PROPOSITION 6

The People of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 44837.5 is added to the Education Code, to read:

44837.5 One of the most fundamental interests of the State is the establishment and the preservation of the family unit. Consistent with this interest is the State's duty to protect its impressionable youth from influences which are antithetical to this vital interest. This duty is particularly compelling when the youth, on the state undertakes to educate its youth, and, by law, requires them to be exposed to the state's chosen educational environment throughout their formative years.

A schoolteacher, teacher's aide, school administrator or counselor has a professional duty directed exclusively towards the moral as well as intellectual, social and civic development of young and impressionable students.

As a result of continued close and prolonged contact with schoolchildren, a teacher, teacher's aide, school administrator or counselor becomes a role model whose words, behavior and actions are likely to be emulated by students coming under his or her care, instruction, supervision, administration, guidance and protection.

For these reasons, the State finds a compelling interest in refusing to employ and in terminating the employment of a schoolteacher, a teacher's aide, a school administrator or a counselor, subject to reasonable restrictions and qualifications, who engages in public homosexual activity and/or public homosexual conduct directed at, or likely to come to the attention of, schoolchildren or other school employees.

This proscription is essential since such activity and conduct undermines the state's interest in preserving and perpetuating the conjugal family unit.

The purpose of sections 44837.6 and 44933.5 is to prohibit employment of a person whose homosexual activities or conduct are determined to render him or her unfit for service.

SECTION 2. Section 44837.6 is added to the Education Code, to read:

(a) The governing board of a school district shall refuse to hire as an employee any person who has engaged in public homosexual activity or public homosexual conduct should the board determine that said activity or conduct renders the person unfit for service.

(b) For purposes of this section, (1) "public homosexual activity" means the commission of an act defined in subdivision (a) of Section 286 of the Penal Code, or in subdivision (a) of Section 286a of the Penal Code, upon any other person of the same sex, which is not discreet and not practiced in private, whether or not such act, at the time of its commission, constituted a crime;

(2) "public homosexual conduct" means the advocating, soliciting, impounding, encouraging or promoting of private or public homosexual activity directed at, or likely to come to the attention of, school children and/or other employees; and

"employee" means a probationary or permanent certified teacher, teacher's aide, school administrator or counselor.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law regardingrima

1. Through the governing board, upon the filing of written charges that the person has committed public homosexual activity or public homosexual conduct, duly signed and verified by the person filing the charges, or upon written charges formulated by the governing board, shall set a probable cause hearing on the charges within fifteen (15) working days after the filing or formulation of written charges and forward notice to the employee of the charges not less than ten (10) working days prior to the probable cause hearing. The notice shall inform the employee of the time and place of the governing board's hearing to determine if probable cause exists that the employee has engaged in public homosexual activity or public homosexual conduct. Such notice shall also inform the employee of his or her right to be present with counsel and to present evidence which may have bearing on the board's determination of whether there is probable cause. This hearing shall be held in private session in accordance with Govt. Code 54957, unless the employee requests a public hearing. A finding of probable cause shall be made within thirty (30) working days after the filing or formulation of written charges by not less than a simple majority vote of the entire board.

(d) Upon a finding of probable cause, the governing board may, if it deems such action necessary, immediately suspend the employee from his or her duties. The board shall, within thirty-two (32) working days after the filing or formulation of written charges, notify the employee in writing of its findings and decision to suspend, if imposed, and the board's reasons therefore.

(e) Whether or not the employee is immediately suspended, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the governing board may suspend the employee for thirty (30) working days after the notice of the finding of probable cause, hold a hearing on the truth of the charges upon which a finding of probable cause was based and whether such charges, if found true, render the employee unfit for service. This hearing shall be held in private session in accordance with Govt. Code 54957, unless the employee requests a public hearing. The governing board's decision as to whether the employee is unfit for service shall be made within thirty (30) working days after the conclusion of this hearing. A decision that the employee is unfit for service shall be determined by not less than a simple majority vote of the entire board. The written decision shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.

(f) Factors to be considered by the board in evaluating the charges and determining the fitness of the employee include, but not be limited to: (1) the likelihood that the activity or conduct may adversely affect students or other employees; (2) The proximity or remoteness in time or location of the conduct to the employee's responsibilities; (3) the extenuating or aggravating circumstances which, in the judgment of the board, must be examined in weighing the evidence; and (4) whether the conduct included acts, words or deeds of a continuing or comprehensive nature which would tend to encourage, promote, or dispense schoolchildren toward private or public homosexual activity or private or public homosexual conduct.

(Emphasis ours).

(g) If, by a preponderance of the evidence, the employee is found to have engaged in public homosexual activity or public homosexual conduct which renders the employee unfit for service, the employee shall be dismissed from employment. The decision of the governing board shall be subject to judicial review.

SECTION 4. Severability Clause

If any provision of this enactment or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or application of this enactment which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this enactment are severable.
PROP. 6: Trying to tell us all how to live

IN ORDER TO PASS PROPOSITION 6, ITS SUPPORTERS ARE RELYING ON TWO THINGS:

1. that voters will not be informed of the actual content of the initiative and
2. that Californians can be scared into voting for the initiative on the basis of lies and distortions.

Following are a variety of statements made by clergy, psychologists, researchers and concerned individuals about the nature and practice of homosexuality.

“There is probably more nonsense written about homosexuality, more unwarranted fear of it, and less understanding of it than any other area of human sexuality.”
Dr. Wardell B. Pomeroy, psychologist, marriage counselor, staff member of the Institute for Sex Research, Indiana University

WHO ARE HOMOSEXUALS?
“The Task Force has found that homosexual men and women are represented in all age groups, socio-economic classes, racial and ethnic groups, educational levels and employment categories. They are an integral part of our society.” Oregon Task Force on Sexual Preference

“The common myth that homosexual males are effeminate and identifiable and that homosexual females are swaggering, ‘butch’ types is not borne out by the facts. About 15 per cent of males and 5 per cent of females with extensive homosexual histories are identifiable.”
Dr. Wardell B. Pomeroy, psychologist

“Using the Kinsey Institute statistics, the only broad-based studies available, 13% of the adult male population and 7% of the female population is predominantly homosexual.”
Sue March, social worker, author

WILL HOMOSEXUAL TEACHERS ALTER THE SEXUAL PREFERENCE OF THEIR STUDENTS?
“There is no evidence that homosexual teachers might affect the sexual orientation of their students.”
Dr. John Spiegel, President, the American Psychiatric Association

“I can’t imagine teachers having any influence on whether students become homosexual or heterosexual. Anita Bryant’s ideas about homosexual teachers recruiting young boys is nonsense. It goes against all the facts we have.”
Dr. Wardell B. Pomeroy, psychologist

ARE HOMOSEXUALS LIKELY TO RECRUIT OR MOLEST CHILDREN?
“The great majority of sexual offenses against children are heterosexual in nature, i.e., male offenders and female victims.” Oregon Task Force on Sexual Preference

“97% of child seduction is heterosexual.”
Dr. Benjamin Spock, pediatrician, author

IS HOMOSEXUALITY UNNATURAL?
“Hormonally speaking, the sex drive is neither male nor female but undifferentiated — an urge for warmth and sensation of close body contact and genital proximity.”
Dr. John Money, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Science, the John Hopkins School of Medicine

IS HOMOSEXUALITY A MENTAL ILLNESS?
“Homosexuality is nothing to be ashamed of; no vice, no degradation, it can not be classified as illness.”
Sigmund Freud

“One of the revelations to me in recent investigations I have been doing ... homosexuals has been how much they enjoy their lives — how happy many of them are and how completely fulfilled they feel.”
Dr. Judd Marmor, psychoanalyst, UCLA

CAN A PERSON BE RELIGIOUS AND ACCEPT HOMOSEXUALS?
“The homosexual has every right to expect the church to serve as an advocate, to be his [her] protagonist in obtaining full civil liberties, law reform, and the end of sexual bigotry.”
The Rev. Ralph Weltge, United Church of Christ

“Christian judgments on human conduct are subject to change. The harshest glance at history will show such change in judgment of behaviour — whether sexual, economic, military, racial, political or anything else.”
Dr. Roger L. Shinn, Union Theological Seminary
What does Prop. 6 really mean?

Proposition 6 (the Briggs Initiative) calls for the investigation and firing of public school employees who in any way indicate an open mind on the subject of homosexuality. If passed, it will create an atmosphere of spying and slander in our communities. Because the wording of this initiative is so vague, an employee could be fired or lose his or her reputation for reasons that may or may not have anything to do with personal sexual preference. In addition to homosexuals, heterosexuals of a minority race, religion or political opinion will be easy and frequent targets. And Proposition 6 opens the door for similar legislation in almost all areas of employment.

The sponsors of this bill are trying to manipulate our valid concerns about human relationships—not because they care about the harmony and stability of these relationships, instead, they seek to give a single-minded group legal control over the lives of the rest of us. The Education Code of this state already contains laws that demand the dismissal of school personnel on grounds of "immoral or unprofessional conduct" and "mental condition unfitting him [or her] to associate with children" (Section 44940). Proposition 6 will not make better readers and clearer writers out of students. It will detract from genuine education by tying up personnel time and tax money in its enforcement and by hampering effective classroom teaching. A disgruntled or confused student, angry over an assignment or grade, has an easy avenue of revenge with this proposition. This is what will go into law if 6 passes:

"One of the most fundamental interests of the State is the establishment and preservation of the family unit. Consistent with this interest is the State's duty to protect its impressionable youth from influences which are antithetical to this vital interest."

Proposition 6 falsely implies that the family unit cannot survive unless the government censors all information on other forms of domestic and emotional life. The family is defined in this bill as the "conjugal [based on marriage] family unit." This proposition would set a precedent under which families with one parent, people who are divorced, single, living unmarried with a person of the opposite sex, even priests and nuns, could be subject to legal restrictions in employment, housing and other areas. This initiative invites massive censorship of speech and press, and broad government interference into the lives of youth and adults. Potentially, the government could attempt to regulate even the parent-child relationship.

"... the state finds a compelling interest in refusing to employ and in terminating the employment of a school teacher, a teacher's aide, a school administrator or a counselor... who engages in public homosexual activity and/or public homosexual conduct. ... shall set a probable cause hearing."

"... notwithstanding any other provision of law, the governing board shall hold a hearing on the truth of the charges upon which a finding of probable cause was based and whether such charges, if found to be true, render the employee unfit for service."

Charges can be filed by anyone in the community regardless of motives. Once charges are filed at least one hearing must be held. Regardless of the validity of the "charges" time and tax money will be tied up in such hearings, and the reputation of the charged employee will be damaged. These sections of the proposition overrule any previous regulations, such as existing state law or a union contract, regarding the firing of an employee.

It is quite likely that beyond the two hearings leading to an employee's dismissal, the school board will repeatedly have to defend its actions in higher courts.

In summary, Proposition 6 is an attempt to deprive school employees, and possibly others, of their rights of free speech and privacy. One's opinions, home life, friendships, appearance, interests, and tastes will be open to constant scrutiny. Employees must condemn or silence discussions of homosexuality in their presence, on or off school grounds, regardless of whether students are involved, or be open to charges.

This bill sets a dangerous precedent for similar legislation in other areas of employment. It also opens the door for wide-ranging censorship of religious, political and social beliefs.

School districts are presently struggling to halt the downward slide of reading and writing scores, and to deal with reduced operating budgets. Passage of Proposition 6 will burden districts to a point where they cannot function. Precious time and tax money will be wasted on unnecessary hearings and court appeals.

Proposition 6 wants to tell us all how to live. It must be soundly defeated in November.
TIPS FOR EFFECTIVE SPEAKING

1. Be a human being - be yourself - be open.

2. Do not be discouraged by outright disgust, hostility, ignorance or prejudice. Greet such utterances as opportunities for growth. Be suspicious of placating "liberals," you-do-your-thing attitudes. Everyone brought up in a homophobic society has residual prejudice - confront liberals to get at their repressed homophobia.

3. Stay tuned into your own feelings, trust your intuition - your feelings provide useful information about the dynamics going on. Be flexible and change your tact when that seems appropriate.

4. Try not to lose your cool. Feel free to share your feelings (anger-sadness-joy, etc) but do so from a centered place.

5. Don't get caught up in arguments. Don't speak abstractly or rhetorically - speak from gut level experiences.

6. Don't expend energy on the far-goners. Put out for the fence sitters.

7. This is serious stuff but don't forget humor. People will relate to you better if you're relaxed, easy-going, and non-defensive (tricky under defense producing circumstances).

8. Speaking about gay experience to straights is emotionally draining. Be clear on your motivation. Make sure you have support; when possible speak with someone else.

9. Know your audience. Know where they're coming from so that you can anticipate the questions they're not asking. Anticipate the level of their awareness. With some groups we need to start from the beginning, i.e. define terms such as lesbian, gay man, bi-sexual, transexual, transvestite.

10. Give the person support for her/his homophobic feelings. Validate the person's feelings who is attacking you, then share your own feelings/experiences.

11. Be aware of the ways in which you are still homophobic. Remember consciousness-raising is a process we're all in. When appropriate, share yours with the audience. Remember we all grew up in this society together.

12. Have a number of techniques in your repertoire for stimulating discussion, i.e.: "What are the first 3 things that cross your mind when you hear 'dyke' - faggot?" "You just found out your best same-sex friend is gay - you feel...?" "Think back to when you were young. Remember an occasion when you witnessed gay oppression - participated in it - were victimized by it - i.e. women not stereotypically feminine being called DYKE - men not into sports called FAGGOT!" "You can't walk down the street with your lover - turn the tables. Make the oppression real for them."

13. Know your facts. Actually read the initiative, laws affecting gays, the spectrum of gay experience, statistics, names, studies - the real world respects expertness.

14. Don't be afraid to say taboo words or talk about sexual feelings and experiences. Be prepared for questions about how you do it. Remember we're taking sex out of the closet.

15. Bring up & counter stereotypes and myths.

16. Draw parallels to other oppressed groups. Okay to have prejudice but don't legalize it.
PACIFIC CENTER: SPEAKERS' BUREAU TRAINING

MOST FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Questions for Discussion without Fact Sheets:

1. Questions that indicate confusion in terminology:
   - Don't homosexuals want to change sex? (Homosexual-Transsexual)
   - Don't gay men want to wear women's clothes? (Homosexual-Transvestite)

2. Questions that grow out of sex-role stereotyping:
   - Are lesbians masculine? Are all gay men effeminate?
   - Are some homosexuals active and some passive?
   - Who plays "the man" (or "the woman") in homosexual relationships?

3. Related stereotypes:
   - Aren't lesbians truckdrivers? Aren't gay men hairdressers and florists?

4. Questions growing out of straight insularity (defining problems as belonging to 'the other,' not seeing problems as societal or human):
   - Why do homosexual men flaunt it?
   - Aren't homosexuals unhappy?
   - Aren't some people's lives ruined by homosexuality?
   - Aren't homosexuals poor security risks?

5. Sexual questions:
   - What do you do? How do you do it?
   - Do you enjoy sex?

It's probably worth noting that studies have shown that people with strong anti-homosexual feelings generally also hold attitudes that are:

--anti-sex generally.
--rigidly conventional on sex-roles.
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Questions for Discussion with Fact Sheets:

6. How many homosexuals are there?
7. What made you gay? What causes homosexuality?
8. Can't homosexuals change? Aren't some techniques effective?
9. Don't homosexuals hate the opposite sex?
10. Isn't homosexuality sick?
11. Don't homosexuals molest children?
12. Doesn't exposure to homosexuals affect the way children form their sexual predilections?
13. Isn't homosexuality unnatural? (Usually an unstated assumption rather than a direct question.)
14. If laws are made more permissive, won't homosexuality rise?
15. Are homosexuals discriminated against?
16. Is homosexuality a white problem?
17. Don't homosexuals grow old and lonely?
18. Isn't homosexuality a sin? Don't most religions ban homosexuality?
SUPPORT MATERIAL FOR QUESTION SHEETS

6. The generally accepted figure is roughly 10%, based on Kinsey (the average of about 7% for women and 13% for men). The figure was updated and made more precise in a letter to the National Gay Task Force in March, 1977 from Paul H. Gebhard, one of Kinsey's associates.

His figure, essentially unchanged for at least thirty years, is 9.13%.

That means over 20,000,000 people in the U. S. today (close to the number of Blacks); and almost 2,000,000 in California.

Other quotations from Kinsey:

"At least 37% of the male population has some homosexual experience between the beginning of adolescence and old age"--that is, more than one in three.

Since 13% of men are exclusively homosexual, and 37% have some homosexual contact, Kinsey goes on, "only 50 per cent of the male population is exclusively heterosexual throughout its adult life."

7. In The Homosexual Matrix, Tripp has two chapters--the first on the origins of heterosexuality, the second on the origins of homosexuality (they are good supplemental reading)--to make his point that so many factors go into sexual makeup, and so little is known, that it seems premature to try to pin down individual causes.

There are two basic approaches to the area:

A) The post-Freudian school represented most visibly by Irving Bieber, et al., Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study of Male Homosexuals (New York, 1962), which assumes that homosexuality is an aberration and that abnormal factors must be found to explain it (away).

Taking up Freud's early notion of homosexuality as arrested development and as related to a castration complex, Bieber concluded first that homosexuality is the result of "fear of heterosexuality."

Comment: Research done in the seventies (Freund, et al.) have determined behaviorally that homosexual men (very few studies have as yet been done on lesbians) do not have aversive reactions to women.

The theory that homosexuality is a fixation at an early stage of sexual development has been disproved by the finding that tendencies that Freud labelled stages actually coexist in the child.

On the castration-complex theory, Tripp comments:"(In this view) a man can become homosexual because he unconsciously imagines there are teeth in the vagina, and so, unaccountably, he chooses to place his penis in a cavity where there are real teeth."
Bieber's second "cause" was a particular configuration of abnormal family relations: "detached and hostile" fathers and "close-binding-intimate" mothers who because of an inability to relate romantically to their husbands cling to and demasculinize their sons. Families of homosexuals are seen as incapable of a love relationship.

Comment: The sexism in Bieber's treatment of mothers has been challenged by recent research, which found no abnormally intense mother-child relationships in the background of their sample of homosexual males.

Also, Bieber's conclusions ignore other cultures, where this pattern is not found, as well as the many homosexuals without this family configuration and the many heterosexuals with it.

Bieber's sample has been criticised: it included only homosexual males diagnosed as neurotic to schizophrenic who were in psychoanalysis in New York City. Thus the results of the study might pertain more directly to family structures in the urban middle-class on the Eastern seabord than to homosexuality.

For detailed investigation of Bieber's study, see Churchill, 260-273.

B) The second approach to homosexuality is best represented in the works of Evelyn Hooker, Wainwright Churchill, Thomas Szasz, and Kinsey and his associates. They see homosexuality as the expression of a basically human capacity for general sexual responsiveness--a directing of a basic (pan-)sexual urge.

The conclusion of the Final Report of the Task Force on Homosexuality, chaired by Evelyn Hooker in 1969, was that "homosexuality may be a deviation in sexual pattern which is within the normal range psychologically."

Bieber's pathological abnormality theory leads to attempts to pigeon-hole causes (one writer lists 77, some contradictory). It justifies punitive and "corrective" measures and seeks to limit personal freedom, not to speak of the pain that it has caused gay people and their families alike.

Hooker's approach opens the way for understanding the diversity of sexuality, and places an emphasis on dealing with the realities of homosexuality: further research, expanded education, awareness and facilities.

Freud, by the way, came around to a view close to Hooker's by 1935:

"Homosexuality is assuredly no advantage, but it is nothing to be ashamed of, no vice, no degradation, it can not be classified as an illness. We consider it to be a variation of the sexual function."

--Freud, Letter to an American Mother.
8. Some therapists, notably Lawrence Hatterer and Edmund Bergler (whose books were for a long time the only popularly available ones on homosexuality) claim success in "curing" homosexuals. Irving Bieber et al. have the best-documented record of success in this field, however—only 73% failure.

All these claims have been disputed because of lack of follow-up studies.

Dr. George Weinberg cautions against trying to convert, since the most likely results are difficulties with sex in general, and the individual's feelings about her/himself in terms of guilt, fear, and regret.

Historically, "cures" for homosexuality have included castration (also considered a cure for masturbation), lobotomy, shock treatment and other kinds of aversion therapy.

"Aversion Therapy is the name applied to no less than six different systems for trying to make a homosexual male "averse" to male partners. Most of these techniques involve showing a picture of a nude male to a man at the moment he is given an electric shock, or an instant before he is thrown into drug-induced convulsions or vomiting. Although most such procedures have been carried out in respectable-sounding institutions both in Britain and the United States, they are a professional embarrassment and a laughingstock. They usually entail giving the patient a number of jolts (at least one a day) until he says he is "cured"—often to a doctor who is at that moment ready to order another needle or electric shock should the patient say he is not cured.

A variation of this technique is to put the patient in a dark room, instructing him to masturbate to orgasm and at that moment shout "ready," at which time the doctor throws a switch that lights up a picture of 'a beautiful girl.' In an especially amusing example reported from an Italian clinic, the patient is subjected to several weeks of harsh treatment, after which he is brought in to sit across the table from an old doctor with a long beard who proceeds to show him nude pictures of "beautiful boys." Midway through the series, the doctor reaches under the table and feels the patient's penis to see if it is getting hard. Evidently none ever did; he reports 100 per cent cures."


9. Kinsey reported informally that two-thirds of heterosexual males "didn't like" women. Again, behaviorist studies showed that homosexual males did not have aversive reactions to women.
10. In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association took homosexuality off its list of mental disorders; the American Psychological Association followed suit in 1975, and went on to urge support for civil and legal rights for homosexuals, including equal employment rights.

11. Last available figures from San Francisco (1972) indicate that 107 instances of child molestation occurred—all by heterosexuals. This is also true of the 505 cases of forcible rape and the 29 of statutory rape. 95-97% of such crimes are committed by heterosexual men. 85-90% of child molestation occurs within the family.

Some recent evidence indicates that pedophilia (attraction to children) may be more and attraction to a certain age group than to a certain sex. Many pedophiles, then, can't really be categorized as either heterosexual or homosexual.

12. "Experts, such as Dr. John Money of Johns Hopkins University, agree that a child's sexual orientation is determined by age 3 or 4. Major studies like those done by the Kinsey Institute show that it's impossible to change sexual orientation once it has been determined....

"The President of the American Psychiatric Association, Dr. John P. Spiegel, commented, 'Some have feared that homosexual teachers might affect the sexual orientation of their students. There is no evidence to support this thesis.'"

--Facts pamphlet.

Cities which have policies prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination in schools—San Francisco, Washington, Minneapolis, Portland, and others—report that this legal guarantee of equal rights has had no adverse effect on the children in the schools.

Also, from one's own point of view: most gay people's parents are straight—and that didn't affect their children's behavior. All my own and my friends' teachers were straight-identified, without effect on our sexual orientation.

It would have been helpful for me and many homosexual children to have a gay-identified role-model in school.
13. What does unnatural mean? If it means "not occurring in nature," then homosexuality is natural:

--homosexuality occurs in almost every mammal.
--homosexuality occurs with greater frequency the further up the evolutionary scale you go. Rather charming examples of homosexual coupling among porpoises have been noted.

If it means "not occurring in most societies," again homosexuality must be called natural:

--homosexuality occurs in countries in hot and cold climates, among all colors of people, and at all stages of social development.
--homosexuality has occurred throughout history: its occurrence among the ancient Greeks and Persian, and among several American Indian tribes is well-known.

If "unnatural" is defined as "statistically insignificant," other problems crop up. As Gore Vidal pointed out (when he reviewed Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Sex...) if you prescribed sexual acts on the basis of statistical occurrence, then masturbation would win hands down.

"Natural," of course, can be used to actually mean "what feels good to me and to the people I know," or "What is encouraged by my culture, friends, family, church, etc.

14. Followup studies in countries with liberal laws on homosexuality indicate no rise in homosexuals--though there is more openness, similar to the increased visibility that is bothering some people in the U.S. right now. These countries include Holland, Sweden, and Denmark.

Homosexuals in these countries have also had no effect on family life or family structure. President Carter has gone on record as saying that homosexuality poses no threat to the family.

The fear that the ranks of homosexuality would swell if it were legalized prompted Pauline Kael to comment: "The assumption is that in a free market heterosexuality wouldn't stand a chance."
Sodomy Laws: Most sodomy laws proscribe non-marital sex and many types of sex commonly practised by heterosexuals as well as homosexuals, but enforcement is almost entirely limited to homosexuals. The existence of laws against homosexuality means that we are often afraid to call the police when we are robbed or beaten for fear of being accused of a crime ourselves. These laws also act as sanction for unofficial harassment: lack of police action (even when murder is involved), brutality, and blackmail.

In 38 cases of violence vs. gays reported by the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, only 16 arrests were made. As a result, citizen patrols have been set up in harrassed areas in New York and San Francisco.

Job Discrimination: Gays are prohibited explicitly by the military and by state and federal civil service. Also, military discharges for homosexuality follow a person around for the rest of her/his life. Studies have shown that many people who "appear" gay (though in some cases they aren't) are discriminated against unofficially by employers.

In 1976 the San Francisco Human Rights Commission found that Pacific Telephone was discriminating against gay people in their hiring procedure, and ordered them to stop doing so in accordance with the nondiscrimination clause covering "sexual orientation" in the SF Administrative Code (Section 12B2).

The Briggs bill is an example of job discrimination.

Housing Discrimination: Denial of housing to single or to same sex couples is common; many instances are cited in the Human Rights Commission report (SF, June 1977, p. 20)

Other Discrimination: Child custody, tax structures, insurance, adoption, public office, prison treatment, wills, immigration...
16. Homosexuality has been found in varying degrees in many African cultures. The Siwan tribe, for example, required homosexual experience of 100% of its adult males.

17. Studies on aging done recently show that non-homosexuals and homosexuals score the same on "loneliness," no better, no worse. This is a cultural problem, not a homosexual one.

18. Homosexuality is under discussion in most of the major religions. The issue is right behind that of the involvement of women in the ministry--also under discussion because of some Biblical statements.

In Leviticus, the passage that seems to ban homosexuality also condemns women who wear red dresses, and people who eat shellfish.

To quote again from the "Facts..." pamphlet:

Some people and religions argue that the Bible says homosexuality is a sin. But our Constitution defines a clear separation between Church and State; between religious beliefs and civil laws. So, while some people and religions may regard homosexuality as a sin, that belief cannot be the basis for legal discrimination.... Among the organizations who have gone on record in support of equal rights for homosexual are:

- The Lutheran Church of America
- The United Church of Christ
- National Federation of Priests' Councils
- Commonweal (Catholic)
- The Episcopal Church
- The U.S. National Council of Catholic Bishops
- The American Jewish Committee (New York Chapter)
- The Society of Friends (Pacific Yearly Meeting)
- The Unitarian Universalist Church.

From the "Social Principles of the United Methodist Church":

Homosexuals no less than heterosexuals are persons of sacred worth, who need the ministry and guidance of the church in their struggles for human fulfillment, as well as the spiritual and emotional care of a fellowship which enables reconciling relationships with God, with other and with self. Further we insist that all persons are entitled to have their human and civil rights ensured....

From "A Word for Love and Affection," by David R. Nkin, Senior Minister of the First Unitarian Church of San Francisco:

...I believe in love. I don't think that anything in our society--oppression, hatred, prejudice--can stand against love. And when I see love between two people, male and female, male and male, female and female, I rejoice. And I celebrate that love, and I fear nothing where love exists. And I ask no questions, for love is good, love is God--not even the gates of hell will prevail against it.
1) How many homosexuals are there? -- The average accepted figure based on Kinsey's research, that means over 20,000,000 people in U.S. today (close to the # of blacks) or 2 million in Ca. More than 1 in 3 men have had some kind of homosexual experience. Only 50% of the male population is exclusively heterosexual throughout its adult life.

2) What made you gay? What causes homosexuality? -- Many factors go into sexual makeup (for straights as well as lesbians and gay men) nothing conclusive can be said about individual causes.
   a) From Freud we get homosexuality is arrested development, and induced by "fear of heterosexuality" -- '70's research by Freud et al. have determined that gay men do not have aversive reactions to women. By 1935 Freud stated "Homosexuality is assuredly no advantage, but it is nothin to be ashamed of, no degradation, it can not be classified as an illness. We consider it to be a variation of the sexual function"
   b) An other commonly thought cause is a particular configuration of abnormal family relations, (ie. "hostile and detached fathers" and "close binding, intimate mothers") This theory has been challenged by recent research, as there are many cultures where this configuration is not found, and there are still gays, as well as many gays who don't have this type of family and many straights who do.

3) Can't homosexuals change? Aren't some techniques effective? -- Historically cures for homosexuality have included castration, lobotomy, shock treatment and other aversive therapies (ie. induced vomiting upon presentation of a same sex nude photo) The studies claiming cure rates are all under attack because of a lack of adequate follow-up, the best documented record of success has a 73% failure rate. Dr. George Weinberg cautions against attempts to convert/change gays because the most likely results are difficulties with sex, and the bad feelings the gay person has from this process-guilt, fear and regret.

4) Don't homosexuals hate the opposite sex? see 2a above.

5) Isn't homosexuality sick? -- In 1973 the A.P.A. took homosexuality off the list of mental disorders and went on to urge support of civil and legal rights for gays, including equal employment rights.

6) Don't homosexuals molest children? -- The figures in '72 from S.F. indicate that all 107 instances of child molestation were by heterosexual men, this was also true of the 593 cases of forced rape. 85-90% of child molestation occurs within the family.

7) Doesn't exposure to gays affect the way children develop their sexual inclinations? -- Experts like John Money of Johns Hopkins agree a child's sexual orientation is determined by age 3 or 4. Major studies by Kinsey say
it is impossible to change sexual orientation once it has been determined.

The Pres. of the American Psychiatric Assc. Dr. Spiegel said "Some have feared that homosexuals teachers might affect the sexual orientation of their students. There is no evidence to support this, thesis"

8) Isn't homosexuality unnatural? (often not stated so directly)--

What does unnatural mean? If it means not occurring in nature than homosexuality is natural: Homosexuality occurs in every mammal. 

" " with greater frequency the further up the evolutionary scale you go.

If it means "not occurring in most societies" then again homosexuality is natural: homosexuality occurs in all countries, among all colors of people, " 

" throughout all history, notably the Greeks and Persians and some American Indian Tribes.

**if you prescribed sexual acts on the basis of statistical occurrence than masturbation would win hands down.

9) If laws are more permissive won't homosexuality rise? -- Follow-up studies in countries with liberal laws show no rise in the # of gays. Gays in these countries also have had no affect of family life or structure. Pres. Carter has said that, homosexuality poses no threat to the family.

10) Are homosexuals really discriminated against? -- YES!

a) Sodomy laws-- about other types of sex as well but enforcement is limited to gays. These laws act to sanction un-official harrassment, brutality and blackmail.

b) Job Discrimination-- Prohibited directly by the military, and by state and federal civil service. People who "appear" gay are often discriminated against too gay or not. '76 it was found that Pacific Tel was discriminating against gays in their hiring process.

BRIGGS?

c) Housing-- denial of housing to singles or same sex couples is common

d) Others-- child custody, tax structures, insurance, adoption, prison treatment, wills, immigration etc.

11) Isn't homosexuality a sin? Don't most religions ban homosexuality?

(See Religious Outreach Fact Sheet)
THE FOLLOWING REMARKS ARE LARGELY DIRECTED TOWARD CHRISTIAN CONCERNS IN THE MATTER OF HOMOSEXUALITY. THE RELIGIOUS OUTREACH COMMITTEE OF E.B.A.C.A.B.I./NO ON 6; THIS GROUP IS WORKING TO DEVELOP A MORE COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF ALL RELIGIOUS STANCES IN RELATION TO GAY CONCERNS. THIS SUMMARY, THEN, IS, AT BEST, SUGGESTIVE.

THE GOSPELS DO NOT SPEAK DIRECTLY TO THE ISSUE OF HOMOSEXUALITY AT ALL. THE GOSPEL MESSAGE IS ONE OF UNDERSTANDING, COMFORT AND MUTUAL AID. THOSE PASSAGES WHERE HOMOSEXUALITY IS EXPRESSLY MENTIONED ARE FOUND ONLY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND IN THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. CHRIST NEVER RAISED THE QUESTION--LET ALONE CONDEMNED ANYONE--IN ANY OF HIS TEACHINGS.


THE OLD TESTAMENT/ THE SODOM STORY/ Genesis 19: 4-11. TWO EVANGELICAL scholars, LETHA SCANZONI AND VIRGINIA MOLLENKOTT, argue that "rather than concentrating on homosexuality, the Sodom story seems to be focusing on two specific evils: (1) violent gang rape and (2) inhospitality to the stranger". (IS THE HOMOSEXUAL MY NEIGHBOR?, P.57)

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES/ Corinthians 6:9-10, I Timothy 1:9-10, Romans 1:26-27 Father John McNeill, a Jesuit priest, suggests that certain ambiguities in the Greek text of the Epistles, support the contention that Paul was addressing his remarks only to persons who gave up their natural appetites (heterosexual) to pursue those (homosexual) which were not natural to them. Therefore, he concludes, "THE PAULINE EPISTLES DO NOT EXPLICITLY TREAT THE PROBLEM OF HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVITY BETWEEN PERSONS WHO SHARE THE HOMOSEXUAL CONDITION, AND AS SUCH CANNOT BE READ AS EXPLICITLY CONDEMNING SUCH BEHAVIOR". (THE CHURCH AND THE HOMOSEXUAL, P.67)

ST. PAUL IS ALSO DRAWING ALWAYS UPON HIS TRADITIONAL JEWISH UPBRINGING AND THEREFORE HAS IN MIND OLD TESTAMENT PROHIBITIONS, RATHER THAN A DIRECT STATEMENT OF CHRIST.

BOTH THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE EPISTLES MUST BE READ IN CONTEXT, A FACT WHICH TOO OFTEN ESCAPES THOSE WHO USE A SINGLE PASSAGE OR PART OF A PASSAGE TO BACK UP A SEEMINGLY-BIBLE-BASED ARGUMENT.

IS MARRIAGE-AND-PROCREATION THE ONLY FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING SEXUAL BEHAVIOR? NOT NECESSARILY, argues Father O'NEILL. "Owing to many factors--longer life-span, overpopulation, birth control, the women's liberation movement, the development of asexual means of procreation, and so forth--the procreative context is necessarily breaking down and factually will no longer serve in the future as a practical means of regulating and judging the greater part of human sexual activity. [THE] INTERPERSONAL CONTEXT,
properly understood...can and will provide an adequate framework for moral judgment and healthy regulation of...heterosexual and homosexual relationships." (THE CHURCH AND THE HOMOSEXUAL, p. 36)

In summary.... "A careful examination of what the Bible says about issues relating to homosexuality leaves us with many unanswered questions. For one thing, the idea of a lifelong homosexual orientation or 'condition' is never mentioned in the Bible. An evangelical pastor in the Netherlands...explains that "the confirmed homosexual was not recognized until roughly 1890. The Bible writers assumed that everyone was heterosexual and that in times of moral decay, some heterosexual people did some strange and unnatural things with each other.' Since the Bible is silent about the homosexual condition, those who want to understand it must rely on the findings of modern behavioral science research and on the testimony of those persons who are themselves homosexual." (IS THE HOMOSEXUAL MY NEIGHBOR? p.70)

IN THIS MATTER, THE RECENTLY-PUBLISHED FINDINGS OF THE KINSEY REPORT ON HOMOSEXUALITY, ALONG WITH COUNTLESS OTHER DATA, WILL BE SUGGESTIVE.

Since the problem is, admittedly, complex, it is impossible to do more, in a short time, than suggest that there is still much room for dialogue—in spite of arguments often voiced that the Bible can only be interpreted in one way. A closer, more reasoned approach to the Bible would, in fact, suggest that such arguments distort the true, universal message of the Gospels by taking selectively certain passages from the Old Testament and Epistles without taking into account the cultural/historical contexts in which these books were written—without, in fact, sometimes taking into account the very passage in which these remarks appear—remember, the Old Testament also prohibits such things as the wearing of garments woven of two kinds of fiber, eating shellfish, etc.

Many churches are re-examining their views on homosexuality. A large number, while not yet resolved on the theological issues, support fully the civil rights of gay people. Several are actively supporting the current struggle to preserve the civil rights of gay school teachers. A person does not have to fully accept an alternate lifestyle in order to reject a clear violation of another person's right to work, right to privacy and right to his or her own beliefs.

"Last August an interfaith committee of 25 religious leaders joined together to discuss this issue. The group drafted and endorsed a statement which reads in part...."AS MEMBERS OF THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY...WE BELIEVE HOMOSEXUAL PERSONS ARE CHILDREN OF GOD WHO HAVE FULL AND EQUAL CLAIM WITH ALL OTHER PERSONS UPON THE LOVE AND ACCEPTANCE OF OUR CHURCHES AND SYNAGOGUES AND THAT THEY ARE ENTITLED TO EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS WITH ALL OTHER CITIZENS".

(Letter from the INTER-FAITH COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT THE BRIGGS INITIATIVE)


Proposition 6, the Briggs Initiative, is on the November ballot in California. If passed it would allow school boards to fire all school personnel who are gay, seem gay or advocate gay rights in any way. The initiative is six pages long. Copies of it are in the speakers' packets. Also key quotes from it are highlighted on the green sheet called "The Straight Facts about the Briggs Initiative" and will also be in the educational pamphlet, revised version of the same sheet.

THE FAMILY

If Prop 6 passes, the state would have the duty to interfere with people's private lives in order to promote the conjugal family unit. Non-nuclear families would be considered undesirable and not sanctioned. Families will actually be destroyed as homosexual members are ostracized and persecuted.

FREE SPEECH, ASSOCIATION

If Prop 6 passes, it will infringe on the right of people to have open minds and to support whatever issue they choose. Association with gay people or with same-sex people could be interpreted as "homosexual conduct," thus limiting freedom of association.

LACK OF DUE PROCESS

If Prop 6 passes, a sixty day suspension of suspected individuals will be allowed before guilt is proven.

EDUCATION

If Prop 6 passes, it will in no way improve the quality of academic education for students. Legislation to protect children from abuse is not needed, as sufficient laws are already on the books to do so.

LABOR

If Prop 6 passes, the right to work and the collective bargaining process will be superceded. Unions will lose the ability to protect their members from discrimination that has nothing to do with job performance.

GAY RIGHTS

If Prop 6 passes, gay people will be forced back into the closet unless they are willing to endure increasing social and economic attacks. Fair, accurate information on gay men and lesbians will be repressed while myths and stereotypes go unchallenged.

STATE INTERVENTION

If Prop 6 passes, the state will have the right to censor information on a particular lifestyle and orientation and to promote one particular type of relational unit, i.e. the conjugal family unit, while supressing others.
HOMOSEXUALS ARE NOT A FRINGE GROUP:

"The Task Force has found that homosexual men and women are represented in all age groups, socio-economic classes, racial and ethnic groups, educational levels and employment categories. They are an integral part of our society." Oregon Task Force on Sexual Preference

TEACHERS DO NOT AFFECT THE SEXUAL PREFERENCE OF THEIR STUDENTS:

"There is no evidence that homosexual teachers might affect the sexual orientation of their students." Dr. John Spiegel, President, the American Psychiatric Association

"I can't imagine teachers having any influence on whether students become homosexual or heterosexual. Anita Bryant's ideas about homosexual teachers recruiting young boys is nonsense. It goes against all the facts we have." Dr. Wardell B. Pomeroy, psychologist, marriage counselor, staff member of the Institute for Sex Research, Indiana University

HOMOSEXUALS ARE NOT SICK:

"Homosexuality is nothing to be ashamed of; no vice, no degradation, it can not be classified as illness." Sigmund Freud

"One of the revelations to me in recent investigations I have been doing with... homosexuals has been how much they enjoy their lives — how happy many of them are and how completely fulfilled they feel." Dr. Judd Marmor, psychoanalyst, UCLA

"97% of child seduction is heterosexual." Dr. Benjamin Spock, pediatrician, author

---

S.F. Republican Central Committee called Prop 6 "A tool of fear that pits one group against another and makes discrimination legal." Both the Republican and Democratic Central Committees passed resolutions against Prop 6.
Proposition 6 Threatens You

Proposition 6 calls for the investigation and firing of public school employees who, on or off school grounds, express a tolerant view of homosexuality.

Prop. 6 Will Result In

...harassment of school employees
...the denial of the rights of free speech, privacy and association
...tax money intended for educating students spent instead on hearings and lawyers
...a precedent for discrimination against other minorities
...a precedent for similar legislation based on other issues and in other occupations
...an increase in the harassment of homosexuals in all areas of their lives

Prop. 6 Is Unnecessary

The California Education Code already contains very comprehensive laws that demand the firing of any teacher or other school employee, heterosexual or homosexual, for “immoral or unprofessional conduct” and “mental condition unfitting him (or her) to associate with children.”

State Superintendent of Schools Wilson Riles, Governor Jerry Brown and State Attorney General Evelle Younger have all denounced Prop 6 as unnecessary.

Prop. 6 Wastes Tax Money

A single case carried through under Prop 6 will run into thousands of dollars. Money intended for books, supplies, salaries, and maintenance will be diverted into investigatory hearings and lawyer’s fees. Personnel time will likewise be wasted.

Under Prop 6 charges can be brought against a school employee by anyone in the community who feels that the employee has in some way, on or off school grounds, indicated a tolerance of homosexuality. Once even a single charge is filed, a hearing must be called by the school board and time and money invested in carrying it out.

Prop. 6 Seeks To Force Conformity

Prop 6 seeks to impose one single pattern on our personal lives and to make personal relationships a matter of law.

The only acceptable domestic model as defined in Prop 6 is the “conjugal (based on marriage) family.” Prop 6 falsely implies that this model can only survive if the government censors information on other lifestyles.

If voters put these assumptions into law, a precedent will be set for discriminating against single parent families, and people who are divorced, single, or living unmarried with a person of the opposite sex.

Prop. 6 Undermines Our Children’s Education

Prop 6 has nothing to do with an employee’s professional competence. It is concerned only that employees conform to the opinions of Prop 6’s sponsors.

It will create harassment of school personnel and contribute to an already existing discipline problem. Teachers will be reluctant to exercise their authority because a disgruntled or confused student has an easy avenue of revenge under Prop 6.

Education should prepare students to understand the world around them. Homosexuals make up approximately 10% of that world. They can be found in all races, economic classes, religious, social, political and educational groups. Many students will grow up to find that they have friends, relatives, or co-workers who are homosexual. If they are to respond with anything but fear and hatred towards them, they should not be denied the opportunity to discuss homosexuality.

Prop. 6 Encourages Other Restrictions

Once such an irrational, anti-civil rights bill as Prop 6 becomes law, no one’s rights are guaranteed. Individuals who are seen as “different” because of race, religion, political or social opinions, etc., can also be targeted as unfit to work in the public schools. The legislation of Prop 6 can be extended to other fields of employment and other areas of our lives.

We all think we lead upstanding, moral lives, but if it were up to every citizen in our community to judge us, would each one agree? Under Prop 6 it will only take one negative opinion to ruin a career, if not a life.
The goal of education is, at least in part, to prepare the students to understand and respond to the outside world. Homosexuals make up approximately 10% of the population of this country. They can be found in all races, economic classes, jobs, and religious and social groups. It is almost certain that students at some time in their lives will meet a homosexual and/or the child, parent, brother, sister or friend of a homosexual. If they are to respond with anything but fear and hatred, they should not be denied the opportunity to discuss homosexuality. And that, where appropriate, should include the schools.

The prejudices and distortions being used to pass Proposition 6 have been used, at one time or another, against numerous groups. They have been used against such ethnic groups as Blacks, the Irish and the Japanese. They have been used against Catholics and Jews. They have been used against teaching evolution and giving women the right to vote. They will be used again and again unless we repeatedly show that we will not be blinded by them. And one place to start is in defeating Proposition 6.

"In Germany, the Nazis came for the Communists and I didn't speak up because I was not a Communist. Then they came for the Jews and I didn't speak up because I was not a Jew. Then they came for the Trade Unionists and I didn't speak up because I was not a Trade Unionist. Then they came for the Catholics and I was a Protestant so I didn't speak up. Then they came for me... By that time there was no one to speak up for anyone."

Rev. Dr. Martin Niemoeller
President World Council of Churches, 1961-1968
Prisoner in concentration camps, 1937-1945

Homosexuals were arrested and required to wear inverted pink triangles in the Nazi concentration camps. It is estimated that over 200,000 were killed in these camps.

STOP PROPOSITION 6 (THE BRIGGS INITIATIVE)
Support the $49.95 grassroots campaign to defeat Prop. 6.
I can volunteer. Phone: ___________ I can donate $_______ □$10 □$25 □$49.95
□ Outreach □ Media/Publicity
□ Fundraising □ Office work
□ Graphics □ Other_________________________________________________________

Signature__________________________________________ Name__________________________

Address______________________________________________________________

I endorse EBACABI/NO ON 6. My name can be used for other anti-Briggs activities.
(Contributions over $50.00 must not be cash and require that you supply the name and address of your employer.)
RETURN TO EBACABI/NO ON 6, 2000 CENTER STREET, SUITE 1221, BERKELEY, CALIF. 94704
Jone Lemos, Treasurer, East Bay Area Committee Against the Briggs Initiative /NO ON 6.
tritium during his efforts to reproduce the experiments of Drs. Stanley Pons and Martin Fleischmann at the University of Utah. Last month, Dr. John Appleby, a chemist from Texas A&M University speaking to the Workshop on Cold Fusion Phenomena at Los Alamos, said, "Tritium *** can only be coming from fusion. That's the bottom line." Other successful experiments producing tritium have been reported in at least a dozen other laboratories around the world, and some experiments have also indicated a burst of neutron radiation, another telltale sign of fusion.

In a dramatic reversal of his earlier findings and his often critical statements about Pons and Fleischmann's research, Dr. Nathan Lewis of the California Institute of Technology recently revealed that his experiments, too, had produced "excess power."

The prospects for cold fusion are looking brighter and brighter and, yesterday, the University of Utah formally announced a collaborative agreement with General Electric on cold fusion.

Drs. Pons and Fleischmann are presently in England at Southampton University, working on a detailed scientific paper which will be released sometime in the next few months, and scaling up their experiments with larger levels and equipment.

I want to communicate to my colleagues that "cold" fusion is alive and well, being performed in increasingly larger jars in laboratories around the world. I have great confidence in Pons and Fleischmann as exceptionally able scientists and men of honesty and dedication. I believe they have discovered something so revolutionary it will yet have major implications for the pursuit of the clean energy that our polluted planet so desperately needs.

Nevertheless, many scientific discoveries have initially met with unreserved praise, and research into cold fusion is no exception. But, like Galileo, branded as a heretic and forced to recant his assertion that the Earth revolves around the Sun, Pons and Fleischmann may yet be able to say, "E pur si muove." And, yet, it does still move.
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HOMOSEXUALITY

(Mr. DANEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, revelations about a male prostitution ring involving officials in the Federal Government shed new light on a very perplexing question of our day. How is it that over the course of this decade undeniably conservative administrations have been used to promote homosexuality.

Fascial wisdom blamed it on the strange bedfellows of politics. As if to say, "This democracy is a government of all the people." But current wisdom now suggests that the "strange bedfellow" answer should be taken more literally.

I urge President Bush to investigate this matter to its fullest and be totally honest with the American people in this very controversial area. We will discover why our national AIDS policy has been turned upside down, why the Federal Government insists on funding homoerotic art, and why such obvious planks of the homosexual agenda, like the "hate crimes bill," is allowed to maintain the cloak of civil rights rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, Guide magazine is one of many publications serving homosexuality in America today. Guide is the self-proclaimed homosexual magazine of the Pacific Northwest.

In November 1987, Guide ran an illuminating article on the Machiavellian tactics of the homosexual movement in their desire to gain social legitimacy. "The first order of business," begin the authors of "The Overhauling of Stigma," "is the desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights."

The authors explain that,

To desensitize the public is to help it view homosexuality with indifference instead of with revulsion. If we have straight register difference in sexual preferences the way they register different tastes for ice cream or sports games.

And with the characteristic candor of a pathologically provincial mind, the authors scheme that,

At least in the beginning, we are seeking public desensitization and nothing more. We do not need and cannot expect a full "appreciation" or "understanding" of homosexuality from the average American. You can forget about trying to persuade the masses that homosexuality is a good thing. But if only you can get them to think that it is not an abomination; if only you win the battle for legal and social rights is virtually won.

This is the key to the politics of the homosexual movement: Attempt to delude the public into viewing homosexuality as an innocuous alternative lifestyle, hopefully to the point where it is viewed as simply being an abstract social question in the minds of most Americans. They are actually asking Americans to believe that a man can be a homosexual without ever committing sodomy or any other intimate physical act with the same sex.

WHAT HOMOSEXUALS DO not want you to know of the behavior that defines their existence. They do not want you to know that the average homosexual has homosexual sex two or three times per week.

This is the average homosexual has 1,000 or more sexual partners in his lifetime.

That the average homosexual has only one sexual encounter per partner and never sees the partner again after the encounter.

These are powerful arguments on their surface. The rhetoric is appealing to our libertarian sensibilities. After all, Millitants homosexuals cringe at the thought of what these graphic images mean to our children. Mind you, most Americans do not view homosexual sodomy in the same light as heterosexual intercourse or even the aberration of heterosexual sodomy. One of the most recent public opinion surveys on the subject found that 81 percent of the public believes that homosexual relations are wrong. (Source: National Opinion Research Center, General Social Survey, Annual.)

BIBLICAL FOUNDATIONS

A majority of Americans still base their moral values on the same book that commands us not to "lie with mankind, as with woman kind" [Leviticus 20:13]. Yet, can we say, "Neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminates, nor abusers of themselves with mankind...shall inherit the kingdom of God." (1 Corinthians 6:9-10) These Americans daily affirm the societal, if not intrinsic, value of the traditional family. They are still the overwhelming majority in our society and our laws reflect this admitted bias.

THE CONSTITUTION AND MAJORITARIAN VALUES

I should take the time at this point to address this issue of bias in the form of majoritarian morality. We should all understand the significance of this American principle. All too often militant homosexuals will insist that one person's values should not be forced upon another person. And that just because a man and woman enjoy sexual relations, it does not mean that two men cannot equally enjoy sodomy, or that sexual intercourse and sodomy should not be equally valued.

"Anyway," they will proclaim, "You can't legislate morality."

These are powerful arguments on their surface. The rhetoric is appeal-
this is America, a land where anyone can do as they wish provided they do no harm to another. These thoughts comprise the homosexual liturgy.

Unfortunately for the homosexual movement, these arguments are spurious and totally void of historical and legal claims of jurisprudence. As recently as 1961, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that "The constitutional right to commit homosexual sodomy" In the case of Bowers versus Hardwick (1986), the Court boldly reaffirmed society's right to enact moral statutes of this nature.

On the one hand, the Court, through the majority concurrence of Chief Justice Warren Burger, explained the historical precedent for such prohibitions of personal conduct. Justice Burger explained that such:

Proscriptions against sodomy have very ancient roots. Decisions of individuals relating to homosexual conduct have been subject to certain restraints throughout the history of western civilization. Condensation of those practices is firmly rooted in Judeo-Christian moral and ethical standards.

Homosexual sodomy was a capital crime under Roman law. During the English Reformation when ecclesiastical courts were transferred to the King’s courts, the first English statute criminalizing sodomy was passed. (In Blackstone’s Legal Commentaries, he) described the infamous crime against nature as an offense of “deeper malignity” than rape, an heinous act “the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature,” and “a crime not fit to be named.”

The common law of England, including its prohibition of sodomy, became the received law of Georgia and the other colonies. In 1816 the Georgia Legislature passed the statute at issue here, and that statute has been continuously in force in one form or another since that time.

Justice Burger concluded his concurrence by adding that, “To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching.”

On the other hand, Justice White in drafting the majority opinion took up the issue of privacy or consensual acts and public morals. Justice White wrote that:

The right pressed upon us here has no (first amendement) support in the text of the Constitution, and it does not qualify for recognition under the prevailing rule for construing the fourteenth amendment. Its limits are also difficult to discern. Plainly enough, otherwise illegal conduct is not always immunized whenever it occurs in the home.

Victimless crimes, such as the possession and use of illegal drugs do not escape the law when committed in the home, and if respondent’s submission is limited to the voluntary sexual conduct between consenting adults, it would be difficult, except by further restrictions, to limit the claimed right of homosexual conduct while leaving exposed to prosecution adultery, incest, and other sexual crimes even though they are committed in the home. We are unwilling to start down that road.

The Justice continues:

Even if the conduct at issue here is not a fundamental right, respondent asserts that there must be a rational basis for the law and that there is none in this case other than the well-entrenched belief of the majority of the electorate in Georgia that homosexual sodomy is immoral and unacceptable. This is said to be an inadequate rationale to support the law.

The law, however, is constantly based on notions of morality, and if all laws representing essentially moral choices are to be invalidated under the due process clause, the courts will be very busy indeed. Even respondent makes no such claim, but insists that majority sentiment about the morality of homosexuality should be declared inadmissible. Respondent is also presumed that the sodomy laws of some twenty-five states should be invalidated on this basis.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS DECEPTION

Lest we be deceived by the language of civil rights today as it relates to homosexuality, I would like to quote from Dr. David Pence, a sixties radical, civil rights marcher, anti-war protester, and now a practicing physician. His insights pierce the homosexual armor: "The road to Selma did not lead to the right to sodomy." Homosexual behavior is a completely different category of activity which cannot be seriously considered even an analogue of race or gender. The freedom train has been hijacked."

By restoring its moral foundation, the civil rights movement will no longer serve the ideologies of the last twenty years but will fulfill the democratic promise of America’s first two centuries.

THE HOMOSEXUALITY

Of course, all the legal and historical precedents in the world would become starkly irrelevant were homosexuals to prove that their behavior was not simply a deviant personal choice or even a psychological orientation. But if they can prove that their behavior is genetic or hereditary or somehow show that it is physiologically determined, then homosexuals may legitimately say that they have no choice in the matter thereby providing impetus to add “sexuality” to the list of protected civil rights.

The genetic explanation of homosexuality is the one that many homosexuals prefer. Most often cited is a study published back in 1952 that analyzed the histories of 37 pairs of identical twins and 26 pairs of fraternal twins and reported that in 100 percent of the cases of identical twins where one twin was homosexual, in the fraternal twins only 12 percent of the cases were both homosexual. (Source: "Comparative Twin Study on the Genetic Aspects of Homosexuality," F.J. Kalman, 1952.)

Subsequent researchers have not been able to replicate the same findings. So what conclusions are we to draw? One writer has summiex that.

No firm conclusion can be drawn from these studies. A higher concordance rate for twins, for example, could be due to genetic factors, but may result from factors such as intense identification or specific practices related to twinship. (Source: "A General Psychiatric Approach to Sexual Deviation," Anthony Wakeling, 1979)

Others have chosen to focus on the effects of hormonal androgens and testosterone to make their case. None of these studies has provided the scientific fruits necessary to lay claim to a homosexual-from-birth principle.

I have found that homosexual activists are simply unwilling to acknowledge the complexity of their own sad plight. They want so desperately to believe they are normal and natural in what they do that they snatch at any theory that seems to support that idea, ignoring the enormous body of opinion among medical clinicians that tells a different and less satisfying tale.

A significant proportion of clinicians actively engaged in treating patients today believe that homosexuality is, in most cases, an abnormal condition and, in some cases, a serious mental disorder. Others in this category believe that it is no more than an alternative way of behaving, like left-handedness. But all reject the idea that homosexual behavior is inherited or instinctual.

THE CRASHING OF THE APA

Militant homosexuals knew that social progression in this environment of diagnostic ambiguity was tentative at best and they became impatient with the APA patient to the point that the politics of diagnosis took a dramatic turn in 1973 when the law was being able to molest the senses of the American Psychiatric Association (APA) into removing homosexuality from the official list of mental illnesses.

I recently read a powerful narrative detailing this occasion. The event has provided fodder for the homosexual movement ever since. The author of the narrative, far from being a so-called homophobe, is an apostle for homosexuality and a political advocate for homosexual movement. (Source: Homosexuality and American Psychiatry, Ronald Bayer.)

In brief, a group of homosexuals at the APA annual convention on successive years in the early seventies and, with deliberately disruptive tactics, actually forced the psychiatrists to accede to their demands and declare homosexuality a normal condition. In effect, the nature of medical opinion was altered by strong-arm tactics. If you doubt that homosexuality should have remained on the APA’s list of mental illnesses, you have only to read this account of how it was removed.

After describing the growing tendency toward disruption and violence in homosexual activism, the author tells us that because the APA convention of 1973 had been so damaging, the homosexual leadership decided to focus their attack on that particular organization. And as he puts it, "guerrilla theater tactics and more straightforward shouting matches characterized their presence."
Panel after panel at the 1970 convention was used by the homosexual to shout expletives and comments like, "where do you stand on Auschwitz?" Each successive annual convention brought more of the same, until by 1973, the association's all-important nomenclature committee determined that, "Homosexual behavior was not necessarily a sign of psychiatric disorder, and that the diagnostic manual should reflect that understanding."

Since the time homosexuality was removed from the official list of mental illnesses in 1973, pedophilia has also been stricken from the list, except when the adult who has intercourse seeks sex from a child, as a sign of psychiatric distress. If the past is any indication of the future, in the next few years what we have known as child molesting will be officially termed a normal variant of human sexuality and its practitioners will successfully argue before a dazed group of psychiatrists that any mention of pedophilia in the profession's diagnostic manual would be cruel and discriminatory.

THE HEALTH OF HOMOSEXUALS

If legal grounds, historical grounds, moral grounds, and medical grounds do not provide enough reasons to quell the homo-hysteria that has been unleashed on the public over the last 30 years, perhaps the health reasons will. Homosexuals are among the most unhealthy of demographic groups. Historically, their bowels have been full of the bulk of enteric diseases in America. Syphilis, gonorrhea, and hepatitis A have all been included in their viral menu. And, of course, AIDS has saturated and nearly decimated their ranks.

Homosexuals and their sympathetic media are quick to point out that exposure to venereal diseases, including AIDS, is a result of behavior modification. But as the voice of experience has told us, there are liars, damn liars, and statisticians.

I sincerely hope that homosexuals have modified their sexual behavior. However this hope and seemingly statistical evidence belies common sense as well as conflicting evidence. We cannot fairly compare apples and oranges. Homosexual claims that venereal diseases have skyrocketed in the heterosexual community while declining among homosexuals misses the point. The comparison that needs to be made is not among promiscuous or illicit heterosexual sex versus homosexual sodomy. We should begin to compare traditional heterosexual sex versus both promiscuous heterosexual sex and homosexual sodomy.

In any case-related physical health of a man and woman who have come together in the bonds of a mutually faithful monogamous marriage versus the sex-related physical health of any other type of sexual relationship. Then, and only then, will we get a true picture what behavior is healthy and what behavior is unhealthy.

As it stands, statistical records allow homosexuals to compete medically with their promiscuous heterosexual counterparts. This is like two alcoholics competing for sobriety. If common sense does not compel a reassessment of how we look at the health of the homosexual community, we are only left to revert to other causes of AIDS. For instance, we examined the records of certain hospitals over a 2-year period and found that 3-4 percent of all cases of gonorrhea were among male homosexuals. The same group was accountable for nearly 60 percent of the cases of AIDS. Other venereal diseases, other than sexually transmitted diseases, homosexuals were accountable for 17 percent. Remember that homosexuals themselves claim they are only 10 percent of the population. In this study anyway, homosexuals represent a percentage of disease far beyond their actual numbers. (Source: "Changes in Sexual Behavior and Incidence of Gonorrhea," Lancet, April 25, 1987.)

Flying in the face of safe sex rhetoric are record-breaking cases of AIDS in San Francisco. The 1988 monthly newsletter San Francisco AIDS Project reported in that city was 133. In March of 1989 the count was an astounding 193 new cases, only to be topped by an April figure of 207 new cases. The city's health services are now pushed to the limit in caring for the sick.

If it's not within the homosexual community it will be other venereal diseases as previously mentioned along with the likes of gay bowel syndrome, a particularly vile grouping of infections attacking the intestinal tract, tuberculosis, and cytomegalovirus.

It is the onset of AIDS and the generality unhealthy lives of homosexuals who have given me insight to their enslaving pathology. They attack morality and virtue at every turn even though these positive characteristics can incite the very behaviors they need to stay healthy and alive. The unavoidable question to be posed is, why do homosexuals continue in their deleterious ways? Perhaps society will never come to a consensus on this question.

HOMOSEXUALS WELL-PLACED TO INFLUENCE SOCIETY

What can be done, however, is the fact that the homosexual movement refuses to be deterred in advancing their cause. Though comparatively few in number, homosexuals are well-placed in society to perpetuate their chosen behavior. Beyond the obvious fields of entertainment, literature and certain creative occupations, they have systematically entered professional fields.

If homosexuals need bias within medicine, they can muster a group of homosexual physicians to add credibility. If homosexuals need bias within public health, they can call on a legion of homosexual bureaucrats, clinicians, and researchers.

If homosexuals need bias within mental health, they will find a motley crew of homosexual psychiatrists at their disposal.

If homosexuals need bias within the legal structure, they can get the proverbial services of a number of homosexual legal firms and foundations.

The thing is, homosexuals are not just in the social sciences, academia provides an endless breeding ground for homosexual apologists.

If homosexuals need bias in the news media, the editorial boards of most of the major media outlets inevitably sprout a homosexual or two.

If homosexuals need bias in politics, they need look no further for political cover than the conclaves of both political parties, especially the Democratic Party.

THE POLITICAL AGENDA

Their social agenda is clear: destigmatize, legitimize, and gain privilege. They say they seek equality, but the very nature of their existence only lends itself to contention as they move their way into the value system of middle America. They argue for some sort of law that they can only achieve through despoticism—forcing Americans to accept homosexual sodomy as they do their own heterosexuality. What begins as a call for equality will naturally lead to a call for privilege.

One activist incited a throng of homosexuals during a march on Washington by proclaiming that:

We are no longer seeking just a right to privacy and a protection from wrong. We also have a right—as heterosexual Americans already have—to see government and society affirm our lives... (October 1987 rally)

At the Federal level of Government, the homosexual movement seeks to:

Amend all Federal civil rights acts, other legislation, and Government controls to prohibit discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations, and public services.

Prohibit the military from excluding homosexuals entrance in the armed services.

Prohibit discrimination in the Federal civil services because of sexual orientation in hiring and promoting.

Encourage Federal funds to support sex education promoting homosexuality.

At the State level of government, they are asking for:

Repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent.

Enactment of legislation so that homosexuals have access to adoption, visitation rights, and foster parenting shall not be denied because of sexual orientation or marital status.

Enactment of legislation prohibiting insurance companies from screening applicants based on their sexual orientation.
Congressional Record — House
June 29, 1989

Repeal of all State sodomy laws. The Democratic Party has wholly incorpored affirmative action policies into their national and State party platforms. Rule 5C of the National Democratic Party by-laws now reads that:

Each State party shall develop and submit party outreach programs for such groups identified (including lesbians and gay men) in their recruitment, education, and training in order to achieve full participation by such groups in the delegate selection process and at all levels of party affairs.

Seventy-three Members of the House of Representatives, 69 Democrats and 4 Republicans, have sponsored a bill to amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act to include sexual preference as a protected civil right. (See appendix A for list of Members.)

The political clout of the homosexual movement can be measured by their high ranking among prosperous political action committees. In 1987, the Human Rights Campaign Fund ranked ninth among independent PAC’s taking in just over $1 million in contributions.

HOMOSEXUAL INFLUENCE IN AIDS POLICY

But this clout is nowhere more present or more intimidating than in the struggle to stop the spread of AIDS. The irony of their position, however, is that they choose every public health strategy designed to impede the progress of the virus. They are opposed to confidential reporting. They prefer to remain anonymous and unaccountable. They are opposed to routine testing. They prefer to remain uninformed and, hence, psychologically protected.

They oppose legal restrictions on the knowing transmission of the virus. They prefer to pass the virus at will if they so choose.

They oppose proscriptions on blood donations. They prefer to be able to donate when and where they wish no matter the risks involved.

They are opposed to contact tracing. They prefer not to run the risk of being embarrassed or held accountable for wanted transmissions.

In sum, homosexuals oppose the very time-tested public health procedures that will save their lives. They prefer to protect their lifestyle rather than protect their lives. This pathology is many. They deny us our right to know and, hence, to live as we wish, and to suffer in our suffering. They are the basis for many diseases, and should still be considered, a mental illness. They remain a walking, public and mental health time-bomb.

HOPE FOR OVERCOMING HOMOSEXUALITY

But homosexuals are not left without hope for a better and healthier life. A majority of doctors and psychologists who have experience with homosexuals every day to reverse this devastating pathology. These professionals are dedicated to the proposition that all homosexuals are able to be helped.

May outreach programs exist to provide homosexual and former homosexuals with support to change and remain changed in their behavior. Some are religious in nature and some are not. These groups include Regeneration in Baltimore, MD, White Stone Ministries in Boston, MA, Dynamics, CA, Life in New York City, Exodus International, headquartered in San Rafael, CA, and Beyond Rejection Ministries, in Orange County, CA. Each of these can provide help for homosexuals and/or victims of AIDS.

CLOSING COMMENTS

In closing, we have allowed the tactics of the militant homosexuals to confuse us because of our sense of fairness, with false scientific data, with litigation in courts at every level, and with threats against the public order—all simultaneously. And instead of responding as a united people, we have either surrendered at the outset or else responded in one of several inappropriate ways.

We have tried to ignore the phenomenon in hopes that it will go away. It won’t. We must either defeat militant homosexuality or it will defeat us. They made it clear: we have no third choice.

May opponents of homosexuality have resorted to name-calling and ridicule, confirming in the eyes of fairminded people that we are as hardhearted as homosexuals say we are. In taking this tactic, we deny the humanity of other children of God and forfeit our right to speak as the true keepers of our Judeo-Christian heritage.

We have also attempted to compromise our principles, reaffirming our opposition to homosexual conduct while arguing that under the Constitution we have no right to forbid them much of what they want. Such tactics, however, fail to recognize the essential soundness of our Constitution and its safeguards. We have to concede a single point to the homosexual movement, so long as we retain our sense of charity and our capacity to love even those who want to destroy the social foundation of America.

Americans are extremely tolerant. We tend to ignore the consensual relationships of adults behind closed doors. However, when that behavior seeks to find the light of day, out among the public, then Americans become concerned. And it is on this point that homosexuals have at least my attention.

As long as I have the pleasure to serve in the U.S. Congress, I will continue to affirm the heterosexual ethic at every turn, with every subtly, with every bit of imagery we can conjure, with the help of good people across this Nation, as well as with the help of a majority of my colleagues in Congress, and also by the grace of God.

DISTRESS OVER ADMINISTRATION CONTACTS WITH PLO

(M. ENGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my dismay and anxiety at the improper nature that the Bush administration has apparently secretly expanded their contacts with the PLO, with the Ambassador, U.S. Ambassador to Tunisia, meeting at least twice in Tunis with the PLO second highest official, Salah Khalaf. State Department officials confirmed this today. Mr. Khalaf is also known as Abu Iyad, and indicted yesterday in Italy for selling PLO guns to the Red Brigade.

Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words, and since the time the PLO purported to recognized Israel’s right to exist, they have committed no less than 8 terrorist attacks against the State of Israel. I certainly think that the plan that Prime Minister Shamir has put forward for the West Bank and Gaza certainly should be met with happiness, and I think that those in the United States should reject this. I think that they really ought to be called to task for it. We ought to make sure they do the things they say they are going to do, instead of secretly expanding contacts with them when all they have done in the Middle East is promote terror and speak out of both sides of their mouth.

INTRODUCTION OF INNOCENT LANDOWNER DEFENSE AMENDMENTS

(M. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, an important part of the legislative process is finetuning laws as so that people understand how they can comply. Today I introduced the Innocent Landowner Defense Amendments of 1989. Designed to make a technical correction to a very confusing provision in the superfund law.

When Congress passed the Sara Amendments in 1986, it added a narrow exemption from the law’s liability. This exemption, known as the innocent landowners defense, has been the subject of considerable debate in the real estate, lending, and environmental communities because no one seems to understand what the conditions for the defense, a phrase requiring a purchaser of commercial real estate to do all appropriate inquiry into the previous uses of the property.

My legislation will address this problem by establishing three basic steps a purchaser should take to satisfy this condition. I am confident the legislation is an evenhanded approach to a very difficult problem. It creates a new exemption from superfund liability. Instead it spells out the rules of the game to the real estate and lending communities and in the process helps to fulfill