HOMOSEXUALS: JUST ANOTHER MINORITY GROUP?

Introduction

The highly organized and well funded movement in this country toward legal and institutional acceptance of homosexuality has had an impact too great and far reaching for Americans to ignore. Members of this movement, whether they be homosexuals themselves or sympathizers, are actively working to achieve their agenda in our courts, our state legislatures, in Congress, in the military, the private sector, churches, schools and in nearly every aspect of American life. What do they want? The nearly two million homosexuals in this country, (numbers estimated by the Gay Activist Alliance), demand that our laws be changed to permit homosexuality, lesbianism, sodomy, and a myriad of other practices into the mainstream of American culture, in the same way that we have always accepted heterosexual relationships, marriage and family.

This State Factor takes a closer look at today's homosexual movement, its goals, its political impact, its lifestyle and also reports the progress of so called "gay rights" legislation at the state, federal and local level.

The Ultimate Goal: Acceptance

The homosexual community has become militant in its quest for "the ultimate goal," i.e. "acceptance of homosexual acts as a normal variant of human behavior and of homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle." This goal provides the impetus for all the activities undertaken by the homosexual movement through its network.

The "1972 Gay Rights Platform" adopted by the National Coalition of Gay Organizations in February of that year constitutes one of the most detailed outlines of the homosexualized society produced thus far by the movement. The following demands are part of their overall agenda:

Federal

1. Amend all Federal Civil Rights Acts, other legislation and government controls to prohibit discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations and public services.

2. Issuance by the President of an executive order prohibiting the military from excluding for reasons of sexual orientation, persons who of their own volition desire entrance into the Armed Services; and from issuing less-than-fully-honorable discharges for homosexuality; and the upgrading to fully honorable all such discharges previously issued, with retroactive benefits.
3. Issuance by the President of an executive order prohibiting discrimination in the federal civil service because of sexual orientation, in hiring and promoting; and prohibiting discrimination against homosexuals in security clearances.

4. Elimination of tax inequities victimizing single persons and same-sex couples.

5. Elimination of bars to the entry, immigration and naturalization of homosexual aliens.

6. Federal encouragement and support for sex education courses, prepared and taught by gay women and men, presenting homosexuality as a valid, healthy preference and lifestyle as a viable alternative to heterosexuality.

7. Appropriate executive orders, regulations and legislation banning the compiling, maintenance and dissemination of information on an individual's sexual preferences, behavior, and social and political activities for dossiers and data banks.

8. Federal funding of aid programs of gay men's and women's organizations designed to alleviate the problems encountered by gay women and men which are engendered by an oppressive sexist society.

9. Immediate release of all gay women and men now incarcerated in detention centers, prisons and mental institutions because of sexual offense charges relating to victimless crimes or sexual orientation; and that adequate compensation be made for the physical and mental duress encountered; and that all existing records relating to the incarceration be immediately expunged.

State

1. All federal legislation and programs enumerated in Demands 1, 6, 7, 8, and 9 above should be implemented at the State level where applicable.

2. Repeal of all state laws prohibiting private sexual acts involving consenting persons; equalization for homosexuals and heterosexuals for the enforcement of all laws.

3. Repeal all state laws prohibiting solicitation for private voluntary sexual liaisons; and laws prohibiting prostitution, both male and female.

4. Enactment of legislation prohibiting insurance companies and any other state-regulated enterprises from discriminating because of sexual orientation, in insurance and in bonding or any other prerequisite to employment or control of one's personal demesne.

5. Enactment of legislation so that child custody, adoption, visitation rights, foster parenting, and the like shall not be denied because of sexual orientation or marital status.

6. Repeal of all laws prohibiting transvestism and cross dressing.

7. Repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent.

8. Repeal of all legislative provisions that restrict the sex or number of persons entering into a marriage unit; and the extension of legal benefits to all persons who cohabit regardless of sex or numbers.²
Many groups not organized specifically for the propagation of the homosexual agenda are strong supporters of the cause. The National Education Association's handbook states in Resolution #H-11, "The NEA is committed to the achievement of a totally integrated society and calls upon Americans to eliminate by statute and practice barriers of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age, handicap, marital status and economic status." (emphasis added).

The 1984 Democratic Party Platform also commits its support to the homosexual revolution as shown in Chapter 11, "Justice, Dignity and Opportunity". The text includes the term "sexual orientation" to signify one of the groups to whom the government has a special responsibility because society has historically prevented them from enjoying the benefits of full citizenship; and so that homosexuals will be "protected from discrimination", they will support legislation.

It further states that sexual orientation should not be a barrier to participate in the military or gain entrance into the country, and that they will support legislation to prohibit discrimination in the workplace on this basis. Lastly they "support an enhanced effort to learn the cause and cure of AIDS and to provide treatment for people with AIDS."

The National Organization for Women (NOW) has also pledged its "vigorous support of all [our] allies in the lesbian and gay community." The group has resolved to see that child custody rights are given to lesbian mothers. In fact, NOW has made the accomplishment of equal rights for lesbians their national priority. To their Task Force on Sexuality/Lesbianism alone, they have committed themselves to appropriating at least 1% of their total annual dues.

Former President Carter's public support of homosexual rights caused one commentator to dub his Presidency the "golden age" of the homosexual movement. Two months after his election in 1976, Carter followed up his campaign promises by inviting representatives of the National Gay Task Force to the White House.

A record number of other political leaders also have recently courted the homosexual vote, including former Vice President Walter Mondale (who also employed a gay liaison on his presidential election campaign staff), Sen. Gary Hart (D-CO), Sen. Alan Cranston (D-CA), former Sen. Paul Tsongas (D-MA and sponsor of homosexual rights legislation in the Senate), Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-MA) and New York Governor Mario Cuomo.

Representative Gerry Studds (D-MA) revealed his own homosexuality to the public during the last Congressional session and called it, "an affirmation of my fullness as a human being." Despite his affirmations, Studds had been censured by the House of Representatives for having had sexual relations with a 17 year-old male page and making advances to others.

Homosexuality: Just Another Minority Group?

Homosexuals are claiming to be members of a minority group and that any discrimination directed at this group is unjust. Homosexuals are striving to be equated with groups that have historically been discriminated against for reasons such as race, color, disability, etc., and thus receive the special benefits accrued by these groups. Homosexuals believe that homosexuality is not a matter of choice and that, like blacks and hispanics they are in no way responsible for being the way they are, as their homosexuality develops through self-discovery and maturation.
However, that is only partly true. Though the childhood environment has a great effect on the formation of sexual attitudes, the homosexual makes the conscious choice to pursue members of his or her own sex. In fact, it is because homosexual influence upon children alters their normal sex role development that minority status should be questioned. Furthermore, contrary to some homosexual movement propaganda, there is no evidence to support the claim that homosexuality has solely a biological basis. In fact, several studies show just the opposite. One study revealed a large number of cases where subjects had experienced homosexual relationships before they were ever aware of any homosexual desires. Forty-three percent of the subjects had their first homosexual experiences before they were twelve years of age.

An article entitled "Gays and Lesbians on Campus," in the April 5, 1982, issue of Newsweek stated, "For some women, more so than for men, homosexual relations are just an experimental phase. Some lesbians on campus were not homosexual when they came to college and may not be after they leave. Some are lesbians for political reasons."

The homosexual also believes that homosexuality is not changeable, but an integral part of his or her person. Many experts, however, including two psychotherapists, Edmund Bergler and Irving Bieber, state otherwise. According to Bieber, out of seventy-two homosexual patients, 38% had become heterosexuals or bisexuals (19% each) and 27% had shifted from homosexuality and bisexuality to exclusive heterosexuality.

Similarly, Tom Minnery, who writes for Christianity Today, has written about homosexuals forsaking their homosexuality upon becoming Christian. He says, "the fact is, many people are experiencing deliverance from homosexuality. The evidence is too great to deny it."

The Homosexual Lifestyle

Gay bars, gay bookstores, gay dances and gay bathhouses are just a few of the elements that comprise today's homosexual lifestyle. At least 168 bath houses around the country are at the disposal of homosexuals for the purpose of one-on-one or group sex. One author gave this description, "The degree of promiscuity in the baths defies the imagination of those not familiar with homosexuality. From the point of view of traditional values, they are probably some of the most destructive and degrading institutions in America today."

If a bar scene is preferred, the "Gayellow Pages" helps the homosexual find appropriate meeting places for socializing with other homosexuals.

While gay bars and gay bathhouses constitute a major medical problem, they have become so popular that owners and managers sometimes hold week-long conventions like many other businesses.

The homosexual's vocabulary is another part of their culture that separates them from the heterosexual mainstream. For example, "cruising" means to go out looking for sex, a "nellie" is an effeminate man, a "butch" is a virile one, and a "chicken hawk" is an older homosexual that lusts after young boys. S&M (sadism and masochism) and B&D (bondage and discipline) are also terms for types of deviant sexual behavior practiced by homosexuals.

In further anticipation of such activities, the city coroner of San Francisco conducts workshops for the homosexual community on S&M Safety, or "how to engage in sado-masochistic sex without permanent damage." These workshops were formed in
response to statistics that report 10% of the city's homicides are a result of S&M accidents among homosexuals.

While the types of activity vary widely among homosexuals, the community can be separated into six separate groups; the blatant, the secret lifer, the desperate, the adjusted, the bisexual and the situational.

The blatant homosexual is the obvious "limp-wristed" individual who typifies America's stereotype of the "average" homosexual. Secret lifers comprise the largest number and "lead double lives and pass as straights." 14

A desperate homosexual frequents the public restrooms, massage parlors, and bathhouses in his or her quest for immediate sex. The bisexual indulges in sexual relations with both men and women.

Adjusted homosexuals are those who attend gay bars and pool parties to pick up a lover and try to conduct a "conventional" gay marriage. However, most marriages between homosexuals are shortlived due to frequent acts of infidelity. 15

The final type of homosexual is the situational one who participates in homosexual acts more so because of his or her situation, i.e. prison, rather than for any deep homosexual conviction.

Pedophilia

Whatever the type of homosexual, one of the more dominant practices within the homosexual world is pedophilia, the fetish for young children.

The most widely known pederast (homosexual acts between a man and boy) organization is the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA). The Chicago Sun-Times reported January 18, 1983, that NAMBLA's philosophy is, "Children should be treated like full human beings, not as the private property of their parents and the state." NAMBLA ironically views itself as a civil rights organization dedicated to "broadening the freedoms of children" and sees no harm in seducing boys aged 8-15. Another group, the Rene Guyon Society, holds the motto, "Sex by eight or it's too late."

Time magazine observed that while pedophiles have learned to package their desires in currently acceptable language, "no matter how sanitized, it is still the systematic exploitation of the weak and immature by the powerful and disturbed. No society interested in its own preservation," Time concluded, "can allow such conduct." 16

What is important to remember here is the fact that homosexuals cannot reproduce themselves biologically so they must recruit the young. It has been noted by J.C. Coleman in his work, "Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life" that half of adult homosexuals today had been seduced by older homosexuals before the age of 14. 17 This fact is also further proof that homosexuality is a learned behavior.

Health Risks

The health risks involved in a homosexual lifestyle are significant and a major cause for alarm. Because of the overall promiscuity of the homosexual way of life, homosexuals have been linked to the recent catastrophic spread of venereal diseases. About 49% of all syphilis and 20% of all gonorrhea in the U.S. is carried by gays.
They have a rate of infectious hepatitis 8–25 times higher than heterosexual males and two-thirds of all gays have had at least one venereal disease.\textsuperscript{18}

A Houston doctor also reported, "In contradiction to all that is sanitary, homosexual practices involve the direct contact with and ingestion of human excrement. It is not surprising to discover that homosexuals as a group serve as a reservoir for a host of contagious diseases which inevitably affect the public health of our society at large."\textsuperscript{19}

Perhaps the most well-known consequence is the recent AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) epidemic among homosexuals, about which scientists are now warning of the inevitable threat to the general public. AIDS is a 100% fatal condition that renders impotent the body's natural immunity system. People who acquire AIDS are automatically susceptible to a variety of rare illnesses, as well as common germs to which their immunity system has no defense. The result is imminent death.

Seventy percent of all AIDS cases are found in sexually active homosexual and bisexual men with multiple sex partners. Seventeen percent involve present or past abusers of intravenous drugs. Haitian entrants into the country comprise 4%; while patients who have been transfused with blood or blood products are 1%. Steady sexual partners of persons with AIDS or persons in groups at high risk for AIDS comprise 1%; and hemophiliacs, 0.7%.\textsuperscript{20}

The Atlanta Center for Disease Control (CDC) reported 8,314 cases of AIDS in the U.S. as of February 11, 1985, almost half of which have already resulted in death. AIDS cases are growing by geometric proportions; in another two years there will be at least 40,000 AIDS victims in the U.S., five times the number today.

The AIDS epidemic has reached such proportions that Dr. Mervyn F. Silverman has recently resigned as Director of Health in San Francisco, where there is currently a death a day due to AIDS. Two new cases are reported each day, which means that a year from now there will be two deaths a day. The number of AIDS cases has escalated to the extent that Congress appropriated $18.7 million to CDC for the research of AIDS for Fiscal Year 1985 under the Labor, Health and Human Services Act of 1985. Last year the American taxpayers funded a total of $13.75 million to the AIDS disease.

In addition to federal funding of AIDS research, the federal government had been active in directly funding the homosexual movement. During the Carter Administration, so many homosexual organizations were applying for federal grants that the United Fellowship Metropolitan Community Church in Washington (a homosexual church) listed as part of its gay constituent services, "tracking the progress of grant applications to federal agencies."\textsuperscript{21}

Outside the federal government, other sources of funding include state and local governments, individual donations, client fees, foundations and churches. Yet, it is safe to assume that the American taxpayer provides the primary source of funding.\textsuperscript{22}

Homosexual Rights: A Legislative Report

The following is an update on the progress of gay rights legislation at the state, federal, and local levels.

At the federal level, Democratic leaders in both the House and Senate are responsible for the introduction of homosexual rights legislation. In the new 99th
Congress, Congressman Ted Weiss (D-NY) and 57 co-sponsors introduced HR 230, known as the "Gay Bill of Rights." The bill would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of affectional or sexual orientation. The bill attempts to calm fears of affirmative action by including a provision that the Act shall not be construed to permit a finding of discrimination based on statistical differences or the fashioning of any remedy requiring a quota. However, its effects will still be far reaching into the lives of every American.

The bill would prohibit discrimination against homosexuals in the admittance to and service in public facilities (hotels, restaurants, theaters, etc.), access to and participation in federally assisted programs (public schools, Boy Scouts of America, grants, loans, etc.), hiring and promotion practices in the area of employment (private businesses, private professionals), and housing.

On America's 44,420,694 school students, the critical effect of such a bill will be major. Parents will no longer be able to keep their children out from under the tutelage of homosexuals regardless of the religious convictions of the parents. Private schools will also be subjected to the federal legislation due to the broad application of the equal opportunity employment required by current legislation and court interpretation.

Private employers will no longer be able to decide whom they can hire. Private professionals such as doctors and dentists cannot refuse to hire a homosexual despite possible health risks. Landlords will be forced to rent their property to a homosexual couple even if the landlord's family shares the same building.

In other related legislation, Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) has moved to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act by eliminating the "sexual deviation" exclusion provision. This bill would permit known homosexuals from other countries to become citizens of the U.S. Cranston's bill, SB 196, awaits further action in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The 50 States

Homosexuals have also targeted the state legislatures to enact pro-homosexual legislation. Wisconsin is the only state to have a law that prohibits discrimination against homosexuals in housing, public accommodations and employment. As a result, many cases have already come before Wisconsin courts in response to suits filed by homosexuals. California, Hawaii, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Illinois and New York have similar legislation pending.

In New York, Assemblyman William Passannante (D-Manhattan), immediate past President of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), was the first state lawmaker in the country in 1971 to introduce legislation on homosexual rights. Passannante's current bill, ABN 3930, would amend New York's executive law, civil rights law, and education law by prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Assemblyman Steven Sander's bill (D-Manhattan), introduced January 9, 1985, though not as far reaching as Passannante's, would accomplish the same thing.

New York State Assemblyman John Kuhl (R-Stuben and Yates Counties) has stated that if a bill of this type should pass, they could expect "local school districts having to hire homosexuals. There will also be more litigation against the private sector by homosexuals because they will then have a law upon which to base a civil rights case."
In related measures, ABN 829, sponsored by Assemblywoman Mae Newburger (D-Nassau County) and SBN 656, sponsored by Senator Eugene Levy (R-Long Island), would prohibit an employer or licensing agency from refusing to hire, employ, bar or discharge from employment an individual because of the marital relationship of such individual or the identity or situation of the individual's spouse. Originally proposed to prevent discrimination against employees who marry other employees within the same organization, the homosexual community has commandeered the legislation and adopted it for their own purposes, i.e. to require employers to accept homosexual marriage as normal and to reap the employee benefits granted to heterosexual married couples.

On the other side of the continent, two California state legislators are stepping up their efforts to try to convince Governor George Deukmejian that state legislation is needed to make it illegal for an employer to discriminate because of sexual preference in the areas of hiring, promoting and salary practices. To accomplish this, State Assemblyman Art Agnos (D-San Francisco) and State Senate President Pro Temp David Roberti (D-Los Angeles) have developed a statewide operation to obtain testimony from homosexuals who allege they have been discriminated against. Governor Deukmejian vetoed Agnos' Assembly Bill #1 last session stating "there was no compelling evidence" that homosexuals face such discrimination.

In Springfield, Illinois, lawmakers heard the presentations of HB 3&9, both co-sponsored by Rep. Woods Bowman (D-Evanston) and Rep. Ellis Levin (D-Chicago), on January 9, 1985. Both bills are presently still in committee. HBN 8 amends the Human Rights Act, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in relation to employment, real estate transactions, financial credit and public accommodations. In the area of real estate transactions, it can easily be conceived that homosexual investors can create their own homosexual community or subdivision within an area, since opponents to such an idea would not have a legal leg to stand on.

Illinois HBN 9 focuses on the Criminal Code, giving homosexuals special protection under the law by adding sexual orientation to the definitions of ethnic intimidation and institutional vandalism. Furthermore, a definite outcome of this legislation will be an increase in litigation and thus an overburdening of the courts. Every time a rock is thrown through a homosexual's window, he will be able to sue.

According to Illinois Representative Penny Pullen, "What is being sought is not a granting of basic American rights, but a granting of privilege. When privilege is extended by law to some, it requires the removal of rights from others, and sets an extremely dangerous precedent."

New Jersey ABN 1721, Massachusetts HR 937 & SB 748, and Hawaii S 292 are all bills currently being debated before their legislatures. They are all modeled after the federal bill, HR 230, i.e. they will prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual or affectional orientation.

Another type of legislative battle currently being fought in a number of states is the legality of sodomy. State Representative Bill Cervera of Texas, who introduced anti-sodomy legislation two years ago, stated that "anti-sodomy laws have been on the books of most states since their origin; that is until the Courts came along and struck out sodomy language from the state constitutions. The legislatures are basically too gutless to stop them or even come up with middle ground legislation." By middle ground, he points to establishing the illegality of homosexuals propositioning children. It is presently not against the law to do so though "the effects can be extremely traumatic on a child."
Currently 33 states have anti-sodomy statutes. Virginia just recently saved their law that prohibits non-married lovers from living together. New Orleans is also presently hosting a court suit to make sodomy legal.

America's Cities

The push for homosexual rights legislation has had its greatest effect in America's cities and neighborhoods.

Boston Mayor Raymond Flynn signed into law an ordinance passed by City Council that provided comprehensive legal protection for the city's homosexual men and women. This law gives homosexuals the right to file suit whenever they feel they have been discriminated against when denied credit, a job in the public or private sector, or use of public accommodations and services. This is a privilege heterosexuals do not have. The City Council voted 12 to 1 to give these rights to homosexuals, causing their victory to be labeled "the best news since Anita Bryant was drummed out of town in 1977."[25]

As Senator Ed Fredericks of Michigan phrased the question, "How does a person prove that he or she is entitled to these special homosexual rights? And once they have been established, how many other groups will be entitled to similar rights?"

The City Council in Laguna Beach, CA unanimously passed a gay rights ordinance giving homosexuals the right to teach in public schools and access to all public accommodations and housing. Oddly enough, this ordinance makes history as the "first of its kind" in the "staunchly conservative" Orange County.[26] More understandable is the fact that the bill was introduced by Mayor Robert Gentry, one of four openly homosexual mayors in the country.

Buffalo also succumbed to this growing movement when its City Council overrode a mayoral veto to pass an ordinance 9–2, banning homosexual discrimination by the city. The ordinance forbids any private firm that does business with the city from discriminating against homosexuals but does not extend this ban to housing, public accommodations or to areas of the public sector provided for by other legislation around the country.[27]

In another not so surprising example, the new municipality of West Hollywood, whose city council is controlled by homosexuals voted into office by a predominantly homosexual citizenry, has a new batch of rights designed expressly for homosexuals. West Hollywood's first mayor is a lesbian.[28]

An interesting result of homosexual rights legislation occurred in Philadelphia, which had given new meaning to the name "City of Brotherly Love", when it slipped a homosexualist bill through its city council with little public discussion in 1983. The Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations recently ordered Temple University to ban military recruitment from its campus on the grounds that the military violates the city's fair practices ordinance, (i.e. the military will not recruit homosexuals).[29]

Major Homosexual Defeat In Houston

One of the more widely publicized efforts of the homosexual community to achieve the privileges it thinks it deserves has been in Houston.

Homosexual residents there first rejoiced when their City Council members narrowly approved two ordinances prohibiting discrimination against homosexuals. But
the rest of Houston's residents emerged as the final victors when a quickly forced referendum was placed on the ballot January 19, 1985 which soundly defeated the two ordinances by a 82% to 18% margin. Thirty percent of the Houston electorate turned out (an unusually high percentage in comparison to past Houston special referenda) to make it a 198,563 to 44,706 defeat. The ordinances would have amended the city's affirmative action and civil service laws to add the words "sexual orientation" to the lists of groups protected against discrimination.

Part of the opposition to recognizing homosexuals as a new minority category is the group known as the Committee for Public Awareness. Founder and Houston Councilman John Goodner says he tolerates and accepts the gay community but adds, "I don't think the city should try and make one group special by recognition. To my mind, that's counterproductive." He also wrote "Do you want to see Houston turn away from the traditional family values that made a small settlement on the bayou into a world class city and instead pursue a course that leads to the erosion of the very foundations of morality and social values that made this a great city?"

The Houston Chamber of Commerce was also an opponent to the ordinance, as was former Houston Mayor, Louie Welch, now President of the Chamber of Commerce. The coalition between the business community and those spurred by religious or moral concerns was a crucial factor in the margin of popular rejection suffered by the proposition.

The strongest support for the ordinances came from the Gay Political Caucus (GPC) in Houston which was the main lobbying force behind convincing the City Council to first pass the legislation.

Court Action

The homosexual issue has now found its way into our country's judicial system. The U.S. Supreme Court, which has not ruled on a homosexual rights issue since 1967 when the justices ruled that the government could legally deport homosexual aliens, has recently failed to overturn a lower court ruling that had given homosexuals in Oklahoma the right to advocate homosexuality in the public schools. It was a 4-4 split decision which means it cannot be used as a precedent in future cases.

The suit was between the Oklahoma City Board of Education and the National Gay Task Force (NCTF). The NCTF had challenged the constitutionality of an Oklahoma statute that allowed teachers to be fired for "advocating, soliciting, imposing, encouraging, or promoting public or private homosexual activity." NCTF argued that this statute violated their freedom of speech.

The Oklahoma City Board of Education argued that teachers must not be allowed to say anything they want to their students; that although public school teachers have free speech rights, "these rights are not absolute and may be subject to certain restrictions."

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has announced a major fundraising drive to hire a lawyer to work exclusively on a new homosexual rights project, similar to those already created by the ACLU on such topics as reproductive rights and child rights. Though still awaiting approval from the ACLU's Board of Directors, this new project will go on the offensive against the remaining state laws that make homosexual activities illegal and other issues in our court affecting homosexual men and women.
The current homosexual movement will prove to have a profound effect on every aspect of American life. Lawmakers confronted with homosexual rights issues must carefully consider the ramifications of such legislative proposals--on the American family, our neighborhoods, school systems, courts, job market and business community, tax system, and a myriad of other areas. Lawmakers, judges and policymakers must attempt to answer the following questions: Does the State have the right to dictate to parents the type of educational environment their children must have? Can the State tell a private employer, especially one in the health care field, that he cannot use his own discretion in employment selection? And should tax and adoption laws be changed to give homosexual couples the same tax advantages and adoption privileges as traditionally married couples? These questions and others must be carefully considered in order to even begin to treat the issue adequately.

NOTES

3. For more information on supporters of the gay rights movement, write to the National Gay Task Force, 80 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10011, have available a booklet entitled "Who's Behind The Gay Rights Movement? A Gay Civil Rights Packet", that quotes from official letters and statements from over 200 institutions and prominent individuals.
12. Ibid., p. 33.
14. Ibid., p. 70.
15. Ibid.
17. Noebel, p. 73.
18. Ibid., p. 85.
19. Steven F. Hotze, M.D., Houston, Texas.
20. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, U.S. Department of Health, Bethesda, MD.
22. Ibid., p. 474.
23. Co-sponsors of H.R. 230:
   - Henry Wayman (D-CA)
   - Barbara Mikulski (D-MD)
   - Walter Fauntroy (D-DC)
   - Les AuCoin (D-CA)
   - George Brown (D-CA)
   - Mel Levine (D-CA)
   - Ronald Dellums (D-CA)
   - George Crockett (D-MI)
   - Thomas Foglietta (D-PA)
   - Stephen Solarz (D-NY)
   - GaryAckerman (D-NY)
   - Julian Dixon (D-CA)

Ted Weiss (D-NY)
Gerry Studds (D-MA)
Robert Matsui (D-CA)
Howard Berman (D-CA)
Matthew Martinez (D-CA)
John Conyers (D-MI)
(H.R. 230 Cosponsors, cont'd.)
Parren Mitchell (D-MD)  Bill Green (R-NY)  George Miller (D-CA)
Bruce Morrison (D-CT)  Barney Frank (D-MA)  Charles Schumer (D-NY)
Edward Markey (D-MA)  Mervyn Dymally (D-CA)  Sala Burton (D-CA)
Martin Olav Sabo (D-MN)  Bob Edgar (D-PA)  Alan Wheat (D-MO)
Steny Hoyer (D-MD)  Morris Udall (D-AZ)  William Coyne (D-PA)
James Weaver (D-OR)  Jim Moody (D-WI)  Major Owens (D-NY)
Michael Barnes (D-MD)  Barbara Boxer (D-CA)  Mickey Leland (D-TX)
Pete Stark (D-CA)  Mike Lowry (D-WA)  Edolphus Towns (D-NY)
Sidney Yates (D-IL)  Charles Hayes (D-IL)  Cardiss Collins (D-IL)
Patricia Schroeder (D-CO)  Lindy Boggs (D-LA)  Vic Fazio (D-CA)
William Gray (D-PA)  Robert Torricelli (D-NJ)  David Bonior (D-MI)
Charles Rangel (D-NY)  Stewart McKinney (R-CT)  Jim Bates (D-CA)
Edward Roybal (D-CA)  Peter Kostmayer (D-PA)  Robert Kastenmeier (D-WI)
Don Edwards (D-CA)

33. Ibid.