

From CWA.org
Sexual Orientation and American Culture 7/10/2002
By Robert Knight

Few businessmen realize that when they allow the addition of "sexual orientation" to their nondiscrimination codes, they are tying their own hands when it comes to objecting to:

- A man in a highly visible sales job coming to work in a dress and high heels;
- A woman in a highly visible position coming to work in men's clothes;
- A person of indeterminate sex who insists on using either the men's room or the women's room;²¹
- A person of either sex who indulges a taste for extreme sexual promiscuity and pornography during working hours despite being charged with representing the company's tone and character;
- A man who frequents prostitutes while on business trips and claims that it is none of the company's business, regardless of the company's public image.

A partial list of "sexual orientations" from the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition*, published by the American Psychiatric Association, are included in an appendix.²² Heterosexuality, homosexuality and bisexuality are routinely included in broad legal definitions of "sexual orientation." A fourth "sexual orientation," transgenderism, is beginning to be included in such descriptions. Other categories consist of paraphilias,²³ which are defined as sexual disorders. Note: Some of the descriptions may be offensive to readers' sensibilities.

THREATS TO FREEDOM



When "sexual orientation" is added to a legal or corporate nondiscrimination code, it is a giant step toward the adoption of policies that discriminate against people with traditional views of morality.

In companies that have "sexual orientation" in nondiscrimination codes, employees face pro-homosexual diversity training, and even programs that openly assail traditional morality. As homosexual "diversity guru" Brian McNaught writes in his book *Gay Issues in the Workplace*, "There are people who believe that homosexual behavior is forbidden by the Bible. This too is a personal belief."²⁴ McNaught, who frequently consults for AT&T and other Fortune 500 firms, counsels employers to dispense with any references to marriage: "[H]eterosexual language can also be changed. We can say, for instance, *partner* or *significant other* rather than *spouse*. We can say, 'Are you in a relationship?' rather than, 'Are you married?'"²⁵ As for employees who decline to go along with the homosexual program, McNaught has this advice:

"If individuals insist that the company's efforts to create a safe work environment for gay employees 'discriminates' against the religiously conservative employee and their values, I would ask them to 1) utilize the support services, such as

counseling, made available to distressed employees; 2) speak to their supervisors so that they will be aware of their stress; and 3) do their best to stay focused on the purpose of their time at work. If the stress is so great that they are unable to function at work, I would reaffirm the company's policy on discrimination and tell them if they could not be comfortable with this policy I would understand why they would feel it necessary to seek employment elsewhere."²⁶

With pressure to conform to the view that "sexual orientation" is a protected right, some employees have been harassed, lost promotions or even have been terminated for questioning the premise. Here are a few illustrative cases:

- A San Antonio bank employee, Betty Sabatino, was told to attend a "fair employment practices" session. During a period of open questions, employees were told they were in a "safe zone," and that they could ask anything. After being told that "sexual orientation" was being added to company policy, Mrs. Sabatino asked why the company would choose to give someone special consideration based solely on sexual behavior. Later, her boss expressed concern over her question on two occasions. Less than a month later, she was terminated. Reason: "Management's loss of confidence with employee."²⁷
- A California software maker was forced to pay a settlement and legal fees totaling over \$1 million because the company did not promote a man who had come to work dressed as a woman. It did not matter that the company did not even know the "woman" was a man. The "victim" sued under California's "sexual orientation" law. As legal fees escalated, the company finally settled out of court. To pay for the loss, eight employees were laid off, with the number eventually growing to 20.²⁸
- In Hollywood, California, an Orthodox Jew was working at his desk when two homosexual colleagues stopped nearby. In graphic detail, they discussed pornographic films that one of them had seen. The Orthodox Jew, who asked that his name be withheld, asked the men to stop. They refused. He voiced his concern to the human resources department and was told that he had no business disapproving of the men's "sexual orientation" and that he was the one who had better "lighten up."²⁹