

# Traditional Values

SPECIAL REPORT

## Homosexual Activists Attack Traditional Marriage, Abstinence, And Bush's Faith-Based Initiative

*With welfare reform up for debate in Congress, homosexuals are lobbying for inclusion as "families" under any new legislation to be passed.*

In 1996, President Clinton signed into law The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-193). This replaced the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program with the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program.

According to Heritage Foundation authors Robert Rector and Pat Fagan, in "The Good News About Welfare Reform," this new program has cut welfare caseloads in half, reduced hunger and out-of-wedlock births to single moms.

This anti-poverty legislation has been successful, but more needs to be done. Debate on the reauthorization of this law begins this year—but homosexuals are planning on using welfare reform as a tool for social change.

The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) for example, is on a campaign to undermine traditional marriage, abstinence education, and faith-based initiatives as part of an overall strategy to normalize "homosexual families" in America.

In late December, 2001, the NGLTF issued "Leaving Our Children Behind," an analysis of the upcoming



**Homosexuals are using welfare reform to push for the normalization of same-sex relationships as "families" under federal law. While 34 states have passed laws protecting marriage as a union between a man and woman, homosexuals are going around these laws to promote "civil unions" and "domestic partnerships" as the legal equivalent to marriage.**

debate in Congress over welfare reform. This report, paid for by the Ford Foundation, claims that pro-marriage efforts, fatherhood initiatives, abstinence-only campaigns, and faith-based welfare reform efforts all threaten the safety and well-being of homosexual "families" and members of transgender (cross-dressers, transvestites, and transsexual) communities.

The report's authors, Sean Cahill, and Kenneth T. Jones, make the following claim: "Welfare reform is not only, or even primarily, about poverty policy. Welfare reform is also fundamentally about family policy—about promoting and privileging particular kinds of families, and about penalizing and stigmatizing others. It is also fundamentally about the promotion of heterosexuality, but only for heterosexuality practiced within the context of marriage. Most alarmingly, welfare reform is about the discouragement and stigmatization of homosexuality and lesbian and gay families."

Beginning from this flawed premise, authors Cahill and Jones go on to construct a series of elaborate and inaccurate descriptions of pro-marriage efforts, abstinence-only education, fatherhood campaigns, and

more. In the view of Cahill and Jones, fathers are irrelevant to the emotional development of children; abstinence doesn't work; and children who grow up in homosexual homes are just as healthy as those who are brought up in heterosexual families. In addition, they apparently believe that homosexual behavior has few, if any negative consequences. According to Cahill and Jones, any discussions of AIDS are considered a "blame-the-victim" argument that unfairly "scapegoats" homosexuals.

### **ATTACKING TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE**

Cahill and Jones claim that the effort to save and strengthen traditional marriage is a "highly reactionary agenda" that "privileges" heterosexual married couples, discourages divorce, second marriages and stigmatizes homosexual relationships. The authors also make the unfounded claim that marriage-saver reforms involving children who are raised in homo-

---

***Fatherlessness—the absence of paternal transmission—contributes to a decline in character and competence in children. . .***  
— David Blankenhorn

---

sexual households may force homosexual parents to marry heterosexuals in order to enjoy any federal welfare benefits. The authors observe: "Promarriage counseling which promotes heterosexual marriage as the preferred norm also implicitly denigrates same-sex unions and promote heterosexism, if not homophobia."

In short, in their view, any attempt to create public policies to strengthen the two-parent, male-female household is viewed as an attack against homosexuality and the creation of homophobia.

In attacking traditional marriage and attempts to create strong heterosexual families, the authors are conveniently ignoring thousands of years of human history and decades of social research that demonstrates the superiority and stability of a family consisting of a father, mother, and children.

As social scientist Amitai Etzioni has written: "There never was a society throughout all of history . . . without a family as the central unit for launching the education of children, for character formation, and as the moral agent of society." Etzioni, of course, is

referring to the traditional family.

David Blankenhorn, founder of the Institute for American Values notes in *Fatherless America*, that, "Fatherlessness—the absence of paternal transmission—contributes to a decline of character and competence in children. . . . For boys, the most socially acute manifestation of paternal disinvestment is juvenile violence. For girls, it is juvenile and out-of-wedlock childbearing." The father, notes Blankenhorn, "plays a distinctive role in shaping a daughter's sexual style and her understanding of the male-female bond."

Mothers are essential in the moral and social development of both boys and girls. As psychologist Dr. Brenda Hunter has written in *The Power of Mother Love*, "Without our [a mother's] presence, our love, our empathy, many of our children will grow up emotionally handicapped, unable to say a timely word to a hurting friend or to reach out to the less fortunate. Others—and their number is increasing—may even become brutal, remorseless killers."

Dr. William Bennett, writing in *The Broken Hearth: Reversing the Moral Collapse of the American Family* details the importance of the traditional family and observes that "The timeless function of marriage is childbearing and child-rearing, and the best arrangement ever developed to that end is the marital union between one man and one woman, channeling reproductive activities in a way that is orderly, responsible, humane, and civilizing. The fact that homosexual marriages would be intrinsically nonprocreative ought to tell us something significant all by itself."

Yet homosexual writers Cahill and Jones argue unpersuasively that the family structure doesn't matter. All that matters is that same-sex parents "love" their children. They also argue that single parent families are just as viable for children as two-parent families. In fact, they argue that singles should be free to adopt children if they wish.

Single parent families, of course, are not equal to or superior to traditional family structures.

As Heritage Foundation expert Patrick Fagan has written in "How Broken Families Rob Children Of Their Chances For Future Prosperity":

- Children living with a single mother are six times more likely to live in poverty than are children

whose parents are married.

- Children in stepfamilies and single-parent families are almost three times more likely to drop out of school than are children intact families.”

Writing on welfare reform, Heritage Foundation researcher Robert Rector observed: “Girls raised in single-parent homes on welfare are five times more likely to give birth out of wedlock when compared to girls from intact non-welfare families. And a boy from a single-parent home in the inner city is twice as likely to engage in crime when compared to a similar boy who is poor, but living with a father and a mother.”

Contrary to what Cahill and Jones would have us believe, single parent homes are not equal to the two-parent (mother and father) home.

### **ATTACKING FATHERHOOD INITIATIVES**

The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force authors also criticize the growing fatherhood movement. This, say the authors, “threatens an increased stigmatization of lesbian and gay families, and especially lesbian families” and it may make “lesbian and gay families hard to form in the first place.”

The Fatherhood Movement is also criticized for its “Christian exceptionalism” that encourages men to restrict their sexual activities to within marriage. This view is condemned by Cahill and Jones.

They criticize the Fatherhood Movement because it is based on the premise that fathers are necessary for the successful raising of a child. They are conveniently ignoring the work done by Robert Rector, Patrick Fagan, David Blankenhorn, Maggie Gallagher, and many other reputable researchers who prove beyond doubt that children brought up in single parent homes are at risk for emotional problems, behavioral problems, promiscuity, lowered grades, and economic failure.

### **CHILDREN IN HOMOSEXUAL HOUSEHOLDS**

Cahill and Jones quote statistics from several pro-homosexual studies that seem to indicate that children brought up in same-sex households experience no discernible emotional or psychological differences as compared to children in heterosexual

homes. Yet this is inaccurate. One of the pro-homosexual researchers quoted is University of Southern California professor of gender studies, Judith Stacey.

Stacey and a fellow researcher recently reexamined data from 21 studies on homosexual parenting dating back to the 1980s. They discovered that:

***The Fatherhood Movement is also criticized for its “Christian exceptionalism” that encourages men to restrict their sexual activities to within marriage. This view is condemned by Cahill and Jones.***

- Daughters raised in lesbian homes more frequently dress, play and behave in ways that do not conform to cultural norms.
- Children raised in a homosexual home are more likely to consider a homosex-

ual relationship.

- Sons raised in lesbian homes are more feminized than their heterosexual counterparts. (“Gay Parenting Does Affect Children Differently, Study Finds,” Online web site: National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality, narth.com.)

To homosexuals, these outcomes are fine, but they should not be considered positive outcomes for most parents. In homosexual households, boys are feminized and girls are masculinized.

Robert Lerner and Althea K. Nagai, conducted a review of 49 studies on children raised in homosexual homes. Their findings were presented at a Brigham Young University conference in March, 2000. According to Lerner and Nagai, the quality of research done in these studies was “dismal.” They noted the following flaws in all the studies allegedly showing positive or neutral effects of children being brought in homosexual homes: small sample sizes; only small outcomes measured; samples not nationally representative; lack of controls and confounding variables (comparing lesbian PhD mothers with single moms with high school diplomas).

In short, say these researchers: “No verdict can be reached by the dispassionate analyst of these studies.”

### **ATTACKING THE ABSTINENCE MOVEMENT**

Cahill and Jones claim that emphasizing “abstinence-only” education in welfare reform discussions also stigmatizes homosexuals, bisexuals, and transgen-

dered people. "Abstinence-only-until-marriage (AOUM) approaches to sex education are counterproductive, dangerous, and even harmful to the youth who are subject to their messages," say Cahill and Jones.

Homosexuals, of course, are wildly promiscuous and should be expected to oppose any attempts by welfare reformers to promote abstinence before marriage.

Homosexual males routinely engage in sex with multiple partners and are subject to a whole range of sexually transmitted diseases, AIDS, and anal cancer as a result of engaging in rectal intercourse.

While condemning abstinence education as "harmful" to youth, these writers conveniently ignore the spread of infectious diseases in their own communities due to unrestricted and irresponsible sexual activities. The statistics are sobering:

- As of January, 2001, 60% of HIV infections were from homosexual sex. (Online *Fact Sheet*, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, 2001)
- A 1999 study found that 25% of homosexuals have rectal Gonorrhoea. ("Gonococcal infections in the adult," *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*)
- Dr. Stephen E. Goldstone, the medical director of GayHealth.com says that 68% of HIV-positive and 45% of HIV-negative homosexuals have abnormal or precancerous cells. (*Essence*, 11-01-2000)
- A study published by the CDC and University of California, San Francisco in 2001 indicated that as much as 8% of all HIV infections are from homosexuals engaging in oral sex. Homosexuals have promoted oral sex as a "safe" way to engage in sex. ("Oral Sex Causes HIV Infection in 8 Percent of Gay San Francisco Cohort," *HIV and Hepatitis.com*, 2-02-00)
- In January, 2001, San Francisco health officials reported an upsurge in HIV infections. Homosexuals are staying alive longer because of anti-viral drugs so they are infecting more individuals. ("HIV On Rise in San Francisco," CBS News, 1-24-2001)

It is dishonest to criticize abstinence-only efforts, while engaging in sexual behaviors that infect oth-

ers and can lead to death.

### **ATTACKING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM**

The NGLTF also criticizes President Bush's *faith-based initiative*—specifically attacking H.R. 7, the Community Solutions Act. The authors claim that efforts to expand charitable choice to enable religious groups to receive federal funds is "taxpayer-funded discrimination" that actually threatens the religious freedom of those in need. The authors criticize the *faith-based initiative* because it will protect religious organizations from having to abide by local or state laws that provide special rights for homosexuals.

Liberals in the U.S. House tried to strip religious freedom protections from H.R. 7 with a pro-homosexual amendment. The legislation passed the House in July, 2001, but the amendment failed. Pro-homosexual Senators are working to ensure that there is no provision in the Senate version of the legislation that protects religious organizations from state and local pro-homosexual "sexual orientation" laws. If these protections are eliminated from H.R. 7 and the Senate version, it will have the following effect: 1. If groups accept federal money, they will have their First Amendment rights of religious freedom stripped away; or 2. The lack of protective religious freedom language will force many groups to reject federal aid to avoid having to violate their religious beliefs on homosexuality.

**Homosexuals are clear that they do not believe in religious freedom if it conflicts with their desire to normalize sodomy in our culture.** Nationally syndicated columnist and homosexual activist Deb Price criticized passage of the Religious Liberty Protection Act in the House in 1999. She wrote: "We each have a right to our own private religious beliefs. However, when we enter the public sphere, we have a shared civic duty to respect one another's legal rights. Religion should not be treated as a 'Get Out of Jail Free' card that lets people pick and choose which laws to obey."

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of the constitutional right of religious or secular groups to set their own standards for membership and association in *Dale vs. Boy Scouts of America*. The Court ruled that the Boy Scouts was free to "discriminate" against homosexuals by denying them membership or leadership positions. **This is a right that must not be violated in order to favor homosexual behaviors.**