage on January 11, 1944 during the State of the Union:

We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all.

Among these are:

- The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the nation
- The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation
- The right of every family to a decent home
- The right to a good education

Our fighting men abroad expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it (Roosevelt, 1944, January 11, p. 7).

This style employed by Roosevelt is seen in another speech upon his signing into law the G.I. Bill. Outlined herein are six rights the bill is meant to further because of the “empathetic notice” all Americans should heed to the plight of veterans (Roosevelt, 1944, June 22, p. 1). Specifically he wrote:

1. ...gives service men and women the opportunity of resuming their education or technical training...with the right to receive a monthly living allowance.

2. ...makes provision for the guarantee by the Federal Government...of loans...for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business properties.
 3. ...provides for reasonable unemployment allowance.
 4. ...finding jobs for returning soldiers and sailors.
 5. ...authorizes the construction of all necessary additional hospital facilities.
 6. ...strengthens the authority of the Veterans Administration...
- (Roosevelt, 1944, June 22, p. 1).

Both of the above speeches detail the rights and desires of the veterans and how it is America's responsibility to fulfill those as promised by the Bill of Rights. Disguised as a rational argument this truly pulls at the same American emotions, especially with terminology such as "emphatic notice" (Roosevelt, 1944, June 22, p. 1). As will be detailed relating to Theme V, it is a very effective method to use the nationalistic mentality brought upon during wartime so as to further an agenda. Veiled in language of rationality, these emotional cues Americans possess are deeply embedded within the notions of war, the military and its personnel.

Johnson in an aligned fashion spoke, in his State of the Union speech on January 8, 1964 about minorities in economic hardship and the rights not currently afforded them; this again linking directly to the Bill of Rights. He spoke to the hopes of minorities below:

He hopes for a fair chance to make good.

He hopes for fair play from the law

He hopes for a full-time job on full-time pay.

His hopes for a decent home for his family in a decent community.

His hopes for a good school for his children with good teachers.

And his hopes for security when faced with sickness, of unemployment or old age.

Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope...

(Johnson, 1964, January 8, p. 2).

In further support, Johnson spoke a little more than a year later:

Liberty was the second article of our covenant. It was self-government. It was our Bill of Rights. But it was more

Johnson, 1965, January 20, p. 4).

Six months later on June 4, 1965 in a segment of the commencement speech given at Howard University an entire section is entitled "To Fulfill These Rights" (p.6). Johnson offers a list of rights not currently afforded to minorities. Below are excerpts from that list:

- Jobs are a part of the answer. They bring the income which permits a man to provide for his family
- Decent homes in decent surroundings and a chance to learn—an equal chance to learn.
- ...social programs better designed...
- Care for the sick...
- An understanding heart by all Americans...

- To move beyond opportunity top achievement (Johnson, 1965, June 4, p. 5-6).

Likened back to the emotional argument employed by Roosevelt, Johnson also harkens back to an “understanding heart” (Johnson, 1965, June 4, p. 6) and “live on the outskirts of hope” (Johnson, 1964, January 8, p. 2). Undoubtedly intending to place disenfranchised groups in a more sympathetic light, President Johnson’s clearly and plainly lists the rights needed and then slides in towards the end an emotional appeal meant to soften the mind of a critic to the plight of people and not just statistics.

Theme V: War Metaphors

This section covers an interesting metaphor throughout Johnson’s speeches. Phraseology such as “difficult to fight”, “battlefield”, “struck down...barriers” are intriguing war metaphors in this lasting struggle for civil rights via AA. These words speak to the arduous task placed before minorities and women in the 1960’s, and still today, to attain equal opportunity. (Johnson, 1965, August 6; Johnson, 1965, March 15; Johnson, 1965, January 11). Other examples include:

But the struggle for equality must now move toward a different battlefield. It is nothing less than granting every American Negro his freedom to enter the mainstream of American life (Johnson, 1965, August 6, p. 4).

For at the heart of battle for equality is a deep-seated belief in the democratic process. Equality depends not on the force of arms or tear gas but upon the force of moral right; not on recourse to violence but on respect for law and order (Johnson, 1965, March 15, p. 6).

There have been many pressures upon your president and there will be others as the days come and go. But I pledge you tonight that we intend to fight this battle where it should be fought...

(Johnson, 1965, March 15, p. 6).

One final example further aligns his was metaphor argument in citing the courage seen in African-Americans.

The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro. His actions and protests, his courage to risk safety and even risk his life, have awakened the consciousness of this Nation (Johnson, 1965, March 15, p.6)

The relating of this metaphor to Roosevelt's discourse is atypical. While not perfectly aligned with a likeminded metaphor, there really doesn't need to be. Obviously this is due to Roosevelt's social program being the response to an actual war, World War II. Similarly termed and devised (Roosevelt, 1943, November 23; Roosevelt, 1943, July 28) the words used by Roosevelt regarding WWII supported a social program to account for the war's presence and detriments placed upon America.

Briefly touched upon above and further explored in the discussion of this piece, war carries with it emotional sways in the American people. Through examination of the history of war in the U.S. there is a national unquestioned belief in the social construct of America. Using language in and around such a counted upon mentality further strengthens the resolve of the American people to instinctively support the social program linked to such ideology.

Theme VI: Discourse Placement Within State of the Union Speeches

A last piece of data in examining the similarity in the public discourse on the G.I. Bill and AA is how they are placed within the public discourse. For this section I am only investigating State of the Union speeches by both presidents to equalize the audience and delivery expectations inherent to such an annual speech.

In both cases for Roosevelt and Johnson, the coverage of their governmental/societal programs came more towards the late beginning or early middle portions of the speeches. In the case of Roosevelt, mired down in the affairs of World War II, he describes in detail the successes and setbacks of this war and the future directions it will take. An example is listed below:

It is our duty now to begin to lay plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever known before him.

(Roosevelt, 1944, January 11, p. 2)

Cleverly designed, in one sentence Roosevelt endears himself to his audience by promising a peaceful end to WWII and directly ties that to the next steps intended to improve the life back in America.

In a similar situation, Johnson inherited the Vietnam War which had a greater degree of debate on the pro and con spectrum which necessitated his attention at the outset of his addresses. However, also having seen the activities surrounding the Civil Rights Movement, Johnson's speeches moved immediately into addressing the needs brought forth by this movement (Johnson 1964, January 8; 1965, January 4; 1967, January 10; Roosevelt, 1944, January 11).

The effectiveness of such discourse placement has been touched upon throughout the aforementioned themes. Even by proximity of placement, the ability to link anything to the nationalistic mentality brought upon in war time was of paramount importance to these presidents. It put the country at ease that their leaders were first dealing with the most pressing affair of state, the war, and then moved onto the secondary initiatives which furthered their own social agendas.

Chapter 5

Discussion

This research has yielded a solid finding that the G.I. Bill was an Affirmative Action program. In further support of the above assertion are the results of this document. In response to the first research question regarding what themes and metaphors exist relating to the communications surrounding the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action, six solid themes are directly drawn from the speeches of Roosevelt and Johnson. These six highlight similar linguistic styles in defense of their social agendas.

Throughout the results of this piece is a pervasive communication style used still today in presidential speeches. Underneath a rational veil of discourse and delivery we can see emotional appeals which undoubtedly are strategically placed to galvanize a response in the people. We have a society which is perceived as being built upon reason. When viewing the vast majority of presidential addresses, flamboyant inflections of pitch, mobility of the speaker and other indicators of outward emotion are absent. Instead we are left with the non-verbal indicators of a calm, centered individual delivering an address in a composed manner. However, veiled by this delivery, there are the easily recognizable underpinnings of emotional discourse.

Outlined in the first theme which has threads that run through the following three, ethics are central to this debate. Ethics are devised as a rationalistic framework for all entities within society. Explicit is the notion that there is a good and bad or black and white reality used to override the emotionality of any

situation. The presidential discourse exemplifies the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action as aligned to the American notion of the ethical equity of opportunity which should be available to all. By doing so, this debate is first painted in an overarching calm demeanor, rational in its delivery and thereby similar to ethical entanglements in fields such as medicine, psychology and law.

Such devices seemingly remove emotionality from an equation that simply does not exist without it. Equity of opportunity is completely emotional. It has to do with people being able to live, people being free. Few things elicit greater emotion. However, the painting of the rational overtones are not received the same between the G.I. Bill and AA. As detailed earlier, this is simply understood as being the G.I. Bill supported White males and AA supports everyone but them.

Although AA is commonly viewed as solely a vehicle to assist disenfranchised groups, it can be effectively argued that it has positive educational outcomes for dominant group members. Through AA a greater diversity of individuals are brought to 'the table', thereby allowing for a more rich and fruitful learning/working environment. Additionally it equips dominant group members with the skills necessary to navigated this ever evolving diverse world

Moving onto discussion of the second theme, here it is postulated that the problems of both these segments of the population rest upon the entire country. There is discernment as to whether or not one group's status is somehow less due to their disadvantaged state. The use of the American Dream is one of the aforementioned emotional cues for Americans. For a society which is so critical of countries who follow blindly to the letter of the law the teachings of their faith

and use them in their political diplomacy (i.e. countries in the Middle East), in the U.S. there are few things defended more rigorously across multitudes of population as this. Therefore, both of these presidents tying their arguments to the promise of America and resting that promise upon the shoulders of the country furthered their legislative and social agendas.

This argument also sets up a binary opposition viewpoint. If we are to believe that this problem exists and if we believe that it is a problem for all Americans to hoist upon their shoulders, how are individuals viewed when they detract from one or all of these assertions? Simply put, if ALL Americans agree with this and you don't, then you are un-American. This binary opposition will be linked to and further explored in the 'with us or against us mentality' covered regarding war metaphors.

The aligning of this belief with the American Dream is one also that causes great turmoil amongst academia. Many, including myself, would argue that the American Dream is really a fallacy. We are raised from an early age that if we work hard enough, we too can become one of the elite 1% in America. However, simple mathematics can show that there is no conceivable way 100% of something all have the chance exist within 1% of its space. But, these ideas fall on deaf ears when laid upon the public.

Supplementing this promise of America is the third theme's coverage of bringing increased equity to educational opportunities. Both arguments center on the positive outcomes inherent to an educated people in remarking that if we wish to advance as a nation, then these opportunities must be available to all.

Seen in Bollinger's writing (Whitaker, 2001), there is an enormous educational advantage to AA bringing greater diversity to higher education. It gives students a chance to dialogue with people who are removed from their own background. This is of paramount importance today because even though Brown vs. Board of education is now 50 years old, we know that our schools are not much more desegregated than they were in the 1950s. Therefore, in order to compete in a diverse world, one must have those personal interactions which can not be learned by reading a book.

Along with Affirmative Action's equity, the G.I. Bill furthered the veteran's future. Today minorities are thought to clog the educational system because standardized test say they can not effectively compete. So too in the 1940s, the veterans were thought not to have the adequate background or youth to handle higher education. Those who said so were dead wrong. As was reported, the G.I.'s succeeded. Therefore, it is easy to see that minorities today are in a similar position to what veterans were in before the G.I. Bill. This again brings the philosophies behind these social programs into greater symmetry.

The clearest support for this theme can be seen by how interchangeable the quotes are by Roosevelt and Johnson. It is interesting to view passages with the absence of the words referring to Negroes and veterans. It is my contention that when viewing the excerpts by Roosevelt and Johnson independent of the date or author it is impossible to ascertain whether they are arguing for equal opportunities for veterans or for minorities. A few such examples are listed below:

- "...to **Negro Americans**...elimination of barriers..."
(Johnson, 1965, January 4, p. 3).
- "But whatever the cause, our joint Federal-local effort must pursue poverty, pursue it wherever it exists...among **Negros**" (Johnson, 1964, January 8, p. 2)
- "What our **servicemen**...want, more than anything else, is the assurance of satisfactory employment" (Roosevelt, 1943, October 27).
- "We must...help our returning **servicemen**...bridge the gap" (Roosevelt, November 23, 1943).

A final point of contention regarding this theme of equity pertains to disbursement of money. One of the reasons research like this is important is that it exposes inequity of perception. In very black and white terms, this piece demonstrates an inequity of money disbursement. As covered earlier, the WWII price tag for the G.I. Bill was 5.5 billion dollars (Kiestler, 1994) and adding up through the Vietnam War, that number jumps to above \$40 billion (Mattila, 1978). It is hard to comprehend what our society would look like if the U.S. made a similar financial commitment equally to other segments of the population. Affirmative Actions programs overall may not even be needed with such equity.

As another example of emotional appeals veiled in rational communications, citing the Bill of Rights in the fourth theme is highlighting its importance as being the backbone to the philosophy behind the American

Dream. It is clear via the literature review and the presidential speeches that at its essence the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action are both programs needed to fulfill America's promise to all individuals. All Americans desire the equal access promised by our Bill of Rights, Constitution and the culture of surrounding the belief in the American Dream. Again, this galvanizes a similar response similarly across multitudes of populations to support the presidents' messages.

This theme, paired with the second, completes the solid parallel both presidents are making between their cause and a greater American philosophical belief. Such blatant use of similar emotionality makes analogies between these two sets of discourse easy to decipher.

However, even taking together all of the emotional appeals above, none can compare to the impact that war and war metaphors make in the U.S. Amid linguistic styles centering on this theme, both presidents attempted to capitalize on the primitive response that war brings out in the U.S. Even though Roosevelt was discussing his program in light of World War II, Johnson capitalized on a similar dynamic in using such metaphors coupled with speaking to the war in Vietnam. Similar historical realities draw these dynamics into greater congruence.

This above theme influences the final comparison made here. With a similarity of discussion placement of these programs within speeches, both had a formula of first discussing their respective wars and then either the G.I. Bill or AA. Of course, it would have appeared political suicide to begin the State of the Union in any other way. Sun Tzu states in Art of War, "Warfare is the greatest

affair of state” (Tzu, p. 1). By not covering this first would have sent the message to America that the president is not giving his greatest attention to the fact he is placing America’s youth at risk thousands of miles from home. The political reality of failing to highlight this actuality is incomprehensible and remains congruent with presidential speeches through present day. It would highly irregular for our current president George W. Bush to begin a State of the Union not on the War on Terror given events of the past 3 years.

Further highlighting how this discourse placement is so incredibly effective is the above mentioned example. President Bush’s placement of discussing first the War on Terror and then the Iraqi conflict allowed for a majority of Americans conclude that Iraq played a role in the attack on September 11, 2001. This of course has later been debunked. But, the nationalistic mentality brought on by 9-11 linked the two in the American consciousness and ultimately garnered support for the second Iraqi war.

Therefore, this discourse placement is such a strong point due to the aforementioned nationalistic mentality seen in American wartime. These presidents spoke first of the most pressing state of affair as expected. It is reasonable to assume that by following this discussion with the G.I. Bill, Affirmative Action, or even Iraq is a clear indication of what is second on his list of importance.

As mentioned several times throughout this piece, these presidents’ used war metaphors and strategically placed their arguments for their social agendas as peripheral to an actual war. I purport that this was done deliberately, aligned

with an example from recent history. As shown from post 9/11, President George W. Bush was quoted as “you are either with us or against us” (Bush, 2001, November 6, p. 1). This furthers the nationalistic mentality seen and capitalized upon in American war time. Such devices are not unique to just these three presidents, but rather today’s nationalistic mentality is due to the sum total of hundreds of years of leaders using similar devices to further their own agendas.

All told, the above analysis is further supported and understood through the lens of Social Dominance Theory as inquired about in the second research question. It is of great benefit to the dominant class to define the G.I. Bill and AA as separate and distinct entities. This is to further delineate that the White men served by the former are not related to the disenfranchised groups served by the later. This distinction legitimizes our hierarchy and furthers the status quo. However, the results of this piece do so debunk this myth and expose history’s distortion of the truth.

As mentioned earlier, this allows us to understand why leaders such as President George W. Bush oppose Affirmative Action. Although his success is directly tied to his father’s use of the G.I. Bill for him to support AA would be inviting others to take a portion of his control. This sentiment is counterintuitive to our capitalist society. Although ultimately illegitimate, the self preservation inherent to his higher social dominance orientation is advantageous to his interests.

In summation, several times throughout these six comparisons it is plain to see underlying currents of uniquely American notions such as the American Dream, the Bill of Rights, the 'pull yourself up by your bootstraps' mentality and the nationalistic wartime mentality. All of these are inherently emotional in the elicited primal responses and place all Americans in varying roles of maintaining the power of the dominant group. Again, painted in a rational framework, Roosevelt and Johnson are capitalizing upon American mentalities to foster support for their social programs.

Additionally we can see that the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action are indeed so incredibly similar that these six themes can be pulled from only a small handful of speeches by two presidents. It is plainly seen by the G.I. Bill's easy success and Affirmative Action's more difficult road and the failure for this comparison to arise in history is based upon maintaining dominant status. It can not be reiterated enough and is central to the theme of this document -- the dominant class will maintain its supremacy by any means necessary. It was advantageous for the G.I. Bill to be implemented because it would help White men and those Black men who were eligible would be kept out due to openly accepted governmental racism of the day. Today, AA is not commonly thought as advantageous to Whites and therefore is met with great hostility in implementation. In spite of the data and explanations of how the G.I. Bill is an Affirmative Action program in this document, we can understand our society's failure to link these as analogous through our previous discussion of our varying social dominance orientations and belief in hierarchy-enhancing myths.

However, even though the above contention is understood, now that the truth is exposed it can no longer be accepted.

Chapter 6

Limitations and Response

The inclusion of speeches by presidents Roosevelt and Johnson was intentional, however, it not without its limitations. The G.I. Bill has been in effect for decades since its inception and in this piece a specific point was raised that it has cost 40 billion dollars up through the Vietnam era. Many other presidents and politicians have spoken of it and their argument threads are not represented here. Additionally, it is true that Johnson is credited with the first substantive use of the term Affirmative Action; however, the themes of AA appear before then. In research, several speeches of John F. Kennedy were found which spoke of similar themes to those of Johnson. Not to mention the thousands of others which have joined this debate over the last 40 years.

Another segment of speeches was omitted from analysis also, those who spoke against these programs. Obviously since Roosevelt and Johnson were working towards legislation to pass in support of their program, their speeches only spoke of the benefits and reasons why they should be supported. An interesting analysis may be to see if similar themes may emerge from looking at the discourse surrounding the detractors from these governmental programs.

Lastly, the inclusion of only presidential speeches is another limitation. Many others have spoken on these issues, most notably those who would directly benefit from these programs. Omitting their voices leaves a void in the complete understanding of what these programs represent and the real life impact the benefits bring about.

An argument used to detract in the comparison made in this analysis is the reasoning behind Roosevelt's instituting of the G.I. Bill when compared to Johnson's on Affirmative Action. Alluding back to the literature review of the G. I. Bill, the common thought was that the veterans who fought in World War II made a tangible sacrifice for America which makes them deserving of the benefits outlined in the G.I. Bill. However, some view those wishing to benefit from AA as desiring a hand out; they are viewed as less worthy. So, why is assisting minorities different from assisting veterans?

A first answer can be the obvious distinction based upon race. The G.I. Bill was helping White men and AA is helping everyone else but them. Again the fact the argument for greater educational outcomes through having greater diversity of individuals around the table must be interjected. That notwithstanding, this argument would be congruent with the research covered earlier which purported that feelings about AA are rooted in undercurrent racist values (Carroll, 2001, Flemming, 2001, & James, et al., 2001) . Even taking this into account, it does not relieve the obvious comparison between these two.

However, one argument that I have continually come up against to separate the G.I. Bill from AA is that the G.I. Bill was a way to show our appreciation to our veterans for their sacrifices. On the other hand, modern day AA is seen as a handout; even though Kiester (1994) reports that many saw the G.I. Bill originally as a handout also. It can be very much agreed that gratitude and respect should always be paid to our veterans and that the G.I. Bill is a token of that. However, two things are incongruent. Being in the military was a job

which all were paid for. When the veterans returned from war, how is the implementation of the G.I. Bill not a handout, or at least a hand-up, for them? This is incongruent with the 'pull yourself up by your bootstraps' mentality covered previously.

Additionally, if this is truly a way to show our gratitude, where in our history has gratitude been shown to minorities for the vital role they have played? If we examine American history, veterans are not the only segment of the population which has made tangible sacrifices for America. America's Industrial Revolution in the mid-1800s was the first major shift in our economy, developing us from a largely agricultural economy to industrial producers. This is due to the large profits made through the cultivation of cotton by slave labor on land which was ripped away from Native Americans by President Andrew Jackson (Temin, 1994). Or we could look to the notion on Manifest Destiny which was America's destiny to rule this land from sea to sea. This was largely accomplished through the running of railroads, also on former Native American land, out to California predominately built by minorities, mostly Asians, along with working class Irish. Or we could cite the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 where Mexico ceded half of its national territory to the U.S. and the inhabitants of that land immediately were evicted even though much of it had been family owned for generations (Castillo, 1992). Or lastly, to bring the discussion back to World War II, we can discuss the internment of 110,000 Japanese-Americans from 1944-1945. Truthfully, these individuals did receive reparations for their internment. However, those reparations were only 10 cents on the dollar (Robinson, 2003).

This review of history could go on and on, but the point behind it is clear; no doubt veterans deserve reward for their service and sacrifices made in the defense and growth of America. But, they are not the only section of the population to pay great dividends in the name of America. However, those other non-White populations have long been ignored. Affirmative Action is one mechanism bringing equality to these groups. In fact this is not even a reward, because all AA seeks to do is level the playing field, not to reward a group so greatly that it surpasses others as was done by the G.I. Bill. As can be seen, it is difficult to find merit in the attempt to drive a wedge between the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action.

Implications

Social Dominance Theory is best utilized in analyzing the disparity of view between these two entities. Specifically, the myth being perpetuated is that the veterans who took advantage of the G.I. Bill and their offspring were dedicated workers who earned what they received. Conversely, recipients of AA today are seeking a handout and are thereby a part of the out-group. Thus, the hypocritical hierarchy-legitimizing myth is that those in power now due to the G.I. Bill are keeping the out-group excluded by removing AA.

The following is a short list of individuals who are in power today due to the G.I. Bill: Presidents Gerald Ford, George Bush, and George W. Bush, Vice-President Al Gore, Chief Justice William Rehnquist, Justice John Paul Stevens and Secretary of State Warren Christopher (G.I. Bill, 2004). As this paper

contends, it is ironic that some of these figures, such as our current president George W. Bush have come out so vehemently against AA even though he is in power largely due to his father taking advantage of the G.I. Bill.

This discrepancy highlights how the role of hierarchy-enhancers in SDT is fluid given socio-historical context. In the 1940s and 1950s, it was of enhancement to our society to have an AA program like the G.I. Bill to assist our in need veterans. Also, it is now enhancing to the dominant structure to battle against present day AA for minorities and women because implementation would disrupt the dominant system of power and control built upon throughout the history of the U.S. The evolution exemplified here surmises where this paper began; at the essence of society is dominance.

Future Directions

Examples abound throughout history of times when the dominant societal group has exerted its influence so as to paint themselves as heroes and all others as the enemy, as exemplified above by the Japanese internment during WWII and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. By drawing out those inconsistencies as done in this analysis it can be detailed how power is ultimately held through belief in illegitimate myths. Breaking this cycle of misinformation is a large piece to the puzzle in the combating of privilege within society.

Investigating some of the other speeches related to the G.I. Bill and Affirmative Action is a necessary part to the future directions of this work. All future research needs to look at the world with a creative eye in order to uncover other places

where we are blinded by emotional discourse veiled in a rationalistic mentality
meant to assign roles to everyone which support the hegemonic viewpoint of the
powerful.

Speeches for Analysis

Johnson, L. B. (1964, January 8). State of the Union: The Months Ahead.

Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Johnson, L. B. (1965, January 4). State of the Union. Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Johnson, L. B. (1965, January 20). Inaugural Address: The New Meaning of Change. Presented at Presidential Inauguration, Washington D.C.

Johnson, L. B. (1965, March 15). Special Message to Congress: The American Promise. Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Johnson, L. B. (1965, June 4). Commencement Address at Howard University: To Fulfill These Rights. Presented at Howard University, Washington D. C.

Johnson, L. B. (1965, August 6). Remarks in the Capitol Rotunda at the Signing of the Voting Rights Act, Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Johnson, L. B. (1967, January 10). State of the Union: A Time of Testing and Transition. Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Roosevelt, F. D. (1943, July 28). On Progress of War and Plans for Peace.

Presented in Radio Broadcast from White House, Washington, D.C.

Roosevelt, F. D. (1943, October 27). Message to Congress on the Education of War Veterans. Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Roosevelt, F. D. (1943, November 23). Message to Congress on the Return of Service Personnel to Civilian Life. Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Roosevelt, F. D. (1944, January 11). State of the Union. Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Roosevelt, F. D. (1944, June 22). Statement on Signing the G. I. Bill. Presented at White House, Washington D. C.

Additional Speeches Reviewed

Bollinger, L. C. (2003, November 3). Educational Equity and Quality: Brown and Rodriguez and Their Aftermath. Presented at College Board Forum 2003.

Bush, G. (1989, June 27). The President's News Conference. Presented at the White House, Washington D.C.

Bush, G. (1991, November 21). Remarks on the Civil Rights Act of 1991. Presented at the White House, Washington D.C.

Dewey, T. E. (1944, September 18). Labor Policies "Where Are We Today?" Presented to residents of Seattle Washington.

Executive Order No. 10925. (1961). Retrieved on December 18, 2003 from <http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/jfkeo/eo/10925.htm>.

Jackson, J. (1974, August 1). Rebirth of a Nation. Retrieved on December 18, 2003 from <http://www.commonwealthclub.org/archive/20thcentury/74-08jackson-speech.html>.

Johnson, L. B. (1966, January 12). State of the Union: Home and Abroad. Presented at the United States Congress, Washington D.C.

Johnson, L. B. (1966, April 15). The Challenge of the Americas: Social Justice. Presented at Mexico City, Mexico.

Katzenbach, N. (1964, September 18). The Civil Rights Act of 1964: Respect for Law. Presented at the Federal Bar Association, Washington D. C.

- Kennedy, J. F. (1963, November 22). The Strength of the United States:
Second to None. Presented to Citizens of Fort Worth, TX.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1963, November 22). The Goal of the United States: Peace on
Earth, Good Will Toward Men. Speech was to be presented at Dallas
Citizens Council, Dallas TX.
- King, M. L. (1963, August 28). I Have a Dream. Presented at the Lincoln
Memorial, Washington D.C.
- Luce, C. B. (1944, June 27). A Greater and Freer America: G. I. Joe's Future.
Presented at Republican National Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Roosevelt, F. D. (1945, January 6). The State of the Union. Presented at the
United States Congress, Washington D.C.
- Taylor, W. L. (1964, November 14). Civil Rights: Federal Responsibility.
Presented at the Southern Political Science Association, Durham, NC.
- Wallace, H. A. (1944, September 21). Government Service the Supreme Duty:
What I Mean by a Liberal Person. Presented at the Independent Voters
Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Roosevelt, New York, NY.
- Young, W. M. (1964, May 12). Civil Rights: Discrimination in Labor Unions.
Presented at 50th Anniversary Convention of the Amalgamated Clothing
Workers of America, New York, NY.

References

- Bates, C. & Heaven, P. C. L. (2001). Attitudes to women in society: The role of social dominance orientation and social values. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 11*, 43-49.
- Bush, G. W. (2001, November 6). Addresses at an antiterrorism summit in Warsaw.
- Carroll, G., Tyson, K., & Lumas, B. (2001). Those who got in the door: The University of California-Berkeley's affirmative action success story. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*, 128-144.
- Castillo, R. G. (1992). *The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: A Legacy of Conflict*. University of Oklahoma Press: Tulsa, OK.
- Clark, D. A. (1998). "The two Joes meet – Joe college, Joe veteran": The G.I. Bill, college education, and postwar American culture. *History of Education Quarterly, 38*, 165-189
- Dick, Bob (2002) Grounded theory: a thumbnail sketch. Retrieved June 11, 2004, from <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/grounded.html>.
- Eisenman, R. (1996). Dubious value of affirmative action, with emphasis on making up for past discrimination. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 1353-1354.
- Fleming, J. (2001). Affirmative action and standardized test scores. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*, 27- 37.
- G.I. Bill. (2004). Retrieved January 9, 2004, from <http://www.wld.com/conbus/weal/wgibill.htm>.

- Glaser, Barney G. (1992) Basics of grounded theory analysis: emergence vs forcing. Mill Valley, Ca.: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, Barney G., ed. (1994) More grounded theory methodology: a reader. Mill Valley, Ca.: Sociology Press.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S. & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*, 330-367.
- Haig, Brian D. (1996) Grounded theory as scientific method. Retrieved on June 12, 2004 from http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPSPES-yearbook/95_docs/haig.html.
- Heaven, P. C. L. (1999). Attitudes toward women's rights: Relationships with social dominance orientation and political group identities. *Sex Roles, 41*, 605-614.
- Heilman, M. E. (1996). The other side of affirmative action: Reactions of nonbeneficiaries to sex-based preferential selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 346-357.
- Helms, J. E. & Carter, R. T. (1993). Development of white racial identity inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity* (p. 67-80). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Herrnstein, R. J. & Murray, C. (1996). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press.
- James, E. H., Dietz, J., Brief, A. P. & Cohen, R. R. (2001). Prejudice matters: Understanding the reactions of whites to affirmative action programs targeted. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1120-1129.

- Kiester, E. (1994). The G.I. Bill may be the best deal ever made by Uncle Sam. *Smithsonian*, 25, 129-139.
- Kowalski, K. & Lo, Y. (2001). The influence of perceptual features, ethnic labels, and sociocultural information on the development of ethnic/racial bias in young children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 444-55.
- Levin, S., Federico, C. M., Sidanius, J., & Rabinowitz, J. L. (2002). Social dominance orientation and intergroup bias: The legitimization of favoritism for high-status groups. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 144-157.
- Manzo, K. K. (2000, May 11). Sorry, wrong numbers. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 14-15.
- Mattila, J. P. (1978). G.I. Bill Benefits and Enrollments: How did Vietnam veterans fare? *Social Science Quarterly*, 59, 535-545.
- McIntosh, P. (1989, July/August). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, 10-12.
- Merriam-Webster On-Line Edition. Ethics. Retrieved on August 12, 2004 from <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=ethics&x=18&y=16>
- Moses, M. S. (2001). Affirmative action and the creation of more favorable contexts of choice. *American Educational Education Journal*, 38, 3-36.
- Pratto, F., Stallworth, L. M. & Conway-Lanz, S. (1998). Social dominance orientation and the ideological legitimization of social policy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1853-1875.

- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M. & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Olson, K. W. (1973). The G.I. Bill and higher education: A success and surprise. *American Quarterly*, 25, 596-610.
- Onkst, D. H. (1998). "First a Negro...incidentally a veteran": Black World War Two veterans and the GI Bill of Rights in the deep south, 1944-1948. *Journal of Social History*, 31, 517-543.
- Robinson, G. (2003). By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Sawyer, R. D. (2001). Sun Tzu Art of War. Barnes & Noble Books.
- Schmidt, P. (2002, December 2). U.S. Supreme Court agrees to hear 2 key affirmative-action cases from Michigan. *The Chronicle for Higher Education*, online edition.
- Schmidt, P. (2003, July 2003). Affirmative action survives and so does debate. *The Chronicle for Higher Education*, online edition.
- Sidanius, J., Liu, J. H., Shaw, J. S. & Pratto, F. (1994). Social dominance orientation, hierarchy attenuators and hierarchy enhancers: Social dominance theory and the criminal justice system. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 338-366.
- Sidanius, J., Devereux, E. & Pratto, F. (1992). A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 132, 377-395.

- Steeh, C. & Krysan, M. (1996). The polls – Trends affirmative action and the public, 1970-1995. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60, 128-158.
- Suskind, R. (1998). A Hope in the Unseen. Broadway: New York, NY.
- Swim, J. K. & Miller, D. L. (1999). White guilt: Its antecedents and consequences for attitudes toward affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 500-514.
- Temin, P. (1994). The Industrial Revolution in North America. Blackwell Publishers: Malden, MA
- Whitaker, C. (2001, July). Affirmative action's last stand. *Ebony*, 108-114.
- Woodhouse, S. (2002). The historical development of affirmative action: An aggregated analysis. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 26, 155-159.
- Zuriff, G. E. (2002). Inventing racism. *Public Interest*, 146, 114-28.