

Some corporations are adopting policies based on flawed reasoning

INTRODUCTION

Beset by homosexual pressure groups, some of America's corporations and governments are adopting policies based on "sexual orientation." What seems at first like a fairly easy and painless way to mollify activists inside and outside the company instead invariably triggers more and more demands.

Caught in a spiraling campaign, companies and governments wind up adopting policies that defy their self-interest, create a hostile climate for other employees and citizens, and open the firm to government intrusion and lawsuits designed to speed up a radical transformation of American culture. As homosexual activists themselves acknowledge, their final objectives are to eliminate company policies that impart a unique value to marriage and to install a system to discriminate against people with traditional values.

The strategy is this: Transform morality into a form of bigotry and then use corporate and government power to eliminate that "bigotry." A case in point is Lotus Corporation's "Diversity at Work Awareness Program," in which a fact sheet is distributed that includes this statement: "*Myth*: Loving people of the same sex is immoral (sinful). *Fact*: Many religious denominations do not believe this. What is universally understood is that intolerance and hatred is wrong."¹

Businesses are a key part of the larger culture's tentative embrace of "sexual orientation," which is altering America's cultural values. By the time they have reached the last stage of adopting homosexually-oriented policies, companies celebrate homosexuality through "gay pride" events and even finance homosexual activism out of fear of offending newly empowered homosexual employees.

Adding a formula to make a company more vulnerable to lawsuits and further activism does not seem to be in the best interests of the company or its stockholders. Yet many businesses have tried to appease homosexual activists by incorporating "sexual orientation" into their nondiscrimination policies. It is then that their troubles begin in earnest.

RECENT HISTORY

Since the dawn of civilization, all successful societies have had rules regarding sexual behavior. All societies have channeled sex into marriage. When they failed to do this, they lost creative energy and perished.²

Until the latter decades of the 20th century, America had a marriage-centered culture and government policies that discouraged sex outside of marriage.³ Extra-marital and premarital sexual behavior had been discouraged as immoral as well as destructive to individuals, families and communities. In 1885, the U.S. Supreme Court, in response to Utah's petition to enter the Union, declared that to be admitted any state had to have laws resting on "the basis of the idea of the family, as consisting in and springing from the union for life of one man and one woman in the holy estate of matrimony; the sure foundation of all that is stable and noble in our civilization, the best guaranty of that reverent morality which is the source of all beneficent progress in social and political improvement."⁴

Ratchet forward to the 1950s: Pent-up demand following World War II pushed America's marriage rate to sky-high levels.⁵ Family life and the economy surged along with the Baby Boom. But as America prospered, the seeds had already been planted for a radical revision of how Americans viewed marriage and sexuality. That development took off in the 1960s and is with us still. Before we look at current trends, it is helpful to take a quick tour of the socio/psychological history that led to the creation of the term "sexual orientation" and to the modern-day homosexual activist movement.

THE CREATION OF SEXOLOGY

In 1879, Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), the "father of experimental psychology," opened the first experimental psychology laboratory at the University of Leipzig in Germany.⁶ The lab operated on the materialistic premise that the mind and soul were one, and that psychology was a matter of mechanically managing the mind. The view that man was responsible for his own behavioral choices as a matter of right and wrong was giving way to the view that man was the product of genetics, brain chemistry and environmental forces in childhood. One of Wundt's disciples was William James, known as the "father of American psychology." James, who wrote the influential book *The Varieties of Religious Experience* in 1902, reduced religion from a matter of truth to merely a therapeutic tool.

As a biographer of James wrote, the change was quite radical: "Western society underwent a transformation of the basis for personal and collective values.... Salvation was now a matter of survival, sin became a sickness, and such religious rituals as confession, designed to alleviate guilt and atone for sin, were replaced by individual and group psychotherapeutic interventions, designed to alleviate the guilt of anxiety neurosis."⁷

In the early 20th century, Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) transformed right and wrong into the language of "needs," "responses" and *id*, *ego* and *superego*, with sex as paramount. Psychology eventually grew into the dominant values reference system among academic elites, displacing morality as a decision-making framework.

Soon, sex was placed under the microscope. In 1919, an entrepreneurial homosexual, Magnus Hirschfeld, founded the Institute for Sexology in Berlin, Germany.⁸ The Institute studied the burgeoning homosexual subculture, which was challenging traditional family morality in film, stage and in the increasingly decadent "cabaret" culture of post-World War I Germany. As historian Paul Johnson notes, "Stage and night-club shows in Berlin were the least inhibited of any major capital. Plays, novels and even paintings touched on such themes as homosexuality, sado-masochism, transvestitism and incest; and it was in Germany that Freud's writings were most fully absorbed by the intelligentsia and penetrated the widest range of artistic expression."⁹ Meanwhile, "the Church, and, above all, the comfortable, industrious middle classes, were savaged and ridiculed."¹⁰ In such an atmosphere, Adolf Hitler was able to persuade millions of Germans that he alone could restore decency and order, despite the fact that many of his earliest supporters in the "Brownshirts" were sexual deviants themselves.¹¹

Amid the growing decadence, Hirschfeld's institute thrived for several years until the Nazis declared it subversive and closed it along with other avant garde cultural experiments. But Hirschfeld's ideas traveled across the Atlantic. In 1931, he toured America, aided by people who later boosted the career of a young zoologist who was to become one of the most influential men of the 20th century: Alfred C. Kinsey.¹²

THE KINSEY PHENOMENON

In 1948, Kinsey published *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, a massive volume containing page after page of graphs, charts and reams of data that supposedly provided the first scientific overview of sexuality.¹³ A willing news media reported uncritically that "science" had overthrown traditional mores and that Americans were awash in unorthodox and even bizarre sexual behavior. Out of the Kinsey research came the idea that fully 10 percent of the population was homosexual, an estimate that later, more reliable surveys show to be closer to one percent.¹⁴

It didn't matter that Kinsey had faked much of his research, including data in his 1953 volume, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*.¹⁵ It didn't matter that biographers of Freud and Kinsey both found that the great scientists had skewed their data in order to validate personal biases (in fact, Kinsey was even exposed as an outright fraud who made up "findings"¹⁶ to justify his own prodigious appetite for sadistic, homosexual sex).¹⁷ Within a few years, Playboy magazine publisher Hugh Hefner and other pornographers were citing Kinsey to justify their challenges to America's decency laws. The drumbeat of "science" and the natural human bent

toward vice transformed cultural values regarding sex. Instead of viewing sex outside marriage as "sin," Americans increasingly viewed sex as something free of moral consideration. And with the introduction of the birth control pill in the early 1960's, sex could now be totally recreational.

As a result of the Freud-Kinsey effect on an increasingly splintered and individualistic culture, homosexuals in urban centers like New York and Los Angeles began to work toward permanent, institutionalized change in the way sexuality was viewed. Their work paid off with a major triumph in 1973.

TAKEOVER AT THE APA

By a vote of its House of Delegates, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its list of disordered conditions in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, the bible of the profession. The change came about not because of new research. Scientists had made no groundbreaking discoveries. No, the change because of a political coup engineered by homosexual activists, a process documented by pro-gay writer Ronald Bayer.¹⁸

Dr. Charles Socarides, a practicing psychiatrist who witnessed events at APA conventions, including threats of violence by homosexual activists, said, "The APA could only take the action it did by disregarding and dismissing hundreds of psychiatric and psychoanalytic research papers and reports that had been done on homosexuality over the previous two decades."¹⁹ In 1974, the American Psychological Association followed suit under similar conditions. Meanwhile, under pressure from homosexual activists, states had already begun dropping laws against sodomy, thus paving the way for the free-wheeling, promiscuous "gay" scene that homosexual writer Randy Shilts chronicled as the prelude to the AIDS epidemic of the 1980s.²⁰

Shortly thereafter, the term "sexual preference" began to give way to "sexual orientation" in homosexual publications and then in the psychiatric and psychological literature. In fact, it began to turn up everywhere, from magazines to school policy proposals. A seemingly innocuous phrase to describe everybody's sexual roadmap, "sexual orientation" is much more than that. The preceding historical overview was intended to show that the term did not appear in a vacuum but was instead a key and deliberate step in an unfolding process of securing social, political and economic support for homosexuality.

THE REAL MEANING OF "SEXUAL ORIENTATION"

Just as many other terms swiftly achieve commonly accepted usage, "sexual orientation" is rarely challenged or examined. Yet "sexual orientation" as a concept is a radical challenge to the core beliefs of all major religious faiths and even to the very notion that sexual behavior has moral dimensions. While other human activities, such as buying and selling, remain subject to moral judgments, the concept of "sexual orientation" places sex outside morality. No other human behavior with such sweeping consequences has received such a stamp of neutrality. "Sexual orientation" contains the following chain of assumptions:

1. People are born with certain sexual desires;
2. These desires are innate and therefore unchangeable;
3. Sexual preference is identical to other immutable characteristics such as ethnicity;
4. People cannot choose to govern their sexuality any more than they can govern their skin color;
5. Sexual activity stemming from these desires is self-validating;
6. "Sexual orientation" should have special protection in the nation's civil rights laws and corporate policies;
7. Religious beliefs about sex and morality are no longer valid;
8. People who still feel that sexuality has moral consequences are bigots;
9. Such people must be silenced to achieve corporate harmony.

Springing from the psychological literature, "sexual orientation" is often taken to mean "homosexuality." Given that its inclusion in policies is the singular work of the homosexual pressure groups, that is a reasonable

deduction. However, the two words constitute an umbrella term for numerous sexual behaviors, including paraphilias, which are sexual disorders. According to the therapeutic manual of the American Psychiatric Association, there are at least 20 distinctive sexual variations of "sexual orientation," and perhaps many more.

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]eterosexist 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

ATTACKING THE BOY SCOUTS

Even though they won a U.S. Supreme Court case in June 2000 that affirmed that the Boy Scouts of America have a right to set their own membership standards, the Scouts have been under attack in many places for resisting homosexuals' demands for inclusion. In virtually all cases, critics of the Scouts point to laws or policies containing the term "sexual orientation."

- In June, 2001, the District of Columbia's Commission on Human Rights fined the Scouts \$100,000 and ordered them to reinstate two openly homosexual leaders.³⁰
- In Broward County, Florida, in March 2001, the Scouts were forced to sue after county commissioners barred their access to public schools in the fall of 2000.³¹
- The Ann Arbor, Michigan, City Council cut ties in August 2001 to the local United Way for its refusal to eject the Scouts from the United Way program.³²
- More than two dozen chapters of United Way have cut off the Scouts, and at least 359 school districts with a total of 4,418 schools in 10 states have taken action against the Scouts, according to the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network.³³
- Former Vice President Al Gore pledged someday to use the proposed Employment Non-Discrimination Act, a bill to empower the federal government to ban discrimination based on "sexual orientation" in all workplaces with 15 or more employees, to force the Scouts to admit homosexuals.³⁴
- During the week of June 17-23, 2001, PBS aired "Scout's Honor," a one-sided documentary making the Scouts out to be bigots.³⁵
- On June 19, 2001, the American Medical Association's policy-making arm, the House of Delegates, voted to urge the Scouts to admit homosexuals on the grounds that exclusion is a medical risk. Ignoring the voluminous data regarding the health risks of homosexual behavior, delegates aired comments like this one: "Homophobia is a health hazard," said Dr. Thomas Hicks, a supporter of the resolution, according to *American Medical News*.³⁶

Despite all the media-driven attacks, most Americans support the Scouts' right to set their own moral standards. In an October 2000 *Chicago Tribune* poll of Chicago-area residents, "82 percent said the Scouts should be allowed to meet in schools and other public buildings. Only 10 percent disagreed, and 7 percent had no opinion."³⁷

GOING AFTER THE SALVATION ARMY

Another organization that has run afoul of laws containing "sexual orientation" is the Salvation Army, perhaps America's most respected charity. In 1997, the Salvation Army gave up \$3.5 million in San Francisco city funding rather than submit to an order³⁸ for them to offer "domestic partner" benefits to homosexual employees.

In Washington, D.C., homosexual D.C. City Councilman David Catania boasted in crude terms in July 2001 about how he threatened Salvation Army officials over their policy on "sexual orientation."³⁹

Recalling a conversation with a national Salvation Army official, Catania related: "I said this faggot [referring to himself] controls federal grants in the District as well as local and you'll never see another cent as long as you live. I'll subpoena every one of you mother [expletive]s and I'll bring you down and I'll turn my chamber into a national circus. Do we understand each other?"⁴⁰

Catania had made news on July 11, 2001 when he threatened the Salvation Army and the Boy Scouts with cutting off city grants in the wake of a *Washington Post* report that Salvation Army officials had tried to reach an agreement with the Bush White House on the faith-based charity initiative. The *Post* had reported that Army officials wanted assurances that they would be exempt from local or state policies mandating special rights for "sexual orientation."⁴¹

CRACKING DOWN IN CANADA

We need look no farther than our neighbor to the north to see what America's future may hold as "sexual orientation" policies and laws proliferate. Unlike the United States, Canada does not have a First Amendment to protect the freedoms of speech, press, religion and free assembly. But Canadians share many cultural similarities with Americans, so their experience with "sexual orientation" contains clues about where the concept eventually leads.

- Section 319 of Canada's Criminal Code banning "public incitement of hatred and promoting hatred" has been used against people who are critical of homosexuality.⁴²
- Dianne Haskett, the mayor of London, Ontario, was brought before the Ontario Human Rights Commission for declining to declare "Gay Pride Weekend." The city was fined a total of \$10,000, of which the mayor helped pay half by stepping down and forfeiting salary for three weeks.⁴³ (Later, in an election in which her opponent backed "gay" rights, Mayor Haskett prevailed in a landslide.)⁴⁴
- A Saskatchewan newspaper publisher and a man who bought an ad featuring a list of five Biblical verses about homosexuality were fined \$4,500 each and warned never to run a similar ad.⁴⁵
- The Canadian Broadcast Standards Council has warned major U.S. broadcasters such as Dr. Laura Schlessinger and Dr. James Dobson's *Focus on the Family* that Canadian stations may carry their programs only after excising any segment dealing with homosexuality.⁴⁶ Following a 1997 *Focus on the Family* program in which panelists discussed scientific claims about genetic studies and homosexuality as well as the aims and activities of homosexual pressure groups, the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council issued a statement saying that *Focus on the Family* "attributed to the gay movement a false and flimsy intellectual basis and a malevolent, insidious and conspiratorial purpose, which, in the view of the Council, constitute abusively discriminatory comment on the basis of 'sexual orientation.'" ⁴⁷

HOW "SEXUAL ORIENTATION" UNDERMINES MARRIAGE AND FAMILY

Although homosexual pressure groups contend that they are only seeking tolerance, many "gay" writers (and their critics) acknowledge that their gains are already having a radical effect on society.

Writer Frank Browning describes how "gay people have pushed open a social space through which individuals are searching for new kinds of family roles and relationships, and that out of the search, some as yet unknowable traditions will emerge.... Their determination to find a new sort of family may well provide vital models for the remaking of all families, straight and gay."⁴⁸

World magazine culture critic Gene Edward Veith notes that the homosexual drive to gain marital benefits is destroying the institution of marriage itself as people abandon commitment and embrace the "gay" notion of serial monogamy with "sex partners."

"This sort of reductionism — a spouse is nothing more than a sex partner, so a sex partner is the same as a spouse — misses the point of what marriage is and what its role in society amounts to," Veith writes "... So far, governments are resisting same-sex marriages. But instead, marriage is being defined down. As marriage becomes unnecessary—not just for job benefits but for adopting children, inheriting property, and being socially acceptable—the whole nation will be 'living in sin.'"⁴⁹

Indeed, homosexual writer Michelangelo Signorile boasts, "Rather than being transformed by the institution of marriage, gay men — some of whom have raised the concept of the 'open relationship' to an art form — could simply transform the institution itself, making it more sexually open, even influencing their heterosexual counterparts."⁵⁰

Homosexual editor Chris Crain openly boasts that the drive for "gay" domestic partner benefits has fueled a dramatic erosion in respect for marriage.

"In the English-speaking world, the faux marriages have been called 'domestic partnerships.' In France, they're called Pacte civil de solidarité, or 'PACS.' ...

"The effect on 'traditional marriage' has been dramatic. In France, where PACS first became available in 1999, some 14,000 couples signed up the first year, and almost half of them heterosexual. ...

"Back in the States, many heterosexual couples are also choosing domestic partnership [DP] over marriage for many of the same reasons. In almost every jurisdiction where DP status is available, straight couples far outnumber gay couples on the sign-up sheet, even taking into account that there are more of them out there generally than there are of us. ...

"The threat to 'traditional marriage' from quick and dirty domestic partnerships comes at the same time some states are purposefully making it harder to enter and exit that venerable institution. ... These ineffectual attempts at bucking up traditional marriage are losing the battle to a popular and easier alternative [that] is increasingly available. There's your threat to traditional marriage.

"That may well be a good thing, but it is ironic that the short-term resistance from some quarters to recognition of gay marriage has contributed significantly to the very harm that our foes fear the most — the piecemeal destruction of traditional marriage."⁵¹

Homosexual writer Andrew Sullivan, in his book *Virtually Normal*, argues that homosexual relationships might even be superior to husband-wife marriage because of the homosexuals' capacity to understand the need for "outside relationships."⁵²

In 1997, the *New York Times* reported on a growing phenomenon called "polyluv," in which three or more people form sexual relationships. Because jealousy is still a problem, organizations devoted to group sex such as Loving More use exercises "in which you practice feeling glad that your mate is with another.... Some have even 'married,' with as many as six figures on the wedding cake."⁵³

As homosexuality becomes more accepted, so too is the trend toward homosexuals acquiring children through adoption. Although many experts quoted in the media continue to repeat the idea that: "Children with two parents of the same gender are as well adjusted as children with one of each kind,"⁵⁴ there is no solid science to back this view. In a look at 49 studies about children in homosexual households, Robert Lerner, Ph.D. and Althea Nagai, Ph.D. found that all had fatal flaws, such as tiny sample size, skewed selection of subjects, and

built-in biases of the researchers.⁵⁵ A study in the April 2000 edition of *American Sociological Review* by pro-homosexual researchers also refutes the idea that research proves that children are unaffected by living in "gay" households.⁵⁶

Culture critic Michael Bronski summarizes:

"Whereas the original studies found that lesbian parents do not produce a higher percentage of gay or lesbian children than heterosexual parents, the reality, as Stacey and Biblarz point out, is a little more complicated. In one of the original studies, 25 percent of adults raised by lesbians (six of 25) reported having a homoerotic relationship, as compared to none of those (out of 20 surveyed) with heterosexual parents. In another study, 64 percent of the adults with lesbian parents (14 of 22) reported that they would consider having a same-sex relationship, as opposed to just 17 percent of those with heterosexual parents (three of 18).

"It's true that the people raised by lesbian parents were not more likely to be gay in the sense of identifying themselves as homosexuals in adulthood. That was the question the original studies asked. But their sexual identities do seem more open-ended. And the new study does seem to show that, as Barnard women's-studies professor Ann Pelligrini says, "queer families are going to produce queer kids. By 'queer,' I mean kids who can resist thinking in cultural norms. Kids with a sense of difference who have the capacity to be critical of 'common-sense notions' of what families should be...."⁵⁷

Cultural analyst Patrick Fagan notes that the homosexual push for acceptance became possible only because marriage itself had already fallen into a sorry state: "Most of heterosexual America is now very close in its attitudes about sexuality to the heart of the homosexual affective disorder: the inversion into the self. These attitudes have created for children a culture of rejection that is incapable of providing the antidote to the demands of the homosexual movement."⁵⁸

In summary, the growing acceptance of homosexuality cannot help but to undermine societal support for marriage and family. Christopher Wolfe, professor of political science at Marquette University, puts it this way:

"The most significant harm of legitimizing active homosexuality – the way it would harm the family most – would be the educative impact on the formation of people's ideas regarding the nature and purpose of sex, marriage and family. Most important, the legitimization of active homosexuality would be the most straightforward and comprehensive attempt to separate the essential connection between sex and children that society has ever proclaimed. In so doing, society would be undermining one of its most fundamental institutions, marriage."⁵⁹

A COSTLY SHIFT

When marriage is undermined, entire communities suffer. Fagan notes that broken households increase the risk for children of:

- health problems;
- retarded cognitive, especially verbal, development;
- low educational attainment;
- behavior problems;
- low impulse control;
- warped social development;
- physical and sexual abuse;
- crime in the local community.⁶⁰

The breakdown in marriage even leads to shorter lives. A study in the *American Journal of Sociology* found that "for both sexes, the hazard of dying falls significantly with marital duration, suggesting a cumulation of the benefits of marriage over time."⁶¹

Contrast this with studies showing that homosexual men die far younger than heterosexuals as a whole and many years younger than married men. An Oxford University study showed that homosexual men lose seven to 20 years off their lives,⁶² and an obituary study from gay newspapers in *Omega: The Journal of Death and Dying*, revealed that homosexual men's average age of death, at least for the group represented in urban gay publications, is 42 for all causes, and 39 for AIDS.⁶³

Corporations that accord nonmarital relationships the same status and benefits of marriage are helping to undermine society's ability to produce productive, honest, hard-working employees. What might appear to be a concession to a relatively few employees actually constitutes a frontal attack on the institutions of marriage and family. Not only is the incentive to marry reduced, but the temptation to attain marital benefits outside of wedlock reinforces extramarital sex, with all its consequent problems of out-of-wedlock pregnancies, sexually transmitted diseases, and risk of domestic abuse. Domestic partner policies also send an indelible, socially dangerous message to young people: Marriage is no longer important.

As social analyst Robert Rector has long contended, the surest road out of poverty is threefold: get a high school diploma, get married and find a job.⁶⁴ Very few people who do this fall into poverty and become problems for others. While people in the upper income brackets can temporarily weather the abandonment of marriage, people on the poverty line cannot afford to do so. Eventually, the loss of marital energy saps entire communities when the unmarried household rate reaches 30 percent.⁶⁵ Crime increases, along with taxes, making such communities unattractive for business.

Marriage-based family life is the organizing principle behind all civilized cultures. Marriage brings the sexes together in a unique legal, social, economic and spiritual union. Because it is indispensable, societies have accorded it various protections and privileges not granted to other types of relationships. No other relationship transforms young men and women into more productive, less selfish and more mature husbands and wives, and fathers and mothers. No other relationship affords children the best economic, emotional and psychological environment.

"Marriage-based kinship is essential to stability and continuity. A man is far more apt to sacrifice himself to help a bona fide son-in-law than some unrelated man (or woman) who lives with his daughter. Kinship imparts family names, heritage and property, secures the identity and commitment of fathers for the sake of the children, and entails mutual obligations to the community. Same-sex relations are a negation of the ties that bind, which are the continuation of kinship through the procreation of children."⁶⁶ But even without children, marriage is a societal good, as the two sexes complement each other and provide stability to communities.

CONCLUSION

The acceptance of "sexual orientation" as a civil right is having profound effects on businesses and on American society as a whole. As the drive for acceptance of homosexuality increases, societal support for marriage and family decreases, with predictable negative consequences. One of them is a loss of freedom for people who believe in traditional morality. Another is a loss of stability in communities, with a rise in crime, sexually transmitted diseases and other social pathologies. Still another is a shortage of employable, stable people.

The stakes are very high: Absent a marriage-based culture, can America continue to function as a self-governing republic? History indicates that the chances are slim.

America's best hope is to reverse the trend away from traditional morality and to bolster the institutions of marriage and family, the surest producer of stable, productive citizens.

Robert H. Knight, a former editor and writer for the Los Angeles Times and former Hoover Institution Media Fellow, is Director of the Culture and Family Institute, an affiliate of Concerned Women for America. He is the author of *The Age of Consent: The Rise of Relativism and the Corruption of Popular Culture* (Spence Publishing, 1998, 2000).

END NOTES

1. Warren J. Blumenfeld, *From Homophobia - How We All Pay the Price* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992), p. 38, as quoted in the Lotus Diversity At Work Awareness Program.
2. Joseph Daniel Unwin, Ph.D., *Sexual Regulations and Cultural Behaviour*, an address given March 27, 1935 to the Medical Section of the British Psychological Society, Oxford University Press, reprinted in 1969 by Frank M. Darrow. Also, Pitirim A. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age: The Social and Cultural Outlook* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1941), and Pitirim A. Sorokin, *The American Sex Revolution*, (Boston: Porter Sargent Publisher, 1956).
3. Charles Murray, *Losing Ground: American Social Policy 1950-1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).
4. *Murphy v. Ramsey*, 114 U.S. 15, 45 (1885).
5. Murray, *supra*.
6. *The Concord Desk Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3, (New York: Time, Inc.), p. 1297.
7. Clarence J. Karier, *Scientists of the Mind* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), p. 28, quoted in Bruce Wiseman, *Psychiatry: The Ultimate Betrayal* (Los Angeles: Freedom Publishing), 1995, p. 10, 11.
8. Judith A. Reisman, *Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences* (Arlington, Va.: The Institute for Media Education, Inc., 1998, 2000), p 21.
9. Paul Johnson, *Modern Times: The World from the Twenties to the Eighties* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers), 1983, pp 114-115.
10. *Ibid*, p. 115.
11. William Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), p. 38.
12. Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes and Consequences*, p. 22.
13. Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Co., 1948).
14. E.O. Laumann, J.H.Gagnon, R.T.Michal, & S. Michaels, *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); D. Forman & C. Chilvers, "Sexual Behavior of Young and Middle-Aged Men in England and Wales," *British Medical Journal*, 298, 1989: 1137-1142; G. Remafedi, et al., "Demography of Sexual Orientation in Adolescents," *Pediatrics*, 89, 1992: 714-21.
15. Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell H. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders and Company, 1953).
16. Judith A. Reisman, Edward W. Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People*, John H. Court and J. Gordon Muir, editors (Lafayette, La.: Huntington House/Lochinvar, 1990); and Judith A. Reisman, *Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences*.
17. James H. Jones, *Alfred C. Kinsey: A Public/Private Life* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997).
18. Robert Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), p. 102, cited in Jeffrey Satinover, *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Bookhouse, 1996), pp. 31-35.
19. Dr. Charles Socarides, *Homosexuality: A Freedom Too Far: A Psychoanalyst Answers 1000 Questions About Causes and Cure and the Impact of the Gay Rights Movement on American Society* (Phoenix: Adam Margrave Books, 1995), pp. 73-74.
20. Randy Shilts, *And the Band Played On: Politics, People and the AIDS Epidemic* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987).
21. A recent example involved a male employee who allegedly perceived himself as a female. When the Minnesota employer instructed him not to use the women's restroom, he sued-and won-under the "sexual orientation" provision of the Minnesota Human Rights law. *Goins v. West Group*, 619 N.W.2d 424 (Minn. App. 2001).
22. "Paraphilias," *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition, Text Revision* (Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 2000), pp. 566-582.
23. *Ibid*, p.566. "The essential features of a Paraphilia are recurrent, intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors generally involving 1) nonhuman objects, 2) the suffering or humiliation of oneself or one's partner, 3) children or other nonconsenting persons that occur over a period of at least 6 months.... The diagnosis is made if the behavior, sexual urges, or fantasies cause clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning."
24. Brian McNaught, *Gay Issues in the Workplace* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 10.
25. *Ibid*, p.50. Italics in original.
26. *Ibid*, pp. 100-101.
27. Robert H. Knight and Kenneth L. Ervin II, "Can I question homosexuality? Don't bank on it," in *The Other Side of Tolerance: Victims of Homosexual Activism*, Family Research Council, 1997, p. 8.
28. Based on confidential interviews with the author on Feb. 18, 1997. The incident was related in "Computer Soft-Wear," in *The Other Side of Tolerance*, p. 12.
29. "Privacy as a One-Way Street," in *The Other Side of Tolerance*, p. 9.
30. Matthew Cella, "Panel orders gay Scout leaders reinstated," *The Washington Times*, June 22, 2001.
31. Author's interview with national Scout spokesman Phil Bevins, March 15, 2001.
32. Associated Press, "Ann Arbor City Council Votes to Withdraw from United Way Campaign," August 20, 2001.
33. As cited in George Archibald, "Senate approves president's blueprint for education: Helms amendment on Boy Scouts sparks debate," *The Washington Times*, June 15, 2001, p. A-1 at A-22.

34. Interview with Charles Gibson on ABC's *Good Morning America*, Oct. 26, 2000.
35. Peter J. LaBarbera, "PBS' 'Scout's Honor' Dishonors Scouts and Journalistic Integrity," *Culture and Family Report*, Culture and Family Institute, June 22, 2001.
36. Victoria Stagg Elliott, "AMA Recognizes Bullying as Public Health Problem," *American Medical News*, online edition (amednews.com), June 9-16, 2001.
37. Lisa Black, "Voters Back Scouts' Ban on Gay Leaders," *Chicago Tribune*, Oct. 18, 2000, reporting on a Chicago Tribune/WGN-TV poll taken Oct. 6-9, 2000, of 900 registered voters.
38. Based on San Francisco city ordinance #461-96, pp. 3-4, 10-11. See also "City demands benefits for 'partners,' unwed couples, mostly same-sex," *The Washington Times*, Dec. 30, 1996, p. A-3.
39. The statement was in a posting on the pro-homosexual Liberty Education Forum Web site. David Catania is quoted during a "Redefining the Gay Agenda" panel at the Liberty for All National Leadership Conference, held July 21, 2001, in Chicago. Log Cabin President Rich Tafel moderated the panel, which included reporter Bo Roehr, and "gay youth" advocate Verna Eggleston. United Airlines was featured prominently as corporate sponsor and "the official and exclusive airline of the Liberty Education Forum."
40. Ibid.
41. *The Washington Post*, July 11.
42. See Peter LaBarbera, "Focus Bristles at Canadian 'Censorship,'" *CultureFacts*, Family Research Council, Sept. 9, 1998, Vol. 1, No. 32, and Charles W. Moore, "Free Speech challenge based on biblical passages," *Calgary (Alberta) Herald*, August 1998, p. A-11.
43. John Miner, "Haskett shocker: The mayor steps down for three weeks until election day," *The London (Ontario) Free Press*, Oct. 22, 1997, p. A-1.
44. Deborah Van Brenk, "Haskett landslide," *The London Free Press*, Nov. 11, 1997. The mayor received 61,908 votes to her opponent's 30,207.
45. Joanne Laucius, "Bible had role in exposing gays to hatred," *The Ottawa Citizen Online*, June 20, 2001.
46. Author's interviews with producers from *The Dr. Laura Show* during 1999 and 2000 and a conversation with Dr. James Dobson during a taping of *Focus on the Family* on August 31, 2001.
47. Canadian Broadcast Standards Council, Prairie Regional Council, CKRD re: Focus on the Family, CBSC Decision 96/97-0155, decided Dec. 16, 1997.
48. Frank Browning, *The Culture of Desire: Paradox and Perversity in Gay Lives Today* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1993), pp. 155, 157.
49. Gene Edward Veith, "Wages for sin: Marriage benefits are starting to go to those who are shacking up," *World* magazine, Aug. 18, 2001, Vol. 16, No. 31.
50. Michelangelo Signorile, "Bridal Wave," *OUT* magazine, December/January 1994, p. 32.
51. *New York Blade* Executive Editor Chris Crain in his August 3, 2001 editorial, "Gays May Ruin 'Traditional Marriage.'"
52. Andrew Sullivan, *Virtually Normal: An Argument About Homosexuality* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995, 1996).
53. "They Call it Polyluv," *The New York Times Magazine*, Feb. 16, 1997, Section 6, p. 15.
54. J.R. Harris, *The nurture assumption: why children turn out the way they do* (New York: Free Press, 1998), p. 51, quoted in Robert Lerner, Ph.D. and Althea K. Nagai, Ph.D., *No Basis: What the Studies Don't Tell Us About Same-Sex Parenting* (Washington: Marriage Law Project, 2001).
55. *No Basis*, op. cit.
56. Judith Stacey and Timothy J. Biblarz, "Does the 'Sexual Orientation' of Parents Matter?" *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 66, April, pp. 159-183.
57. Michael Bronski, "Queer as Your Folks," *Boston Phoenix*, August 8, 2001, concerning the article "Does the 'Sexual Orientation' of Parents Matter?" in *American Sociological Review*. University of Southern California professors Judith Stacey and Timothy J. Biblarz found that, contrary to claims that "gay parenting" studies show that children are no different in "gay" households, the same studies actually indicate that children of lesbian parents are more likely to experiment with and identify with homosexuality than children raised in normal households.
58. Patrick Fagan, "The Inversion of Heterosexual Sex," in *Same-Sex Matters: The Challenge of Homosexuality*, edited by Christopher Wolfe (Dallas: Spence Publishing Company, 2000), p. 45.
59. Christopher Wolfe, quoted in Lawrence Burtoft, "A Rhetoric of Hope," in *Same-Sex Matters*, p. 53.
60. Fagan, *op. cit.*, p. 34. Also, see the compendium of more than 100 family studies in Digital Archive, March 1987 to July 1996 from New Research, *The Family in America* (Rockford, Illinois: The Rockford Institute, 1996).
61. Lee A. Lillard and Linda J. Waite, "'Til Death Do Us Part': Marital Disruption and Mortality," *American Journal of Sociology* 100, 1995, pp. 1131-1156, cited in "Living Longer, New Research," *The Family in America*, July 1995.
62. R.S. Hogg, S.A. Strathdee, K.J. Craib, M.V. O'Shaughnessy, J.S. Montaner and M.T. Schechter, "Modeling the impact of HIV disease on mortality in gay and bisexual men," *International Journal of Epidemiology*, Vol. 26, 1997, pp. 657-661.
63. P. Cameron, W. Playfair, & S. Wellum, "The longevity of homosexuals: Before and after the AIDS epidemic," *Omega: The Journal of Death and Dying*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1994, pp. 249-272.
64. Author's conversations with Robert Rector at the Heritage Foundation, 1990-1991. Author served as Heritage's Senior Fellow for Cultural Policy Studies in 1990-1991.
65. Charles Murray, as cited in Fagan, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
66. Robert H. Knight, "The Importance of Families and Marriage," Testimony before the Senate Health, Education and Social Services Committee, State of Alaska, regarding SB 308, which would amend the state's marriage statute, March 18, 1996.

APPENDIX OF SEXUAL BEHAVIORS

WARNING: some of the descriptions may be offensive to readers' sensibilities.

[Page numbers are from " Paraphilias," *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition, Text Revision* (Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 2000), pp. 566-582.]

1. **Heterosexuality:** the universal norm: sexual interaction with the opposite sex.
2. **Homosexuality or "Gay":** sexual interaction with persons of the same sex.
3. **Bisexuality:** sexual interaction with both males and females.
4. **Transgenderism:** an umbrella term referring to and/or covering transvestitism, drag queen/kings, and transsexualism.
5. **Pedophilia:** "sexual activity with a prepubescent child (generally age 13 years or younger). The individual with Pedophilia must be age 16 years or older and at least 5 years older than the child. For individuals in late adolescence with Pedophilia, no precise age difference is specified, and clinical judgment must be used; both the sexual maturity of the child and the age difference must be taken into account." (p.571)
6. **Transsexuality:** the condition in which a person's "gender" identity is different from his or her anatomical sex.
7. **Transvestitism:** the condition in which a person is sexually stimulated or gratified by wearing the clothes of the other sex.
8. **Transvestic fetishism:** for males, "intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors involving cross-dressing." (p. 575)
9. **Autogynephilia:** the sexual arousal of a man by his own perception of himself as a woman or dressed as a woman. (p. 574)
10. **Voyeurism:** "obtaining sexual arousal through the act of observing unsuspecting individuals, usually strangers, who are naked, in the process of disrobing, or engaging in sexual activity." (p. 575)
11. **Exhibitionism:** "recurrent, intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors involving the exposure of one's genitals to an unsuspecting stranger." (p. 569)
12. **Fetishism or Sexual Fetishism:** "intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors involving the use of nonliving objects (e.g. female undergarments)." (p. 570)
13. **Zoophilia:** becoming excited by and/or engaging in sexual activity with animals. (p. 576)
14. **Sexual Sadism:** "recurrent, intense, sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors involving acts (real, not simulated) in which the psychological or physical suffering (including humiliation) of the victim is sexually exciting to the person." (p. 574)
15. **Sexual Masochism:** "recurrent, intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors involving the act (real, not simulated) of being humiliated, beaten, bound, or otherwise made to suffer." (p. 573)
16. **Necrophilia:** sexual arousal and/or activity with a corpse. (p. 576)
17. **Klismaphilia:** erotic pleasure derived from enemas. (p. 576)
18. **Telephone Scatalogia:** the compulsion to utter obscene topics over the phone. (p. 576)
19. **Urophilia:** sexual arousal associated with urine. (p. 576)
20. **Coprophilia:** sexual arousal associated with feces. (p. 576)
21. **Partialism:** "sexual arousal obtained through exclusive focus on part of the body."(p. 576)
22. **Gender Identity Disorder:** "a strong and persistent cross-gender identification, which is the desire to be, or the insistence that one is, of the other sex," along with "persistent discomfort about one's assigned sex or a sense of the inappropriateness in the gender role of that sex." (p. 576)
23. **Frotteurism:** "touching and rubbing against a nonconsenting person." (p. 570)