

Over the Rainbow: The Gay Battle For Social Reorganization of America

By Marjorie L. Coppock, Ph.D.

E-mail: Marjorie@coppock.com

Website: www.wrestlingwithangels.com

Blogsite: www.concerningthis.blogspot.com

Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association Annual Meetings
March 31st – April 3rd, 2010. Houston, Texas

Over the Rainbow: The Gay Battle for Social Reorganization of America

Table of Contents

Page /Discussion

4.	Introduction
5.	Gay History in America
7.	Organizations Form to Support and Oppose the gay agenda
7.	Supporting
8.	Opposing
9.	Reframing Education
10.	The Rainbow Curriculum
10.	It's Elementary
11.	BACKLASH in Education4
11.	Parents Shut Out
12.	Political Correctness in Academia
12.	Concerned Christians Organize
13.	The Professional Health Establishment Responds
14.	Demands to Change
15.	The Debate on Reparative Therapy
16.	Concerns about Health Risks
18.	Risky Behaviors Cause Concern
19.	Safe Sex Becomes Seductive
19.	Statistics and Surveillance of Sexually Transmitted Diseases in the Gay Population
21.	BACKLASH/ Promoting Responsible Policies
22.	The Gay Agenda Battles the Military
23.	The Military in the New Millennium
24.	BACKLASH to Gays in the Military
25.	Gays Confront the Media
25.	Six-point Strategy
27.	Television
28.	Child Molestation Episode
29.	Coast to Coast Surveillance
30.	Movies
30.	Media in the New Millennium
31.	BACKLASH to Gay Programming
32.	Gay and Lesbians in Corporations and business
32.	Gay Demographics

(Table of Contents, cont.)

- 34. Corporations Address Gay Concerns
- 36. BACKLASH to Corporate Sponsorship of the Gay Agenda
- 37. Reproduction and Children in Gay Relationships
- 37. Reproductive Technologies Challenge the Traditional Family
- 39. Adoption Becomes Controversial
- 40. BACKLASH/Americans Divided
- 41. Rights in Conflict
- 41. Moving Toward Marriage
- 42. Hawaii Considers Gay Marriage
- 42. Vermont Recognizes Gay Unions
- 43. Promoting a *Federal Defense of Marriage Act*
- 43. California Wrestles with Same-Sex Marriage
- 44. Gay Marriage Ping Pong in San Francisco
- 44. California Supreme Court Affirms the Right to Same-Sex Marriage
- 45. Proposition 8 Eliminates Right to Same-Sex Marriage
- 45. Appeal to U.S. Supreme Court is Imminent
- 46. State Scorecard on Same-Sex Marriage - 2010
- 46. Arguing for Gay Marriage
- 47. BACKLASH to Same-Sex Marriage
- 48. Challenge to the Churches
- 49. Churches are Challenged
- 49. Aggressive Attacks on the Church
- 50. Soulforce, Inc: We Will Split You
- 50. Denominations Divided
- 51. Priestly Sexual Abuse Challenges the Church
- 52. ENDA and Hate Crimes Challenge Religious Liberty
- 53. BACKLASH –Protecting Religious Liberties
- 55. Politics and Beyond
- 56. Bankrolling the Battle
- 57. Obama’s Rainbow World
- 58. Social Consequences of Normalizing Same-Sex Marriage
- 59. Questions on Gay Reorganization of Society
- 60. CAUTION IS WISDOM
- 62. REFERENCES

Over the Rainbow: The Gay Battle for Social Reorganization of America

Marjorie L. Coppock, Ph.D. /April, 2010

Introduction

Over the last 50 years gay activist groups have organized to construct a social reorganization of America. Although a comprehensive survey of sexuality conducted in 1992 at the University of Chicago documented that only 2.8 percent of men identified themselves as homosexual or bisexual, and 1.4 percent of women defined themselves as lesbian or bisexual, (Laumann, et.al. 1994) the gay culture, influenced by the civil rights and women's movement, rapidly influenced the American culture with gay liberation.

The movement to bring homosexual behavior into social acceptance is challenging every social institution with fundamental change, including the government and legal system, the education system, the professional health industry, religious organizations, the military, the media, corporations, and the institution of marriage and the family.

As gay movements gained momentum, particularly in the media, the schools and the churches, powerful counter-movements and organizations developed to challenge the changing expectations of sexual behavior as being personally and socially destructive. Battles ensued as groups within the military, educational systems, health systems and religious organizations claimed adverse impacts on societal outcomes.

The normalization of homosexuality in society will create profound changes in social organization, especially in the areas of social integration, social reproduction, social health and the intergenerational transfer of cultural values. The social discourse has been rampant with charges of bigotry, hate mongering and charges of homophobia. However, neither intimidation, tolerance nor back slapping love fests are appropriate means to bring about change in social behavior that has wide reaching consequences. These foundational social issues deserve serious and thorough consideration.

In 2003, Melik Kaylan called for caution in discussing the growing changes in society. "Libertarians, now both on the left and right, say that relations between consenting adults should not be regulated if no participant is hurt, which includes the freedom to marry anyone you please. Here, there's no concern for the aggregate effect on society of cumulative

individual choices...Gay marriage... alarms many Americans precisely because it portends blurry unknowable enormities. We will be, after all, the first society ever to pursue the experiment fully” (Kaylan. 2003).

“The concept of externalities helps define situations that justify government intervention and identify appropriate policy solutions to the problem. Externalities exist when an individual’s actions impose costs on or provide benefits to others who are not parties to the decision... This approach provides criteria for when government should act and the type of policies it should use... Positive externalities provide gains for society, while negative externalities produce losses... ” (Steinacker, 2006:460)

This paper documents the social movements that developed over the last 50 years in support of increased social acceptance for homosexuality in society and the social movements that organized to challenge and deter them. The ideologies and arguments presented by the opposing groups and the positive and/or negative externalities outlined by them will be identified. The ‘battles’ within the military, professional health organizations, religious organizations, and schools are examined , as well as the battle over definitions of marriage and family.

Events will be organized in chronological order to keep in focus the development of the opposing movements as they progress through the decades.

Gay History in America (GA, 1996: chap. 1)

Until the middle of the 20th century, homosexuality in America was a taboo subject and a criminal offense. In early America sodomy was a capital offense. While some people engaged in ‘deviant’ sexual behavior, it was not often divulged.

1948, The Kinsey Institute published a study of the sexual behavior of 5,300 men which reported that 10% of the sample had been more or less exclusively homosexual for 3 years and that 37% of the sample had some homosexual experience resulting in orgasm. The Kinsey Reports were based on samples of convenience rather than scientifically developed random samples. Kinsey had drawn samples of respondents from prisons, mental hospitals, college fraternities and even hitchhikers. Although research by Reisman and Eichel (1990) exposed serious scientific and ethical flaws in these reports, the findings helped foster a sense of community and self-acceptance among homosexuals.

1951 Gay activist, Harry Hay, and others formed the Mattachine Society in Los Angeles, one of the first gay organizations in the United States and forerunner of the gay liberation movement.

1961. Illinois was the first state to repeal the ban on consensual homosexual sex.

1969 The Stonewall riots in Greenwich Village, New York, became a symbol of defiance for the homosexual community. On June 27th a riot ensued when police tried to close a gay bar called the Stonewall Inn. For several days homosexuals, transvestites, teenage male prostitutes, a few lesbians and some passersby marched, yelled, booed, sang and threw bottles. The police were threatened with rape. The demonstration became a rallying point for gay and lesbian organizations. The day continues to be commemorated in many cities with parades, dances and other events. (Abrahamson. 1996:108).

1971. The National Organization for Women supported lesbian rights, over the opposition of founder Betty Friedan, who referred to lesbians as ‘the Lavender Menace’.

1973: The American Psychiatric Association no longer classified homosexuality as a mental disorder.

1978: The Rainbow flag, designed by San Francisco artist Gilbert Baker, becomes a symbol of gay and lesbian pride. The motif may have been taken from Judy Garland’s popular song, “Over the Rainbow” .

1979 : The first national March on Washington for Gay and Lesbian Rights drew over one hundred thousand marchers.

1981: The U.S. Department of Defense bared gay people from serving in the military.

1981: On July 3rd the New York Times published “Rare Cancer Seen in 41 Homosexuals”. This is the first reporting on what later becomes known as AIDS.

1987: 2nd March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights draws a half million. The NAMES quilt is displayed on the mall to remember those who have died of AIDS.

1989: Over 5,000 ACT UP activists staged a protest in front of and inside St. Patrick’s Cathedral against the Catholic Church’s negative policies on homosexuality and AIDS.

1993: President Clinton attempts to overturn the ban on gays in the military. After opposition he settles for a compromise, “Don’t ask, don’t tell”.

1994: The 25th anniversary of the Stonewall Riots draws 1.1 million marchers.

2000: Vermont is the first state to legally recognize civil unions between gay or lesbian couples.

2003; U.S. Supreme Court strikes down all remaining sodomy laws. (Biskupic.2003).

2009: Vermont becomes the first state to legally recognize gay marriage through the legislature. (Infoplease.com 2009)

2010: President Barack Obama supports gay rights in society.

Organizations Form to Support and Oppose the Gay Agenda

Influenced by the civil rights and women's movement, and encouraged by the aftermath of the Stonewall riots, gay rights activists organized to create a public presence and press for gay rights. Marches and rallies were organized across the country. As gay organizations achieved recognition and social support, powerful opposing groups developed to challenge the normalization of the gay and lesbian lifestyle within society.

The following lists of organizations will identify major groups that formed to support or oppose the normalization of homosexuality in America. This is not an inclusive listing, but will demonstrate the impact this social movement has had in American life over the last 50 years.

Organizations Formed to Support Gay Rights . (GA,1996)

1969: The Gay Liberation Front was founded as an ongoing militant political action group.

1973: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) formed to lobby, organize, educate and advocate for gay civil rights.

1973: The Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund works to achieve full recognition through litigation, education and public policy.

1980: The Human Rights Campaign developed the nation's largest political organization for gay rights. This group lobbies Congress. It sponsors the National Coming Out Day on October 11th.

1980: The North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) sought to abolish all age-of-consent laws and other laws that violate the freedom of young people to control their own body.

1981: Los Angeles parents form P-FLAG – **Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gay Men** to combat homophobia.

1985: New York activists found GLADD – **Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation**, as a watchdog for the presentation of lesbian and gay men in Hollywood and the media.

1994: Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), works to end anti-gay bias in America's public, private and parochial schools.

1994: the National Lesbian and Gay Health Association (NLGHA), was formed by gay health providers across the country to focus on improving health in the gay communities.

1998: Soulforce, Inc formed to challenge church doctrines on homosexuality (Van Biema,2000).

Organizations Formed to Oppose Gay Rights

1973: Concerned Women for America works to reverse the moral decline and to protect and restore the family to its traditional purpose.

1976: Exodus International is a non-profit, interdenominational Christian organization promoting freedom from homosexuality.

1977: Focus on the Family believes that marriage is intended by God to be a permanent, lifelong relationship between a man and a woman.

1980: Traditional Values Coalition (TVA) defends biblical principles in regard to homosexuality and family values.

1983: Family Research Council (FSC) is dedicated to the promotion of marriage and family and the sanctity of human life in national policy.

1987: Institute for American Values develops research, publication, and public education on major issues of family well-being and civil society.

1988: American Family Association (AFA) organizes educational campaigns and boycotts to combat pornography and the homosexual agenda.

1992: The National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) is a professional and scientific organization that offers education and therapy to those who struggle with unwanted homosexuality.

1993: Alliance Defense Fund (ADF) provides legal support for cases of religious discrimination

Reframing Education

The first gay studies course was offered at The University of Nebraska in 1970 as an interdisciplinary course through the anthropology, sociology, and English departments. In 1974 the National Education Association (NEA) added 'sexual orientation' to its resolution on nondiscriminatory personnel policies (GA, 1996:180). Gay and lesbian studies developed in universities across the country in the 1980's. The University of San Francisco was the first to offer an undergraduate major in gay and lesbian studies. Yale, Pace, MIT, Cornell, City University of New York, Duke and Temple followed, and gay and lesbian studies are now standard at many universities (Elder,1991) .

The National MultiCultural Institute (NMCI) was founded in 1983 to provide services and skills in multiculturalism and diversity. NMCI worked with corporations, educational institutions, government agencies and non-profit organizations in the areas of workforce diversity in order "to build an inclusive society that is strengthened and empowered by its diversity... and help individuals and organizations gain the skills necessary to seamlessly integrate effective diversity and inclusion practices into their organizational culture" (NMCI,2010). Diversity training, which included acceptance of the gay and lesbian lifestyles, became the requirement for educational administrators, teachers and students.

In 1991, The Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies (CLAGS), the first university-affiliated research center in the U.S. devoted to the study of gay and lesbian students, was established by the Graduate School of the City University of New York (CUNY) with a grant from the Paul Rappoport Foundation, a major supporter of gay/lesbian concerns (Elder, 1991). CLAGS operated as a clearinghouse for scholarly research and offered symposia, conferences and public programs on gay related issues. It also prepared syllabi for those offering gay and lesbian courses and encouraged curriculum reform at all grade levels in support for gay and lesbian concerns (GA, 1996:185-186).

A group of 70 gay and lesbian educators formed the Gay and Lesbian Independent School Network (GLSTN) in 1990 to form Gay-Straight Alliances (GSA's) with the policy to protect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) students. Chapters were established across the country and in 1995 it became a national organization. Kevin Jennings, GLSTN's founder and executive director, was hired as it's first full time staff person. In 1997, GLSTN changed it's name to **Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network** (GLSEN) to attract new members to the struggle for safe schools for all students, regardless of sexual orientation. GLSEN has registered more than 4,000 GSA's on school campuses and grew to 40 full time staff. GLSEN

sponsors the National Day of Silence at school campuses across the country to bring attention to the silence caused by anti-LGBT bullying (GLSEN, 2010).

The Rainbow Curriculum.

In the early 1990's the gay agenda sought to promote tolerance and understanding of the gay/lesbian lifestyles in the public schools, and to normalize the lifestyles in the public perception. Homosexual activists pushed for schools to promote their sexual orientation as equal to heterosexuality through the elementary curriculum entitled *Children of the Rainbow* which encouraged diversity and inclusion of non-European, women's and gay and lesbian history in every stage of education from kindergarten through high school (Buss, 1993). Books supporting gay and lesbian families and the gay lifestyle were included in school curriculums.

It's Elementary

In 1999 a ninety-minute video, entitled *It's Elementary: Talking About Gay and Lesbian Issues in School* was shown on public broadcasting stations across the country. The video showed elementary grade-level classroom discussions about homosexuality. Young homosexuals informed the students of the five gender orientations: male, female, gay, lesbian, and bisexual.

Although homosexual activists have made inroads into the public schools in every state, Massachusetts and California have incorporated homosexual behavior as normal and accepted behaviors in the schools. Indoctrination becomes more intense in the middle schools and high schools. In Framingham, Massachusetts, students were required to respond to questions that challenged their heterosexuality. Heterosexuality was presented as the abnormal behavior (Sears and Osten, 2003:62).

Some of the questions asked were:

1. What do you think caused your heterosexuality?
2. When did you first decide you were heterosexual?
3. Is it possible heterosexuality is a phase you will grow out of?
4. If you have never slept with anyone of the same sex, how do you know you wouldn't prefer it?

BACKLASH in Education

When the video, *Elementary: Talking About Gay and Lesbian Issues in School* aired across the country, groups opposing the use of the schools to promote homosexuality staged protests. In San Antonio, Texas, 200 protestors picketed Public Broadcasting station KLRN to protest the showing (Dorsett:1999).

The normalization of homosexuality became 'politically correct' in academic and educational settings. Silence was no longer imposed upon those supporting gay rights, rather those seeking to challenge the usefulness of the gay lifestyle were violently attacked and intimidated when they spoke out. Diversity training, when led by trainers with agendas, became sessions of intimidation. Courtney Halligan, a student at the University of Delaware was not opposed to attending a required diversity training session. Halligan soon changed her mind. In one-on-one group sessions in the dormitory, white students were made to feel like racists. Students were encouraged to speak openly about their sexuality and gay students felt pressured to publicly out themselves.

In response to student complaints and pressure from the *Foundation for Individual Rights in Education*, a Philadelphia-based civil liberties advocacy group that monitors freedom of speech issues on campuses, the university suspended the program. Dr. Michael Gilbert, the school's vice president for student life, said, "The university had good intentions in initiating a program to teach students to be tolerant of those who are different from them, but the way the program was run was unacceptable" (Watson,2008).

Parents Shut Out

Nondiscrimination laws and diversity education opened the door for educational materials to promote and encourage homosexuality. When same-sex 'marriage' became legal in Massachusetts in 2003 the school room doors were thrown open to sexual activists and shut to keep parents out. In Newton, Mass. The rainbow flag is flown instead of the American flag at some schools. Pro-homosexual picture books were placed in the classrooms in the name of tolerance and diversity.

Robin Wirthlin was puzzled when her 2nd grade son, Joey, came home and reported to her a story about a prince who married another prince. He recapped the story about the prince who didn't like the princesses his mother brought home. He fell in love with a prince and married him. Wirthlin was concerned that they were reading books like this to grade-schoolers. She questioned the teacher, who informed her that it was her responsibility to fulfill the school district's mandate to read pro-gay lifestyle books to her students. The year

before the Wirthlins had moved to Lexington, Mass. another couple, David and Tonia Parker were startled when their kindergarten son brought home a “Diversity Book Bag” which included a picture book called *Who’s In a Family?*. The text began “Laura and Kyle live with their two moms, Joyce and Emily...Robin’s family is made up of her dad, Clifford, her dad’s partner, Henry, and Robin’s cat...” (Curtis,2008).

When The Wirthlins and the Parkers filed suit against the town of Lexington asking to exempt their children from teaching about homosexuality, The U.S. District Chief Judge Mark Wolf ruled against parental rights stating, “The (state) Constitution does not ...permit the Parkers and the Wirthlins to exempt their children from teaching about homosexuality or same-sex marriage.” He wrote. “After all, if a few parents could do it, others would follow, maybe in vast numbers” (Curtis,2008).

Political Correctness in Academia

In 1993, David Woodward, a political science professor at Clemson University, was asked to serve as an expert witness for the state of Colorado to testify about the political power of homosexual groups in America. When he testified in support of traditional values he discovered that to publicly oppose gay rights was “the equivalent to being sent to the university Gulag.” He was labeled ‘ideologically incompatible’ with the values of the university, the press attacked him viciously, and he often found the word ‘Homophobe’ scribbled on his office door. In his book, *Why We Whisper: Restoring Our Right to Say It’s Wrong*, Woodward and coauthor, Jim DeMint, point out, “historically freedom of speech is crucial in any democracy...The demise of good government comes when this conversation is abbreviated.” We now suffer from what John Stuart Mill called, “tyranny of prevailing opinion” (Colson:2008).

Concerned Christians Organize

Concerned Christians and groups supporting traditional family values worked tirelessly to challenge and oppose the gay takeover of educational institutions. The **Traditional Values Coalition**, under the direction of Rev. Louis P. Sheldon, networked with 43,000 churches to provide materials for Christian voter mobilization and pro-family lobbying activities. Sheldon wrote, “Children have long been targets of homosexual activists. ...**GLSEN** has established Gay Straight Alliance clubs in hundreds of junior and senior high schools. The goal of GLSEN is to convince sexually confused children that they were ‘born gay’...Each year, GLSEN uses its Gay Straight Alliance clubs to promote its political and social agenda. The Day of Silence is supposed to give students a chance to protest alleged discrimination against homosexual, bi-sexual, and transgender students at junior high and senior high schools. In reality, the effort is designed to intimidate and silence any opposition to the homosexual agenda...”(Sheldon, 2005)

Concerned Women for America (CWA), under the leadership of Beverly LaHaye, holds community and state events, meets with legislators, and informs the public of issues affecting the family. In 2007 members were requested to return their opinions about the homosexual presence in the public schools.

A notice was sent to parents and grandparents of school-aged children stating,

“The term ‘Radical Homosexual Agenda’ refers to a movement begun approximately 25 years ago to ‘normalize’ homosexuality and other deviant behavior within our culture... Their rally cry is “Whoever controls the schools controls the future.” High on their agenda is to expose children to sex at earlier and earlier ages in our schools...”

When President Barack Obama nominated Kevin Jennings, the founder of **GLSEN**, to be Assistant Deputy Secretary of Education, in charge of the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, LaHaye wrote, “Jennings and GLSEN have one goal: promote homosexuality and trans-sexuality to children through schools – away from the protection of parents, churches, doctors and others who know homosexual acts are unsafe, immoral and damaging... They claim to make schools ‘safe’ for students and teachers who engage in physically and spiritually dangerous homosexual and transgender behavior, by celebrating the dangerous behavior!” (LaHaye, 2009).

Dr. James Dobson, founder of **Focus on the Family**, also expressed deep concern about the appointment of Kevin Jennings as the head of the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools. Dobson states, “What hypocrisy! Jennings is the founder of the **Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN)**, the largest advocacy group in the nation dedicated entirely to the promotion of homosexuality to students as young as kindergarten age. He has written five books advocating homosexual teaching in the schools and elsewhere, as well as the foreword to a widely publicized book titled *Queering Elementary Education*” (Dobson,2009).

The Professional Health Establishment Responds

In a speech following the defeat of Proposition 6, which would have barred homosexuals from teaching in the public schools, the gay activist, Harvey Milk said, “Every gay person must come out. As difficult as it is, you must tell your immediate family, you must tell your relatives, you must tell your friends...And once, once you do, you will feel so much better” (GA,1996:79).

In 1963, concern about the increase in homosexuality prompted the New York Academy of Medicine to address the subject of homosexuality. Noting that some homosexuals were arguing that sexual deviancy is a ‘desirable, noble, preferable way of life’, they issued the following statement: “Homosexuality is indeed an illness. The homosexual is an emotionally

disturbed individual who has not acquired the normal capacity to develop satisfying heterosexual relations” (Satinover, 1996:32).

Until 1994, when all references to “sexual orientation related disorders” were removed from the official policies of the American Medical Association, this perspective was used to justify therapies for treating homosexuality (GA, 1996:221). Until 1973, the American Psychiatric Association also viewed homosexuality as a mental disorder. Over the years cures for treating homosexuality included: castration or vasectomy (1890’s), hypnosis (1890’s to 1960’s), lobotomy (early 1900’s to 1950’s), analysis (1920’s to 1970’s), institutionalization or hospitalization (1920’s to 1970’s), aversion therapy, including drug caused nausea or electroshock (to the (1970’s), and abstinence (1890’s to the present) (GA, 1996:221).

Demands for Change

Demands for normalizing homosexual behaviors occurred in the early 1970’s. A homosexual faction in the **American Psychiatric Association** (APA) planned to disrupt the annual meetings, challenging a paper presentation on homosexuality and trans-sexualism. The following year the APA agreed to sponsor a special panel led by homosexuals. The **Gay Liberation Front** planned a demonstration at the meetings. On May 3, 1971, gay activists broke into a meeting, grabbed a microphone, and declared, “Psychiatry has waged a relentless war of extermination against us. You may take this as a declaration of war against you.” “In 1973 APA voted to strike homosexuality from the officially approved list of psychiatric illnesses.” Only about one-third of the membership was involved in this decision. A follow-up survey reported that “69 percent of psychiatrists disagreed with the vote and still considered homosexuality a disorder.” The *American Psychological Association* voted to follow the lead set by the APA in 1973 (Satinover, 1996:32,33,35).

The Jewish psychiatrist Dr. Jeffrey Satinover lamented that although psychiatry is presumably a scientific discipline and makes its decisions based on scientific evidence, the changes in definition and classification were determined not by scientific evidence, but were corrupted by politics (Satinover, 1996:37).

Political pressure again affected decisions of the APA when in 1994 the chairman of the APA’s Committee on the Abuse and Misuse of Psychiatry presented to the Board of Trustees a change, making it a “violation of professional conduct for a psychiatrist to help a homosexual patient become heterosexual even at the patient’s request.” When the board sent the statement to its legislative body, a fierce battle ensued (Satinover, 1996:35-36).

The Debate over Reparative Therapy

Therapists who help homosexuals change and ex-homosexuals threatened to file a lawsuit against the APA and reopen the consideration of the 1973 decision, which removed homosexuality from the list of mental illnesses. However, the **Gay and Lesbian Task Force** continued to challenge not only psychiatrists who undertook reparative therapy, but also to challenge psychologists, social workers, pastoral counselors, and ministers. “The National Association of Social Workers (NASW), which accredits the largest body of mental health practitioners in the country, also continues to be influenced by gay activists. The NASW Committee on Lesbian and Gay Issues has lobbied the NASW to declare that the use of reparative therapies is a violation of the NASW Code of Ethics” (Satinover, 1996: 35-36).

The APA met challenges to its assertion that counselors should refrain from helping homosexuals change their sexual orientation. In the mid 1990’s professionals concerned about the APA retreat from therapy for homosexuals formed the **National Association for Research and Treatment of Homosexuality** (NARTH) to serve as an alternative to APA and a referral service for homosexual clients. By 2000 the membership was over 1000. NARTH is a “professional, scientific organization that offers hope to those who struggle with unwanted homosexuality.” It provides educational information, conducts and collects scientific research, and promotes therapeutic treatment to those seeking their help. NARTH contends that “The right to seek therapy to change one’s sexual adaptation should be considered self-evident and inalienable” (NARTH, 2010).

In 1973, Psychiatrist Robert L. Spitzer had offered key testimony stating that homosexuality was not a clinical disorder, leading to the APA proposal that declassified homosexuality as a mental disorder. Several decades later, however, Spitzer, a professor of Biometric Research at Columbia University and Co-Editor of Psychiatry’s *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual* reversed his position, contending that mental health professionals had abandoned homosexuals who were attempting to change their sexual orientation. After former homosexuals picketed an APA meeting, Dr. Spitzer talked to numerous ex-gays and had a radical change of mind about the possibility of homosexuals changing their orientation.

Spitzer conducted a study involving phone interviews of about 45 minutes with each of 200 participants, 143 males and 57 females, to determine whether and how people change sexual orientation. Spitzer concluded that the research “shows some people can change from gay to straight, and we ought to acknowledge that.” Initially many colleagues and members of the gay community felt outraged and betrayed at his change in perspective. Spitzer notes, “I think that has largely dissipated. But also, I’m at the point in my career that I don’t worry about such

things.” He added, “the politically correct term now is reorientation therapy. Reparative already implies something’s broken – of course the reparative therapists believe this, but it kind of infuriates the gays to even call it reparative therapy.” (Adamson, 2001; Leblanc, 2005).

Christian leaders stepped forward to protect the rights of homosexuals who sought to change their sexual orientation. In 1973, Frank Worthen ministered to homosexuals in the U.S. In 1976 he organized a conference of ex-gay ministers who formed a coalition called **Exodus International**, North America. The group became international in 1978 when a group formed in Australia, followed by an independent group, Exodus Europe, which formed in 1982 in the Netherlands. In 2004 leaders from around the world joined to form Exodus Global Alliance (Exodus history, 2010). “Exodus is a nonprofit, interdenominational Christian organization promoting the message of Freedom from homosexuality through the power of Jesus Christ...Exodus is the largest Christian referral and information network dealing with homosexual issues in the world.” Each year, over 1000 members and interested persons come together for instruction and celebration in a five-day event in cities throughout North America (Exodus, 2010).

Love Won Out Conferences are organized by **Focus on The Family** to minister to those who struggle with unwanted same-sex attractions and to family and friends of those who are living homosexually. Since 1998, *Love Won Out* has traveled to more than 50 American cities to bring “the power of God’s love and His desire to transform the life of a struggling homosexual to find freedom in Jesus Christ.” Attendance is limited to adults, although participants ages 16-18 may attend if accompanied by a parent. Speakers include ex gay and lesbians, Christian counselors, ministers, and educators. Melissa Fryrear, an ex-lesbian and director of gender issues for Focus on the Family notes that many protestors often have attended the conferences carrying signs accusing Love Won Out with intolerance and bigotry. She says, “There is nothing intolerant about what we say” (Fryrear, 2009). An 18 year-old gay attendee commented, “While I strongly disagree with many points in your message, you presented them in a loving way. I think it’s important that people look at all sides of this issue. ..This conference was informing” (Focus on the Family, 2004).

Concerns about Health Risks

It was 1981. Dr. Jeffrey Satinover braced himself as he examined a gaunt young man whose arms and sides were covered with angry purple welts from a rare, ugly cancer, Kaposi’s Sarcoma. This once rare disease was now popping up around the country, especially in San Francisco and New York. This deadly, wasting disease was known then simply as GRID, “gay-

related immune disorder” because of its disproportionate appearance among male homosexuals. As GRID spread it was grouped with other conditions such as “Gay-related Bowel Syndrome” which gays were prone to because of the practice of anal intercourse.

It was anticipated that the fledgling “gay liberation” movement would be dealt a severe setback for medical reasons. Unexpectedly the gay community’s first priority was “to protect homosexuality itself as a perfectly acceptable, normal, and safe way of life”. Because the virus could, under the right conditions, be transferred to anyone, the first move was to rename “gay-related immune disorder” to AIDS: “Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome”, though gay related anal intercourse and promiscuity created and continues to preserve the American reservoir for HIV. AIDS was politicized from the start (Satinover, 1996:9-16.)

The sociology community responded with concern. Ellen Berg wrote in the American Sociological Association (ASA) Footnotes, “Undeniably a medical emergency, AIDS is also a social crisis. The domains of private troubles and public issues merge in AIDS... AIDS is caused by a virus for which we do not have a vaccine. Therefore it is imperative to know how the virus is transmitted... ‘Education is our vaccine – our only vaccine” (Berg. 1986). Stephen O. Murray responded with frustration and anger in the March ASA Footnotes. “As of July 1988, 70 percent of the cases identified with AIDS in the United States are gay men – with 10 percent of these also being IV drug users...In the seven years of AIDS and President Ronald Reagan, the U.S. government has again been indifferent to the deaths of my generation” (Murray, 1989).

Social and cultural factors came together to bring about a significant delay in the attack on AIDS. Because the disease was linked to homosexuality and drug use, many people in positions of power felt the problem did not need to be seriously addressed. Some religious leaders declared that AIDS was punishment for the sins of homosexuality. A second reason was that the Reagan administration’s policy of smaller government and austerity in social and health programs created competition for government funds and AIDS researchers lost out in the battle (Sullivan,2000:116).

By 1995 AIDS was causing 53,000 deaths a year in North America. By 1997, however, an expensive AIDS cocktail including protease inhibitors was being widely used that dramatically reduced the amount of immunodeficiency virus (HIV) in a patient’s bloodstream providing AIDS patients additional years of relatively healthy life. This created a drop in death rate from 59 per 100 people with AIDS in 1987 to 4 per 100 in 1998. Although vaccines are being tested, none has proven successful. The Centers for Disease Control researchers are concerned that unsafe sex among young gay men may increase if they believe that AIDS can be effectively controlled by protease inhibitors (Palen, 2001:404-405)

Risky Behaviors Cause Concern (Byrd. 2010).

In the **June 2003 edition of the *Journal of the American Public Health***, health risks associated with homosexual practices were highlighted. Bad news was reported in one article after another. Dr. A. Dean Byrd, Vice President of NARTH, summarized these concerns . Beryl A. Koblin and associates reported on alarming data from Boston, Chicago, Denver, New York, San Francisco and Seattle involving HIV-negative homosexual men who reported engaging in anal sex with one or more partners in the previous year. Among 4,295 men, 48% reported unprotected receptive anal sex and 54.9% reported unprotected insertive anal sex. Unprotected anal sex was significantly associated with drug and alcohol use.

A study by Daniel H. Ciccarone and associates indicated that sex without disclosure of HIV status is common among persons living with HIV. Their study reported 45,300 gay or bisexual men, 8,000 heterosexual men and 7,500 women who were HIV infected, were also engaging in sex without disclosure of their HIV status.

David J. Malebranche reported on a US metropolitan study of six sites that reported 93% of African American men who were HIV infected did not know they had the virus. Malebranche's study contradicted the view that 'coming out' is associated with better mental health, responsible behavior and lower rates of HIV infection. African-American men who disclosed their homosexuality had a higher HIV prevalence (24%) and engaged in more unprotected anal sex (41%) than those who did not disclose (14% and 32% respectively).

In 1999, J. Michael Bailey commented on the research on homosexuality and mental illness in the *Archives of General Psychiatry*. He concluded "Homosexual people are at a substantially higher risk for some forms of emotional problems, including suicidality, major depression and anxiety disorder". This conclusion was corroborated by a large, well-conducted study from the Netherlands that was published in *Archives of Psychiatry*, 2001. The Dutch society is recognized as one of the most gay tolerant in the world. Yet the risk for mental illness by those engaging in homosexuality is significantly higher than among heterosexuals in that country.

Dr. Byrd, in response to the above research, expressed concern that the authors failed to conclude that "homosexuality is neither innate nor immutable," that "homosexual men and women have a choice in how they respond to their attractions," and "that homosexuality represents an adaptation – not an identity." Byrd criticized many of the authors for being preoccupied with 'homophobia' without allowing room for other hypotheses. Byrd stated, "Perhaps it is not homophobia but misguided activism that is responsible for the current health

problems that plague homosexual individuals. .. Rights issues seem to have replaced individual and community health concerns” (Byrd, 2010:3).

Safe Sex Becomes Seductive

In the last 30 years condoms have been claimed to provide safe sex or safer sex. Condoms are being sold and distributed around the world as the solution to casual sexual behaviors in preventing pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases. Condoms are being ‘pushed’ by school and university health clinics, and even medical facilities with the implication that sex will be safe if you ‘protect’ yourself with a condom. However, the typical failure rate of condom use is 14%, accounting for inconsistent and incorrect use as well as breakage and slippage. Use factors such as experience, condom size and use of lubricant can affect slippage and breakage (Workshop Summary, 2000:10).

A study involving 26,291 homosexual men, heterosexual men and heterosexual women who visited the University of Colorado’s clinic in Denver over a two year period reported that 57% of the women, 48% on the heterosexual men and 33% of the homosexual men reported error in their use of condoms (Condomman, 2008). Efficacy rates for condom use is generally reported for pregnancy. However, rates for sexually transmitted diseases vary by disease. Condoms do not prevent transmission of the human papilloma virus which is the leading cause of cervical cancer (the Media Project, 2005). Michigan’s statewide gay newspaper, *Between The Lines*, reports that the risk of anal cancer increases by nearly 4,000% for men who have sex with men. They state that a condom only offers limited protection against anal cancer (Glenn,2001).

In considering the safety of condoms, if 20 million people used condoms for ‘protection’, by the typical use failure rate of 14%, **two million eight hundred thousand people** will be unpleasantly surprised that they were, in fact, not safe.

Statistics and Surveillance of Sexually Transmitted Diseases in the Gay Population

The Center for Disease Control (CDC) reports statistics on sexually transmitted diseases in the United States and its dependent areas. Health departments report their data to CDC so the information can be analyzed to determine who is being affected and why. The CDC 2008 surveillance report estimated that there were approximately 19 million new STD infections each year – almost half of them among young people 15-24 years of age.

Syphilis was a disease that was on the verge of elimination. In 2001 it re-emerged as a public health threat because of a resurgence of the disease among men who have sex with men

(MSM). In 2008 there were 13,500 reported cases of primary and secondary syphilis, the most infectious stages of the disease. Reported cases of syphilis showed that 63 percent were among MSM. This is of particular concern because syphilis infection facilitates HIV transmission. Syphilis rates among blacks was about eight times higher than that of whites in 2008 (CDC,2008).

HIV was introduced into the United States through the homosexual community. After its initial diagnosis in 1981, it spread rapidly across the country through male homosexuality, intravenous drug use, bisexuality, and multiple high risk heterosexual partners. Infants were infected by mothers who had the HIV virus. In 2006, CDC estimated that over half (53%) of new cases occurred in gay and bisexual men. Through 2007, the cumulative estimated number of AIDS diagnoses in the 50 states and the District of Columbia was well over one million, 1,018,428. Over half (50.3%) of these cases were reported in four states: New York, California, Florida and Texas. By 2007, the cumulative estimated number of deaths from AIDS in the 50 states and the District of Columbia included 557,902 adults and adolescents and 4891 children under age 13 years. Although Blacks represented about 12% of the U.S. population, cumulated estimated AIDS cases for Black and African Americans through 2007 exceeded that of Whites, numbering 426,003 to 404,465 respectively. Black women were particularly affected as bisexual men brought the disease home to their wives and girlfriends. (CDC,2007).

Cumulative estimated # of AIDS cases for 50 states and DC (CDC, 2007)= 1,018,428

Cumulative estimated # of AIDS deaths for 50 states and DC (CDC, 2007) = 562,793

Life expectancy for gay and bisexual men is compromised by perhaps 20 years. An article printed in the New York Times reported that a young male homosexual has about a 50% chance of getting HIV by middle age. In 1998 the CDC reported that an estimated half of all new infections of HIV in the U.S. were among people under 25. HIV/AIDS is accompanied by a list of other STD's common among the homosexual population. Included in this list of particular concern is anal cancer. Other maladies include Chlamydia, cryptosporidium, herpes simplex virus, human papilloma virus or genital warts, isospora belli, microsporidia, gonorrhea, viral hepatitis types B & C and syphilis (Brinkmann, 2004).

Refusing to admit any problem with the homosexual practices themselves, homosexual activists actively suppressed information portraying HIV/AIDS as a gay disease, contending that it affected the whole population equally. However, in his 'State of the Moment' address at the National Conference of the **National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF)** in February of 2008, the executive director, Matt Foreman made a statement acknowledging HIV as a gay disease. He said, "Folks, with 70 percent of the people in this country living with HIV being gay or bi, we cannot deny that HIV is a gay disease. We have to own that and face up to that". Curiously,

instead of asking NGLTF to accept responsibility for education about HIV, Foreman, turned the concern into a racist attack on the government saying, "...funding for meaningful and honest prevention programs has been systematically excised from the federal budget. If these things don't prove that our government considers the lives of gay black men utterly expendable, I don't know what does" (Foreman, 2008).

BACKLASH/Promoting Responsible Policies

Writing for the website, *Your Life, Family and Culture Outpost*, Patrick B. Craine concluded, "Matt Foreman, by admitting that HIV is a gay disease acknowledged what the medical community has known for decades, the homosexual lifestyle is extremely high risk and often leads to disease and death. Pro-family advocates maintain that sex related disease is clear evidence of the disorder of homosexual practices" (Craine, 2009).

Gary Glenn, president of the Michigan chapter of the **American Family Association**, added "Foreman should also publicly accept responsibility for professionally promoting a lifestyle that's medically associated with a dramatically higher risk of domestic violence, mental illness, substance abuse, eating disorders, life-threatening diseases such as AIDS, cancer, and hepatitis, and premature death by up to 20 years" (Vitagliano, 2008).

The President of NARTH, Joseph Nicolosi said, "Most medical groups have embraced the homosexual agenda and are advocating that lifestyle despite all the scientific studies and medical evidence that demonstrate medical and psychological risks...Homosexual activism and political correctness are clearly trumping science" (Brinkmann, 2004).

Dr. Byrd, vice president of NARTH, argues that it is essential in any society that policies are implemented that promote and protect the health and well-being of its citizens. The American Public Health Association and other health organizations must be aggressively held accountable for accurate reporting. 'Activist spin' must not be allowed to override responsible scientific research. Evidence shows that mortality and morbidity rates are substantially higher for those who engage in homosexual practices, particularly anal intercourse, with the tearing of the rectal lining and diseases associated with subsequent contact with fecal matter. "Activism must not be placed above science in informing public policy. It is an injustice to homosexual men and women to allow activism, including accusations of homophobia, to silence discussion of health risks or to suppress research" (Bryd, 2010).

The Gay Agenda Battles the Military (GA, 1996: 298-311)

The largest employer in the United States is the military, providing people, particularly individuals from poor communities, with jobs, education and other benefits. This avenue for employment has been challenged or denied to gays and lesbians in the United States. Although the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy does not allow them to serve openly, more than 36,000 gays and lesbians serve actively in the military. Gay men and lesbians are estimated to represent 2.5 percent of active duty personnel (Urban Institute, 2009).

American military law outlining punishment for homosexual soldiers took effect in 1917 when The Articles of War included "assault with the intent to commit sodomy" as a capital crime. In 1942, The Armed Forces instructed military psychiatrists that "Those who "habitually or occasionally engaged in homosexual or other perverse sexual practices" are "unsuitable for military service". Between 1941 and 1945 nearly ten thousand homosexuals received dishonorable discharges from military service. Since 1945 over 100,000 gay men and lesbians have been dishonorably discharged. In 1957 a Navy report, called the *Crittenden Report* for the man who headed the committee, concluded that there was "no sound reason for the charge that homosexuals in the military pose a security risk". However, the Pentagon ignored the report for 20 years. During the 60's, gays and lesbians staged demonstrations challenging their treatment by the military. However, the Vietnam War era saw draft resisters feigning homosexuality to avoid being drafted.

During the Carter administration, gay discharges increased dramatically. In 1981, during the last week of Carter's administration, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Graham Claytor issued a policy stating that "homosexuality is incompatible with military service...The presence of such members adversely affects the ability of the armed forces to maintain discipline;... to facilitate assignment and worldwide deployment of service members who frequently must live and work in close conditions affording minimal privacy: to recruit and retain members of the armed forces: to maintain the public acceptability of military service: and to prevent breaches of security" This policy was implemented by the Reagan administration.

When Bill Clinton took office as President, he sought to overturn the 1981 ban. However, Congress strongly opposed. In September of 1993 the vote to continue the ban against gays in the military passed in the Senate by votes of 63 to 33, and in the House by 301 to 135. Clinton was forced to accept "Don't ask, don't tell" as a compromise. This represented a continuation of the ban on gays and lesbians serving in the military, with two stipulations. Subordinates and

recruits could not be questioned about their sexual orientation by commanding officers, and gays and lesbians serving should not come out of the closet.

Those who argue against the normalization of homosexuality in the military contend that:

- * discrimination based on sexual orientation cannot be equated to race because sexual orientation outlines changeable and chosen behaviors rather than innate characteristics;
- * the presence of gays in the close environment of the military in foxholes, showers, and sleeping quarters invades the privacy rights of heterosexuals;
- * the military is not the appropriate place for a 'social experiment';
- * straight service members would fear sexual harassment and sexual overtures by openly gay and lesbian service members;
- * AIDS will increase with the presence of gay service members and blood transfusions in combat will be made risky; and
- * sexual behaviors between gays and lesbians would undermine morale.

Gay activists argue against these concerns contending that several scientific studies indicate that there may be a biological link to sexual orientation, and that gay and lesbian inclusion is not a social experiment, as gay and lesbians already work and live with heterosexuals throughout society. Gay and lesbians also serve in the military and discrimination against them is wrong. Gay advocates argue that military regulations already prohibit individual sexual activities and open displays of affection while on duty, and that penalties for inappropriate sexual behaviors are already in effect.

The Military in the New Millennium

In 2007 retired Army General, John M. Shalikashvili, spoke out for reconsideration of the ban against openly gay men and women in the military. In noting that President Bush had called for a long-term plan to increase the size of the armed forces, Shalikashvili suggested that the time had come to give this policy serious reconsideration. He noted that in a Zogby poll, three quarters of 500 service members returning from Afghanistan and Iraq said "they were comfortable interacting with gay people." He commented, "Our military has been stretched thin by our deployments in the Middle East, and we must welcome the service of any American who is willing and able to do the job" (Shalikashvili, 2007).

In October of 2009 President Barack Obama spoke at the annual national dinner of the **Human Rights Campaign**, the US's largest gay advocacy group, reaffirming his commitment to end the ban against gays openly serving in the military. Obama had run a campaign strongly supportive of gay rights in society, however gay activists were frustrated at his failure to take

up gay rights issues. Obama assured them of his continued support, saying, "My expectation is that when you look back on these years, you will see a time in which we put a stop to discrimination against gays and lesbians, whether in the office or on the battlefield" (McGreal, 2009).

By 2009 the military had expelled 12,500 gay service members since 1993 as a result of violations of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. With two wars in progress this was a hard-to-abide consequence (Ephron, 2009). A 2009 Gallup poll based on telephone interviews with 1,015 adults found that 69% of Americans were in favor of allowing openly gay men and lesbians to serve in the military (Jones, 2009).

BACKLASH to Gays in the Military

The military population is more conservative than the broader population. A Military Times poll of active-duty service members in 2009 showed that 58% opposed any change in the policy toward gays, and 23% might not re-enlist if the "don't ask, don't tell" law is revised. Decisions to enlist are made around the dinner table. Opponents to such a change contended that allowing gays to serve openly could harm unit cohesion and discourage conservative parents from supporting and encouraging their children to enter a 'gay military'.

In response to President Obama's request to repeal the "don't ask, don't tell" law Senator Carl Levin called a meeting to discuss the issue. Wendy Wright, President of **Concerned Women for America**, sent an urgent request to members to "Call your Senators and Representatives and tell them to keep the current law that prohibits homosexuals from openly serving in the military. If the policy is overturned, it would distract from the critical mission of the military simply to impose a sexual agenda onto society." She contended that "This is not the time to begin social experimentation in our military. Our armed forces are stretched fighting the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Repealing the 1993 law now will create an undue hardship on our military and their families" (Wright, 2010).

Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and highest-ranking officer in the armed forces, likes to talk to the enlisted troops and listen to their concerns. In Feb. of 2010, Mullen called for a repeal of the ban as the "the right thing to do". Mullen is faced with the possibility of having to ask troops to openly welcome gay men and women. If this becomes a reality, he will be required to act as a mediator between President Obama and the wider cultural scene, advising Obama on what the military and the troops can or cannot accept (Ephron, 2009).

Gays Confront the Media

The *Comstock Act* was passed in 1873 prohibiting the dissemination of any “article of an immoral nature, or any drug or medicine, or any article whatever for the prevention of contraception or procuring of abortion” through the U.S. mail or across state lines. It remains on the books today, forbidding use of the mails to distribute obscene material (Rierson, 2010).

In the 1950’s, the Mattachine Society, the Daughters of Bilitis, and ONE, Inc. developed into national organizations supporting gay liberation by defying the Comstock laws. In 1958, *ONE Magazine*, the first gay magazine to reach a wide audience, won a decision from the U.S. Supreme Court to allow it’s mailings. Feminist publications addressed lesbian concerns in the 1970’s and 1980’s, and during the 1980’s and 1990’s, gay and lesbian publications boldly promoted safer sex practices for ‘queers’, countering mainstream admonitions for celibacy (GA,1996:281).

When homosexuals were discussed in the news prior to the 1960’s it was generally in a negative light. During the 1950’s, *The New York Times* used the word ‘perverts’ in reference to homosexuals. The first instance of positive reporting appeared in *People Today* in 1955 with an article entitled, “Third Sex Comes Out of Hiding”, in response to an article published by *ONE Magazine*. In 1964, *Life* magazine published an article entitled “Homosexuality in America”. Although mostly negative, it attempted to explain homosexuality to the mainstream society.

Following the declassification of homosexuality as a mental disorder in 1973 media became more positive in its willingness to discuss issues related to gays and lesbians. In 1979, *Time* magazine reported increasing coverage on gays that outlined both tolerance and concern. “Homosexual publishing is booming, and gays now receive far more sympathetic coverage in the media...Police who were once notorious for harassing homosexuals are now likely to be found playing good-will softball games with gays...At the same time, there is strong reaction against the homosexual rights movement. Polls show resistance to homosexuals as schoolteachers, and to laws that seem to enshrine homosexuals as a specially protected minority” (Leo, 1979).

Six Point Strategy

In 1987 homosexual activists, Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, published an article titled “The Overhauling of Straight America”, followed in 1989 by a book titled *After The Ball*. In these writings Kirk and Madsen laid out a six-point strategy to radically change the way Americans perceived homosexual behavior (Sears and Osten, 2003:17-28).

The six points were:

1. **Talk about gays and gayness as loudly and often as possible.** “The principle behind this advice is simple: almost all behavior begins to look normal if you are exposed to enough of it at close quarters and among your acquaintances.”
2. **Portray gays as victims, not aggressive challengers.** Tragedies were turned into opportunities to promote the homosexual agenda by portraying anyone who opposed homosexuality as a murderer or sympathetic to murder. When Matthew Shepard was murdered by two non-religious thugs homosexual activists went on the *Today Show* to blame the murders on conservative Christians groups such as **Focus on The Family**.
3. **Give homosexual protectors a ‘just’ cause.** “A media campaign that casts gays as society’s victims and encourages straights to be their protectors must make it easier for those who respond to assert and explain their new perspectives.”
4. **Make gays look good.** Portray homosexuals sympathetically in the media. Rewrite history to convince people that many famous individuals were homosexual.
5. **Make the victimizers look bad.** “We intend to make the anti-gays look so nasty that average Americans will want to dis-associate themselves from such types.”
6. **Solicit Funds.** Get corporate America and major foundations to financially support the homosexual cause.

To gain sympathy and attract the attention of the American public Kirk and Madsen knew that they would be required to wage a war of propaganda similar to that waged by both sides during World War II. A quote from *After the Ball* outlines this strategy. “We have in mind a strategy as calculated and powerful as that which gays are accused of pursuing by their enemies...It’s time to learn from Madison Avenue, to roll out the big guns. Gays must launch a large-scale campaign ...to reach straights through the mainstream media. We’re talking about propaganda” (Sears and Osten,2003:28). Opponents were portrayed and denounced as ugly caricatures. Even, or perhaps especially, thoughtful and heartfelt concerns for family well-being were vilified as hate-mongering, bigotry or homophobia.

In 1989, twenty years after the Stonewall riots forced the nation to recognize the presence of gay and lesbian citizens, *The San Francisco Examiner* interviewed people in the Bay Area and across the nation, to bring to awareness the details of living as a gay or a lesbian person in America. The report entitled “Gay in America” ran for 16 days (GA:1996:286-287). Subsequently,

newspapers across the country ran articles, often two or three pages in length, explaining gay issues to the local public.

Television (Montgomery, 1989:chap. 5.)

A breakthrough for prime-time television occurred when *That Certain Summer* played on ABC in November of 1972. The movie featured a divorced father whose son comes to stay with him for the summer. The boy is shocked when he discovers that his father lives with his male lover. Although the child is unable to accept his father's lifestyle, the movie deals sympathetically with what it means to be gay. It was acclaimed for its sensitive treatment of the subject matter and did well in the ratings. Before the airing of this film, primetime television had not dealt with homosexuality .

Three years after The Stonewall Riots representation on prime time TV became a critical symbolic target for homosexual activists. They sought to gain influence over the way in which they were portrayed. Although gays did not have the legal assistance or public sympathy that minority or women advocacy groups received, they did have one important advantage. They had what they referred to as 'agents in place'. A substantial number of gay people, some in high positions, worked in the television industry who were not open about their lifestyle. These 'agents in place' were able to leak information to gay activists, alerting them to upcoming episodes in which gays were depicted negatively. Shortly after the airing of *That Certain Summer* activist groups began to approach the networks to negotiate the way in which gays were portrayed.

Ron Gold ,the media director of the New York based **Gay Activist Alliance (GAA)**, wrote to the standards and practices department of all three networks requesting meetings. Before the meeting with ABC, an agent had supplied GAA members with an upcoming episode of *Marcus Welby, MD.* where Welby advised a homosexual who was both a husband and a father to suppress his homosexual desires. The meeting with ABC was both confrontational and hostile. A meeting with twenty-five angry activists was not the kind of meeting that network executives preferred to have with activist groups. Although the objectionable episode aired few days later, it did impact later decisions. Gay activists were invited by ABC executives to comment on any scripts dealing with homosexuality. Executives were hoping for either approval or minor changes.

Child Molestation Episode (Montgomery, 1989:pgs 81-83)

A story line that was totally unacceptable to the activists was an episode that linked homosexuality to child molestation, a relationship that gay activists wanted to eliminate in the media. When Ron Gold lost his temper with ABC executives, communication broke down. The **Gay Activist Alliance** experienced internal disagreements. Ron Gold and some other members split from the group to form the **National Gay Task Force** (NGTF), which developed as an umbrella organization for gay rights groups around the country. NGTF turned the concern over the episode related to child molestation to a pioneer gay media activist in Boston, Loretta Lotman. Lotman launched a national campaign by the gay and lesbian community against the *Welby* show, galvanizing the gay community.

Although unsuccessful at keeping the program off the air, it was a show of power that served as basic training for gay activist leaders. In their campaign against *Marcus Welby*, grassroots groups applied pressure on local ABC affiliates. Threats were included as strategies for success. Gay groups had the advantage of advance knowledge of the upcoming episode. Lotman called the Boston ABC affiliate, WCVB. She warned the management that “if something were not done about the program, the station would be ‘hit with a protest the likes of which you’ve never seen before’”. Advertisers were also pressured. When agents were able to provide information about the companies that had bought advertising for the episode, protest letters were sent to advertisers. The names of the sponsors were published in the gay press, which was carrying stories about the *Welby* campaign.

The mainstream press was used to publicize their campaign and gather support from outside the gay community. A year earlier gay activists had successfully struggled with the American Psychiatric Association (APA) to have homosexuality removed from the list of mental illnesses. NGTF pressured the APA to publicly condemn the offensive *Marcus Welby* episode. They also succeeded in having the National Education Association release a report objecting to the show’s negative portrayals of homosexuals as stereotypes.

In response to this aggressive campaign, ABC issued a statement defending the episode and asserting that a psychiatrist had been consulted. However, the producers made changes to minimize offenses. Some scenes were reshot, references to homosexuality were deleted, and the term ‘pedophile’ became the new label for the sex offender. In spite of the changes, seven companies withdrew their ads, leaving only one minute of air time sold. Five affiliates withdrew the program from the air. The management at WPVI-TV, Philadelphia, explained their reason for refusing to air the episode, saying “the author’s original premise is a false stereotype of homosexuals as persons who pursue and sexually assault young boys.”

Coast to Coast Surveillance (Montgomery, 1989: pgs. 87-94)

The NGTF leaders presented themselves as a 'resource' for information about homosexuality rather than a pressure group. However, the possibility of a protest was never out of the question. Between 1974 and 1977, seven 'zaps' – as the activists called their protests- occurred. Gays working in television continued their surveillance of the industry. The NGTF had an agenda for network programming. "Arguing for 'minority group status', gay activists demanded: increased visibility, elimination of stereotypes, continuing gay and lesbian characters, and gay couples. Gays also insisted on a 'moratorium on negative portrayals'...Gays thus became an ongoing political presence in network television."

The **Gay Media Task Force**, run by psychologist Dr. Newton Deiter, was formed in Los Angeles at the encouragement of NGTF to hold the media accountable on both sides of the country. Deiter acted as the primary consultant to the networks on gay-related issues. In the 70's, more and more gay characters appeared on prime-time TV. One critic labeled 1976 as "the year of the gay" because gay characters appeared in "at least seven situation comedies and in several television movies". These shows were aimed at public education. "In virtually every one the heterosexual characters learn to accept gay people and their lifestyles." Gay activists had become institutionalized in network television.

When the AIDS epidemic developed in the early 1980's television episodes used lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgendered (LGBT) characters, especially gay men, to address the problem. *L.A. Law* and *Law & Order* included storylines with euthanasia centering around the men dying with AIDS. Sitcoms included a variety of plots: a character would come out, or a lead character is mistaken to be or pretends to be gay, forcing other characters to consider their issues about homosexuality. In *Soap*, Jodie becomes romantically involved with a woman. The last season of *Roseanne* dealt with being gay, as Rosanne Conner revealed that her sister was gay.

Beginning in the mid 1990's *Ellen*, *Friends*, *The Drew Carey Show*, *Will and Grace*, and *Sex and the City* introduced characters with implied or actual gay behaviors and issues (Wikipedia,2010). In the new millennium Oprah Winfrey embraced the LGBT concerns on her popular daily show. Lesbians who had left their husbands to marry their lovers were interviewed; gay men were guests invited to share their life stories; and a week was devoted to the life changes of trans-gendered people. At one point Oprah turned to the television audience and said, "I think this is soooo interesting. Don't you think this is interesting?" Ellen Degeneres, a popular lesbian, became host to a late afternoon talk show.

Movies

Released in 1975, *The Rocky Horror Picture Show*, an openly and wantonly gay film, had long standing runs in theaters, usually playing at midnight showings. Still playing in theaters 30 years later, it features Dr. Frank-N-Furter, the “sweet transvestite from Transsexual, Transylvania.” It became an influence among high school and college age young people in introducing them to homosexual themes. With the exception of *Rocky Horror* and *The Boys in the Band* (1970), movies rarely included gay-related content before the 1980’s, or if they did it was a negative depiction. Gay film-making exploded in the 1980’s. In 2008, the staff at AfterElton.com invited their readers to send in titles of gay films that they considered ‘great’. They received a total of 570 different movies (AfterElton.com, 2008). Mainstream gay themed movies included *An Early Frost* (early 1980’s), , *Our Sons* (early 1990’s), *Philadelphia* (1993), *Priest* (1994), *Broke Back Mountain* (2005), and recently released, *Harvey Milk* (Somelikeitscott. 2010).

Media in The New Millenium

Media reporters and commentators who supported gay and lesbian concerns were outspoken in support. ABC News reporter and talk show host Barbara Walters received an award from the ***Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation*** in April of 2002. Walters replied, “We have done a great many programs about gays and lesbians. We hope that we’ve opened some eyes – and if they’re not open, we just don’t care anymore” (*Citizen*, 2002).

In the summer of 2003 *Queer Eye For the Straight Guy* debuted on TV and became a smash hit. Michael Alvear, a nationally syndicated columnist and genius behind ‘Queer Guy’ explained the success of the show saying, “It employs benign stereotypes – that gay men are fashion hounds – to undercut malignant ones – that they’re predators.” Howard Buford, CEO of Prime Access, an advertising agency that caters to the gay market, explained, “So many people have come out of the closet ...large numbers of Americans personally know someone who is gay or lesbian, and this makes a difference” (Stoeltje, 2003).

Gays continued to influence the culture behind the scenes. Gay writers worked behind the scenes to produce popular TV shows that provocatively defined straight relationships. Marc Cherry and Ryan Murphy respectively were responsible for the creation of the TV award winning shows *Desperate Housewives* and *Nip/Tuck*. Gay screenwriter Alan Ball was responsible for HBO’s *Six Feet Under*. *Sex and the City* was created by Darren Star and later run by Michael Patrick King, both gay (Poniewozik,2005).

BACKLASH to Gay Programming

Sociologist, Gene Edward Veith, accused the cultural elite of ‘defining sexual deviancy down’. He noted that a study by the Kaiser Family Foundation reported that 68% of all TV shows and 89% of all movies shown on the networks and HBO feature sexual content. Moreover what were once considered outrageous sexual perversions now are proclaimed as socially acceptable...”First the pop culture legitimized extra-marital sex...-with absolutely no sense of shame – in sitcoms, PG movies, and real-life relationships. Homosexuality used to be seen as a private vice...Now, homosexuality has become socially acceptable, even *en vogue*... an accomplished fact in the media and the cultural elite”

....” What do we have to look forward to next?...Though the sexual abuse of children has been one of the few evils that all Americans could agree on, there is evidence that among the vanguards of cultural change – academia, the artistic and literary elite, Hollywood – this taboo seems to be weakening.” (Veith, 2001)

Mary Eberstadt, in an article titled, ‘Pedophilia Chic Reconsidered’ “ explained that man-boy sex is now out in the open in a number of places: therapeutic, literary, and academic circles; mainstream publishing houses and journals and magazines and bookstores... Older men seducing young boys has become commonplace in literature. ..” (Veith, 2001).

Gay support groups make an effort to include children as young as 10 and 12. The magazine XY is aimed at adolescents as young as 12, complete with erotic pictures. This magazine, available in many bookstore chains, “ has become a favorite of older gay men, as well as confused 12-year-olds who have no business considering themselves homosexual or anything else at their age.” While not all homosexuals are pedophiles, “the **North American Man-Boy Love Association** (NAMBLA) has a strong presence in the ‘gay community’, and causes such as lowering the age of consent and attacking the Boy Scouts for their protective policies demonstrate their influence” (Veith, 2001).

The saturation of gay themes in the media brought forth criticism from organized groups. Glenn Stanton of **Focus on the Family** said that gay programming was part of an effort to force the gay lifestyle on straight America. “It’s a very deliberate strategy to saturate the culture...And it’s a very effective tool being used to dismantle traditional ideas of marriage and family in our nation... Americans aren’t clamoring for this kind of entertainment...This is agenda television that is attempting to normalize this lifestyle, and in ways that are at odds with the very values of the viewers” (Stoeltje, 2003).

The senior policy analyst for **Concerned Women For America**, Peter LaBarbera, explained the success of 'Queer Eye' saying, "It's a funny sort of novelty to see Jay Leno made over by a bunch of gay guys. The gay side thinks this is their civil rights movement, but I don't think most American viewers see homosexuality as a civil rights issue, and the average Joe doesn't want to see two guys kissing... the media and Hollywood elites are out of touch with mainstream America" (Stoeltje, 2003).

Gays in the Corporations

In the 1970's and 80's, with the encouragement of the women's movement, universities focused on career development over family formation, even for women. Women were being told to be independent, prepare for a profession or go into business so they could take charge of their own lives.

College textbooks on marriage and the family were having a negative effect on the family. After a careful review of twenty undergraduate marriage and family textbooks, Dr. Norval Glenn, noted that textbooks conveyed a pessimistic view of marriage through the use of anti-marriage rhetoric. The values and social functions of marriage were downplayed and the costs of marriage to adults, especially women, were exaggerated. Glenn concluded that the story the textbooks tell about marriage is that "marriage is just one of many equally acceptable and equally productive adult relationships. These various relationships include... gay and lesbian families" (Glenn, 1997). Glenn concluded that the textbooks were misleading because they failed to discuss the real problems involved in alternative lifestyles.

The research on textbooks was sponsored and published by **The Institute for American Values**, an academic think tank of scholars, most of whom were Jewish or secular communitarians rather than conservative Christians (Glenn, 2002). Dr. David Blankenhorn, founder and president of **The Institute for American Values**, said that protecting the married-couple, mother-father child raising unit as an important social institution for adults, children and society was a major concern (Blankenhorn,2009).

Gay Demographics:

Mainstream surveys and polls generally neglected to include a separate category for gay people. In 1989 *Overlooked Opinions, Inc.*, a market research and opinion polling firm concerned with the gay, lesbian and bisexual market, was formed in Chicago. A survey done

in 1992 with a sample size of 7,500 gay men and lesbians reported on education, income, occupation, and living conditions (GA, 1996:100-102, 153).

This survey documented that:

- * Over 50% had a college degree, with 25% a graduate degree.
- * 70% of the occupations were found in the categories of management, health care, education, marketing, technical, clerical, financial, literary, law or science.
- * The median income for lesbians was \$36,000 and for gay men, over \$42,000.
- * 45% were home owners , and over 45% lived in the city, with an additional 33% suburban dwellers.
- * 71% of lesbians were in a relationship, 52 % lived with a partner and 10% of lesbian households included children under 18.
- * 55% of gay men were in a relationship, 37% lived with a partner and 4.8% of gay households included children under 18.
- * Other facts revealed that in 1991 lesbians and gay men took more than 162 million trips, 78 percent of which were for business
- * 89% ate out on a regular basis
- * 6 million home computers were purchased between 1988 and 1991.
- * Gay men and lesbians were estimated to spend as much as \$500 billion annually in the United States.

Gays are not randomly distributed throughout the country. The 2000 Census reported that more than one-quarter of same-sex households were located in five urban areas: New York City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Washington D.C., and Chicago. This same Census reported that the highest concentration of same-sex households were in 7 urban areas: San Francisco,CA; Santa Fe, NM; Portland, ME; Burlington, VT; Seattle, WA; Miami, FL; and Austin, TX (Sears and Osten,2003:25).

Marketing to the gay community developed into a lucrative endeavor. Gay guesthouses and nightlife resorts and cruises became popular. A study by Witech-Combs Communications reported that more than 2.6 million gay households in the U.S. included children. The International Gay and Lesbian Travel Association defined the growing ranks of gay families as 'a niche within a niche'. In the summer of 2004, Kelli O'Donnell, mother of four, married partner of Rosie O'Donnell, and co-owner of R Family Vacations chartered a cruise dedicated to the gay family market. Rosie was to host a variety hour for the 1,600 gays, children and family members on board (Bly, 2004).

The Gay and lesbian community in the U.S. is estimated by national surveys to exceed 18 million people with a large majority having disposable incomes above the national average. Households with dual incomes without children have significant buying power. MYgayweb.com (2010) reported “The Gay and lesbian community is three times more likely to be online than many average Americans” and “Over 29% of gay internet surfers have yearly household incomes of at least \$90,000,” With 62% making over \$40,000 a year. Many are highly educated, with 73% of gay internet surfers having a college degree, 19% with a Masters Degree or higher.

Corporations Address Gay Concerns

Corporations and businesses recognized that singles without family ties were able to dedicate time and energy to their job and were free to travel around the country. *The Advocate*, which had covered the gay market since 1967, featured a ‘how to’ guide for the gay traveler in the 1990’s. Noting that an estimated \$17 billion annually is spent by gay men and lesbians in business related travel, they published a list of travel companies that were ‘exceptional’ or ‘gay friendly’. Included were American , Northwest, Continental and Lufthansa Airlines; Avis, National and Alamo Car Rentals; and Hyatt Hotels (GA, 1996:15,156).

While some gay men and lesbians were fortunate to be in business for themselves or to work in gay organizations, those working in the business world often found it difficult, having to avoid conversations about their private lives when others talked about their families. Having to hide in the closet during working hours sapped energy and creativity. Kirk Snyder, author of *Lavender Road to Success: The Career Guide for the Gay Community*, contends that “an open work environment leads to happier employees and therefore higher productivity”. He found that workers who hide their sexuality at work make less money and are less productive than openly gay people” (Johansson, 2004).

Employee associations and unions developed in corporate America to lobby for gay employee’s rights and domestic partner benefits. In the 1980’s corporations began to include sexual orientation in their nondiscrimination policies (Johansson, 2004). By 1995, more than sixty American companies had lesbian, gay and bisexual employee groups. Half of the Fortune 1000 companies and more than 20 federal agencies had nondiscrimination policies that included sexual orientation. Over 45% of lesbian and gay men had been promoted at work (GA,1996:101-102:153). By 2004 75% of Fortune 500 companies included sexual orientation in their nondiscrimination policies and 42% offered domestic partner benefits (Johansson, 2004).

Cracking The Corporate Closet is a gay and lesbian guidebook that publishes “ the ‘best’ and ‘worst’ companies to work for, buy from, and invest in”. They use three criteria to make assessments on how ‘gay friendly’ a company is:

- 1) is sexual orientation included in the company’s anti-discrimination policy,
- 2) are domestic partnership benefits offered to its employees, and
- 3) is ‘corporate behavior’, determined through press reports and interviews, conducted with present and former employees .

Their research showed that the key factor in effecting change within a corporation was found to be an active and vocal gay and lesbian employee group within the corporation. These pressure groups begin as informal social networks and then announce their existence publicly, soliciting members and advocating for improved work environment (GA,1996:158-159).

In 1995, *Cracking the Corporate Closet* ‘s list of ‘best’ companies for gay and lesbian employees included: Apple Computer, Ben & Jerry’s, Boston Globe, Charles Schwab, Fannie Mae, Levi Strauss & Co., Lotus, Pacific Gas and Electric and Quark (GA,1996:158). Quark was founded and developed by Tim Gill, who formed the Gill Foundation and invested millions of dollars to seed gay-rights organizations in all 50 states and provide financial support for gay political campaigns (Paulton, 2007). Companies that did not include sexual orientation in their non-discrimination policies in 1995 included: Hilton, Corning, Home Depot, Marriott, Motorola, Burger King, The Gap and Pepsico (GA, 1996:157).

By September of 2008 Pepsico had reversed its position on gay rights by donating \$500,000 to **Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays** (PFLAG). PFLAG actively supported the legalization of same sex marriage and worked to defeat Proposition 8, the ballot initiative which restored traditional marriage in California. The homosexual Website *Advocate.com* said that the Pepsico gift was earmarked to help straight allies to “transform people’s attitudes and perceptions of gay individuals and the gay community... and effect real and lasting change “ in society. Pepsico also gave \$500,000 to the **Human Rights Campaign**, the nation’s largest homosexual activist organization ,and was a prominent supporter of the 35th Annual Lesbian and Gay Pride Parade in New York City with it’s own corporate float (American Family Association, Aug, 2008).

The family friendly fast food chain McDonald’s also took a public stand to support the homosexual agenda. In early 2008 Richard Ellis, McDonald’s vice president of communications, accepted a seat on the board of directors of the National Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce. In September of 2008 McDonald’s helped to sponsor the annual Out and Equal Workplace Summit which trains employees on how to aggressively promote homosexuality

within the company. The 2007 Out and Equal conference had included an organized march into congressional offices demanding the legalization of same-sex marriage (AFA, Oct, 2008).

BACKLASH To Corporate Sponsorship of the Gay Agenda

Opponents to the normalization of gay and lesbian rights in society organized boycotts against companies that offered domestic partner benefits and nondiscrimination policies. In 1997 the Southern Baptist Convention launched a boycott against Disney for sponsoring “Gay Day” in theme parks in Orlando and Anaheim, CA. They were not successful in persuading Disney to alter their pro-gay policies (Johansson, 2004).

The **American Family Association (AFA)**, “a Christian organization promoting the Biblical ethic of decency in American society with emphasis on moral issues that impact families “ responded with boycotts when Pepsico and McDonald’s became publicly and actively involved in pro-gay policies.

When corporate decisions at McDonald’s promoted the gay agenda, AFA Chairman Don Wildmon said, “This boycott isn’t about hiring homosexuals, or homosexuals eating at McDonald’s or how homosexual employees are treated. It is about McDonald’s, as a corporation, refusing to remain neutral in the culture war. The company has chosen not to remain neutral but to give the full weight of its corporation to promoting the homosexual agenda, including homosexual marriage.” Wildmon urged AFA supporters to “sign, print and distribute a *Boycott McDonald’s* petition and call the local McDonald’s to politely tell the manager they are boycotting the chain until it stops promoting the gay agenda.” Wildmon said “The homosexual movement is controversial, and we’re simply asking that McDonald’s remain neutral” (AFA, Aug, 2008; AFA, Oct, 2008). In October of 2008 AFA announced that the boycott of McDonalds had ended because McDonald’s had told them they will remain neutral in the culture war regarding homosexual marriage (AFA, Oct 9, 2008).

When AFA asked PepsiCo to remain neutral in the culture war, the company refused – choosing to support the homosexual activists, making no effort to hide their support. In the fall of 2008 AFA called for a boycott of all PepsiCo’s products, including Pepsi, Gatorade, Mountain Dew, Frito Lay chips, and Quaker Oats. On their website, www.boycottpepsico.com, AFA listed the following reasons for calling a boycott.

- * PepsiCo: made large donations to **PFLAG** and the **Human Rights Campaign**;
- * requires employees to attend diversity training where they are taught to accept homosexuality;

- * sponsored the TV show Family Guy which pushes the homosexual agenda and denigrates Jesus;
- * supports homosexual publications which feature page after page of nude and semi-nude men in suggestive positions;
- * sponsors 'gay pride' parades across America;
- * and refuses to help those trapped in this destructive lifestyle.

In February of 2010 AFA called off the boycott . Tim Wildmon reported , “More than 500,000 people signed the Boycott PepsiCo Pledge...I knew we had a lot of friends who would stand with us...After monitoring the company for several months, AFA (the **American Family Association**) is satisfied the company has withdrawn its major financial contributions to gay activist groups...Your AFA will continue to challenge major U.S. companies to remain neutral in the culture wars rather than to use their resources to promote controversial issues (AFA Boycott, 2010).

Reproduction and Children in Gay Relationships

Marxism became politically correct in American universities in the 1960's. The universities became radicalized. Religious faith and traditions were questioned and dismissed as authority for modern society. Marx contended that the framework of society was not determined by spiritual absolutes, but rather it was determined by material conditions. The material conditions available through technology, identified by Marx as the infrastructure, was the determining factor responsible for shaping social relationships, identified by Marx as the superstructure. The superstructure of politics, family, religion, and education, were to be reshaped progressively to change in support of the prevailing conditions of technology and the material means of production.

Marx summarized his theory of historical materialism. “The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life...At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come into conflict with the existing relations of production...Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed” (Aron,1968).

Reproductive Technologies Challenge the Traditional Family

The developing science of reproductive technology presented many questions about the future of social, sexual, ethical, and family practices that drastically and dramatically changed

the moral and relationship variables of human life. At the beginning of the 20th century doctors and scientists began to grapple with the problems of infertility. Quietly a small band of doctors began to experiment with artificial insemination.

In the 1920's Margaret Sanger promoted sexual freedoms by encouraging the use of contraception. Concerned about eugenics and planned reproduction, she organized what was to become the *Planned Parenthood Federation*. The introduction of contraceptives such as the diaphragm and the condom contributed to early movements toward sexual freedoms. The Great Depression and the World Wars of the early 1900's slowed down movements for social change.

When the pill was introduced in 1960, times had changed. Universities increased their advancement into the science of reproduction. Medical students were able to make pocket cash by donating sperm for \$50 a pop. The commercialization of reproduction developed when the first for-profit sperm bank opened its doors in Minnesota in 1970. Prior to the late 1970's artificial insemination (AI) was the technology used to help couples who experienced male infertility. In 1979 fewer than 10% of infertility doctors would provide sperm to single women. In 1982 the Sperm Bank of California was created to provide sperm to unmarried and heterosexual singles and lesbian women. The sperm, delivered to their door in a liquid nitrogen tank, could be taken to their doctor for insertion, or they could do it themselves with a turkey baster (Andrews, 1999:87.)

Egg donation became a commercial enterprise in 1984. Egg donation and surrogacy offered the possibility for a man to create a family. (Curtis,2008). In 1988 a newspaper article reported 1,000 surrogacy births in the ten years prior, although 2,000 was considered more accurate a number by some experts (GA,1996:233). In the 1990's homosexual couples began to use surrogacy in what was labeled a "gayby" boom when a West Los Angeles company, Growing Generations, began helping gay men become fathers (Andrews, 1999: 95, 120-121).

Reproduction had become commercialized and the bottom line of business is "Expand the market". In the summer of 2004 R Family Vacations became the first travel company dedicated to the gay family market. They organized a family friendly cruise which included seminars on surrogacy, adoption and artificial insemination for same-sex parents or would be parents (Bly,2004).

Buying egg and sperm became a spectator sport. Catalogs and web sites became baby brokerage firms with donors' self descriptions of their interests, abilities, IQ scores and pictures. Buyers could design a baby by selecting an egg and sperm and have it created by

InVitro fertilization. The process was not inexpensive. A surrogacy may run from \$10,000 to \$30,000 (Andrews, 1999:103). Fertility doctors charge between \$6,000 to \$14,000 a cycle for in vitro fertilization and it takes an average of three cycles before conceiving (Spar, 2006:53).

Adoption Becomes Controversial (Gandossy, 2007; Johnson, 2010).

A study done in 1993 indicated that there were 3-8 million lesbian or gay parents, raising 6-14 million children in the United States. While most were children from a former heterosexual relationship or marriage, a growing number were opting to become parents through commercial reproductive services or adoption (GA,1996:232).

A March 2007 study reported that 65,000 adopted children were being raised in the United States by same-sex parents and an estimated 14,100 foster children were living with one or more gay or lesbian foster parents. States differ in their laws for single gays and lesbians and same-sex couples who seek to adopt. Florida is the only state that bans gay adoption by both singles and couples but it does allow gays to become foster parents. Arkansas, Utah and Virginia prohibit singles or unmarried couples from adopting a child. By 2010 California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York and the District of Columbia had laws permitting gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgendered (GLBT) single, joint or second parent adoptions. Colorado permits same-sex couple adoptions while also allowing grandparents and other people who are raising a child to adopt.

Many states do not have specific laws covering gay adoptions or foster parenting. Gay individuals have an easier time adopting than do couples. Twenty other states permit single GLBT adoptions but are unclear in regard to joint adoptions. In these states gay couples wishing to adopt or foster a child are at the mercy of judges and adoption agencies. The Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, a non-profit organization that studies adoption and foster care, claims that about 60 percent of adoption agencies accept applications from gays and lesbians, but they often are confronted with prejudice during the process.

Rob Calhoun and his partner, Clay Calhoun, have two adopted children, a 4 year-old daughter and an 18 month old son. Calhoun said, "We're not moms, we're not heterosexual. We're not biological parents...But we're totally equal and just as loving as female parents, as straight parents, and biological parents. Love makes a family, not biology or gender" (Gandossy, 2007).

BACKLASH/Americans Divided

A 2006 Pew Research Center poll reported that 46 percent of Americans supported gay and lesbian adoption. Opponents argue that children raised in gay or lesbian households suffer from not having both a mother and a father. Others argue that there are millions of single heterosexual mothers and fathers raising children across the country. They question why children of single or same-sex couples would be worse off.

Dr. James Dobson, founder of **Focus on the Family**, wrote in a commentary for *Time* magazine, “Love alone is not enough to guarantee healthy growth and development... The two most loving women in the world cannot provide a daddy for a little boy, any more than the two most loving men can be complete role models for a little girl” (Gandossy, 2007).

The Catholic Church opposes gay adoption. On the *Catechism on call* website, Robert Fry speaks for the church in saying, “A child who grows up with a mother and a father is exposed to both the masculine and the feminine, which according to God’s plan, allows that child to grow up with an intimate and connected experience to both sexes. A boy, for example, raised by two women is deprived of the right to learn what society expects of men, and how men are expected to handle the challenges they will face in that society. A woman cannot transmit this knowledge to a child! You can’t pass on what you don’t know! Every child has a right to a mother and a father...Two men, for example, who choose to adopt a little boy, make a conscious decision that this boy will never have a mother. The situation is much worse, when artificial insemination is involved, and the father’s role is reduced simply to that being a ‘sperm donor’” ... To think that we’ve now decided to tamper with this foundation of our civilization, just so that a minority of adults can have their lifestyle sanctioned and codified as both normal and even ‘healthy’ should concern us all” (Fry, 2009).

The Catholic Church has been highly involved in adoption services. Changes in legislation which prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation places in jeopardy the ability of the church to continue offering this family service. Tony Perkins, the President of the **Family Research Council**, is deeply concerned about how same-sex legislation will affect religious liberty in the country. He reports, “When Catholic Charities in Boston insisted that they would stay true to principle and refuse to place children for adoption with same-sex couples, they were told by the Commonwealth that they could no longer do adoptions at all” (Perkins, 2009). In February of 2010, the Catholic Archdiocese ended their 80 year old foster-care program in Washington D.C., citing the same-sex “marriage” bill adopted there as the reason (DOMA Watch (a) 2010).

Rights in Conflict (Blankenhorn, 2007:183-199)

Gay activists want society to adopt a flexible definition of the right to marry and form a family. They embrace the idea that “Adults have the right to marry the person they choose and form the families they choose.” Michael Ignatieff, a human rights scholar, endorses the “the rights revolution in private life” as simply an outgrowth of the idea of equality and freedom.

David Blankenhorn, a family scholar and founder of the **Institute for American Values**, contends that changing marriage radically changes parenthood. He argues that in community the rights of one group often exist in tension with the rights of others, and the ‘right to form the family I choose’ bumps up against the rights of children. In 1989 The U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child adopted a resolution that states, “The child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have the right from birth to a name, the right to acquire a nationality, and, as far as possible, the right to know and be cared for by his or her parents.”

The U N declaration supports the rights of a child to know the mother and father who created him or her. Divorce and unwed childbearing revolutions have created a situation where more and more children are not cared for by their own two natural parents. Because same-sex bonding cannot produce children naturally, reliance on reproductive technologies will increasingly create a situation where children do not even know who their natural parents are. The child’s right to a natural biological heritage is denied to him or her.

Blankenhorn argues, “For those who ask ‘Where’s the harm?’ regarding same-sex marriage, here is the inescapable fact: Changing marriage changes parenthood, and changing parenthood in ways that permit and even encourage adults to wipe out the double origin of some children is a threat to all children... When Canada, by way of implementing same-sex marriage, erased the concept of natural parent from basic Canadian law, there was no asterisk saying ‘for gay and lesbian couples only’. The idea of the natural parent got wiped out in law for every child and every couple in Canada.” The term “natural parent” was removed from Canadian law and replaced with the term “legal parent”.

Moving Toward Marriage

“We’re here, we’re queer, we’re redefining the term ‘family’”. A 1992 study reported that 55% of gay men and 71% of lesbians were in committed or steady relationships. However, they were unable to marry and obtain the legal benefits of marriage, including insurance coverage

as spouse and access to the hospital to visit a dying partner. Seeking to change this, lesbians and gay men created their own weddings and ceremonies. In 1993 at the third March on Washington for Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Rights three-thousand couples gathered for a mass wedding. That same year the Hawaii Supreme Court, in response to an appeal from a lower court decision denying marriage licenses to gay and lesbian couples, ruled that the prohibition of same-sex marriages constituted discrimination and was probably unconstitutional (GA,1996:231,235).

The **Lambda Legal Defense and Educational Fund** had worked to lay a groundwork for winning the right for gays to marry. In 1995 they announced the formation of its Marriage Project to serve as a national coordinator and clearinghouse. A network of volunteer attorneys, law professors, and law students were mobilized to research legal arguments against backlash. The Project developed the Marriage Resolution: “ Because marriage is a fundamental right under our Constitution, and because the Constitution guarantees equal protection under the law, RESOLVED, the State should permit gay and lesbian couples to marry and share fully and equally in the rights and responsibilities of marriage” (GA1996:258).

Hawaii Considers Gay Marriage

When Hawaii became the first state to move toward gay marriage, other states and the Federal Government wrestled with the possibility that through the U.S. Constitution’s “full faith and credit” clause they would be required to recognize same-sex marriages performed in Hawaii. In 1996, Congress adopted the federal *Defense of Marriage Act* (DOMA) with votes of 342 to 67 in the House and 85 to 14 in the Senate. DOMA was signed by President Clinton on Sept. 21, 1996. DOMA defined marriage for purposes of federal law. The “word ‘marriage’ means only a legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife, and the word ‘spouse’ refers only to a person of the opposite sex who is a husband or a wife” (Advocate.com, 2009; Goldberg, 1996; DOMA watch, 2008).

In 1998, the Hawaiian movement toward same-sex marriage was rescinded when Hawaii and Alaska passed constitutional amendments supported by approximately 70% of the voters in each state to ensure that marriage could not be redefined by judges in the court systems (Daniels, 2000).

Vermont Recognizes Gay Unions

Vermont became the first state in the U.S. to recognize homosexual ‘unions’ in July of 2000 when the Vermont Supreme Court required the Vermont legislature to either grant marital status to homosexual couples or institute statewide domestic-partnership. By May of 2001

eighty percent of gay-union licenses in Vermont had gone to nonresidents. These civil unions were marriages in virtually every legal sense except by name. For some the marital bliss was short lived. Town clerks and attorneys shortly received calls about how to terminate a civil union. Although residency was not required to obtain a civil union, getting out of the union was a little more difficult. The fine print spelled out that a residency of six months was required by at least one of the partners to dissolve a union (Drummond, 2001).

Other states were concerned that gay activists would travel to Vermont, get ‘married’, return home and sue for legal recognition of their status. Many states made efforts to protect marriage from legal assault by passing a state *Defense of Marriage Act* defining marriage as the union of a man and a woman (Daniels, 2000).

Following a decision in June of 2003 by the U.S. Supreme Court striking down the nation’s sodomy laws, the highest court in Massachusetts ruled, 4 to 3, in November of 2003 that same-sex marriage was permissible under the State’s Constitution (Seelye and Elder, 2003).

Promoting a Federal *Defense of Marriage Act*

The court decisions extending legal rights to gays made many Americans increasingly uncomfortable with same-sex relations. A growing concern developed about having courts set social agendas that hadn’t been approved by the legislatures. Because of a concern that same-sex marriage activists would encourage federal courts to intervene in the debate over marriage to remove state-law barriers to same-sex marriage, a movement developed in support for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to ban gay marriages. A New York Times/CBS News poll in 2003 found that 55 percent of Americans favored an amendment to the Constitution that would allow marriage only between a man and a woman, while 40 percent opposed.

Rep. Marilyn Musgrave, R-Colo., with 106 co-sponsors, introduced a constitutional amendment in the House in May of 2003, although the measure in the Senate had only a few supporters. Musgrave said. “... if the definition of marriage is to be changed, it should be done by the American people, not four judges in Massachusetts.” President Bush voiced support saying, “I will support a constitutional amendment which would honor marriage between a man and a woman” (Seelye and Elder, 2003).

California Wrestles with Same-Sex Marriage

Same-sex marriage was a contentious issue in California. San Francisco is a cultural center for gay rights. California also has a large representation of Hispanic Catholics and strong

Christian leaders and organizations. In 2000, California voters passed, by a vote of 61% to 39%, *Proposition 22* which recognized marriage only between a man and a woman, even though the media had downplayed public support for the measure characterizing it as hate legislation (Daniels,2000).

Gay Marriage Ping Pong in San Francisco

San Francisco was distinguished by the LGBT culture with a rainbow flag flying on almost every street. After hearing President Bush oppose gay marriage in his State of the Union Address on January 20, 2004, San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom challenged the California State Constitution in regard to unequal treatment for gays and lesbians. Noting that “gay citizens pay taxes and protect our communities as firefighters and police officers, among other occupations, “ He instructed county clerks to issue marriage licenses on a non-discriminatory basis. On the first weekend over 2000 gay and lesbian couples were wed. Approximately 4,000 same sex couples were married in San Francisco’s City Hall between February 12th and March 11th. (SanFrancisco.com, 2004).

Opponents to same-sex marriage filed civil lawsuits to stop San Francisco from issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples. On March 14, Judge Kramer ruled that California statutes denying marriage to same-sex couples were unconstitutional. Opponents appealed the decision. In July of 2006 the appellate court overturned the lower court decision. Presiding Justice William R. McGuinness found: that “the state’s interests in ‘preserving the traditional definition of marriage’ and ‘carrying out the expressed wishes of a majority of Californians’ were sufficient to preserve the existing law.” McGuinness wrote, “That change must come from democratic processes, however, not by judicial fiat” (Wikipedia (b) 2010).

In the 2005-2006 session of the California State Legislature, assembly member Mark Leno introduced Assembly Bill 19, proposing the legalization of same-sex marriage. In September of 2005, the California Senate approved the bill by 21 to 15 and the State Assembly approved it by 41 to 35. California became the first legislature in the nation to approve a same-sex marriage bill. However Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger indicated he would veto the bill, citing Proposition 22 (Wikipedia (b), 2010).

California Supreme Court Affirms the Right to Same-Sex Marriage

Lawsuits challenging the denial of marriage rights for gays reached the Supreme Court of California. On May 15, 2008, it overturned the state’s ban on same-sex marriage with the ruling *In re Marriage Cases*. Even though the ballot initiative to bring the vote for a constitutional

amendment denying gay marriage had qualified two weeks earlier for the November election, the four to three decision took effect on June 16, 2008 (Wikipedia, (b) 2010).

Proposition 8 Eliminates Right to Same-Sex Marriage

In November of 2008 the short lived right to same-sex marriage in California was overturned when Proposition 8, a state constitutional amendment titled *Eliminates Right of Same-Sex Couples to Marry Act* appeared on the California ballot and passed with a 52% majority. This vote superseded the Supreme Court's authorization granting marriage licenses to same-sex couples.

Following the passage of Proposition 8, the California Supreme Court Justices affirmed that marriages performed in California before Proposition 8 took effect continued to be valid. In October Of 2009, Governor Schwarzenegger signed into law *The Marriage Recognition and Family Protection Act* which was proposed by the openly gay State Senator Mark Leno. This bill established that same-sex marriages performed outside the state that were performed before Proposition 8 are recognized by the state of California (Wikipedia, 2010).

Appeal to U.S. Supreme Court is Imminent

Following the vote on Proposition 8 in California angry gay proponents of same-sex marriage vowed to fight on. In early January of 2010 a closely watched federal trial took center stage in a California courtroom to decide a challenge to California's gay marriage ban approved by voters. However the case is decided, the ruling will likely be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. This case, bankrolled by liberal Hollywood activists, was the first federal trial to examine the constitutionality of a ban on gay marriage (Leff, 2010).

U.S. District Judge Vaughn Walker is the federal judge who will decide the case filed by homosexual activists against Proposition 8. In early February of 2010 the San Francisco Chronicle 'outed' Judge Walker reporting that "The biggest open secret in the landmark trial over same-sex marriage being heard in San Francisco is that the federal judge who will decide the case, Chief U.S. District Judge Vaughn Walker, is himself gay" (Barber, 2010).

Judge Walker, appointed to the bench by President George H. W. Bush in 1989, never took pains to hide his orientation. The lawyers representing the activist plaintiffs are a legal odd-couple. Ted Olsen was a former Bush attorney and David Goies was a lawyer for Al Gore. Judge Walker defied federal law by allowing the trial to be broadcast worldwide. This decision was subsequently overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court, but supporters of Proposition 8 had lost two-thirds of their expert witnesses who feared for their safety and for their families.

Homosexual activists seek to demand that federal courts remove all of the state-law barriers to same-sex marriage. Family law has been traditionally a matter for state laws but federal intervention in the abortion debate – striking down all state laws protecting the unborn – demonstrates that the federal courts may do the same for marriage laws (Barber, 2010).

State Scorecard on Same-Sex Marriage , 2010

By November of 2008, 37 states had established their own *Defense of Marriage Acts*, and 30 states had constitutional amendments protecting traditional marriage (DOMA watch, 2008). The constitutional amendments to protect marriage as a union between one man and one woman were passed by typically large margins, crossing party lines. The vote passed in fifteen states by majorities between 70 and 86 percent. The vote passed in twenty-eight states by majorities of 55% or above. By January of 2010, forty-one states prohibited same-sex marriage (Buss, 2009).

However, same-sex marriage was gaining acceptance. As of early 2010, 6 states and the District of Columbia allowed same-sex marriage, although no state had legalized gay marriage by referendum of the people. Decisions by the State Supreme Courts of Massachusetts (in 2003), Connecticut (in October, 2008) and Iowa (in April, 2009) ruled affirmatively on the legality of same-sex marriage. Vermont became the first state to legalize marriage equality through legislative action in April of 2009. State legislatures in Maine and New Hampshire passed a same-sex marriage bill on May, 2009 and June, 2009 respectively. In November, 2009 the District of Columbia approved a same-sex marriage bill (Fitzpatrick, 2010).

Arguing for Gay Marriage

Jonathan Rauch's book *Gay Marriage* is a precise argument in favor of gay marriage. He writes, "I would say that marriage is two people's lifelong commitment, recognized by law and society to care for each other." ..."it fortifies relationships by embedding them in a dense web of social expectations. It represents the spouses' commitment not only to each other but also to their community. They promise to look after each other and their children so society won't have to; in exchange, society deems them a family and provides an assortment of privileges, obligations, and caregiving tools...The example gay couples set by marrying instead of shacking up might even strengthen marriage itself" (Blankenhorn, 2007:xii)

Other leading proponents of gay marriage fail to agree with Rauch about the importance of marriage as a social institution. Sociologist Judith Stacey, a leading proponent of same-sex marriage, views marriage as a flawed and dangerous institution. Her strategy is to deconstruct

marriage's 'customary forms': marriage as between a man and a woman; marriage as between two people; and marriage as connected to sexuality and procreation. Evan Wolfson, the executive director of Freedom to Marry, a group advocating for gay marriage, argues for human dignity and equality. He offers a definition of marriage as: "a loving union between two people who enter into a relationship of emotional and financial commitment and interdependence." He calls the campaign for marriage "conservatively subversive" and involved in "the legal freeing of individuals and society from marriage's customary forms" Many intellectuals and activists seek to deinstitutionalize marriage and weaken its public influence as an important step to larger goals. Ellen Willis, a professor at New York University, foresees other changes. "For starters, if homosexual marriage is OK, why not group marriage." (Blankenhorn,2007:130-137).

BACKLASH to Same Sex Marriage

David Blankenhorn , a family scholar and researcher who focused his career on the importance of fatherhood in society, is the founder and president of the **Institute for American Values**, an academic think tank dealing with the importance of families. In his book *The Future of Marriage* he challenges the movement toward gay marriage. He writes, "marriage is fundamentally about the needs of children. And in thinking and writing about it for nearly two decades, I have come to believe one thing with more certainty than anything else: What children need most are mothers and fathers. Not caregivers. Not parent-like adults. Not even 'parents'. What a child wants and needs more than anything else are the mother and the father who together made the child, who love the child, and who love each other...Redefining marriage to include gay and lesbian couples would eliminate entirely in law, and weaken still further in culture, the basic idea of a mother and a father for every child." Once this proposed reform became law, even to say the words out loud in public – "Every child needs a father and a mother" – would probably be viewed as explicitly divisive and discriminatory, possibly even as hate speech" (Blankenhorn, 2007;2-3).

In November of 2009 the National Organization for Marriage under the leadership of Rick Santorum and Maggie Gallagher invited the American people to join the *Two Million for Marriage Campaign* to tell Congress: "Enough, Don't Mess With Marriage!" The concern focused on a bill introduced by Congressman Jerrold Nadler to repeal the *Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA)*, the law protecting state laws defining marriage as the union of a husband and wife. Santorum notes, "If we don't act today, President Obama, Nancy Pelosi, and others in Congress will succeed in their efforts to repeal DOMA, an effort which the White House has already noted is one of its highest "civil rights" priorities." ... The overwhelming majority of Americans, and even most courts have rejected that view. And just a few months ago, 70 percent of African Americans voted to protect marriage as one man and one woman in

California.”... “Here’s what Dr. James Dobson of **Focus on the Family** said about the urgency of the issue, after personally donating \$25,000 to the National Organization for Marriage: “It’s not just marriage that is at stake; it’s absolutely everything” (Santorum, 2009).

In February of 2010 the **Coral Ridge Ministries**, founded by the late Dr. D. James Kennedy, appealed to their supporters to write Edmund G. Brown Jr. and Arnold Schwarzenegger, the Attorney General and Governor respectively, of California, urging them to reverse course and throw their support behind the legitimate vote of Proposition 8. The Ministry reports that “A clear majority of California voters stood by the traditional definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman...The trial is taking place in San Francisco, where a huge majority voted against traditional marriage... The judge in the case has made a number of rulings which...have the effect of putting the people who voted for traditional marriage ‘on trial’. For example he ruled that the trial will inspect the personal beliefs of those who sponsored the bill in question!” (Cassidy, 2010)

CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCHES

Although prostitution and homosexuality were sometimes included in practices of early religions, the moral commandments of the Hebrew people protected sexual relationships in support of family values. The formation of the family unit through the love and sexual union of a man and a woman was seen as the way in which the love of God was shown to individuals in the present and passed on to the future generations. Scriptures from the Jewish Bible and the New Testament supported husband/wife unions and condemned homosexual relationships.(Scriptures from the Revised Standard Version RSV).

Matthew 19:4-5 “He who made them from the beginning made them male and female...For this reason a man

shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one.”

Leviticus 18:22 “You shall not lie with a man as with a woman; it is an abomination.”

Romans 1:27 “and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in their own persons the due penalty for their error.”

When gay activist groups emerged in the 1960’s, churches were challenged to include homosexuals and allow them to participate without discrimination in church activities and events. Fundamental groups held firm to scriptural guidance, while mainline churches, especially within the leadership of the denominations, moved toward inclusion.

Churches Are Challenged

The Southern Baptists, the largest Protestant denomination with sixteen million members, was not without challenge in its effort to preserve conservative family values. In 1965 Anne and Fred Alexander, members of the Southern Baptist church, started the publication of *The Other Side* magazine “to revitalize the church, to keep alive the possibility of fundamental change.” In 1978 *The Other Side* published an issue dealing with homosexuality, which included groundbreaking articles offering gay and lesbian speakers the opportunity to express their feelings and experiences (Davidson, 1995).

Organized elements within the mainline Protestant churches began a systematic push to change thinking related to theological and ethical issues involving sexuality. In 1978 a Task Force on Homosexuality submitted a report to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church USA (PCUSA) recommending that avowed practicing homosexuals be ordained as ministers, ruling elders, and deacons. The 1978 General Assembly of PCUSA declared homosexual behaviors contrary to Scripture and persons who practiced it could not be ordained. In 1987 the General Assembly appointed a seventeen- member committee, heavily weighted with members who condoned homosexuality, to develop a study on human sexuality. The report repudiated scriptural morality and proposed legitimizing premarital, extramarital, and homosexual relationships. The *Human Sexuality Report* was rejected by 94 percent of the delegation at the 1991 PCUSA General Assembly. A committee moderator stated, “We are convinced that the issue raised by this report will not go away.” (Presbyterian Layman 1995; Jameson.1991). In 2006 a report titled “A Season of Discernment” that devoted 100 pages to “Sexuality and Ordination” was passed by the General Assembly of PCUSA. Agreement was reached on some matters. While ordination would be denied to anyone who demonstrated licentious behavior, celibate homosexuals and bisexuals were not barred from consideration for ordination. Every ordaining body was given the opportunity to decide what departures can be tolerated. (Religious tolerance, 2008).

Aggressive Attacks on the Church

In December of 1989 the late Cardinal John O’Connor was beginning his sermon in New York City’s St. Patrick’s Cathedral when angry shouts came from the congregation. Members of the militant homosexual group ACT-UP stretched themselves out in the aisles or chained themselves to the pews. An angry man yelled, “You bigot, O’Connor, you’re killing us.” Forty-three protesters were arrested while O’Connor tried to go on with the service (Sears and Osten, 2003:127).

In 1992 the voters of Colorado had passed Amendment 2 that denied homosexuals special legal privileges. Will Perkins, the man who helped get Amendment 2 on the Colorado ballot, attended the Village Seven Presbyterian Church. In the middle of a Sunday service in 1993 a dozen homosexual activists leaped out of their seats and bombarded the parishioners with condoms. **Focus on the Family** in Colorado Springs had rocks thrown through windows, dead animal parts were left on the ministry's front door, and flyers were posted on light poles in front of the ministry and throughout the downtown area calling for conservative Christians to be thrown to the lions. (Sears and Osten, 2003:127, 156).

Soulforce, Inc.: We Will Split You

Soulforce, Inc. was a roving protest group of multi-denominational gays, lesbians and transgendered persons committed to nonviolent action with a goal to challenge church doctrines on homosexuality. The organization was founded in 1998 by the Rev. Mel White who had co-authored books in the 1980's with Evangelical elites including Billy Graham, Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson. After twenty-five years of trying to "cure" himself, the father of two left his wife and moved in with his male partner. In the summer of 2000, protests were organized to disrupt the general assemblies of the Methodist, Baptist, and Episcopalian denominations. Working with activists within the denominations, Soulforce staged demonstrations wearing T-shirts lettered with the words THIS DEBATE MUST END-WE ARE GOD'S CHILDREN TOO. White's attitude was "We don't debate anymore. Change your policies or we're going to split you apart and leave." (Van Biema, 2000).

Denominations Divided

The demonstrations brought fervent opposition from evangelical forces within the churches. The publisher of the conservative Methodist journal entitled Good News, said, "We don't feel good about outsiders coming in and using intimidation and pressure on our delegates for something that ought to be a family affair" (Van Biema, 2000). Although 1,300 United Methodist clergy had signed a statement supporting covenant ceremonies for homosexual partnerships, the vote by the delegates at the 2000 Methodist Conference rejected by a two-thirds majority any effort to alter the denomination's marriage centered sexual morality or sexual standards for ordination (Tooley, 2000).

Episcopalians were also divided by the debates on homosexuality. In 1998 conservative members challenged liberal movements in the church who supported homosexual practices. They formed a reform movement called Concerned Clergy and Laity of the Episcopal Church,

reporting, “Today there are two religions in the Episcopal Church, one remains faithful to the biblical truth and received teachings of the Church while the other rejects them” (Moore, 1999). In 2003 the election of a partnered homosexual bishop created further turmoil in the church. The 2009 General Convention adopted two resolutions that seriously departed from biblical sexuality by repealing a moratorium on the consecration of additional gay bishops, while opening the door to blessing same-sex unions (Walton, 2009).

In August of 2009 the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) adopted policies that were a departure from traditional Christian teaching. “The new policies allow ELCA churches to give approval to non-marital sexual relationships, both homosexual and heterosexual, and to ordain persons in such relationships “ (Wisdom, 2009).

Priestly Sexual Abuse Challenges the Church

Accusations of priestly pedophilia exploded in the Catholic Church in the 1980’s. In 1984 a cardinal was accused of abusing a teen. Over the next ten years, more than 400 Catholic priests in North America were accused of molesting children. A church sponsored panel said that “2 percent to 4 percent of Catholic priests over the past 30 years may have been guilty of abuse (AP, 1993). In February of 2002 the pedophile priest scandal exploded in Boston, the nation’s fourth largest diocese, when Father John Geoghan was accused of molesting more than 130 children over a 30 year period and was sentenced to a 9-10 year prison term .

The dual system of sexuality within the Catholic Church created problems in the development of a consistent understanding of sexuality. Church leaders for centuries have been called to celibacy. However seminary training did not adequately address the realities of leading a sexually celibate life. Many Catholic seminaries have a gay subculture. R. Scott Appleby, professor of history at Notre Dame University, said “People I know quite well have left the seminary either in disgust because people are not keeping their vows, or in alienation because they’re not gay.” (Sears and Osten, 2003:152)

Joel Mowbray, a practicing Catholic explained, “ Male homosexuality is inherently promiscuous. In a heterosexual relationship, women moderate the innate, intense male sex drive. But in homosexual conduct, there is no such check. In short, gay couples have two people with male attitudes about sex, which naturally leads to a more permissive view of sexuality. And when seminaries began filling up with homosexuals – both in terms of seminarians and in leadership positions – promiscuity inevitably followed “ (Sears and Osten, 2003:152).

Most sexual abuse victims of priests are teenage boys rather than children. One priest caught in a sex scandal, Reverend Paul R. Shanley, attended the meeting in 1979 that created the **North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA)** (Sears and Osten, 2003:151-152). NAMBLA, identifying itself as a sexual freedom organization, was founded in the mid 1980's. NAMBLA seeks to abolish all age-of-consent laws and other laws that violate the freedom of young people to control their own lives, and calls for the replacement of age-of-consent laws with laws empowering children (Burtoft, 1994:65).

AIDS has taken a toll among Catholic priests. By the beginning of the new millennium, hundreds of Catholic priests had died of AIDS-related illnesses, and hundreds more were living with HIV. Priests were dying of AIDS at a rate four times that of the general population (Thomas, 2000).

Priestly sexual abuse of children and young teens raises two questions. How many young boys were drawn into the homosexual lifestyle by early experiences of sexual behaviors with priests? To what extent has the homosexual challenge to traditional family patterns been supported and encouraged through these behaviors? These question becomes particularly relevant in light of the high rate of AIDS among the priesthood.

ENDA and Hate Crimes Challenge Religious Liberty

Since 1994, the *Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA)* has been repeatedly introduced in Congress. If the bill passes, "sexual orientation" would be added to the list of federally protected classes under the 1964 act that prohibits job discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. ENDA would make it illegal to make decisions on hiring, firing, promoting or paying an employee based on sexual orientation. Supporters argue that ENDA is necessary to protect a minority from discrimination while opponents argue that religious employers who disagree with the homosexual lifestyle would be discriminated against. Church related facilities or non-profits could lose their tax-exempt status if they refused to hire a person on the basis of their sexual orientation. (Riley, 2009).

After a decade of political struggle, President Obama signed the federal hate crime bill into law on Oct 28th, 2009, the *Matthew Shephard Act*. A hate crime is identified as a crime of violence motivated by the hatred of the group to which the victim belongs. Hate crimes are usually attacks on strangers that express hatred toward the group to which the victim belongs with the intent of terrorizing the entire community. The federal hate crime protects against violence based on the race, color, religion, national origin, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and gender identity of the victim.

BACKLASH – Protecting Religious Liberties

When church leadership moved toward changing sexual expectations to include practicing homosexuals as clergy and leaders, church members who leaned toward maintaining a scriptural foundation to the faith voted with their feet. Mainline churches had failed to educate their children into a compelling Christian message. Between 1965 and 1989 six mainline denominations (Evangelical Lutheran, United Methodist, United Church of Christ, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Disciples of Christ) reported a combined membership loss of 6.2 million members. The churches that increased in membership were spiritually evangelical, in contrast to the secular liberalism of mainline denominations (Ostling, 1993).

Bishop Harry R. Jackson, Jr, senior pastor of the 3,000 member Hope Christian Church in Washington D.C. argued in response to ENDA. “Sexual orientation should not be included in the federally protected class list because unlike the other characteristics, a person’s sexual orientation can change. I find it is an insult for myself as an African American that you are granting through this law special protection for sexual orientation that might only be imagined.” (Riley, 2009)

Religious liberties are one of America’s most treasured values. Tony Perkins, President of the **Family Research Council**, says “The dangerous implications of the homosexual agenda are very real”. (Perkins, 2009). State-sanctioned same-sex unions pose a dangerous threat to religious liberties, not just for churches but for everyone. Heterosexual relationships, although the only relationships that can naturally reproduce, would be officially declared ‘nothing special’. Non-discrimination laws would threaten the rights of individual believers trying to live their daily lives in accordance to their faith.

Perkins lists ways in which individuals may be challenged in their faith or denied the right to express their personal religious values.

*Individuals would be denied the right to express their views in regard to the gay lifestyle in public.

* Private business owners would be required to provide benefits for same-sex domestic partners.

* Organizations that challenged same-sex relationships may be denied government grants or aid.

* Organizations might be denied access to public events.

- * Professionals could face lawsuits or be denied licensing.
- * Religious non-profits or educational establishments may lose their tax-exempt status.
- * Religious clubs at secular universities may be denied recognition.
- * Private business owners and religious non-profits would be required to include gays as employees. With concern over our loss of freedom of conscience, Perkins notes occasions in which these conditions have already occurred.
- * Catholic charities in Boston were told they could no longer do adoptions if they refused to place children with same-sex couples.
- * A California fertility doctor was sued for refusing to artificially inseminate a lesbian.
- * Ocean Grove Camp Meeting in New Jersey lost its tax-exempt status because they refused to rent their worship pavilion for a lesbian 'civil union' ceremony. Their status was restored with the help of the **Alliance Defense Fund**.
- * A Jewish school in New York was forced to allow same-sex 'domestic partners' in married student housing.
- * The Christian Legal Society at the University of California Legal Society was denied recognition.
- * A Lutheran school in California was sued for expelling two girls in a lesbian relationship.
- * The online dating service eHarmony was pressured to provide services for same-sex couples.
- * A father in Massachusetts was arrested when he tried to shield his kindergarten son from exposure to a book on same-sex marriage.

Dr. D James Kennedy, the founder of **Coral Ridge Ministries**, sounded the alarm on the federal hate crime law, which is named after Matthew Shepherd. Matthew Shepherd, a homosexual, was brutally pistol whipped and left tied to a split-rail fence in Laramie, Wyoming by two thugs in an attempt to get money and drugs. Homosexual protestors turned the tragic event into an attack against the Christian community, claiming that anti-gay messages by Christians who opposed homosexuality contributed to the 1998 murder of Shepherd. Hate crime laws add additional penalties for crimes committed against homosexuals or other designated groups when hatred or bias is a motivating factor.

Opponents to the hate crime laws argue that sufficient penalties already are in place to protect us from violent actions and hate crime laws are an assault on our beliefs and values. A

federal **hate crimes** bill was passed in Congress in 2007 but President Bush vetoed the bill. When the bill passed Congress on Oct 22nd of 2009, President Obama signed it into law (Kennedy, 2008).

In a DVD titled *Assault on Liberty: The Impact of Hate Crime Laws*, Dr. Kennedy provides evidence that “shows how hate crime laws have been used to silence Christians, while providing special protection to homosexuals.” Opponents of hate crime laws argue that the legislation leads to criminalizing speech that opposes the homosexual lifestyle. Current laws punish behaviors while hate crime laws punish offenders for what they say. In 2004 11 Christians were arrested for committing a hate crime when they preached at a homosexual gay-pride event in Philadelphia. The defendants faced up to 47 years behind bars and \$90,000 in fines. In Canada a youth pastor was convicted of a hate speech law when he criticized homosexual activists in a letter to the editor.

Matt Barber, Director for Cultural Affairs with Liberty Counsel, calls hate crime legislation “Constitutionally dubious and dangerous to religious liberties and freedom of speech” and “entirely unnecessary” (Kennedy, 2008).

Politics and Beyond

Politics involves the ability of interest groups to effect social and legal decisions in favor of their preferred results. Out.com (2010) notes that “influential gays are becoming increasingly more visible and more powerful”. *The Power 50: The Most Powerful Gay Men and Women in America* were outed on their website. Four criteria were used to determine their choices, including: political clout; pop-culture resonance; individual wealth; and current personal profile. Descriptions of their first five choices are listed as follows:

1. David Giffen is a \$4 billion Hollywood entertainment powerhouse . His money has bought him influence over Democratic presidential politics and his name on UCLA’s medical school.
2. Anderson Cooper, as anchor of CNN News, pulls a \$4 million salary.
3. Ellen DeGeneres hosts her own talk show that draws 2.3 million viewers on a daily basis. This out and proud lesbian is reportedly worth \$65 million.
4. Tim Gill is the country’s biggest gay political donor who made his fortune as founder of the publishing software Quark.
5. Barney Frank, Democratic Congressman from Massachusetts, assumed chairmanship of the House Committee on Financial Services when Democrats took control of the House and Senate.

Bankrolling the Battle (Paulton, 2007)

Tim Gill, the leading funder of the homosexual agendas, is perhaps the most powerful force for homosexual activism. Gill grew up in Denver and became involved in homosexual activism after enrolling at the University of Colorado at Boulder in the early 1970's. With a passion for computer technology and making money he launched the software company Quark, which became a major international software firm, making Gill a very rich man.

In 1992, Gill refocused on gay activism after the passage of Amendment 2 , which prohibited Colorado localities from passing gay-rights ordinances. Feeling angry that “the forces of evil are out to destroy us” he began to funnel his wealth to work for pro-homosexual agendas. In 1994, he formed the Gill foundation through which he was able to use his fortune to “seed gay- rights organizations in all 50 states” (Paulton, 2007). His support enabled the **Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network** (GLSEN) to grow into the leading gay-activist group in America's schools. By 2001, the *USA Today* reported that the “Gill Foundation donations to homosexual-rights organizations around the country represented 20 percent of their annual budgets. As of this year, the foundation has made grants of well over \$115 million.”

Besides huge donations, Gill used creative and effective ways to promote the gay agenda. He launched training seminars across the country to “help the organizations sharpen their message, hone their efficiency and raise money more effectively.” To portray homosexuality as mainstream, Gill also gave large grants to symphonies, libraries and colleges with the stipulation that the organizations have a non-discrimination policy toward homosexuals and that they advertise through plaques, event programs, and annual reports that the funding came from the Gay & Lesbian Fund of Colorado.

In 2000 Gill became involved in “strategic politics”. Focusing on local campaigns, Gill gave \$300,000, followed by \$800,000, followed by \$5 million to influence political races. He recruited three multi-millionaires to join his pro-gay cause: Jared Polis; Rutt Bridges; and billionaire heiress ,Pat Stryker, sister to a homosexual billionaire from Michigan, Jon Stryker. The four “Gillionaires” fed money into local races to shift control of legislatures in favor of gay-friendly candidates. In 2006, Gill and his allies targeted 70 state and local races in a dozen states. When Gill funneled \$5 million into Colorado politics, Democrats took control of both the House and Senate for the first time in three decades. In New Hampshire, a new Democrat majority passed a civil-unions law. In Iowa, the Republicans lost the House; the Democratic majority was able to stop the state marriage amendment and the Legislature enacted a homosexual nondiscrimination law.

Obama's Rainbow World (Vitagliano, 2009)

When Barack Obama was elected president, lavender, the signature color of the gay movement, became the preferred color of major media newscasters and talk show hosts. Purple and lavender ties, shirts, dresses, and suit coats blossomed. On Inauguration Day of 2009 the **Human Rights Campaign** president, Joe Solmonese said, "Today's inauguration represents a paradigm shift. The pendulum has swung away from the anti-gay forces and toward a new president and vice president who acknowledge our equality."

Throughout his campaign, Obama made it clear that he supported the homosexual "civil rights" movement. Immediately after his inauguration, the Obama White House Web site posted its agenda, which included a section addressed to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) community. Obama is quoted, "Too often, the issue of LGBT rights is exploited by those seeking to divide us... But at its core, this issue is about who we are as Americans. It's about whether this nation is going to live up to its founding promise of equality by treating all its citizens with dignity and respect." (Vitagliano, 2009).

On the Web site (www.whitehouse.gov) Obama spoke to the relevant political concerns:

- Hate Crimes** - We will "expand hate crimes protection by passing the *Matthew Shepard Act*."
- ENDA** - Obama "supports the Employment Non-Discrimination Act...our anti-discrimination laws should be expanded to include sexual orientation and gender identity."
- Gays in the Military** - "we need to repeal the 'don't ask, don't tell' policy"
- Defense of Marriage Act** – the President wants to "repeal the *Defense of Marriage Act* which was signed into law in 1996 by President Clinton. Obama wants to "enact legislation that would ensure that the 1,100+ federal legal rights and benefits currently provided on the basis of marital status are extended to same-sex couples in civil unions and other legally-recognized unions."
- Gay adoption** - In a letter to a gay rights group in Massachusetts, Obama said, "We have to eliminate Discrimination against LGBT families. And that's why we have to extend equal treatment in our family and adoption laws."

After taking office Obama disappointed many gay activists by not moving aggressively forward in pursuit of gay rights, and even defending some of the policies he criticized. Gay rights groups became outraged when the Obama administration filed a legal brief defending the *Defense of Marriage Act*, which Obama had opposed during his campaign. To lessen the anger, In June of 2009 Obama signed a presidential memo extending some benefits to same-sex partners of federal employees (Froomkin, 2009).

In February of 2010, Obama again disappointed homosexuals who were wanting to serve openly in the armed forces. Michael Mullen, the Joint Chiefs of Staff Adm., reported that the Pentagon is conducting a year long review of policy change. President Obama and Congress will table this issue for the rest of the year (The Washington Times, 2010).

Social Consequences of Normalizing Same-Sex Marriage (Blankenhorn, 2007:202-212)

In considering the future of marriage, Dr. David Blankenhorn chaired three one-day seminars for researchers and family scholars in 2004 to address concerns raised by the prospect of gay marriage. Seminars were held in New York City, Washington D.C. and Atlanta, Georgia, with a total of 40 people attending, including leading family scholars. Some had spoken out in favor of gay marriage and some against. Serious scholars and leaders wrestled with the issue in an attempt to see both sides.

The results of the discussions confirmed that a movement toward gay marriage would not only affect a small minority but would constitute major social change. It became evident that the decision was not a morally easy one because when important goods conflict, any resolution will carry elements of loss. A diverse range of consequences were listed, both positive and negative.

Positive social consequences of extending marriage benefits to same-sex couples included:

- * the improvement of well being and social worth for gays and lesbians,
- * increased tolerance and inclusion in society,
- * and equal treatment under the law.

Extending marriage benefits would:

- * encourage gays to choose committed relationship,
- * contribute to more stability and longer lasting relationships,
- * and lead to less sexual promiscuity.

Negative social consequences identified in changing the public meaning of marriage from a social institution to a private relationship between two people included:

- * the deinstitutionalization of marriage, contributing to a social devaluation of marriage,
- * endorsement of the idea that a child does not really need a mother and a father,
- * opening the door to other forms of 'marriage', including group marriage and polygamy,

- * subsidization of reproductive technologies,
- * and fewer children being raised by their own married mother and father.

The religious values of most Americans in regard to appropriate sexual relationships would:

- * no longer be legally accepted,
- * lead to state imposed restrictions on religious freedom and freedom of expression, and
- * lead to U.S. marriages becoming secularized, undermining religious conceptions of marriage. The public socialization of young people into a marriage culture would be diluted to avoid suggesting that marriage is fundamentally heterosexual. If the decision was reached by the courts, a public loss in confidence in the judicial system would result.

The total list of consequences identified by the 40 conference attendees included 23 negative, 24 positive and 12 'other' consequences that were considered important to recognize. The participants in this discussion concluded that gay marriage would represent "quite a bit of significant social change, affecting many aspects of society."

Questions on Gay Reorganization of Society (Kaplan (a) (b), 1993)

In 1993, Morton A. Kaplan, distinguished service professor of political science emeritus at the University of Chicago and editor of *The World and I* magazine, wrestled with the challenges to society being proposed by gay activism. Noting that the issues of gay rights and alternative family forms generated enormous anger and political energy, he concluded that, "As long as the family, as now understood, commands the rational and emotional assent of most people, it is hard for homosexuality to enter the mainstream of American life." Noting that "We cannot, even if we wished, withdraw from these issues" Kaplan concludes, "It is therefore, quite important to think, through these issues as objectively as possible."

A series of considerations were raised.

- * "Many homosexuals and lesbians are intelligent, honorable, hardworking, and valuable members of society. Many of them are fine parents...They tend to greater promiscuity than heterosexuals, but this may be a product of social and legal factors..."
- * "No decent individual would desire to see homosexuals harassed or deprived of dignified career opportunities."
- * "Although it is regrettable that a group of people should pay disproportionate social and psychological costs because of their sexuality, the survival of the larger group cannot be put at risk."

- * “We legitimate the heterosexual family to preserve the group.”
- * In extending the concept of normality, “damage may be done to society that may take generations to repair... some degree of damage to limited groups of individuals may be justified for the greater good of society...every set of social norms injures some.”
- * “Are homosexual and lesbian tendencies genetically governed? ...such behavior likely depends on more than genetics.”
- * “...there were also incestuous or pedophilic families...But where is the line to be drawn, and on what basis? And, if we cannot draw a firm line, will we remain successful in outlawing child pornography if the child consents?”
- * “Can we tolerate all forms of consensual sexual activity?...Our ability to function rationally depends on taboos and social and legal constraints that maintain character and a sense of appropriateness.”
- * “ I suggest prudence, that we do not allow a slippery slope to take us unawares...we need serious discussion rather than the polemics and the heat we are now generating.”

CAUTION IS WISDOM

Social movements promoting the normalization of homosexuality in our society have, and will continue to bring about profound challenges and changes in social organization, particularly in regard to social integration, social reproduction, social health, and the intergenerational transfer of cultural values.

The heterosexual family unit has integrated men and women, children, grandparents and extended relatives in personal and caring relationships that transcend generations. Countless and consistent family research confirms that the greatest sources of nurture, support and meaning for the majority of Americans are found within the family unit. The foundation upon which freedom is built rests upon the ability of autonomous family units to preserve and pass down cultural values to the next generation. This process develops a diversity of perspectives, providing the checks and balances in society which guard against destructive extremes.

As children are taught to accept homosexuality as a normal choice, the intergenerational transfer of cultural and genetic patterns in society becomes jeopardized. The normalization of homosexuality will create new forms of social reproduction. When society changes rapidly it is prudent to inquire, “Who benefits?” The commercialization of reproduction through the buying of sperm and egg and the creating of children through deliberate planning by professionals (at high cost) will replace the caring and loving union of mother, father, children,

grandchildren, and extended relatives. This is a foundation for eugenics with all the questions to be asked in this regard. Whose sperm? Whose egg will be favored?

The personal and public health risks associated with homosexual behaviors are deeply troubling. It is not useful to pretend that the dangers inherent in the homosexual lifestyle will be overcome by condom use, especially a careless distribution of condoms among the young.

Heterosexual family forms have been protected and passed down through centuries of civilizations and in virtually all societies. This discussion will leave the reader with questions addressed by Melik Kaylan in his article "The Way We Live Now."

"...Most of the 'slippery slope' warnings of the last decades have proved tragically accurate despite the mockery that silenced them. From the domino theory, to drugs, divorce, to permissive sexuality, who can deny the devastation wrought by each – broken homes, addictions, AIDS?..."

Already the era of gay parenting is here. It often involves an affluent gay couple adopting poor orphans and improving their material future immeasurably. How long before market forces noisily hold up such families as role models, pillars of style, tolerance, humor, free-thinking? Yet we have no idea how the children will fare emotionally, how anomalous they will feel...Will children, once reared know how to sustain a heterosexual marriage or family, having no inherited sense of its workings?...What will be the ultimate human cost, and who will have the courage, then to identify the cause?" (Kaylan, 2003).

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson**, Mark. *Urban Enclaves: Identity and Place in America*. NY: St Martin's Press. 1996:108.
- Adamson**, Victor J. "Homosexual Change Study Supports Reparative Therapy". American Association of Christian Counselors. June 13, 2001. <http://www.victorjadamson.com/articles2/article.php?id=4>. 1/24/10.
- Advocate.com**. "Hawaii Gay Marriage, 10 years later". <http://www.advocate.com/printArticle.aspx?id=102704>. Nov.20, 2009.
- AFA, 2008** "McDonald's sponsors summit promoting the gay agenda." *American Family Association Journal*. Vol. 32, No. 10. Oct. 2008:3.
- AFA, 2009** launches boycott of PepsiCo. *AFA Journal*. Vol. 33, No.1, January, 2009:3.
- AFA boycott**. "Reasons for the boycott". <http://www.boycottpepsico.com>. 2/8/2010.
- AFA**. "AFA ends boycott:McDonald's agrees to changes." <http://www.afa.net/DEtail.aspx?id=2147483663>. 2/8/10.
- AfterElton.com** Staff. "The Fifty Greatest Gay Movies". September 7, 2008. <http://www.afterelton.com/movies/2008/9/50greatestgaymovies>. 2/3/2010.
- American Family Association**. "AFA calls for boycott of McDonald's" *American Family Association Journal*. Vol. 32, No. 8, August 2008:3.
- Andrews**, Lori B. *The Clone Age: Adventures in the New World of Reproductive Technology*. NY: An Owl Book/Henry Holt & Co. 1999.
- AP** –Associated Press. "Catholic bishops urge new rules over sex abuse." *San Antonio Express News*. November 18, 1993:15A.
- Aron**, Raymond. *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.1968:155.
- Barber**, Matt. "Is the 'gay' fix in on Prop.8?" OneNewsNow.com. <http://www.onenewsnow.com/Printer.aspx?id=894882>. 2/12/2010.
- Berg**, Ellen. "Sociological Perspectives on AIDS." American Sociological Association Footnotes. December, 1986:8.
- Biskupic**, Joan. "Court's opinion on gay rights reflects trends." *USA Today*. July 18-20, 2003:2A.
- Blankenhorn**, David. *The Future of Marriage*. New York: Encounter Books. 2007.
- Blankenhorn**, David. Institute for American Values newsletter. December 23, 2009.
- Bly**, Laura. "A gay new time: Family cruises, vacations." *USA Today*. Friday, July 9, 2004:D1.
- Brinkman**, Susan. "Health risks of the homosexual lifestyle." *Catholic Standard & Times* (May-June, 2004). <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/printarticle.html?id=4236>. 1/10/2010.
- Burtoft**, Larry. *Setting the Record Straight: What Research Really Says About the Social Consequences of Homosexuality*. Colorado Springs, CO: Focus on the Family. 1994.
- Buss**, Dale. "Homosexual rights go to school." *Christianity Today*. Vol.37, No. 6 (May 17) 1993: 70-72.
- Buss**, Dale. "Gay activists seek to repeal state marriage amendments in U.S." *Citizen*. Vol. 23, No. 10. Dec. 2009:8.
- Byrd**, A. Dean. "The American Journal of Public Health Highlights Risks of Homosexual Practices." NARTH. <http://www.narth.com/docs/risks.html>. 1/10/2010.
- Cassidy**, Jennifer Kennedy. "Power Grab". Coral Ridge Ministries. Newsletter. February 9, 2010.
- CDC 2007**. "Basic Statistics, 2007".<http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/surveillance/print/basic.htm>. 1/10/2010.
- CDC 2008** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "Sexually Transmitted Diseases Surveillance, 2008:1. <http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats08/trends.htm>. 1/10/2010.
- Citizen magazine**. "Overheard". Vol. 16, No. 7. July, 2002:11.
- Colson**, Charles. "The Whisper Zone: Why We're Losing Our Right to Speak Out." *Breakpoint*. Prison Fellowship Ministries. May 1, 2008.
- Condomman**, "Condom Use and the Spread of Sexually Transmitted Diseases." <http://www.condomman.com/articles/index.php?tag=rising-std-rates>. April 19, 2008.
- Craine**, Patrick B. "AIDS Rate 50 Times Higher in Homosexual Men: Center for Disease Control." LifeSiteNews.com. August 26, 2009. <http://www.lifesitenews.com/ldn/printerfriendly.html?articleid=09082609>. 2/5/10.

Curtis, Barbara. "In the beginning". *Citizen*. Focus on the Family. Vol. 22, No. 3. March, 2008:24-27.

CWA. "National Impact Survey of the Radical Homosexual Agenda on America's Public Schools". Concerned Women for America. 2007.

Daniels, Matt. "United, We Fall". *World* magazine. Vol. 15, No. 24. June 17, 2000:65-67.

Davidson, Doug. "Disturbing the Peace: Thirty years on The Other Side". *The Other Side*. 30th Anniversary. Vol.31, No. 6 (Nov/Dec) 1995:7.

Dobson, James. Dr. Dobson's Newsletter. Focus on the Family, Colorado Springs, CO. November 2009:3.

DOMA watch. "Federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA)" Alliance Defense Fund. 2008.
<http://www.domawatch.org/about/federaldoma.html>. 2/17/2010.

DOMA watch (a). <http://www.domawatch.org/index.php> 2/17/10

Dorsett, Amy. "Protest in S.A. targets KLRN." *San Antonio Express News*. July 3, 1999:1B.

Drummond, Tammerlin. "The Marrying Kind." *Time*. Vol. 157, No. 19. May 14, 2001:52.

Elder, Gene. "Gay/lesbian studies: out of the closet, into college." *San Antonio Express News*. November 3, 1991:4M.

Ephron, Dan. "Don't Ask Too Fast". *Newsweek*. Jan 12, 2009.
<http://www.newsweek.com/id/177723/output/print>. 1/29/10.

Exodus History. <http://www.exodusglobalalliance.org/ourhistoryc87.php>. 1/25/2010.

Exodus. "Who We Are". http://www.exodusinternational.org/about_exodus.shtml. 1/25/2010.

Fitzpatrick, Laura. "Spotlight – Same-sex Marriage." *Time*. Vol. 175, No.3. January 25, 2010:20.

Focus on the Family. Love Won Out Conference advertising brochure. 2004.

Foreman, Matt. "State of the Movement Address". National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Feb. 8, 2008.

Froomkin, Dan. "Consolation Prize for Gays." 6.17/2009.
http://voices.washingtonpost.com/white-house-watch/a-consolation-prize-for-gays_pf.html. 2/26/2010.

Fry, Robert. "Learn What the Catholic Church Really Teaches.: Catholic Church and Adoption."
<http://www.catechismoncall.wordpress.com/2009/04/16/catholic-church-gay-adoption/> 2/11/2010.

Fryrear, Melissa . "'Love Won Out' is about ministry, not intolerance." Focus on the Family. Feb. 19, 2009

GA -The Gay Almanac. Compiled by the National Museum & Archive of Lesbian and Gay History. NewYork; Berkley Books. 1996.

Gandossy, Taylor. "Gay adoption: A new take on the American family."
<http://www.cnn.com/2007/US/06/25/gay.adoption>.

Glenn, Gary. "Compassionate Society Should Discourage Deadly Homosexual Behavior." American Family Association. <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1039280/posts>. March 19, 2001.

Glenn, Norval D. *Closed Hearts, Closed Minds The Textbook Story of Marriage*. NY:Institute for American Values. 1997.

Glenn, Norval D. Unpublished e-mail letter to author. August 19,2002.

GLSEN. "Our Mission. Our History". <http://www.glsen.org/chi-bin/iowa/all/about/history/index.html>. 1/21/2010.

Goldberg, Carey. "Hawaii Judge Ends Gay-Marriage Ban". *New York Times* (NYTime.com) December 4, 1996.

Infoplease.com. Database. Pearson Education, Inc. 2009. "The American Gay Rights Movement: A Timeline." <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0761909.html>

Jameson, Vic. "Assembly maintains traditional Presbyterian sexuality policies." Presbyterian Survey. (July/Aug) 1991:24-25.

Johansson, Catrine. "Respect for gays found productive." *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*. Sunday, June 27, 2004:1R.

Johnson, Ramon. "Where is Gay Adoption Legal?"
<http://gaylife.about.com/od/gayparentingadoption/a/gaycoupleadopt.htm?p=1>. 2/11/2010.

- Jones, Jeffrey M.** "Majority of Americans Continue to Oppose Gay Marriage". May 27, 2009.
<http://www.gallup.com/poll/118378/majority-americans-continue-oppose-gay-marriage>. 1/29/10.
- Kaplan,(a)** Morton A. "Homosexuality:New Virtue or Old Vice?" *The World and I*. 1993:361.
- Kaplan,(b)** Morton A. "Common sense on gay rights." *The World and I* , 1993:403-407.
- Kaylan, Melik.** "The Way We Live Now." *The Wall Street Journal*. Friday, August 8, 2003: Opinion Page.
- Kennedy, D. James.** "CRM Sounds Alarm on Hate Crime Laws." *IMPACT*. Vol.XX, No.10. Coral Ridge Ministries.2008.
- LaHaye, Beverly.** Concerned Women for America newsletter. Fall, 2009.
- Laumann, Edward O., John H. Gagnon, Robert T. Michael, and Stuart Michaels.** *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago, IL, 1994.
- Leblanc, Douglas.** "Therapeutically Incorrect: Atheist psychiatrist argues that gays can change". *Christianity Today*. 3/29/2005. <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2005/april/20.94.html>. 1/24/10.
- Leff, Lisa.** "Gay-union trial may set policy". *San Antonio Express News*. Friday, January 8, 2010:13A.
- McGreal, Chris** "Obama renews vow to end ban on gay people openly serving in the military." Oct 11,2009.
<http://www.guardian.com/uk/world/2009/oct/11/obama-gay-rights-in-the-military>. 1/29/10.
- Montgomery, Kathryn C.** *Target: Prime Time- Advocacy 'Groups and the Struggle Over Entertainment Television*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1989.
- Moore, Art.** "One church, two faiths." *Christianity Today*. Vol. 43, No. 8. (July 12) 1999:43.
- Murray, Stephen O.** "AIDS, Gay Men, and Their (Invisible) Sociology". *American Sociological Association Footnotes*. March, 1989:8.
- Mygayweb.** "Gay Demographics". <http://www.mygayweb.com/info/advertising/demographics>. 1/25/2010.
- NARTH.** <http://www.narth.com/index.html>. 1/24/2010.
- NMCI – National MultiCultural Institute.** "The National MultiCultural (NMCI) History.
<http://www.nmci.org/about/index.html>. 1/22/10.
- Ostling, Richard N.** "The Church Search". *Time*. Vol. 141, No. 14(April 5) 1993:44-51.
- Out.com.** "The Power 50: The Most Powerful Gay Men & Women in America."
<http://out.com/detail.asp?id=22394>. 2/26/2010.
- Palen, J.John.** *Social Problems for the Twenty-first Century*. Boston: McGraw Hill Pub.2001
- Paulton, John.** "In the Image of Gill". *Citizen*. Colorado Springs, CO: Focus on the Family Vol. 21, No. 12. December, 2007:24-27.
- Perkins, Tony.** "Same-Sex 'Marriage' vs. Religious Liberty." *Truth & Triumph*. Alliance Defense Fund. Vol. II, Issue 3. 2009:14-15.
- Poniewozik, James.** "Queer Eye for Straight TV". *Time*. Vol.165, No.11. March 14, 2005:56-58.
- Presbyterian Layman.** "Highlights from the Layman's years of reporting on Presbyterian Church (USA)." Vol. 28, No. 6 (Nov/Dec) 1995.
- Religious Tolerance.** "Statement on homosexuality: 2000 to now." 2008.
http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom_pru22.htm. 2/22/2010
- Rierson, Sandra.** "Comstock Act (1873)". <http://www.enotes.com/major-acts-congress/comstock-act>. 2/1/10.
- Reisman , Judith A. and Edward W. Eichel.** *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People*. Lafayette, LA: Huntington House. 1990.
- Riley, Jennifer.** "Gay Employment Bill on Queue for Returning Congress." Aug. 21, 2009.
<http://www.christianpost.com/article/20090821/gay-employment-bill-on-agenda...> 2/21/2010.
- RSV.** *The Holy Bible*. Revised Standard Version. New York. Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- SanFrancisco.com.** "Mayor Newson and Gay Civil Rights." Feb.10, 2004.
<http://www.sanfrancisco.com/gay/marriage.html>. 2/218/2010.
- Santorum, Rick.** National Organization for Marriage. www.TwoMillionForMarriage.com. November 2009.
- Satinover, Jeffrey.** *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books. 1996.

- Sears, Alan & Craig Osten.** *The Homosexual Agenda: Exposing the Principal Threat to Religious Freedom Today.* (Revised and updated) Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing. 2003.
- Seelye, Katharine Q. and Janet Elder.** "Discomfort over gays seen on rise," *San Antonio Express News*. Sunday, December 21, 2003:15A.
- Shalikashvili, John M.** "Second Thoughts on Gays in the Military." *NYTimes.com*. January 2, 2007.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/02/opinion/o2shalikashvili.html?>
- Sheldon, Reverend Louis P.** *It's Not Really About Marriage: The Radical Homosexual Agenda to Undermine American Culture.* Traditional Values Coalition. Washington DC. 2005: 14-15.
- Somelikeitscott.** "What the Mainstream Gay Themed Movies of the 1980's and 1990's Are Still Teaching Me." [http://hubpages.com/hub/What-The-Mainstream-Gay-Themed-Movies-Of-The-1980's ...](http://hubpages.com/hub/What-The-Mainstream-Gay-Themed-Movies-Of-The-1980's...) 2/3/2010.
- Spar, Debora L.** *The Baby Business: How Money, Science, and Politics Drive the Commerce of Conception.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press. 2006.
- Steinacker, Annette.** "Externalities, Prospect Theory, and Social Construction: When Will Government Act, What Will Government Do?" *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 87. No 3. September 2006:459-476.
- Stoeltje, M.** "Attitude adjustment may be taking place." *San Antonio Express News*. Sunday, Aug. 24, 2003:12A. mstoeltje@express-news.net.
- Sullivan, Thomas J.** *Introduction to Social Problems.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon Pub. 2000.
- The Media Project.** "Condoms' Effectiveness in Preventing Pregnancy, Std's at Center of Debate on Revising Package Labels." <http://www.themediaproject.com/news/itn/063005.htm>. June 30, 2005.
- The Washington Times.** "Editorial: Obama disappoints gays again." Feb. 3, 2010.
<http://www.washingtonties.com/news/2010/feb/03/homosexuals-disappointed-again>. 2/26/2010.
- Thomas, Judy L.** "AIDS taking toll among Catholic priests in U.S." *San Antonio Express News*. Saturday, February 5, 2000:10B.
- Tooley, Mark.** "United Methodists move to the center," *Faith and Freedom*. Vol. 19, No.3-4 (Summer/Fall) 2000:6-7.
- Urban Institute.** "Gay and Lesbian Demographics". 2009
<http://www.urban.org/toolkit/issues/gayresearchfocus.cfm>. 1/25/10.
- Van Biema, David.** "Out of the Fold". *Time*. Vol. 156, No. 1 (July 3) 2000:48-51.
- Veith, Gene Edward.** "Out of the dungeon". *World*. Vol. 16, No. 9. March 10, 2001:41-43.
- Vitagliano, Ed.** "Homosexual leader calls AIDS 'A gay disease'." *American Family Association Journal*. Vol. 32, No. 4. April, 2008:20.
- Vitagliano, Ed.** "Homosexual Agenda". *American Family Association Journal*. Vol.33, No. 3. March 2009:20-21.
- Walton, Jeffrey H.** "Episcopalians Roll Down the Slope". *Faith and Freedom*. Vol. 28, No. 4. Fall 2009:7.
- Watson, Jamal.** "When Diversity Training Goes Awry".
<http://diverseeducation.com/cache/print/php?articleId=10543>. Jan.24, 2008.
- Wikipedia.** "List of television shows with LGBT characters."
[http://www.wikipedia.org/wili/List of television shows with LGBT characters](http://www.wikipedia.org/wili/List_of_television_shows_with_LGBT_characters). 2/3/2010.
- Wikipedia.(b)** "Same-sex marriage in California." http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Same-sex_marriage_in_California. 2/18/10.
- Wisdom, Alan F.H.** "Evangelical Lutherans Go Over the Edge." *Faith and Freedom*. Vol. 28, No. 4, Fall 2009:6.
- Workshop Summary: Scientific Evidence on Condom Effectiveness for Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STD) Prevention.** 2000, June 12-13. Hyatt Dulles Airport. Herndon, Virginia. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. National Institute of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, July 20, 2001. Page 10. <http://www3.niaid.nih.gov/about/organization/dmid/pof/condomreport.pdf>
- Wright, Wendy.** "Support Our Troops-Oppose Weakening Our Military" Concerned Women for America. Feb. 2010

